United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 104th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 141 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MAY 24, 1995 No. 87

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

We pray, gracious God, that we will not be content simply to follow old paths and repeat meaningless patterns, but that our hearts and minds would be open to new adventures and new opportunities of service. May Your good Spirit breathe into our souls a freshness that cleanses our ideas, our hopes, and our dreams and may we truly look to Your guidance for the days ahead. Teach us to grow in Your grace and trust in Your goodness, this day and every day. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONES] come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. JONES led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

> I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one Nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER RELATIVE TO FLOOR PRIVILEGES OF FORMER MEMBERS

The SPEAKER. On June 9, 1994, Speaker Foley reminded former Members of the prohibition of clause 3 of rule XXXII against former Members obtaining floor privileges during the pendency of a matter in which they have a personal or pecuniary interest, emphasizing that the test for whether the rule is being violated is the former Member's status as one with a personal or pecuniary interest rather than their intent to lobby. On that occasion Speaker Foley also admonished former Members from importuning the doorkeepers to waive the restrictions of the rule, since the Chair may not even recognize a unanimous-consent request to do so.

The Chair is taking this opportunity to reiterate the guidelines first announced by Speaker O'Neill under clause 3 of rule XXXII on January 6, 1977, and again on June 7, 1978, and by Speaker Foley last year in order to discourage former Members from attempting to exercise their limited floor privileges when they find themselves under this restriction and to remind former Members that the prohibition extends beyond the floor to rooms leading thereto, such as the Speaker's lobby and the respective Cloakrooms.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER RELATIVE TO 1-MINUTES

The SPEAKER. The Chair will take 20 1-minutes on each side.

VINE AND WINE

(Mrs. SEASTRAND asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. SEASTRAND. Mr. Speaker, over the last 30 years, the Federal Government has become far too generous with the taxpayer's money. Washington bureaucrats not satisfied with wasting money on domestic programs find new and inventive ways to waste it in other countries.

Here are a few examples of what I am talking about: The International Institute for the Unification of Private Law, the International Office of Vine and Wine, the Permanent International Association of Road Congresses, the Colombo Plan Council for Technical Cooperation, and the International Natural Rubber Study Organization.

All of these programs have two things in common: They are funded by the American taxpayer and they need desperately to be unfunded by the American taxpayer.

Mr. Speaker, we realize that the Federal Government cannot continue spending money as if there were no tomorrow, and we can no longer afford overseas extravagance. It is time to streamline bureaucracy and eliminate the proliferation of silly named programs that have no real purpose and no real need to exist. The American Overseas Interests Act will reduce our monetary aid commitments overseas to one percent of the Federal budget, much more in line with what the American people want us to do in this Congress.

HOUSE REPUBLICANS FAVOR TAX CUTS FOR WEALTHY

(Mr. GEPHARDT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, now that the Republicans have forced their budget resolution through this House, it is easy to get lost in a sea of numbers and statistics—to forget about the impact this trickle-down travesty will have on the hard-working people of America.

But I cannot forget—because every time I walk the streets of my district in St. Louis, I meet the people who stand to lose health care benefits, pension benefits, and student loans—all to pay for a tax cut for the wealthy that is so unfair, so unnecessary, so

Printed on recycled paper containing 100% post consumer waste

unaffordable that even a Republican Senate rejected it.

This is a picture of Shawn D'Abreu, a student at Webster University in St. Louis. He depends on student loans, as well as college grants and a part-time job, to pay his way through college. To lose any part of his financial aid package could put Shawn's college career in jeopardy, forcing him to delay his degree, or find some source of outside income to make up the difference.

Under the new Republican budget plan, Shawn would have his student loan cut by about $5,000. That is a cut he simply cannot afford to sustain.

If you ask me, a budget that sacrifices Shawn's college education to line the pockets of the wealthy is a dangerous reversal of priorities. The Republicans want to let billionaires renounce their citizenship and pay no taxes. But Shawn, who is the very future of this country, gets stuck with the bill.

That is what the Republicans voted for—tax cuts for the wealthy, and student loan cuts for struggling young people like Shawn. If you ask me, the Senate had it right: That kind of reckless redistribution of income is just plain wrong, and has no place in the United States of America.

HOUSE REPUBLICANS FAVOR FISCAL SANITY

(Mr. HAYWORTH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, once again the distinguished minority leader has given us ample evidence as to why my friends on the other side of the aisle will remain in the minority. I am sorry I did not blow up this picture as did the distinguished minority leader, but I have here a picture of my three children.

My oldest daughter is Nicole. She is preparing to go to Arizona State University and Nicole is very interested in getting a student loan. But Nicole is happy to step up and pay an extra 68 cents a day if it will help us restore fiscal sanity in this country.

To my friends on the other side of the aisle, again I appeal to you, please quit trying to play this baseless class warfare game. Put your shoulder to the wheel and help us govern, because this is not about redistribution of wealth, this is about saving a republic from fiscal disaster, and it is incumbent upon all of us to answer this clarion call to save this country, including students willing to pay an additional 68 cents a day because that is the average they would pay in an increase on their student loan.

HEART SURGERY IN THE OTHER BODY

(Mr. DOGGETT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, perhaps my colleague from Arizona had best direct his remarks to his Republican colleagues in the U.S. Senate. You see, yesterday they did a little heart surgery over in the U.S. Senate. Yes, my colleague from Texas, PHIL GRAMM, said the heart, the very heart of this budget resolution was a tax cut for the privileged.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BONILLA). The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, is it appropriate under the rules to address specific actions taken in the other body?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair advises Members that they should avoid references to Members of the other body.

Mr. DOGGETT. Yesterday the U.S. Senate chose to perform heart surgery. Sixty-nine Members, including 23 Republicans in that body, decided to remove from the budget resolution any tax cut for the privileged. That is good news for Americans. We are still not there. We still do not have a reasonable budget resolution, but the fact that that heart surgery occurred over there in the Senate with joint bipartisan participation to add some reason to the budget resolution speaks volumes for Medicare recipients, speaks volumes for young people in this country, certainly speaks to the needs of Tina Henderson and her daughter Erica in my district who stand to lose substantially on student loans and student assistance, if the budget resolution the House passed is ever written into law.

CONGRESS ACTS TO OVERHAUL FOREIGN AID POLICY

(Mr. JONES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, this week, Congress has the opportunity to vote on legislation which would put American interests first. The American Overseas Interests Act overhauls our Nation's foreign aid policy to reflect our foreign policy and national security interests in the 1990's, not the 1950's. It defends our national security and supports our trade and economic interests while balancing the budget for our children's future.

We draw a line between offering a helping hand to countries which support us and countries who choose to work against our interests. We send a bold statement to our enemies by cutting off funds to countries that spy on us, provide weapons to terrorist states and consistently vote against us in the United Nations.

Most importantly, it eliminates three foreign policy agencies and cuts foreign aid spending by nearly $1 billion. Finally, it sends a message to neighbors around the world that we know ''we cannot buy friendship.''

REPUBLICANS TO STUDENTS: NEED HELP? FORGET IT

(Mr. GONZALEZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, America is the place that invented mass education, and that is one thing that made this the great country that it is.

For the past 50 years, great programs like the GI bill and the Student Loan Program have opened the doors of opportunity to generations of kids from poor, struggling families. The strongest, richest, most progressive regions in America are those regions where a fine education is within the reach of every worthy student, no matter how poor that student might be.

One would think that with millions of success stories, and one would think that with all the lessons of history, the Republicans would conclude that education ought to get a very high priority.

Nope. The Republicans want to strangle very form of student aid. They want to add thousands of dollars to the cost of student loans, and make deep cuts in every other kind of student aid. Hundreds of thousands of deserving kids will find it impossible to afford a good college education.

In my district alone there are almost 33,000 students who need student loans to make it through school. Losing the interest rate benefit will cost them millions of dollars. Since my district is among the Nation's poorest, many of those kids will lose their best chance for a decent life.

The Republican message to them is that hard work and studious habits do not pay. The Republican message to the 50 per cent of kids who need help to go to college is forget it. As a social policy it is tragic. As an economic policy, it is foolish. Our Government has assisted education as a high priority since the Northwest Ordinance of 1789. George Washington must be embarrassed to see the Republican budget.

IN SUPPORT OF THE AMERICAN OVERSEAS INTERESTS ACT

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on International Relations, under the excellent leadership of our chairman, BEN GILMAN, has brought to the floor a bill that combines wise policy guidance with sound fiscal discipline.

The bill represents a substantial cutback in the level of discretionary spending proposed by the administration in its 1996 budget request.

It is fair that the foreign affairs programs of this Government join with the domestic programs in making the sacrifices that are necessary to bring our Federal budget into balance by the year 2002.

It is the administration's responsibility to manage the program entrusted

to it so that these cutbacks in funding levels produce a leaner and more effective set of programs.

I am convinced that with better management and more cost-consciousness, these cuts can be absorbed without major harm to our overseas interests.

We have allowed the Administration a great deal of management flexibility to make these program changes.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the chairman for the responsible bill he has brought to the floor and urge its adoption.

THE AMERICAN WORKER

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, Boeing Corp. needs profits. So guess what? Boeing will get rid of 12,000 workers. That is right. The new American economy: Companies need profits, companies get rid of American workers, companies make more money, Government says, companies are strong, Government says the economy is improving.

Beam me up. In the words of Larry, Moe, and Curly, thank God for Ronald McDonald, ladies and gentlemen. These companies are lean and mean all right, but the problem is the American workers have liens on their homes, without means to pay the mortgages.

Where do we go from here? Four fifty an hour. Congress, Ronald McDonald does not have enough jobs to take care of the American workers' problems in this country. Congress better take a look at this new economy because there is not a job left. I only pray to God that these companies do not have a record year; do you know what I mean?

□ 1015

CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM MEASURES

(Mr. CLINGER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Speaker, the American people are sick and tired of lopsided elections that allow politicians to return to office year after year regardless of their performance. The overwhelming reelection advantages of incumbents have left many American voters feeling that entrenched politicians are rarely held accountable to those they represent.

Many frustrated Americans have identified term limits as a way of bringing Government closer to the people, but the term limits movement has been put on hold after its defeat in the House and the Supreme Court decision handed down this week.

If the 104th Congress wants to address the heart of the public's concerns, we must adopt real campaign finance reform that improves the competitiveness of congressional races.

Today, I am reintroducing a series of bills designed to level the playing field between incumbent and challenger. My four bills would reduce the influence of special interest PAC's, ban leadership PAC's, reinstate the tax credit for in-State contributors, and require that residents of a candidate's district account for a clear majority of the candidate's contributions.

If my colleagues want to restore public confidence in the election process, improve membership turnover, and ensure elected representatives are held more accountable to their constituents. I invite them to join me in cosponsoring these campaign finance reform measures.

ETHICS COMMITTEE ACTION LOOKS LIKE A POLITICAL COVERUP

(Mr. POMEROY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, when ethics charges are filed against a Member, the public has the right to have the absolute assurance that the charges are investigated and appropriate action taken. Appropriate action, as I see it, could even include dismissal of the charges and sanctions against those who filed the charges if they were found to be frivolous and malicious.

I, therefore, cannot understand why the Ethics Committee, on a party line vote, rejected the call for an outside counsel to investigate the charges currently pending against the Speaker of the House, the gentleman from Georgia, NEWT GINGRICH. If the charges are frivolous, no action could dispel the stigma which presently exists more clearly. If the charges are serious, then each of us, regardless of party, ought to support the appropriate handling of them.

In the meantime, the public is thinking, I believe, if there is nothing to hide, what is the problem with an outside counsel. Instead, the Ethics Committee action to date begins to look like a political coverup of serious charges. We will not restore confidence in Government if this troubling problem continues to exist.

MEMBERS URGED TO SUPPORT THE AMERICAN OVERSEAS INTERESTS ACT

(Mr. GILMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, the House today is scheduled to continue our work on the American Overseas Interests Act—a bill designed to reform and reorganize and downsize our Nation's foreign affairs operations so that we can better serve our international interests in the years ahead.

This bill cuts foreign aid spending by $3 billion over 2 years and $21 billion over 7 years, while serving our national security needs and international economic interests, and providing humanitarian assistance for people who have been hit by disaster and cannot provide for themselves.

By maintaining support for the Camp David accords, we are signaling the opponents of peace in the Middle East as well as radical fundamentalists working to undermine other countries in the Middle East that are friendly to the United States, that our resolve to stay the course remains firm.

Our international relations measure punishes our adversaries by cutting off aid to countries that provide weapons to terrorist states and that consistently vote against us in the United Nations.

It is a sound bill, in the interests of Government reform. I urge my colleagues to support it.

A 1988 QUOTATION BY THE CURRENT SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE

(Mr. GUTIERREZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, I would like to explain why the Speaker's alleged ethics violations require a full and thorough investigation.

But, I do not think I can say anything original.

Someone already said it best 7 years ago here on the House floor.

Let me first read the quote from 1988, and then you guess who said it.

I quote:

> The rules normally applied by the Ethics Committee to an investigation of a typical Member are insufficient in an investigation of the Speaker of the House * * * the second-most powerful elected position in America. Clearly this investigation has to meet a higher standard of public accountability * * * the integrity of the House is at stake.

OK—who said it? Sound familiar?

Well, here is a hint—he is from Georgia.

And, he has got a big office.

Yes, the speaker of that quote is the current Speaker of the House: Congressman NEWT GINGRICH.

Well, here is a chance for the Speaker to put his money where his mouth is—or, at least, where it was.

Simply ask your hand-picked Ethics Committee to select an outside counsel with broad powers, just as you wanted in 1988.

The moral is this: You have to live by the words you speak, even when you are the Speaker.

EIGHTY-ONE PERCENT OF AMERICANS WANT DRAMATIC CUTS IN FOREIGN AID

(Mr. BAKER of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BAKER of California. Mr. Speaker, while the liberal Democrats are attacking the Speaker of the House, we are going to go on and change the government because the people last November demanded change. They want changes in foreign aid. The liberal establishment here in Washington is not real fond of change. They do not approve of things like balanced budgets or fiscal responsibility. For years, now, liberals and Washington bureaucrats have made piles of money of the American taxpayer.

Last November, Americans clearly rejected the status quo here in Washington. They rejected deficit spending, and they told Congress to balance their budget and end the bureaucratic spending spree.

This week, Congress will have a chance to make some fundamental changes in our foreign assistance programs. We will scale back foreign aid and eliminate wasteful agencies. Clearly this is an opportunity to dramatically restructure international involvement, making it more accountable to the American taxpayers and more responsive to American interests.

Less than 10 percent cut this year in foreign aid. That is disgraceful. It is not even hors d'oeuvres. Placing AID under the State Department is like giving your mother to the post office. This bill needs work. Eighty-one percent of the American people want dramatic cuts in foreign aid, and we have not done it. This bill is just the beginning. When it goes to conference, this bill needs tremendous cuts.

PLEASE DO NOT CUT FUNDING FOR EDUCATION: IT IS AMERICA'S FUTURE

(Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to object to the budget put forth by the majority Republicans as it relates to education cuts. The majority Republicans have been saying for the past few weeks that their budget is one for the children of America.

Honestly, Mr. Speaker, their drastic budget cut slams the door in the face of our children. Many young people today see education as their only way to become part of the middle class, and they are right. If we cut title I funding, if we cut bilingual funding, if we cut national service assistance, if we cut student loans, if we cut job training, where are they going to get the education and training they need to earn a decent income and become taxpaying citizens?

It does not save taxes next century by cutting education today. Our children will not have a job in the next century to pay taxes if they do not have access to a good education today.

Mr. Speaker, I am particularly concerned about the elimination of bilingual education in the Republican budget. These two children in this picture are from the Love Elementary School in the Heights area of Houston. Love has an incredible success rate in the bilingual program at their school The children are learning English, they are excelling in their studies, and the program works. The students are continuing into junior and senior high. But, they will not if we pass the Republican budget because it cuts education funding.

CHINA SHOULD NOT HAVE MOST-FAVORED-NATION STATUS

(Mr. WOLF asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I suspect that when we are gone, the administration will announce they are going to give China MFN. We should know several things: one, persecution has increased. Catholic priests have been arrested; on Easter Monday a Catholic priest was taken away. On Maundy Thursday they raided a house church. Violations of human rights have increased. The Gulags have increased. Most of the people watching this today are wearing clothing made perhaps in Gulags, but since that time, we have found out two additional things. We now know conclusively that they are shooting 25-year-old men and taking their kidneys and selling them for $25,000. We have conclusive proof. I urge anyone who wants to see it to come to my office and I will show them.

The, last week, we found out in Chinese hospitals they are selling aborted fetuses, aborted babies, for food to eat. When this Congress has an opportunity to vote on MFN, I ask Members to think in terms, do they want to give a country like that MFN when they are selling aborted babies for eating and killing people for kidney transplants? These are the things that the Nazis did, and we would never give MFN to Nazi Germany.

REPUBLICANS SHOULD NOT CUT THE STUDENT LOAN PROGRAM

(Mr. OLVER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Speaker, I have studied the Republican budget. I have seen the charts and the graphs. I have seen the Republicans cut student loans with one hand to give a huge tax cut to the wealthiest Americans with the other hand.

Carissa Guertin of Fitchburg State College in Massachusetts has seen it, too. She says student loan cuts might take her out of college. Carissa writes, and I quote:

> I am the first in my family to actually go to college. Without student aid, I will be forced to quit college and try to get a job without a degree. This may cause me to add to the growing number of welfare recipients. I might have to become one. I do not see how student aid cuts will help our economy at all in the long run.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with Carissa.

A FRIENDLY WAGER: THE HOUSTON ROCKETS VERSUS THE SPURS

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I fought against student loan cuts, but today I ask for a moment of personal privilege. As spring proceeds, Mr. Speaker, many say that the hearts of Americans turn to the boys of summer. Mr. Speaker, the hearts of Texans turn to the boys of the B-ball; that is basketball.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, who I understand is from San Antonio, a friendly wager is in order. That is that the Houston Rockets will take this series in 7. I wonder, does the Speaker have the right stuff to accept this wager, the loser having to provide reasonable penalty for the loss to our respective constituents. I wonder, does he have the right stuff to accept this wager?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BONILLA). If the gentlewoman will yield, I thank her, and I would like to say I accept the challenge with great enthusiasm, and I am sure that my fellow Texan shares the pride that we all have in our State in watching two Texas teams battle it out to represents the West in the NBA finals.

I, as a Spurs ticket holder for many years, will be rooting with my heart and soul for the San Antonio Spurs, and I know the gentlewoman will be doing the same for the Houston Rockets, but regardless of who wins, I am sure that she shares my pride in knowing that there will be a Texas team represented in the NBA finals.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. We are on, Mr. Speaker.

FOREIGN AID

(Mrs. WALDHOLTZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. WALDHOLTZ. Mr. Speaker, speaking as a jazz fan, wait until next year. But today, we will continue debating the American Overseas Act. This act takes bold steps to downsize the Federal bureaucracy, and at the same time make the United States more responsive to a rapidly changing world.

Critics of this bill have said that this is America turning inward, withdrawing from the rest of the world. In fact, however, this is America opening its eyes and squarely facing both our need to balance the budget and to respond to a very different and changing world. Our foreign affairs agencies were created during the cold war, when we had

to work to outbid the Soviet Union to buy friends abroad. Now, in a new post-cold-war world that is fundamentally different from the old one, our foreign affairs apparatus is too big and outdated.

The American Overseas Interest Act will overhaul the foreign aid bureaucracy by merging three independent agencies into the State Department, eliminating outdated bureaucracies, and doing away with conflicting and divisive foreign policy. I urge my colleagues to vote for this bill, and vote for eliminating bureaucracy and streamlining foreign policy. We need foreign policy for the nineties, not for the fifties.

□ 1030

DR. FOSTER DESERVING OF SUPPORT FOR SURGEON GENERAL POSITION

(Mr. HILLIARD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of Dr. Henry Foster's nomination for the position of Surgeon General. Dr. Foster's credentials are impeccable. In my opinion, his background symbolizes the type of doctor we are seeking to fill this important position.

Throughout his career, Dr. Foster has immersed himself in alleviating two of our Nation's biggest problems, the crisis of teen pregnancy, and the tragedy of drug abuse. Teen pregnancy and drug abuse are perhaps the biggest factors in the high school dropout rate today, not to mention the crime, poverty, and child abuse that is rampant throughout our Nation. It is commendable that Dr. Foster has recognized this, and taken the time to reach out to the teenagers in his community and across the country.

I am offended by the way the radical right of this country and in this Congress have treated Dr. Foster. They are playing politics with a good man's life, and I object.

Dr. Henry Foster exemplifies the strong values and innovative thinking that this country needs in a leader, especially now during these difficult times. I ask that my colleagues in the Senate please bring the Foster nomination to the floor, and vote to confirm his appointment.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BONILLA). The Chair reminds Members that they should not refer to the confirmation process in the Senate in their remarks here in the House.

CRUEL CUTS IN STUDENT FINANCIAL AID

(Mr. DEFAZIO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor because I heard an extraordinary exchange earlier between the Democratic leader, who justly slammed the Republicans' budget for its cuts in student loans and grants that will add $5,000 to the debt burden of the typical financial aid student graduating from college in future years for families that earn less than $75,000 a year. A Republican freshman rose on the other side to say he would sacrifice for the sake of his daughter, he would take those financial aid cuts for the sake of his daughter.

Well, I have got news for him. He earns $133,000 a year as a Member of Congress. He had a successful career as a sportscaster. His daughter does not need help to go to college, but millions of other American kids do who come from families of modest means, and he is stomping on their fingers as they try and reach that first rung of the ladder to climb up to the success that we all strive for in this country.

These cuts are cruel and they fall only on families who earn less than $75,000 a year. That is the Republican budget's answer for student financial aid.

CUTS IN STUDENT LOAN PROGRAM AFFECT AVERAGE AMERICANS

(Mr. FLAKE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning to bring attention to the dramatic real-life effects that the proposed cuts to Federal student loan programs and the elimination of the Department of Education will have on average Americans.

I am one of 13 children born to parents of fifth and sixth grade educations. For families like mine and maybe even others, more importantly for the millions of middle-class taxpayers, the American dream of education and improving their lives for the next generation will be just that, a dream.

On Saturday I received my doctor-of-ministry degree. For the most part I earned my degree because of my personal commitment to self-improvement and self-responsibility and the fact that somebody along the way cared about my future.

Without the National Defense Student Loan Program, I would not have even had the opportunity to go to college in the first place. It was a loan. I paid it back. Others will do the same thing if given the opportunity.

We must be mindful that even with all of our ivory tower exhortations about the virtues we hold dear, somebody out there in real life places outside of Washington needs a helping hand. We should care enough, even if nobody else does, to help them to make their American dream come true by getting the best education they can. We can do it by maintaining student support.

STUDENT LOANS

(Ms. VELÁZQUEZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, let me tell you about a letter I recently received from Maria Casillas. Maria lives in my district and writes:

> Cuts in student aid just don't make sense. Student aid actually saves taxpayers money by stimulating economic growth and increasing productivity. Student aid is important to me because it gives me the opportunity to get a better education than my mother or grandmother had. I work hard in school to get good grades and without financial aid, I could not afford college.

Maria wants to go to college and without Federal funding for student loans, she will not have the opportunity to do so. We cannot afford to squander our human resources. Let us invest in the future of our country. Let us provide Maria and young men and women like her with the educational opportunity they deserve. Let us do what is right for the people of this Nation, not what is right for the privileged few.

CALL FOR SPECIAL COUNSEL IN SPEAKER'S ETHICS CASE

(Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is common knowledge today that the Republican members of the Ethics Committee defeated a motion to appoint a special counsel to look into the complaints against the Speaker of the House, NEWT GINGRICH. I am disheartened by this action, and I know many of my colleagues as well as public interest groups share my feelings.

Mr. Speaker, I call on you now to do what is right. Release the Republican members from their obligation to vote in lockstep. These are men and women of conscience for whom the vote consequence is beyond any inquiry into your actions.

Rise up and meet the appropriate precedent of the past. Permit the committee and this House to conduct a fair and formal investigation through the vehicle of a special counsel. Anything less falls short of your moral obligation and our collective responsibility to the public. As quoted by Al Hunt in today's Wall Street Journal, there is no way that the House of Representatives is going to achieve any credibility unless they go to an outside counsel.

Mr. Speaker, if you have no fear of the truth, do the right thing.

UNITED STATES-JAPAN AUTO DISPUTE

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, as the New York Times recently reported, it is a steep, nearly insurmountable uphill journey to Japan for United States autos and auto parts. It is also an expensive journey, as rigged prices in Japan serve as significant nontariff barriers to higher sales of our goods in that country.

In my hometown of Toledo, OH, the world-renowned Jeep Cherokee is manufactured having a factory price of $19,100. By the time that Jeep Cherokee clears customs, passes through Japan's Byzantine distribution system, is checked for compliance with 238 regulations and is inspected in no less than 3 places, the sticker price of the same Jeep Cherokee in Nagoya is $31,372, a 52-percent markup.

Japan claims to be one of the world's greatest competitors. This label seems to be true in every market except their own. The Clinton administration is right to keep its foot on the accelerator of the unfair trade practices of Japan.

Open up your market, Japan. It is long overdue.

MEDICARE REFORM

(Mr. KINGSTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, even though the third largest expenditure of the national budget is the interest on the national debt, there are still Members of Congress and the Senate and the administration who are debating the need to balance our budget. I think this is clearly irresponsible, particularly in view of what we want to do for the future of America, for the future of children, students, senior citizens and so forth.

These same people are debating the need to change Medicare, even though the administration has told us that Medicare is going to be out of money and broke within 6 years. The Republican Party is trying to transform Medicare. If you want to help senior citizens, you need to save Medicare.

We are working on insurance reform, trying to make insurance more affordable and more accessible. We are working on some Medicare options so that senior citizens can keep their choice of doctors, so senior citizens can join a health maintenance organization if they choose to, if they can get better care.

We are trying to cut down on the fraud and abuse in the Medicare system which has driven up the price of it. The average cost payout has gone from $4,700 to $6,300. I hope that the Democrats will join the Republicans in trying to save Medicare rather than partisan grandstanding.

MEDICARE AND THE FEDERAL BUDGET

(Mr. FORD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in reference to the budget that is before the House and the Senate, and to say as we look toward the Medicare cuts that many of the new Republican majority in the House have indicated that they want these Medicare cuts for the purposes of giving huge tax cuts to the well-to-do in America. I think when we look around and we really study what these Medicare cuts are all about, $289 billion, we are basically saying that we are going to increase those premiums on the elderly population of this Nation, those recipients of Medicare.

Yes, we ought to reform Medicare. Sure, we ought to look at some type of national health care plan for this country. Sure, those things should happen. But to say like the new Republican majority that we want to cut the Medicare Program for the well-to-do in America, to give them a tax cut, that is wrong, it is mean to the elderly.

We should not let that happen. We ought to take the budget that we have before this House and the Senate and move over the next 7, 8 to 10 years to try to bring about a balanced budget, but let us not do it with the elderly population and the Medicare Program.

PERMISSION FOR CERTAIN COMMITTEES AND SUBCOMMITTEES TO SIT DURING 5-MINUTE RULE

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the following committees and their subcommittees be permitted to sit today while the House is meeting in the Committee of the Whole House under the 5-minute rule:

Committee on Agriculture; Committee on Banking and Financial Services; Committee on Commerce; Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities; Committee on Government Reform and Oversight; Committee on the Judiciary; Committee on National Security; Committee on Resources; and Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the minority has been consulted and that there is no objection to these requests.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I do not intend to object, the majority has consulted with our ranking members on these requests and we have no objection.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

AMERICAN OVERSEAS INTERESTS ACT OF 1995

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 155 and rule XXIII, the chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 1561.

□ 1043

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 1561) to consolidate the foreign affairs agencies of the United States; to authorize appropriations for the Department of State and related agencies for fiscal year 1996 and 1997; to responsibly reduce the authorizations of appropriations for United States foreign assistance programs for fiscal years 1996 and 1997, and for other purposes, with Mr. GOODLATTE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Tuesday, May 23, 1995, amendment No. 10, offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON], had been disposed of and the bill was open for amendment at any point.

Eight hours and ten minutes remain for consideration of amendments under the 5-minute rule.

Are there further amendments to the bill:

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Smith of New Jersey: In title XXI (relating to authorization of appropriations for Department of State and certain international affairs functions and activities) insert at the end the following new chapter.

CHAPTER 2—GENERAL LIMITATIONS

SEC. 2121. PROHIBITION ON FUNDING FOR ABORTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of law or of this Act, none of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act for population assistance activities are authorized to be available for any private, nongovernmental, or multilateral organization that, directly or through a subcontractor or subgrantee, performs abortions in any foreign country, except where the life of the mother would be endangered if the fetus were carried to term or in cases of forcible rape or incest.

(2) Paragraph (1) may not be construed to apply to the treatment of injuries or illnesses caused by legal or illegal abortions or to assistance provided directly to the government of a country.

(b) LIMITATION ON LOBBYING ACTIVITIES.—(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of law or of this Act, none of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act for population assistance activities are authorized to be available for any private, nongovernmental, or multilateral organization that

violates the laws of any foreign country concerning the circumstances under which abortion is permitted, regulated, or prohibited, or that engages in any activity or effort to alter the laws or governmental policies of any foreign country concerning the circumstances under which abortion is permitted, regulated, or prohibited.

(2) Paragraph (1) shall not apply to activities in opposition to coercive abortion or involuntary sterilizations.

SEC. 2122, PROHIBITION ON FUNDING FOR COERCIVE POPULATION CONTROL METHODS.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law or of this Act, none of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act are authorized to be available for the United National Population Fund (UNFPA), unless the President certifies to the appropriate congressional committees that—

(a) the United Nations Population Fund has terminated all activities in the People's Republic of China; or

(b) during the 12 months preceding such certification there have been no abortions as the result of coercion associated with the family planning policies of the national government or other government entities within the People's Republic of China. As used in this section the term ''coercion'' includes physical duress or abuse, destruction or confiscation of property, loss of means of livelihood, or severe psychological pressure.

In section 2102(b)(2)(F), delete subsections (iii), (iv), and (v).

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, while the pro-life anti-abortion policies I seek to reinstate in our foreign aid population control programs are not new, recent experience suggests that these pro-life provisions are needed now more than ever before. In recent months, the Government-imposed nightmare of forced abortion and involuntary sterilization in the People's Republic of China has taken yet another turn for the worse.

□ 1045

In February of this year the Government announced a new intensified campaign against women who attempt to have a child without explicit government permission. According to Steven Mosher, the Director of the Asian Studies Center, Claremont Institute, ''China's population control policy, which is without question the most coercive in the world, is about to become more so.'' Mr. Mosher explains on February 14 the Chinese Government announced a new campaign designed to ensure what Mr. Mosher termed as the most rigorous enforcement of its 16-year-old one child per couple policy.

By now I think, Mr. Chairman, most people are aware of the fact that brothers and sisters are illegal in China, and the one child per couple policy instituted in 1979 relies heavily on forced abortion and forced sterilizations to achieve its results. Forced abortion, Mr. Chairman, is a crime against humanity. This House has gone on record on two occasions to condemn it as a crime against humanity, and we recognized in those resolutions that just as in the Nuremberg war crimes tribunals forced abortion against Polish women was construed to be a crime against humanity, forced abortions in China likewise is such a crime, and sadly it is on the rise in China and sadly as well the U.N. Population Fund is supporting the program to the hilt.

Arrogant leaders, Mr. Chairman, in Beijing have decreed that children should not be born, and the population control cadres march off in lockstep to ensure that millions of women every year are shamelessly violated and their children are poisoned and dismembered.

Last week the Subcommittee on International Operations and Human Rights which I chair heard expert testimony from Dr. John Aird, the former research specialist on China at the United States Census Bureau. Dr. Aird, who is an advocate of abortion rights, who does not support my view on the right to life, nevertheless testified that the brutal, and I quote, ''1991 crackdown is continuing.'' And he also pointed out that it took a turn for the worse in February, and I quote that, ''contrary to the claims of some apologists for the Chinese program, it continues to rely on coercive measures to achieve its objective.'' He also pointed out in his testimony that the Clinton administration's resumption of funding for the U.N. Population Fund was seen by the Chinese Government as a ''retreat on the coercion issue and indeed that is what it was.''

Mr. Chairman, a retreat on coercion is a retreat on human rights. It is a retreat and abandonment of women who are exploited by their government with international organizations joining in and it is a retreat from the protection and the advocacy of children.

The language in the bill now, Mr. Chairman, and the substitute that will be offered by the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA], would codify that retreat by paying lipservice to concerns about coercion, all the while facilitating U.S. taxpayer funds to the U.N. Population Fund, which unapologetically applauds the Chinese program. Make no mistake about it, the substitute will allow the money to get there and adds some language that looks good. It is form without substance.

Let me remind Members that the U.N. Population Fund cannot say enough good things about the Chinese program. In 1989, even when many abortion advocates in Congress had come to recognize the widespread coercion in China, Dr. Sadig, the executive director of UNFPA, continued to defend the programs as she does today, but she said at that time, ''the UNFPA firmly believes, and so does the Government of the People's Republic of China, that their program is a totally voluntary program.'' She also said that China has—and she gushed with this—''has every reason to feel proud of and pleased with its remarkable achievements made in its family planning policy, and control of its population.''

''Now the country,'' she goes on to say, ''could offer its experiences and special experts to help other countries.'' God forbid that that happen, that the Chinese policy, which has pervasive use of forced abortion and forced sterilizations, be exported to other countries to impose that kind of exploitation on women.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, these kinds of statements make a mockery of human rights and the idea that the UNFPA says over and over again that the Chinese program is voluntary does not comport with reality. It is a whitewash of very, very, serious crimes.

A police state, I would submit, could not ask for a better front. If the U.N. Population Fund was fronting for international terrorists or perhaps a drug cartel, we would not hesitate for a moment in redirecting U.S. taxpayer funds to more worthy recipients, which is exactly what Presidents Reagan and Bush had done when they were in office. They, like me and like many Members of Congress, believe that fronting for crimes against women and children is unconscionable.

Mr. Chairman, just let me remind Members, and Mr. Mosher and others have pointed this out—and again, he is the one who broke the story back in the early 1980's—in China today women who have an unauthorized birth, because again the government tells you when and if you can have that child. And you are only allowed one, they tell you when and if, and if you fight that, women are arrested, they are taken to abortion clinics in handcuffs, and they are tied up and they are forcibly aborted.

Pregnant women are routinely incarcerated, embarrassed until they acquiesce and make the voluntary decision because they have nowhere else to turn. It is not voluntary, it is coercion. They are forced to attend study sessions away from their families until they agree to have abortions. They are forced to carry out sterilizations without their consent. Infants' skulls are crushed, very often late in the term of the pregnancy as a routine. Often when children are being born to a woman who has an unauthorized child she is carrying. Can you imagine it, a country where children are illegal? And here we have—often have the injecting of iodine, alcohol, or formaldehyde into the cranium of the child as the child is emerging from the womb.

Also, Amnesty International just came to us with a chilling report on

how two villages are being focused upon because they refuse to comply, and their homes have been bulldozed, their women have been raped, and there has been torture to get compliance with forced abortions and with the one-child-per-couple policy.

There is also the issue of missing girls, a whole generation of girls, and you are only allowed one. Particularly in the Chinese culture, very often boys are the preference, and that is just the way they do it, but girls are screened out by way of an ultrasound or some other way, and they are killed because they are only allowed one, and the families say if they are only allowed one it is going to be a boy. There is a whole missing generation of girls. Infanticide is on the rise in China.

We are poised, if the Morella amendment were to pass—and unfortunately in the first 2 years of the Clinton administration we are giving money to the group that is out there providing tangible assistance, people on the ground to help and assist these Chinese population-control zealots.

Mr. Chairman, let me remind Members as well that UNFPA, in addition to providing cover and tangible assistance, has pumped over $100 million into this heinous program, and it is the kind of program that only a Nazi could be proud of.

Mr. Chairman, let me also say that the language that I am offering today also would restore longstanding policy as it relates to the so-called Mexico City policy, which erected a wall of separation between family planning and abortion. I remember when President Reagan first announced that back in 1984, Members said no one will accept those clauses. Well, most of the family planning organizations said we want to provide family planning, not abortion, so they accepted it and they and their subcontractees decided to get out of the abortion business.

This is especially important in light of the fact that most of the countries of the world protect their unborn children. Between 95 and 100 nations, virtually all of Central and South America, have laws on their books that protect their unborn children. We are out of the mainstream of human rights when we put those children at such grave risk and allow them to be killed. But let us not export it.

Again, family planning money during the Reagan and Bush years flowed uninterrupted. Only groups like International Planned Parenthood Federation of London, a London-based organization, and PPF of America, their foreign-based organizations, would not accept it, and I say this noting that a number of IPPF affiliates did accept it. They countered what the national office was doing and they said we want to provide family planning and we want to get out of the abortion business.

Mr. Chairman, let me just conclude by saying that this amendment is pro-life. It is backed by all of the pro-life organizations. The amendment of the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA] I like CONNIE MORELLA, she is a good friend and colleague—is opposed by all of the pro-life organizations. It is form without substance. It repeats some of the current law and tries to substitute that with the substantive language that we are offering today.

Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, first, this amendment was defeated in the Committee on International Relations and was proposed by the gentlewoman from Kansas [Mrs. MEYERS]. I am prochoice, but I am adamantly opposed to forced abortions and certainly against sterilization and the policies of the Chinese Government on these issues, but neither does the United Nations Population Control nor any other multilateral or nongovernmental organization working in China fund abortions or support coercive family planning practices.

But because there are forced abortions and sterilizations taking place in China, the Congress, this Congress, previously has mandated that no United States money provided to the United Nations Population Control may be used in China. That is the law today there, and I support this approach.

This amendment is totally unnecessary. It goes far beyond the existing law that we have. It has far-reaching implications for all United States-supported international health and family planning activities.

The real purpose of this amendment is to cut off all U.S. funding for population control worldwide without a doubt.

The United Nations Population Control is the leading multilateral organization providing voluntary family planning services in the developing world. In this bill we already repeat existing law, the Kemp-Kasten language which ensures that no U.S. money go directly or indirectly to support these Chinese programs. This language allows us to take a forceful stand against China without undermining overall multilateral efforts in population planning worldwide.

I strongly urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment, the same as they did in committee.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. MORELLA TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF NEW JERSEY

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. MORELLA to amendment No. 19 offered by Mr. SMITH of New Jersey: Page 1, strike line 4 and all that follows and insert the following:

(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of law or of this Act, none of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act for population assistance activities are authorized to pay for the performance of abortions in any foreign country, except where the life of the mother would be endangered if the fetus were carried to term or in cases of rape or incest.

(2) Paragraph (1) may not be construed to apply to the treatment of injuries or illnesses caused by unsafe abortions.

(b) LIMITATION ON LOBBYING ACTIVITIES.—

(1)(A) Notwithstanding any other provision of law or of this Act, none of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act for population assistance activities are authorized to be available for any private, nongovernmental, or multilateral organization that violates the laws of any foreign country concerning the circumstances under which abortion is permitted, regulated, or prohibited.

(B) Notwithstanding any other provision of law or of this Act, none of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act for population assistance activities are authorized to be available to lobby for or against abortion.

(2) Paragraph (1) shall not apply to activities in opposition to coercive abortion or involuntary sterilization.

SEC. 2122. UNITED NATIONS POPULATION FUND LIMITATIONS ON FUNDING.

(a) LIMITATION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law or of this Act, none of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act are authorized to be available for the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA), unless the President certifies to the appropriate congressional committees that—

(1) either—

(A) the United Nations Population Fund does not support coercive abortion and that no United States funds have been used for activities in the People's Republic of China; or

(B) during the 12 months preceding such certification there have been no abortions as a result of coercion associated with the family planning policies of the national government or other governmental entities within the People's Republic of China; and

(2) the United States representative to the governing board of the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA) has made an official request that UNFPA censure Chinese coercive practices and transmit a report of the action taken on such request to the appropriate congressional committees of the Congress.

(b) DEFINITION.—As used in this section the term ''coercion'' includes physical duress or abuse, destruction or confiscation of property, loss of means of livelihood, or severe psychological pressure.

Mrs. MORELLA (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, I offer this perfecting amendment on behalf of the prime sponsor, the gentlewoman from Kansas [Mrs. MEYERS], who could not be here today because of illness. Mrs. MEYERS is a member of the committee. The amendment of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] was rejected by the full committee, which supported Mrs. MEYERS.

This perfecting amendment states that no American money may be used to perform an abortion overseas except in the case of rape, incest, or endangerment of the mother's life. No American money may be used to lobby either for or against abortion, and no American money may be spent by the UNFPA in China, and further, the

United States representative to the UNFPA must ask UNFPA to condemn Chinese coercion. The bill already reduces our aid to UNFPA by the percentage of its budget which the UNFPA spends in China.

I want to also indicate exactly what it is we are talking about here. This is not, Mr. Chairman, whether or not U.S. taxpayers' money should be going to pay for abortions. This is already prohibited by current law. The Smith amendment strikes directly at women's rights to access family planning information, to space and time their pregnancies to suit the needs of their families, and to prevent pregnancy if they do not want more children. Access to family planning information and contraception decreases abortions, and we have many examples of that.

The amendment of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], by cutting out funding of organizations solely because they have an opinion on abortion, will deny money to those groups which have been most effective in preventing unwanted pregnancies.

□ 1100

This proposal is even more extreme than the Reagan administration's Mexico City policy that denied funding only to groups which actually performed abortions, and this amendment will not just affect groups like Planned Parenthood. The provisions threaten any number of humanitarian assistance organizations sponsored by prolife religious institutions. After all, the U.S. Catholic Conference lobbies on abortion. The proposal offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] will deny funds to Catholic Relief Services. The United States foreign assistance funds have, to the greatest extent possible, been channeled through nongovernmental organizations, because they use the money more effectively and with greater accountability than Government agencies. The Smith amendment will, by default, require population assistance to be channeled through foreign government agencies and less of the money will be available to assist those that it is meant to assist.

The amendment that I offer today will maintain current law. No U.S. taxpayers' money will be used to finance abortion. That is the current law. No U.S. taxpayers' money will be used to lobby for more liberal abortion laws. That is already the law. No United States taxpayers money will be spent by UNFPA in China. This is currently the law.

I would like to also point out, Mr. Chairman, the Smith amendment is extreme because it would defund organizations that perform legal abortions or engage in abortion-related advocacy with their own funds. It is an attempt to revive the so-called Mexico City policy and place a new twist on an old gag rule. It is, in fact, an international gag rule. And the gag rule has been repudiated by Congress.

This version would go far beyond cutting off family planning assistance, however. It would cut off any U.S. foreign aid for child survival programs, HIV–AIDS prevention programs, and other basic health services if a local hospital also provides legal abortion services.

Similarly, indigenous women's organizations that receive U.S. aid to improve, the status of women or to promote female literacy would also be defunded if they engage with their non-U.S. funds in efforts to influence their own country's abortion law either for or against.

And, quite frankly, Mr. Chairman, the Smith amendment would have no impact on access to abortion. Rather, it would only hinder access to family planning and other health and development programs centered on the needs of women.

Despite its ostensible goal of reducing abortion, during the time the Mexico City policy was in effect, which was 1985 to 1993, there was no decrease in the number of abortions worldwide, no decrease.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mrs. MORELLA was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, instead, it perpetuated the situation where women resorted to unsafe abortions in the absence of access to quality family planning and information about safe abortion. According to the World Health Organization, 500,000 women die each year of pregnancy-related causes, 99 percent in the developing world, and up to one-third of these maternal deaths are attributable to septic or incomplete abortion.

Indeed, the only impact of the old Mexico City policy as well as the new, more sweeping version offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is to interfere with the delivery of effective family planning and other development programs whose purpose is to reduce the incidence of unwanted pregnancy and the need for abortion. The prime target of the amendment that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], who is my friend, has offered, the prime target concerning China is the United Nations Population Fund, UNFPA. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] and the anti-abortion movement are using the UNFPA's presence in China as a pretext for pressing for United States withdrawal from supporting UNFPA altogether, and, indeed, they succeeded in convincing some administrations to boycott UNFPA for almost a decade until funding was resumed by the Congress, with the support of the administration, in 1994.

Operating in over 140 countries, besides China, UNFPA is the principal multilateral organization providing worldwide family planning and population assistance. Nearly half of UNFPA assistance is used for family planning services and maternal and child health care in the poorest and most remote regions of the world. And since its founding, UNFPA has saved the lives of countless women and children.

And I, frankly, think the amendment is unnecessary. Current law already denies foreign aid funding to any organization or program that supports or participates in the management of a program of coerced abortion or involuntary sterilization, and this is in any country under the so-called Kemp-Kasten amendment, which is restated in H.R. 1561.

And, further, current law also ensured that none of the United States contributions to UNFPA may be used in its China program, including numerous penalties for any violation of this requirement.

So, current restrictions and conditions are reiterated in H.R. 1561, as amended by the gentlewoman from Kansas [Mrs. MYERS], in committee. So, frankly, for that and a lot of other reasons, if we want to avoid abortions, if we want to allow these organizations to help women and children in countries throughout the world, then I ask this body to vote for the Morella-Meyers-Porter-Gilman amendment.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in sharp opposition to the amendment to the amendment.

(Mr. HYDE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, my colleagues, if you think abortion is a good idea or if you think it is a neutral idea or if you think it is an acceptable solution to unwanted pregnancies, then this amendment is for you.

But if you are troubled by abortion, if you understand the difference between family planning, which prevents a conception from occurring, or facilitate one if you want to get pregnant, as distinguished from abortion, which kills the life of an unborn child once it has begun, and those are the words of Planned Parenthood, which used them in a brochure for some years until they got into the business of promoting abortions, then they backed away from it, abortions kill a human life. They do not kill an animal, a vegetable or a mineral. And so it you think that is a good idea and a helpful idea, there are just too many people in the world and once they get created in the womb, exterminate them, then this is a good amendment.

But if you do not think American money should go to pay for exterminating unborn children, this is a terrible amendment and ought to be opposed.

Now, family planning is one thing. This country supports family planning. But it should not and ought not, and by defeating this amendment will not, support abortion. And those are 2 different ideas. One prevents a conception; the other exterminates it once it has begun.

In this country, now, following, Roe versus Wade, we have had over 33 million abortions. Is that a figure to be proud of?

I hope and pray and believe that this Congress will back away funding organizations that support abortion.

Now, the UNFPA, with all of its gimmicks and its semantic gymnastics, at the end of the day they support the Chinese coerced abortion policy. Nothing is more evil or inhuman that coercing a woman to have an abortion because it conflicts with the population policy. And yet that is what China does, and that is what the UNFPA supports.

Oh, they have a bookkeeping gimmick, but money is fungible, and that would not deceive anybody, and it ought not deceive you.

Now, we support population control if it is done through family planning, and by withdrawing the money from the UNFPA, there are still some 350 family planning organizations that will receive the largesse, the taxpayers' money to pay for family planning around the world. But the two organizations that do not want to take the money under those terms are International Planned Parenthood and the Planned Parenthood Federation of America. Well, they get plenty of money from other sources, from the abortion culture. Let them get it. But the taxpayers ought to make sure their money does not go to support killing unborn children.

And, therefore, I urge you, with all the vigor I can muster, to reject the Morella amendment. I mean no reflection on the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA] or her cosponsors, who are all wonderful people. They just are not as offended by abortion as I am, and I hope this amendment will be defeated.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Smith amendment and in support of the Morella perfecting amendment. The Smith amendment would do nothing to stop China's policy of coerced abortions to which I object just as strongly as does the gentleman from New Jersey. It is merely an attack on international family planning efforts which I strongly support.

The coercive abortion policy in China violates all principles of a modern society. Despite overwhelming evidence of forced abortions and involuntary sterilization, the Chinese Government denies it is conducting a campaign of intimidation and violence against the Chinese people. We must condemn this brutal policy, which deprives families of real choices and threatens hundreds of thousands of lives. We must ensure that no United States funds contribute to China's repression and violation of individual liberties.

That is why we have a compromise that strikes a sensible balance between the need to censure China for its deplorable policies, while restoring the United States commitment to critical family planning programs in other nations that are trying hard to struggle with exponential population growth which makes their economic development goals even more difficult to meet. The family planning portion of the bill before us today accomplishes these goals. It imposes strong policies to confront the abuses, and imposes tough restrictions on the use of United States funds. We continue to ensure that no UNFPA would be used in China.

One of the most important forms of aid we promise to other countries is family planning assistance. No one can deny that the need for family planning services in developing countries is urgent and the aid we provide is both valuable and worthwhile.

The world's population is growing at an unprecedented rate. In 40 years our planet's population will more than double as a responsible world leader, the United States must do more to deter the environmental, political, and health consequences of this explosive growth.

And let us not forget what family planning assistance means to women around the world. Complications of pregnancy, childbirth and unsafe abortion are the leading killers of women of reproductive age throughout the third world. One million women die each year as a result of reproductive health problems.

Each year, 250,000 women die from unsafe abortion.

Only 20 to 35 percent of women in Africa and Asia receive prenatal care.

Five hundred million married women want contraceptives but cannot obtain them.

Most of these disabilities and deaths could be prevented.

Today we have the opportunity to ensure funding for the United Nations populations fund, funding which has been held hostage to anti-abortion politics in the past. Today, we can make a real difference in the lives of millions of women, and the future of our planet.

Yet despite the opportunity to make real progress in world health, some would punish UNFPA, developing nations, and many other public health organizations around the world for China's policies. Approval of the Smith amendment would mean denying funds not only for UNFPA, but for critical projects all over the world.

Let us be frank. The language currently in the foreign aid bill makes clear that no United States funds shall be used in China. A vote for the Smith amendment is a vote against sensible, cost-effective international family planning programs.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the Smith amendment. And support the Morella perfecting amendment.

□ 1115

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, as a member of the committee I rise in strong support of the Smith amendment and in opposition to the Morella amendment, and I would also like to make clear that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE], who spoke so eloquently just a few minutes ago, when he was speaking out against the amendment, he was referring to the Morella amendment. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE] strongly supports the Smith amendment.

Mr. Chairman, my colleague from New Jersey, Mr. SMITH, is one of the great leaders of the pro-life movement, along with the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. HYDE and also the gentlewoman from Nevada, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, who will be speaking shortly, and I want to commend all three of them for their commitment over the years to the defense of the innocent unborn.

This amendment will simply restore the pro-life policies that served as the basis for U.S. international population policy during the Reagan and Bush administrations. Even though the American people strongly oppose the use of tax dollars for abortions, the Clinton administration has embarked on a worldwide crusade to promote abortion in the developing world. The Smith amendment attempts to curb that crusade by preventing U.S. tax dollars from going to any private, nongovernmental or multilateral organization that directly or indirectly performs abortions in foreign countries.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the Smith amendment is a sensible amendment, it is a much-needed amendment, and it is the right thing to do. I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Morella substitute and in support of the Smith amendment and to compliment my colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], on his sustained, vigorous and forthright leadership on the issue of opposition to abortions performed with U.S. funds overseas. He has been vigilant on this issue and has led the way on the committee and in the House year after year.

Mr. Chairman, we cannot allow U.S. funds to be used for population control programs in other countries where abortion is the means of population control. it is just that simple.

If we do not support such policies at home, and we do not—consistently under the Hyde language year after year we have opposed the funding of abortions with U.S. taxpayer dollars here at home—we should not be promoting such practices or allowing such practices to take place overseas. An unborn human being is still a human being whether American, or Chinese, or African, or wherever in the world.

Clearly the language offered by our colleague from Maryland would open the way for funds to be moved from one account to another, would make, as the technicians say, those monies fungible

to be used for abortion support activities in other countries, and particularly in China. The language in the bill is insufficient to prevent the use of Federal funds for abortions overseas.

The Smith amendment will tighten that language up, will make it very clear that no U.S. funding to any private, nongovernmental or multilateral organization that directly or indirectly provides funding for or performs abortions in a foreign country can be supported with U.S. taxpayer dollars in our foreign aid program. That principle should be maintained, should be set forth very clearly in law, and the Smith amendment will do so.

Support the Smith amendment. Defeat the Morella amendment.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

(Mr. PORTER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, the committee did not include in its bill a prohibition on funding for the UNFPA, nor did it impose the Mexico City prohibitions on what international family planning organizations can do with their own funds overseas. The Smith amendment was specifically not adopted by the committee, and for good reason, because it is not in the best interests of the United States, and that is what any foreign policy bill is all about.

Mr. Chairman, the United States is the largest international donor of funds for voluntary family planning. We recognize that a host of international issues, including economic development, immigration, political stability, health, and the environment are all linked to population. Providing targeted family planning assistance to nations that request it is in our Nation's interest.

The U.S. voluntary family planning program is a proven success. In Kenya there was a 20-percent reduction in family size in just 4 year, done through voluntary family planning. In Bangladesh the contraceptive prevalence rate went from 5 percent in 1975 to 40 percent in 1993, and there was a decline in fertility from 6.7 births per woman to 4.9, voluntarily. In Egypt the average number of children per family has declined from 5.8 to 3.9 between 1960 and 1994 through voluntary family planning.

The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] aims at an egregious practice of coercive abortion in China that all of us deplore, but the Smith amendment guts United States bilateral and multilateral population programs, and it would first effectively cut off all United States funds to UNFPA, which operates not in China alone, but in 140 developing countries, including the poorest countries in the world, only one of which is engaged in coercive practices. He claims correctly that China is engaged in a regime of coercive family planning practices, but he would condition all United States contributions to UNFPA on its pulling out of China, and there is not anybody who does not understand that a U.N. agency cannot pull out of a member country. It cannot unilaterally pull out of China.

Mr. Chairman, the Smith amendment is a killer amendment for all U.S. family planning programs.

The UNFPA activity in China is minuscule, and very little, or none, of it goes to support the Government. The UNFPA is not supporting coercive practices. It has a total annual budget of $275 million. Only $4 to $5 million goes to China. China's own family planning expenditures are $1 billion a year. UNFPA is not part of the problem in China, it is part of the solution.

Mr. Chairman, the Morella amendment would prohibit any United States funding going to UNFPA unless the President would certify that the UNFPA does not support coercive abortions in China. That is a reasonable way to approach the problem.

The bill also contains language walling off all United States funds into a separate account that cannot be used in China, and United States law has long prohibited funds in this bill from being used to perform abortions overseas.

These are reasonable protections. They ensure that U.S. funds are not used for coercion or for abortions, but allow truly voluntary family planning programs, the ones that we supported in 139 other countries, to continue, all of which would be cut off if the Smith amendment were to be adopted.

Second, the Smith amendment prohibits U.S. funds from going to the most active and effective voluntary family planning organizations overseas, including Planned Parenthood, and it reinstates the so-called Mexico City language keeping AID from funding the most experienced, successful NGO's in family planning.

The Smith amendment keeps U.S. funds from going to entities that use their own funds for performing abortions or for engaging in any activity or effort to alter the laws of any foreign country concerning the circumstance under which abortion is performed, regulated, or prohibited.

This is, in effect, an international gag rule.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not say or support abortion as a legitimate family planning method; it is certainly not, and we do not fund it. But this amendment keeps organizations from promoting their own agenda with their own funds.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. PORTER was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. PORTER. It is the equivalent of in the United States prohibiting hospitals using title X funds on the first floor from performing privately funded abortions on the third floor. Existing law already prohibits U.S. funds from going for abortions.

Mr. Chairman, I would say that the Smith amendment is extreme, it prevents organizations from using their own funds for their own legal purposes, and it would, together with the part dealing with UNFPA, effectively destroy U.S. voluntary family planning programs in 139 countries that depend upon our support and are making real progress in this area voluntarily, not with coercion.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in very strong opposition to the Morella amendment and in very, very strong support of the Smith amendment.

As a background, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] and I spent a week in China, the week we went into Beijing Prison No. 1, but we interviewed all of the population people in China, and what they are doing is abysmal, it is just a disgrace. I say to my colleagues, ''If you look at the statement by Director of UNFPA, Nafis Sadik, she said China has every reason to feel proud and pleased with its remarkable achievements made in family planning policy and control of its population growth over the past 10 years. Now the country could offer its experience and especially experts to help other countries.''

That is crazy. Let me tell my colleagues what we have now found out. We have found out in China, and I am not going to show this picture, but I will show it to any Member that wants to see it, but we have found out in China that in government hospitals, because of their forced abortion policies, they are selling, and I would urge all Members to read this article from Eastern Express that says embryonic food of life; they are selling aborted fetuses, or frankly they are selling aborted babies for money, for about $1.25 in Hong Kong money. This money will be used by the Chinese indirectly to literally track down women. We have heard, CHRIS and I, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] and I have heard, of cases whereby they literally track down women in the villages, and bring them in and force them to have an abortion.

This is a fundamental, important vote; it is much more important than population control. Let me just say, too, that I support birth control, I support money for birth control to India and places like that unable to gain control of the population, but under no circumstances would I ever support, nor should this Congress support, nor should any Member support, giving any American taxpayer money indirectly that goes to China.

Here is a picture of what is not bad to show, of a young lady leaving, leaving with a container of aborted babies, leaving to go to Hong Kong. I say to my colleagues, ''When you read this story and look at these pictures, which

I will not show, they will make you sick.''

This is a vote on a fundamental, ethical, moral issue. Under no circumstances should any American money go to UNPF and then go to China.

So, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is right, and I commend him for offering this, and I urge all my colleagues, those who have been following this issue and those who may be new, this is a vote that will be watched. The Chinese Government will watch what we will do, and by voting for the Smith amendment we will send the strongest possible message we can to the Chinese Government that their policy of tracking women down, of forced abortions, of selling aborted babies, is fundamentally wrong, and we will support it in no way. A vote for the Smith amendment is a vote, I think, to help a lot of people.

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA]. I have a great deal of respect for the gentlewoman from Maryland, but I truly believe she is wrong on this amendment. The Morella amendment would facilitate taxpayer funding to organizations which provide and promote abortion on demand.

I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH]. Now, some may claim that this amendment is a gag rule on family planning assistance. Nothing could be further from the truth. This amendment would not prevent groups from merely advising women as to what the laws are in each country regarding abortion. Furthermore, abortion is not considered a family planning method and should not be promoted as one, especially by the United States. Recently the State Department decided that the promotion of abortion should be a priority in advancing U.S. population-control efforts. This is unacceptable to the millions of Americans who do not view abortion as a legitimate method of family planning and do not support Federal funding of abortion except to save the life of the mother or in cases of rape and incest.

This is just one reason why this amendment is important. This amendment will simply ensure that none of the moneys sent to the UNPF may be used to fund any private, nongovernmental, or multilateral organization that directly or through a subcontractor performs abortions in any foreign country—except to save the life of the mother or in cases of rape and incest.

Most recipients of U.S. population assistance readily agreed to these terms from 1984 to 1993 and this amendment does not reduce the funding level for real international population assistance.

In a time when 69 percent of the American public opposes Federal funding for abortion this amendment is desperately needed to clarify congressional intent so that it cannot be disregarded by those who seek to fund abortion on demand throughout the world. I urge my colleagues to support the Smith amendment to H.R. 1561.

□ 1130

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Morella amendment and, regretfully, in opposition to the Smith amendment. It is with the highest regard for the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] and others who support his amendment that I beg to differ.

I share the gentleman's concern about the number of abortions that occur in our country, and I believe that if some strong language has been used in this debate already, and I will use a couple strong words too, one being hate, which I do not like to use, but if you hate abortion, as we all do, I think you should love family planning, because this is the way that we can reach the goals that I believe we all share, which is to decrease the number of abortions that occur in our country and in the world.

The Morella amendment reasserts the restriction against any U.S. funds being used to fund abortion except where the life of the mother would be endangered. No taxpayer dollars should be used to fund abortion, nor would they be. The amendment also reasserts the restriction against U.S. funds being used for lobbying on the abortion issue. The Morella amendment further reasserts our strong opposition to the coercive population practices in China.

On the Smith amendment, Mr. Chairman, I believe it is inappropriate to pass this amendment because there are some general setbacks that we would suffer should it become the law. Stabilizing population growth is vital to U.S. national interests. Rapid population expansion is a major source of political instability in developing countries as well as a drain on the global environment. That does not mean that we perform abortions in order to control population growth. It means that we should instead be educating people in methods of family planning so that we, again, can control population growth and reduce the number of abortions.

Rapid population growth makes successful development and democratization much less likely. It reduces the quality and availability of health services, limits employment opportunities, and undermines economic and social progress. There has been tremendous progress already achieved in stabilizing world population, but we can do better and indeed we must.

The new international consensus in support of population planning provides an opportunity to achieve global population stabilization within the next generation. Existing law already prohibits the use of U.S. funds for abortion-related activities. For 20 years there has been a protection in law and policy against using U.S. funds to pay for or advocate abortion.

U.S. population programs focus on providing quality voluntary family planning services. They are directed toward improving maternal and child care of health, slowing the spread of AIDS and HIV and enhancing access to basic education. Population programs work. Since the 1960's, births for women in developing countries have dropped by 37 percent, child mortality by 50 percent, and primary school enrollment is up by 38 percent. U.S. assistance has played an important role in these achievements.

As I said before, there are already strict prohibitions in U.S. funding for abortion as a method of family planning or to motivate or coerce any person to practice abortion. Also, there are strict prohibitions against funding for organizations that support and participate in the management of coercive abortion or in voluntary sterilization. There are existing provisions in the law that prohibit the use of Federal funds for lobbying on abortion.

In addition, Mr. Chairman, I want to point out that, similar to that, indigenous women's organizations that receive U.S. aid to improve the status of women or to promote female literacy would also be defunded if they engage with their non-U.S. funds, with their non-U.S. funds, in efforts to influence their own country's abortion laws, either for or against.

Those are some of the reasons I urge my colleagues to support the Morella amendment and oppose the Smith amendment.

On the subject of China, I am adamantly, as all of our colleagues have declared, adamantly opposed to forced abortion and sterilization and to policies of the Chinese Government on these issues. Neither the UNFPA nor other multilateral or multigovernment organizations working in China fund abortion or support coercive family planning practices. But because forced abortion and sterilization may be taking place in China, and indeed I believe they are, the Congress has mandated that no United States money provided to UNFPA may be used in China. I support this approach. This amendment, the Smith amendment, has far reaching implications for all U.S.-supported health and family planning activities.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the Morella amendment and reluctantly to oppose the Smith amendment.

The real purpose of this amendment is to cut off U.S. funding for UNFPA. UNFPA is the leading multilateral organization providing voluntary family planning services in the developing world.

In this bill, we already repeat existing law (the Kemp-Kasten language) which ensures

that no United States money directly or indirectly supports the Chinese program. This language allows us to take a forceful stand concerning China, without undermining overall multilateral efforts in population planning.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, we have now gone 50 minutes with regard to this issue. We have about three speakers on our side. I think the other side has about three speakers. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment be limited to 12 noon today, and that the time be equally divided between both sides of the issue. This is with regard to the Smith amendment and all amendments thereto.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The time will be equally divided between the minority and the majority to manage.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to control the time on this side.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Who will control time for the majority?

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I will control the time until the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA] returns.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GILCHREST].

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the amendment of the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA]. The amendment continues the policy of preventing funds provided to UNFPA from being spent in China. Further, the United States representative to the UNFPA must seek condemnation of China's coercive population policy, and the amendment prevents funds to groups that lobby for changes in abortion laws in other countries. It does just about everything that anybody wants it to do.

This amendment is the reasonable approach that our foreign policy should take with respect to family planning programs. The aid provided by the United States for the purpose of improving knowledge and access to family planning methods is an important investment in helping people improve the quality of their lives.

Just listen to some of these statistics. In 1830, the world's population reached 1 billion people. Today the world's population is close to 6 billion people. In the year 2020, 8 billion people are expected to live on earth. In 40 years the population is expected to double, to about 12 billion people. During the years 2000 to 2025, the poorest countries will grow the fastest, accounting for 5.1 billion people of the world's population.

Twenty-five percent of the Earth is land, and that is where we live. We do not have that much room on the planet.

Mr. Chairman, population conferences such as the Bucharest Conference, the Mexico City Conference, and the Cairo Conference in 1994, all became mired in this controversy about the abortion issue. I really think it is time, people are pleading with us around the world and people are pleading with us in this country, it is time for us to stop the argument and for those who are pro-choice, if I can label that, and pro-life, if I can label that, to get together and think of creative, thoughtful solutions to this most difficult problem.

I do not think there is anybody in this Chamber that favors abortion. But the people who are discussing this issue today recognize the serious, severe potential calamity if we do not reduce the number of people, the huge burgeoning population growth, especially in underdeveloped countries, where they will never have an economy that can support the people, they do not have resources right now that can support their population.

So it is necessary for us to sit down together, pro-choice people, pro-life people, and think of thoughtful, creative solutions that can solve the problem, so that abortions will become unnecessary as a result of the funds that we provide through education.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the gentlewoman from Maryland's amendment.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. INGLIS].

Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Smith amendment and in strong opposition to the Morella amendment, and to make three very brief points.

First, I think we need to approach this, every time the word ''abortion'' is mentioned on this floor, with tremendous compassion for the victims of abortion that are walking around today. Unfortunately, most of us have had experience with abortion. Somewhere in the family there is somebody hurting from this tragedy of abortion. So every time it comes up on the floor, I think it is important to indicate compassion for those for whom this is a very painful memory. The question then becomes why would we export this pain to other countries?

The second point I would like to make is, is it not wonderful to have a bipartisan discussion here? It is sort of a break here on the floor where you have Republicans and Democrats of good faith working together to restore the right policy created in 1984 under Ronald Reagan.

The third point I would like to make is money is fungible. Any time you have funding for a program, the money is fungible. That means if the money comes to that program, yes, it may be restricted so that it cannot go directly to abortion services, but since money is fungible, it means it frees up other money of that program to go into the provision of those services.

It is very important that we understand what is at stake here. We simply want to return to the Mexico City policy enunciated by President Reagan in 1984 that we will not use taxpayer funded dollars to fund any program in any foreign country that provides abortion services. So it is a very simple point here. What the Morella amendment would like to do is change that policy or actually preserve the now existing policy that we will fund those programs. I believe very strongly we should return to that Mexico City policy and not fund programs that provide abortion services.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA], and ask unanimous consent that she be allowed to control that time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GREENWOOD].

□ 1145

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in very strong support of the Morella amendment to the Smith language.

I believe that every Member of this body who calls him or herself pro-choice should be a yes vote on the Morella amendment but so should every Member of this body who calls him or herself pro-life but also supports family planning, who also supports child survival programs around the world.

The language in the bill gives every Member of this body who is pro-life anything they could possibly want. It prohibits use of U.S. funds for abortion. But it also, unfortunately, produces a result that no Member of this body could possibly want, and that is to deny life saving services to innocent people around the world, many of them children.

Mr. Chairman, whether we are talking about a hospital in Russia, a community center in India or Bangladesh, a hospital in Kenyatta, where on one side of the hospital, with private funds, abortions are being performed and they will continue to be performed with or without this language, precisely because those nations lack family planning services. And on the other side of the hospital services are being provided that all of the Members in support of my friend's amendment say they support, family planning services, also providing services of child nutrition, child inoculation, services to save young lives.

This amendment would cut off funds to those institutions, simply because in another wing of the hospital, unrelated

to those services, not using American money at all, abortions are performed.

For that reason, Mr. Chairman, those of us who do not want to see abortion used as a method of birth control or family planning but do want to see that family planning continues internationally along with American funds for child survival programs should support the Morella amendment. The Morella amendment amending the Smith amendment is a good compromise that we should all support.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, let me point out to my friends that on the Child Survival Program, I take a back seat to nobody. In the mid-1980's, I authored the continuation of that program and made sure that money for immunization and oral rehydration and the like was available.

This language comports, I am not talking about the Morella language, the Smith language, with that whole idea that children born and unborn are precious and valuable. When the Mexico City policy was in effect during the Reagan and Bush years, child survival was not hurt. Family planning organizations had agreed to put a wall of separation between abortion, and family planning got their money. Only the crusaders for abortion disqualified themselves by not agreeing to the walls.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, how much time remains on both sides?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER] has 8½ minutes remaining, and the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA] has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. SEASTRAND].

Mrs. SEASTRAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Smith amendment and strongly oppose the Morella amendment.

The Smith amendment is a straightforward attempt to make sure that the American people are not forced to use their tax dollars to subsidize abortions around the world. I think all Americans, virtually all Americans, no matter where they stand on the issue of abortion, agree that millions of abortions around the world is a human tragedy and what makes this tragedy even worse is the fact that some nations impose abortion.

The Chinese population control policy forces women to have abortions. I can think of few established policies that are more antiwoman or policies that are making women victims.

This is not about family planning. Most Americans support responsible family planning. But support for family planning does not mean support for subsidizing abortions around the world. There is no reason why this Congress should continue to provide financial support for these types of international organizations.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. JOHNSON].

(Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Morella amendment to the Smith amendment. Family planning money that the United States contributes annually to the United Nations Population Fund has had an extremely positive impact in developing countries throughout the world. In the 28 countries with the largest U.S. AID-sponsored family planning programs, the average number of children born per family has dropped from six in the 1960's to about four today, a decline of nearly one-third.

Providing women with the means to control fertility enables them to better provide for the children they choose to have. Thailand has made controlling the rate of population growth a priority issue in their development, and it has paid off. The average number of children born to Thai women has declined from 6 in the 1960's to the replacement level of 2.1 now. That means better health; that means less poverty; that means less tragedy in the lives of women and children in Thailand and a far better future for everyone.

Let me point out to my colleagues that current law already prohibits the use of U.S. funds to either pay for or lobby for abortion. We do not need the Smith amendment. The Smith amendment, however, would cut off all foreign aid not just for family planning but to any organization that performs abortions so that local hospitals throughout the world that legally perform abortions would be denied any foreign aid for child nutrition programs, disease prevention or other basic health services for women and families, simply because those institutions, according to their national law, perform abortions.

This is tragic. This is a stunning example of U.S. hubris that we are willing to micromanage the domestic and health policies of developing nations.

I urge my colleagues to support the Morella amendment, maintain the ban against any U.S. dollars for abortion, maintain the ban against any U.S. dollars used to lobby for abortion, but preserve health services for women and children and population growth programs, population control programs throughout the world.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY].

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, when President Clinton took office in 1993, he changed U.S. family planning policy overseas in fundamental ways.

He reinterpreted law with regard to funding for the U.N. Population Fund so that United States dollars could be used in China, where it is well-known that a brutal and coercive birth quota policy is in place.

Clinton also outright repealed the Mexico City policy, which prohibited United States funding from going to nongovernmental organizations which perform abortions and which lobby internationally for the repeal of laws protecting unborn children and their mothers from abortion.

Now, regardless of one's personal view of whether abortion is right or wrong, one generally agreed-upon principle is that taxpayers' dollars should not be used for its promotion. These drastic policy changes made by the Clinton administration completely fly in the face of this principle.

The Smith amendment contains nothing radical—it simply puts into law what was practiced prior to Clinton's coming to office. It is Clinton's policy that is radical, forcing U.S. taxpayers to fund organizations that promote or lobby for abortion as a method of family planning overseas.

To my colleagues, I say let us stick to the principle that has served U.S. family planning funding overseas well for so many years—that taxpayers should not be forced to support coercive population control or the promotion of abortion as a method of family planning.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a ''no'' vote on the Morella amendment and a ''yes'' vote on the Smith amendment.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WICKER].

(Mr. WICKER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WICKER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

This debate has nothing to do with family planning. It has everything to do with coerced family planning. The Smith amendment has everything to do with funding of forced abortions and everything to do the use of American taxpayer dollars to support organizations which perform abortions overseas and which lobby for pro-abortion policies.

As my colleague from Texas just pointed out, the Smith amendment reenacts, simply reenacts, a policy which was in effect during the Reagan and Bush years. I hope my colleagues can agree that the United States should not be spending American taxpayer dollars promoting abortion anywhere or promoting China's forced abortion policy.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the Morella amendment and to vote ''yes'' on the Smith amendment.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE].

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA] for her leadership on this issue.

I simply ask the question, Mr. Chairman, are we in fact our brothers' and sisters' keepers? And yes, we are. This Nation has been in the forefront of

seeking peace but as well of helping those who cannot help themselves. Unless we implement the Morella amendment, 139 countries across this world will lose opportunities for informed, educated family planning. And yes, millions of families across this international family will lose the opportunity to be informed and educated about the ability to do wise family planning.

Where are we in this instance? Are we willing then to cause the annihilation of young children, through hunger and disease simply because we have not further informed these families of the opportunities of sure family planning?

Mr. Chairman, this is a wise amendment. I encourage us to support the Morella amendment that aids us in providing support for our brothers and sisters across the world for family planning.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. EMERSON], who has been an outstanding advocate for the prolife position.

(Mr. EMERSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Morella amendment and in support of the Smith amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to give my strong support to the Smith amendment to the bill which codifies the Mexico City policy and prohibits funding to the U.N. Fund for Population Activities unless that organization discontinues all activities in China.

During the 1970's and early 1980's, foreign nongovernment organizations were the major source of funding for a number of groups which promoted abortion and the legalization of abortion in developing countries. Adopted in 1984, the Mexico City policy substantially changed the United States position on funding such organizations by stipulating that the Agency for International Development will NOT fund any private organization which participates in performing or promoting abortion as a method of family planning.

A year later, in 1985, the House approved the Kemp-Kasten amendment which denies funds to organizations that support coercive population programs. Funding is denied the UNFPA due to its active participation in China's population control program—its one-child-per-family program.

Today, the Clinton administration is conducting an ideological crusade to expand access to abortion throughout the developing world. The Clinton administration's policy was announced by Under Secretary Tim Wirth in a speech to a U.N. population meeting in 1993. Mr. Wirth stated that the Clinton administration's position was to, ''support reproductive choice, including access to safe abortion'' and to make such ''reproductive choice'' available to every woman by the year 2000.

It is inconceivable to me that as we debate the American Overseas Interest Act—a bill which attempts to support basic human rights across the globe—that the Congress would even consider denying the most basic human right, LIFE.

Mr. SMITH'S amendment will codify the Mexico City policy and ensure that United States tax dollars do not support China's coercive population control policies. The Smith amendment is not a gag rule and will have no effect on private organizations that merely advise, counsel, or refer women for whatever types of abortions are legal within a given country. Rather, the Smith amendment will simply ensure that the United States will not pay for abortions or impose a proabortion doctrine in foreign countries.

I urge my colleagues to support the Smith amendment. The right to life is the most fundamental human right—both here and abroad.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Morella amendment and in favor of the Smith amendment.

I would like to cut through all the rhetoric that has been heard here today for a little over the last hour and put it very simply. If you are in favor of using taxpayers money to kill babies, then I say vote for Morella. If you are in favor of saving those babies and not using taxpayers money to kill babies, then I say vote for Smith.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. BERMAN].

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman from New Jersey and the proponents of the Smith approach have some obligation to explain to the body the effectiveness of their strategy.

Coercive abortion and coercive policies are going on in China. We pulled out for many years. Nothing changed. Things got worse. Meanwhile, you cut out a whole bunch of positive, important profamily planning programs all over the world.

The Morella amendment in this bill reduces the amendment by the amendment they put in to China, requires them not to support any process and allows the other programs to go on. You cannot keep pushing things on rhetorical and ideological basis without some look at the consequences of what you are doing. Your policy did not work. You tried it. China went on, continued to do it, and all you have done is hurt important and good programs all around the world.

I urge a vote for the Morella amendment and defeat the Smith amendment.

□ 1200

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. SMITH], who is a strong advocate of life.

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I want to talk about a woman who, except for being in another country, would look a lot like me. Her name is Chee An. She is a Chinese citizen. I want to give the Members her words as she came back from an abortionist.

She said:

> The population control official gave me an ultimatum. ''I have made an appointment for you tomorrow at 8 a.m.,'' she told me. ''If you miss it, the party secretary swears the consequences will be serious.'' I knew I had no choice, and the next morning, escorted by the population control officials, I went to the hospital. The following days passed in a haze of emotional pain.

I want to tell the Members, under the Smith amendment we would be assured that our tax dollars would not go to that. I ask American women to listen carefully. After Clinton changed the policy, money can be shifted and shuffled to where money that is given for birth control, as we know it, IUDs, condoms, and such, forces women like Chian into stirrups.

I will tell the Members, I started in the proabortion, and none of us ever believed our tax dollars would go to forcing a woman into stirrups. I have to tell the Members, if there is one woman that is kept from this inhumane position, we have done great things today by passing the Smith amendment.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CHRISTENSEN].

Mr. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, 95 nations, including all, I repeat all, of Latin America, most of Africa, and much of the rest of the developing world have laws that are protective of unborn children. We have allowed our own proabortion laws to undermine American values at the expense of 4,000 children killed every day. The Clinton administration arrogantly believes we should require this poison to be spread to other nations. We need to defeat the Morella amendment and pass the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], our outstanding leader.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I thank my good friend for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask my colleagues how they would think they would feel if they, their loves ones, including families and friends, were forced to live in a land where brothers and sisters were officially declared illegal; where only one child per couple is permitted; where children, if not explicitly authorized by a birth quota system, engineered by the Government, are literally stolen from their moms and killed with poison by population

control fanatics; where, as we talk, a new policy of eugenics reminiscent of the Nazis has just gone into effect across the country, and then to know that the United Nations Population Fund is there whitewashing these crimes against humanity in all kinds of international fora where apologists will stand up and say, ''But our money is not going to do that.''

We all know money is fungible. The Morella amendment allows the FPA to take the United States donation, put it in their right pocket, and it frees up other money that they would send to China where this terrible crime and exploitation of women is daily practiced.

Remember, too, that the U.N. FPA Executive Director has said that this is a totally voluntary program. That is a big lie, Mr. Chairman. It is not true. It is a terrible crime against women.

She has always said we need to export the experience of the Chinese Government. God forbid. We would never allow it to happen here. If we were told that women had to be forcibly aborted, there would be rioting in the streets. Defeat the Morella amendment. I urge Members to support the underlying amendment, the Smith amendment.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I am really very surprised about the rhetoric, not only the hyperbole, but the accuracy of what the amendment would do.

Under the bill already, Mr. Chairman, none of the funds authorized would be used to help manage a program of any coercive abortion. No funds can be used for abortion. No funds can be used for lobbying. In fact, there is a reduction of the percentage that the United States would give to U.N. FPA for any funds that go to China. We have spoken against China's policies. The amendment would also direct the United States representative at the U.N. FPA to censure Chinese policies.

Mr. Chairman, I want to reflect on the previous reference to the woman looking for an abortion. She may well be a Russian woman. Russian women have an average of 9 abortions during their lifetime. Why? Because they do not have access to family planning. We are not talking about any proabortion policies, we are talking about policies that are going to enable people to have the ability to manage their lives and their families, and to avoid the need for any abortion.

The amendment of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is not about cutting off China; it is about cutting off family planning aid to 139 other countries. We know the world population tops 5 billion. Many of us will live to see it double by 2025. I urge adoption of the amendment. The Morella amendment is endorsed by the committee of jurisdiction and I hope by this House.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Morella amendment and in support of the Smith amendment. The Smith amendment will reinstate the long-standing prohibition on providing taxpayer dollars to any private organization that performs or promotes abortion in foreign countries.

The Smith amendment is correct in recognizing that promoting abortion is never in the true interests of our Nation. Over 95 countries in Central and South America and Africa have laws on the books against abortion on demand. The Hyde amendment, prohibiting taxpayer funded abortions here in the United States, has been in effect for years.

The United States has no business using American taxpayer dollars to overturn abortion laws in other countries. Why would we, as a nation, encourage a practice that is so divisive and controversial in our own country?

The Smith amendment provides clear rules that will ensure that no taxpayer dollars will be diverted for any form of abortion promotion. The outrageous practice of forced abortion in China demands such clear and strong rules as proposed by the Smith amendment.

It should be noted that the Smith amendment will not prevent private individuals from promoting family planning or abortion around the globe. Rather, the Smith amendment reinstates a sound policy that was in effect under the Reagan and Bush administrations. It is a policy that reflects the views of most Americans. Family planning is important but killing the unborn is just as wrong in Africa, Asia, or Latin America as it is in the United States.

Ms. FURSE. Mr. Chairman, the consequences of rapid population growth include poverty, unemployment, hunger and malnutrition, economic degradation, and urban decay.

These conditions may very well worsen before they improve—especially in countries experiencing high rates of population growth. Forty-five percent or more of the populace in several developing countries—including Libya, Syria, Iraq, Nigeria, Ethiopia, Kenya, Cambodia, Guatemala, and Honduras—have not yet reached their reproductive years.

We must mobilize resources to achieve stabilization of our human numbers through modern, safe, effective family planning. Abortion is not a means of family planning. It is a procedure resorted to when people lack access to modern family planning methods or appropriate information and knowledge about such methods.

Those voting on the Smith amendment should know that it is really not about abortion. It would not prevent a single abortion. It is an amendment to limit funds for the U.N. Population Fund—the largest multilateral provider of family planning services for poor women. Thus, its approval would limit access to family planning, which is what it would indeed to. I intend to vote against it and call on my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA], and in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

The effect of the Smith amendment would be to cripple the ability of such organizations as the UNFPA and International Planned Parenthood to make available family planning services to millions of women and men around the world, at a time when we need these services more than ever, not less than before.

The rapid growth of the world's human population is the most serious problem the world—and the U.S.—faces. We must not adopt a policy that would cut off funding to the organizations that are the most effective in reducing unwanted pregnancies, as the Smith amendment would do. To do so would be utterly senseless.

At this moment, nearly 5.7 billion people share our planet. By this time tomorrow, another quarter of a million will be added to that number.

Ninety-five percent of the newcomers will be born in the developing world. Many of them will die in childhood of malnutrition or disease, and most of the rest will live out their lives in countries that cannot begin to adequately take care of their existing populations, where there are already too few jobs, inadequate schools, inadequate health care, inadequate amounts of food and, usually, very little, if any, individual freedom.

By the year 2020, the world's already strained and overexploited resources will have to sustain life for more than 8 billion people—an increase of 2½ billion, most of them desperately poor, in just 25 years.

In much of the developing world, high birth rates, caused largely by the lack of access of women to basic reproductive health services and information, are contributing to intractable poverty, malnutrition, widespread unemployment, urban overcrowding, and the rapid spread of disease. Population growth is outstripping the capacity of many nations to make even modest gains in economic development, leading to political instability and negating other U.S. development efforts.

The impact of exponential population growth, combined with unsustainable patterns of consumption, is also evident in mounting signs of stress on the world's environment. Under conditions of rapid population growth, renewable resources are being used faster than they can be replaced. Other direct, and catastrophic, environmental consequences of the world's burgeoning population are tropical deforestation, erosion of arable land and watersheds, extinction of plant and animal species, and pollution of air, water, and land.

Overpopulation, however, is not a problem for developing countries only. Rapid population growth in already overcrowded and underdeveloped areas of the world has given rise to an unprecedented pressure to migrate, as people seek decent, and more hopeful lives for themselves and their families. According to a report by the United Nations Population Fund [UNFPA], over 100 million people, or nearly 2 percent of the world's population, are already international migrants, and countless others are refugees within their own countries. Many of the world's industrialized nations are now straining to absorb huge numbers of people, and in the future, as shortages of jobs and living space in urban areas, and resources such as water, agricultural land, and new places to dispose of waste grow even more acute, there will be even greater pressure to emigrate.

Population growth is an enormous problem, but one we can solve—if we make a determined effort to do so. Over the last three decades, population programs have been remarkably successful. Since the early 1960's, contraceptive use worldwide has gone up from roughly 10 percent of couples to over 50 percent today. And over the same period, the number of births per woman dropped from 6

to 3.3, almost half the fertility of just one generation ago. Much of this progress is a direct result of U.S. involvement. In the 28 countries with the largest USAID-sponsored family planning programs, the average number of children per family has dropped from 6.1 in the mid-1960's to 4.2 today.

These international trends, however, while highly encouraging, conceal great demographic diversity among countries and regions. In most of sub-Saharan Africa and some Pacific Island countries, where family planning services are not yet widely available, contraceptive use is below 15 percent, and women bear an average of six or more children. At the global level, an estimated 350 million couples do not have access to a full range of modern family planning information and services. One indication of the large unmet demand for more and better family planning services is the estimated 50 million abortions that occur every year, many of them unsafe.

But time is of the essence. How quickly we provide worldwide access to family planning and reproductive health services is crucial. Like compound interest applied to financial savings, high fertility rates produce ever-growing future populations. For example, if a woman bears three children instead of six, and her children and grandchildren do likewise, she will have 27 great-grandchildren rather than 216.

That is why it is absolutely essential that we adopt the Morella amendment and continue the progress we have been making toward reducing population growth. At the International Conference on Population and Development [ICPD], held in Cairo last year, the United States was instrumental in helping to build a broad consensus behind a comprehensive program of action, which was signed by almost all of the 180 countries that participated in the conference, and which will help guide the population and development programs of the United Nations and national governments into the next century. Central to this plan is the recognition that with adequate funding this decade for family planning and reproductive health services, as well as educational, economic, and social opportunities necessary to enhance the status of women, we can stabilize world population in the first half of the next century.

The ICPD program of action represents a historic opportunity to address adequately the causes and effects of the world's rapidly growing population, while placing an emphasis on individual choice and freedom. To meet this challenge, the international community—developing and industrial countries alike—has agreed to increase spending dramatically to achieve universal access to family planning and basic reproductive health services. In order to fulfill our responsibility under the Cairo agreement, the United States would need to allocate $850 million in fiscal year 1996 for international population programs, an increase of more than $260 million over this year's level.

The U.S. contribution under this bill will no doubt fall short. The fiscal reality of our Nation's fiscal situation has eroded our ability to fully fund even the most effective and cost-efficient programs. But we should still do as much as we can. The Morella amendment will prevent the crippling of our efforts in this area.

Mr. Chairman, combating rapid population growth by ensuring that our limited dollars for family planning assistance are used as effectively as possible is one of the most humane and farsighted efforts we can undertake. Providing adequate funding now will save many times this expense in future U.S. foreign assistance, will greatly reduce human suffering, and will promote global peace and security.

I urge our colleagues to support the Morella amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 2(c) of rule XXIII, the Chair announces that he may reduce to not less than 5 minutes the period of time within which a rollcall vote by electronic device may be taken without intervening business on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 198, noes 227, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 349]

AYES—198

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews
Baesler
Baldacci
Barrett (WI)
Bass
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Berman
Bilbray
Bishop
Boehlert
Boucher
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant (TX)
Cardin
Castle
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Condit
Conyers
Coyne
Cramer
Danner
Davis
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Dunn
Durbin
Edwards
Ehrlich
Engel
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fawell
Fields (LA)
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Foley
Ford
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gilman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hobson
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Jackson-Lee
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kaptur
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Klug
Kolbe
Lantos
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lincoln
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney
Markey
Martinez
Martini
Matsui
McCarthy
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Moran
Morella
Nadler
Neal
Obey
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Pickett
Pomeroy
Porter
Pryce
Ramstad
Rangel
Reed
Reynolds
Richardson
Rivers
Rose
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sawyer
Schiff
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Shaw
Shays
Sisisky
Skaggs
Slaughter
Spratt
Stark
Stokes
Studds
Thomas
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torkildsen
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
White
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates
Zimmer

NOES—227

Allard
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Bereuter
Bevill
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blute
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Brewster
Browder
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Camp
Canady
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clinger
Coble
Coburn
Collins (GA)
Combest
Cooley
Costello
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cunningham
de la Garza
Deal
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dornan
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
English
Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Fields (TX)
Flanagan
Forbes
Fox
Frisa
Funderburk
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Geren
Gillmor
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hancock
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Hostettler
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kanjorski
Kasich
Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Klink
Knollenberg
LaFalce
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Longley
Lucas
Manton
Manzullo
Mascara
McCollum
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
McNulty
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Murtha
Myers
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Ortiz
Orton
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Paxon
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pombo
Portman
Poshard
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Regula
Riggs
Roberts
Roemer
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Royce
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shuster
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stenholm
Stockman
Stump
Stupak
Talent
Tanner
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tucker
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff

NOT VOTING—9

Calvert
Cubin
Fazio
Hansen
Kleczka
McDade
Meyers
Peterson (FL)
Rogers

□ 1223

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair advises Members that there has been a problem with one of the voting machines, so the Members are asked to please confirm their vote with the screen and in the voting machine.

□ 1225

Messrs. MOORHEAD, DORNAN, and BUYER changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. SABO, CLAYBURN, and DAVIS changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 349, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted ''no.''

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 240, noes 181, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 350]

AYES—240

Allard
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Bereuter
Bevill
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blute
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Brewster
Browder
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Camp
Canady
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clement
Clinger
Coble
Coburn
Collins (GA)
Combest
Condit
Cooley
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cunningham
Danner
de la Garza
Deal
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dornan
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Emerson
English
Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Fields (TX)
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Fox
Frisa
Funderburk
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Geren
Gillmor
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hancock
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Hostettler
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jacobs
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Knollenberg
LaFalce
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Longley
Lucas
Manton
Manzullo
Mascara
McCollum
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
McNulty
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Murtha
Myers
Myrick
Neal
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Ortiz
Orton
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Paxon
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pombo
Portman
Poshard
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Regula
Riggs
Roberts
Roemer
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Royce
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shuster
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stenholm
Stockman
Stump
Stupak
Talent
Tanner
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thornberry
Thornton
Tiahrt
Tucker
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff

NOES—181

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews
Baesler
Baldacci
Barrett (WI)
Bass
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Berman
Bilbray
Bishop
Boehlert
Boucher
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant (TX)
Cardin
Castle
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Conyers
Coyne
Davis
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Durbin
Edwards
Ehrlich
Engel
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fawell
Fields (LA)
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Ford
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gilman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hobson
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Jackson-Lee
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E.B.
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Klug
Kolbe
Lantos
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lincoln
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney
Markey
Martinez
Martini
Matsui
McCarthy
McHale
McKinney
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Moran
Morella
Nadler
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Pickett
Pomeroy
Porter
Pryce
Ramstad
Rangel
Reed
Reynolds
Richardson
Rivers
Rose
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sawyer
Schiff
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Shays
Sisisky
Skaggs
Slaughter
Spratt
Stark
Stokes
Studds
Thomas
Thompson
Thurman
Torkildsen
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
White
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—13

Calvert
Cubin
Fazio
Franks (NJ)
Hansen
Johnston
Kleczka
Klink
McDade
McDermott
Meyers
Peterson (FL)
Rogers

□ 1235

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Calvert for, with Mr. Johnston of Florida against.

Mrs. Cubin for, with Mr. McDermott against.

Mr. DAVIS and Mr. THOMAS changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 350, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted ''aye.''

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee will rise informally in order that the House may receive a message.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD) assumed the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will receive a message.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Edwin Thomas, one of his secretaries.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

AMERICAN OVERSEAS INTERESTS ACT OF 1995

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. MCKINNEY

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment numbered 16 offered by Ms. MCKINNEY: After chapter 5 of title XXXI of the bill, insert the following new chapter (and redesignate the subsequent chapter accordingly and make other appropriate conforming amendments):

CHAPTER 6—ARMS TRANSFERS CODE OF CONDUCT

SEC. 3174. SHORT TITLE.

This chapter may be cited as the ''Code of Conduct on Arms Transfer Act of 1995''.

SEC. 3175. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds the following:

(1) Approximately 40,000,000 people, over 75 percent civilians, died as a result of civil and international wars fought with conventional weapons during the 45 years of the cold war, demonstrating that conventional weapons can in fact be weapons of mass destruction.

(2) Conflict has actually increased in the post cold war era, with 34 major wars in progress during 1993.

(3) War is both a human tragedy and an ongoing economic disaster affecting the entire world, including the United States and its economy, because it decimates both local investment and potential export markets.

(4) International trade in conventional weapons increases the risk and impact of war in an already over-militarized world, creating far more costs than benefits for the United States economy through increased United States defense and foreign assistance spending and reduced demand for United States civilian exports.

(5) The newly established United Nations Register of Conventional Arms can be an effective first step in support of limitations on the supply of conventional weapons to developing countries and compliance with its reporting requirements by a foreign government can be an integral tool in determining the worthiness of such government for the receipt of United States military assistance and arms transfers.

(6) It is in the national security and economic interests of the United States to reduce dramatically the $1,038,000,000,000 that all countries spend on armed forces every year, $242,000,000,000 of which is spent by developing countries, an amount equivalent to 4 times the total bilateral and multilateral foreign assistance such countries receive every year.

(7) According to the Congressional Research Service, the Untied States supplies more conventional weapons to developing countries than all other countries combined, averaging $14,956,000,000 a year in agreements to supply such weapons to developing countries since the end of the cold war, compared to $7,300,000,000 a year in such agreements prior to the dissolution of the Soviet Union.

(8) In recent years the vast majority of United States arms transfers to developing countries are to countries with an undemocratic form of government whose citizens, according to the Department of State Country Reports on Human Rights Practices do not have the ability to peaceably change their form of government.

(9) Although a goal of United States foreign policy should be to work with foreign governments and international organizations to reduce militarization and dictatorship and therefore prevent conflicts before they arise, during 4 recent deployments of United States Armed Forces—to the Republic of Panama, the Persian Gulf, Somalia, and Haiti—such Armed Forces faced conventional weapons that had been provided or financed by the United States to undemocratic governments.

(10) The proliferation of conventional arms and conflicts around the globe are multilateral problems, and the fact that the United States has emerged as the world's primary seller of conventional weapons, combined with the world leadership role of the United States, signifies that the United States is in a position to seek multilateral restraints on the competition for the transfers of conventional weapons.

(11) The Congress has the constitutional responsibility to participate with the executive branch in decisions to provide military assistance and arms transfers to a foreign government, and in the formulation of a policy designed to reduce dramatically the level of international militarization.

(12) A decision to provide military assistance and arms transfers to a government that is undemocratic, does not adequately protect human rights, is currently engaged in acts of armed aggression, or is not fully participating in the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms, should require a higher level of scrutiny than does a decision to provide such assistance and arms transfers to a government to which these conditions do not apply.

SEC. 3176. PURPOSE.

The purpose of this chapter is to provide clear policy guidelines and congressional responsibility for determining the eligibility of foreign governments to be considered for United States military assistance and arms transfers.

SEC. 3177. PROHIBITION OF UNITED STATES MILITARY ASSISTANCE AND ARMS TRANSFERS TO CERTAIN FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS.

(a) PROHIBITION.—Except as provided in subsections (b) and (c), beginning on and after October 1, 1996, United States military assistance and arms transfers may not be provided to a foreign government for a fiscal year unless the President certifies to the Congress for that fiscal year that such government meets the following requirements;

(1) PROMOTES DEMOCRACY,—Such government—

(A) was chosen by and permits free and fair elections;

(B) promotes civilian control of the military and security forces and has civilian institutions controlling the policy, operation, and spending of all new enforcement and security institutions, as well as the armed forces;

(C) promotes the rule of law, equality before the law, and respect for individual and minority rights, including freedom to speak, publish, associate, and organize; and

(D) promotes the strengthening of political, legislative, and civil institutions of democracy, as well as autonomous institutions to monitor the conduct of public officials and to combat corruption.

(2) RESPECTS HUMAN RIGHTS.—Such government—

(A) does not engage in gross violations of internationally recognized human rights, including—

(i) extra judicial or arbitrary executions;

(ii) disappearances;

(iii) torture or severe mistreatment;

(iv) prolonged arbitrary imprisonment;

(v) systematic official discrimination on the basis of race, ethnicity, religion, gender, national origin, or political affiliation; and

(vi) grave breaches of international laws of war or equivalent violations of the laws of war in internal conflicts;

(B) vigorously investigates, disciplines, and prosecutes those responsible for gross violations of internationally recognized human rights;

(C) permits access on a regular basis to political prisoners by international humanitarian organizations such as the International Committee of the Red Cross;

(D) promotes the independence of the judiciary and other official bodies that oversee the protection of human rights;

(E) does not impede the free functioning of domestic and international human rights organizations; and

(F) provides access on a regular basis to humanitarian organizations in situations of conflict or famine.

(3) NOT ENGAGED IN CERTAIN ACTS OF ARMED AGGRESSION.—Such government is not currently engaged in the acts of armed aggression in violation of international law.

(4) FULL PARTICIPATION IN U.N. REGISTER OF CONVENTIONAL ARMS.—Such government is fully participating in the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms.

(b) REQUIREMENT FOR CONTINUING COMPLIANCE.—Any certification with respect to a foreign government for a fiscal year under subsection (a) shall cease to be effective for that fiscal year if the President certifies to the Congress that such government has not continued to comply with the requirements contained in paragraphs (1) through (4) of such subsection.

(c) EXEMPTIONS.—The prohibition contained in subsection (a) shall not apply with respect to a foreign government for a fiscal year if—

(1)(A) the President submits a request for an exemption to the Congress containing a determination that it is in the national security interest of the united States to provide military assistance and arms transfer to such government; and

(B) the Congress enacts a law approving such exemption request (including a law containing an approval of such a request); or

(2) the President determines that an emergency exists under which it is vital to the interest of the United States to provide military assistance and arms transfer to such government.

(d) NOTIFICATIONS TO CONGRESS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The President shall submit to the Congress initial certifications under subsection (a) and requests for exemptions under subsection (c)(1) in conjunction with the submission of the annual request for enactment of authorizations and appropriations for foreign assistance programs for a fiscal year and shall, where appropriate, submit additional or amended certifications and requests for exemptions at any time thereafter in the fiscal year.

(2) DETERMINATION WITH RESPECT TO EMERGENCY SITUATIONS.—The President shall submit to the Congress at the earliest possible date reports containing determinations with respect to emergencies under subsection (c)(2). Each such report shall contain a description of—

(A) the nature of the emergency;

(B) the type of military assistance and arms transfers provided to the foreign government; and

(C) the cost to the United States of such assistance and arms transfers.

SEC. 3178. SENSE OF THE CONGRESS.

It is the sense of the Congress that the Committee on International Relations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate should hold hearings on—

(1) controversial certifications submitted under section 3177(a).

(2) all requests for exemptions submitted under section 3177(c)(1); and

(3) all determinations with respect to emergencies under section 3177(c)(2).

SEC. 3179. UNITED STATES MILITARY ASSISTANCE AND ARMS TRANSFERS DEFINED.

For purposes of this chapter, the terms ''United States military assistance and arms transfers'' and ''military assistance and arms transfers'' means—

(1) assistance under chapter 2 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (relating to military assistance), including the transfer of excess defense articles under section 516 of that Act;

(2) assistance under chapter 5 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (relating to international military education and training); or

(3) the transfer of defense articles, defense services, or design and construction services under the Arms Export Control Act (excluding any transfer or other assistance under section 23 of such Act), including defense articles and defense services licensed or approved for export under section 38 of that Act.

Ms. MCKINNEY (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

(Ms. MCKINNEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Chairman, today, I will offer the Code of Conduct amendment to H.R. 1561. My amendment seeks to give Congress—for the first time in two decades—a role in U.S. arms export policy.

As the law is currently written, Mr. Chairman, it is nearly impossible for Congress to stop an arms sale. Not since 1986 has a floor vote been taken on an arms sale, nor has a sale proposed by the administration formally been disapproved by Congress.

In addition to the lack of congressional oversight in arms sales, the economic cost to the American taxpayer is more than $7 billion a year just to support the arms export bureaucracy.

U.S. weapons are being used in 90 percent of today's most significant regional and ethnic conflicts. The weapons and technology that devastated the Iraqi Army only a few years ago, are now available to nations that are undemocratic, violate human rights, and are governed by dictators.

In 1993, the U.S. Government cornered a colossal 70 percent of the global arms sales market, and in 1994 U.S. foreign military arms sales were a whopping $12.9 billion.

America's arms sales have skyrocketed since the end of the cold war. As this first chart shows, Mr. Chairman, U.S. arms transfers from 1990 to 1993 averaged $21.7 billion a year, whereas, from 1986 to 1989, arms transfers only averaged $10.6 billion. It is amazing and shameful that as America solidifies its post-cold war leadership and encourages global democracy, the U.S. Government sold $83.1 billion in foreign military sales to dictators with no congressional review.

Despite this enormous dominance of the international arms market and the ''Boomerang Effect'' against U.S. Armed Forces—only a few Members of Congress have worked to restrain this dangerous trade.

Additionally, America spends billions of tax dollars to finance exports to tyrants—highlighted by the second chart—while cutting billions from key domestic programs like veterans benefits, Social Security, and student loans.

Mr. Chairman, the Code of Conduct amendment would not prohibit arms transfers to any country. Rather it would establish a higher standard of scrutiny for countries receiving U.S. weapons and more congressional oversight of arms sales. The Code of Conduct makes sure that we look before we leap by providing four guiding principles for U.S. arms transfers.

History demonstrates that as a result of Siad Barre's Somalia, Cedras' Haiti, and Saddam Hussein's Iraq, our soldiers have paid the price for selling U.S. materiel to dictators.

The code would require that both the President and Congress agree that providing assistance to a certain country is in the best interest of the United States. The code also gives the President flexibility. He can request a 1-year waiver for countries not meeting the code's standards, or in cases where vital U.S. interests are in jeopardy, use an emergency authority.

The code is endorsed by 275 organizations from Amnesty International to the YWCA and is supported by the European Parliament. Arms sales to unstable governments must end, and the Code of Conduct will be the first step in that direction.

There are 102 Members of Congress who support the guiding principles of the code—democracy, respect for human rights, and nonaggression. I urge all of you to cast your vote in favor of the Code of Conduct. Let's ensure that America's leadership is positively reflected in our arms export policy. Vote for the Code of Conduct.

[From World Policy Institute, May 1995]

U.S. WEAPONS AT WAR: U.S. ARMS DELIVERIES TO REGIONS OF CONFLICT

(By William D. Hartung)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

From Richard Nixon to Bill Clinton, it has been an article of faith for executive branch policy makers that U.S. weapons exports are only made to responsible allies who use these systems for legitimate defense purpose. This report puts that thesis to the test by documenting U.S. weapons deliveries to 50 current ethnic and territorial conflicts.

Contrary to the conventional wisdom in Washington, official U.S. government data on arms transfers provides overwhelming circumstantial evidence that U.S.-supplied weaponry is at the center of many of today's most dangerous and intractable conflicts:

In the past ten years, parties to 45 current conflicts have taken delivery of over $42 billion worth of U.S. weaponry;

Of the significant ethnic and territorial conflicts going on during 1993–94, 90% (45 out of 50) of them involved one or more parties that had received some U.S. weaponry or military technology in the period leading up to the conflict;

In more than half of current conflicts (26 out of 50), the United States has been a significant arms supplier, accounting for at least 5% of the weapons delivered to one party to the dispute over a five year period;

In more than one-third of all current conflicts (18 out of 50), the United States has been a major supplier to one party to the dispute, accounting for over 25% of all weapons imported by that participant in the most recent five year period;

Despite the popular perception that it is U.S. policy to cease deliveries of weapons once a conflict is under way, as of the end of 1993 (the latest year for which full statistics are available) the United States was shipping military goods and services to more than half (26 out of 50) of the areas where there were wars being fought;

In a number of volatile areas the United States has been the primary supplier to governments that are involved in ongoing conflicts. In Turkey (76%), Spain (85%), Israel (99%), Morocco (26%), Egypt (61%), Chad (27%), Somalia (44%), Liberia (40%), Kenya (25%), Pakistan (44%), the Philippines (93%), Indonesia (38%), Guatemala (86%), Haiti (25%), Columbia (28%), Brazil (35%), and Mexico (77%), the United States has been the primary supplier of imported weaponry in the most recent five year period for which full data is available.

Turkey's use of U.S.-supplied fighter aircraft, helicopters, tanks and armored personnel carriers in its recent invasion of Northern Iraq highlights the dangers of a policy of uncritical assistance to allies engaged in ethnic or territorial disputes, as does the employment of U.S.-supplied equipment on both sides of the 1995 Peru-Ecuador border war.

Since the end of the Cold War, the continuing U.S. policy of promoting weapons exports as a key element of U.S. security strategy and economic policy has accelerated the incidence of the ''boomerang effect'': the transfer of U.S. weaponry to forces that end up doing battle against U.S. troops. The last four times the United States sent troops into combat in significant numbers—in Panama, Iraq, Somalia, and Haiti—they faced adversaries that had received U.S.-origin arms, training, or military production technology in the period leading up to the conflict. This is a clear sign that something is awry in U.S. arms transfer decision making processes.

Last but not least, covert U.S. arms sales have come back to haunt U.S. citizens by inadvertently strengthening terrorist organizations. Two of the men convicted in the 1993 World Trade Center bombing received weapons training in Afghanistan under the direction of fundamentalist Islamic forces that were armed and trained by the CIA. The suspects in the recent murders of several U.S. embassy employees in Karachi, Pakistan are also suspected of having ties to the CIA's Afghan arms pipeline. David Whipple, the former head of counterterrorism at the CIA, has indicated that these are not isolated cases: ''some of the people who are actual or potential terrorists in this country are former guerrilla fighters in Afghanistan.'' And an Algerian official has described the existence of a ''floating army'' of Islamic fundamentalist fighters who were trained with CIA assistance in Afghanistan and are now engaged in organized attempt to overthrow the governments of Algeria, Egypt, and Saudi Arabia, among others.

As President Clinton tries to mobilize world public opinion against Iran, in part for its alleged role in supporting terrorism in the Middle East, it would behoove him to get his own house in order by clamping down on the CIA's covert weapons trafficking operations, which all too often end up hurting innocent people, including U.S. citizens. The recent revelations that a Guatemalan colonel on the CIA payroll is implicated in the murders of Michael DeVine, an American who ran a farm in Guatemala, and Efrain Bamaca Velazquez, a Guatemalan rebel leader who was married to American lawyer and activist Jennifer Harbury, is just the latest example of a covert arms trading culture that is out of control.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The report makes the following specific recommendations for promoting greater accountability in arms transfer decision making (for the full text of the recommendations, see section IV, below):

Recommedation 1: Pass the arms transfer Code of Conduct bill

In February of 1995, Senator Mark Hatfield (R–OR) and Representative Cynthia McKinney (D–GA) reintroduced legislation calling for the establishment of a Code of Conduct for U.S. weapons transfers. Under the code, governments that engage in aggression against their neighbors, violate the human rights of their own citizens, come to power through undemocratic means, or refuse to participate in international agreements like the United Nations arms register would not be eligible to receive weaponry from the United States. If the President wanted to make an exception for a specific country on national security grounds, he would have to ask Congress to pass a bill providing an exemption for that nation.

The benefits of the Code of Conduct would be twofold. First, it would place considerations about the character of a given arms recipient and how that nation might use U.S. weaponry up front in the arms transfer decision making process, preventing sales to unstable regimes in the process. Second, even in cases where the President sought an exemption, members of Congress would be forced to go on the record for or against, providing a measure of public accountability that rarely occurs under current law.

Recommendation 2: Provide more detailed reporting on U.S. transfers of arms and military technology, and press for other nations to do the same

Up until the Reagan Administration, the State Department issued an annual report under Section 657 of the Foreign Assistance Act that listed most significant items of military equipment delivered from the United States to any foreign country in the prior fiscal year, ranging from rifles and bullets on up to advanced combat aircraft. The section 657 report should be reinstituted as an annual publication, to provide a tool for keeping track of potential abuses of U.S.-supplied weaponry.

A full accounting of U.S. arms transfer policy must also include regular, detailed reporting on U.S. transfers of so-called ''dual use'' equipment—items such as advanced machine tools and computers, measuring instruments, or unarmed light helicopters and aircraft. If Congress and the public had been aware of the particulars of the nearly $1.5 billion in dual use export licenses that the Commerce Department granted to companies seeking to sell equipment to Iraq during 1985 through 1990, some of the more dangerous items on the list might not have been approved for sale.

Recommendation 3: The Pentagon and the intelligence community should publish regular reports on the use of U.S.-supplied weaponry in ongoing conflicts

All too often, U.S. weapons are supplied on a ''fire 'em and forget 'em'' basis: the decision to sell is made based on short-term political, strategic, or economic considerations, with little thought given to how these arms might be used a few years down the road. In an attempt to prevent this ''boomerang effect'' from repeating itself in the future, Representative Cynthia McKinney sponsored a successful amendment to the Fiscal Year 1995 Department of Defense Authorization bill requiring the Pentagon to report annually on how proposed arms transfers might create ''increased capabilities'' on the part of potential adversaries, and how they might ''pose an increased threat'' to U.S. forces in some future conflict.

As a further step in the right direction, the Pentagon and the Central Intelligence Agency should be required to file annual reports on how U.S.-supplied weaponry is being put to use in current conflicts, either by the original recipients, or as the result of unauthorized transfers to third parties. These reports could serve as a running record of the consequences of past U.S. weapons trading activities, and they would hopefully inject a note of caution into congressional debates over new proposed transfers.

Recommendation 4: Outlaw covert weapons shipments

From Iran/contra to the arming of Iraq to the ongoing proliferation of weapons originally intended for Afghan rebel movements, covert weapons trafficking have been at the center of a series of unmitigated foreign policy fiascos. As part of the effort to restructure the CIA to better meet the realities of the post-Cold War world, covert arms sales by the CIA and other government departments should be strictly outlawed.

Recommendation 5: The Clinton Administration (or its successor) should vigorously pursue a policy of multilateral arms transfer restraint designed to limit sales of conventional weaponry to regions of conflict or repressive regimes

Contrary to the findings of the Clinton Administraton's new conventional arms transfer policy, Presidential Directive 41, limiting the spread of weaponry to regions of conflict should be the paramount priority governing U.S. arms transfer decisions in the post-Cold War era. Economic and defense industrial base concerns should take a back seat to efforts to construct a multilateral arms export control regime that can serve both as a tool for preventing conflicts, and for limiting their duration and severity once they break out. At a time when the United States controls 72% of new arms sales agreements with the developing world, U.S. leadership remains an essential prerequisite for implementing any meaningful multilateral arrangement for limiting the flow of conventional armaments.

I. Introduction: U.S. Arms Transfers—Promoting Stability or Fueling Conflict?

''[T]here is almost no case since World War II in which arms provided by the United States have been used by the country receiving them for purposes of aggression.''—Richard Nixon, ''The Real War,'' 1980.

''[T]here is almost no instance of a country which is primarily dependent upon U.S. weapons using those weapons in an offensive manner.''—Joel Johnson, Aerospace Industries Association, February 1994.

''[T]here is strong evidence that countries relying on American weaponry have not started wars with their neighbors . . . To cite the most egregious example, Iraq . . . purchased its weapons primarily from Russia and France.''—Ethan Kapstein, ''Foreign Affairs,'' May/June 1994.

''Given the complexities of arms transfer decisions and the multiple U.S. interests involved . . . decisions will continue to be made on a case-by-case basis. These case-by-case reviews will . . . draw the appropriate balance between legitimate arms sales to support the national security of our friends and allies, and the need for multilateral restraint against the transfer of arms that would enhance the military capabilities of hostile states or that would undermine stability.''—Fact Sheet on Clinton Administration, Arms Sales Policy Directive, February 17, 1995.

The Arms Export Control Act states that U.S. military equipment and services shall be provided to other nations only for purposes of internal security, ''legitimate self-defense,'' participation in United Nations peacekeeping operations, or involvement in operations consistent with the U.N. Charter.[1] Based in part on this legislative requirement and in part on their ingrained assumptions regarding U.S. weapons sales, several generations of executive branch officials, policymakers, and independent analysts have taken it as an article of faith that U.S.-supplied weapons are primarily used for defensive purposes.

Now that the United States controls nearly three-quarters of all weapons exports to the developing world, the question of whether or not U.S. weapons are used aggressively is of more than merely academic interest.[2]

As of early 1994, there were 50 significant ethnic and territorial conflicts under way in Europe, Africa, the Middle East, Asia and Latin America.[3] By the end of 1993, the number of ongoing wars involving more than one thousand battle-related deaths reached 34, marking the first increase in this grim statistic since the end of the Cold War.[4] By early 1995, progress towards peace in South Africa, the Middle East, and Northern Ireland had been offset by the escalation of conflicts in North Africa (Algeria) and Russia (Chechnya), and the outbreak of a border war between Peru and Ecuador.[5]

With the exception of Russia, China, and a few other nations that produce a wide array of weapons systems for their own use, the majority of participants in today's armed conflicts depend upon imported weaponry.[6] The conventional wisdom among U.S. policymakers is that the weapons that are actually used in the majority of the world's conficts are supplied by other, less ''responsible'' suppliers. To the extent that U.S. officials raise questions about arms supplies to regions of conflict, the usual targets of criticism are either Russia or China, which have historically been more willing to supply arms and military technology to ''rogue'' states like Iraq, Libya, North Korea, and Iran.[7] In addition, some observers make pointed references to France's allegedly amoral, mercantile approach to arms sales.[8] In contrast, it has been argued that U.S. arms sales are grounded in carefully considered decisions to bolster the security of trustworthy allies in critical regions.

The notion that the United States is only arming the ''good guys'' has a long history. In his book ''The Real War,'' Richard Nixon, the architect of the current U.S. role as the world's leading weapons trafficking nation, argued that U.S.-supplied weapons have rarely been used in a belligerent manner, but that ''Soviet arms are the ones that are constantly used to break the peace.''[9] Nixon's blanket claim ignored a series of aggressive actions by major U.S. arms clients during the Nixon/Ford administrations, including Turkey's invasion of Cyprus, Indonesia's invasion of East Timor, Morocco's occupation of the Western Sahara, and General Augusto Pinochet's reign of terror in the wake of his 1973 coup d'etat in Chile.[10]

The Reagan Administration presided over one of the most revealing incidents in the history of U.S. policy towards aggressive uses of U.S. military equipment when it responded to Israel's June 1981 bombing of Iraq's Osirak nuclear reactor. Initially, U.S. weapons deliveries to Israel were suspended until the State Department could determine whether the bombing, which utilized U.S.-supplied F–15 and F–16 aircraft, violated Israel's pledge to use U.S. systems for defensive purposes. After a ten week review, Secretary of State Alexander Haig decided to resume arms shipments to Israel, arguing that ''I think one in a subjective way can argue to eternity as to whether or not a military action may be defensive or offensive in character.'' Rather than making a specific case that Israel's bombing of Osirak was justified as a defensive act, Haig seemed to be saying, in Alice-in-Wonderland style, that a defensive use of a weaponry is whatever the U.S. government and its allies say it is.[11] Turkey's 1995 invasion of Northern Iraq, which has been justified by Turkish Prime Minister Tansu Ciller on the grounds that Turkish forces are in ''hot pursuit'' of Kurdish terrorists, raises similar questions about what constitutes a genuinely defensive deployment of U.S.-supplied weaponry (for further discussion of Turkey's use of U.S. weapons against its Kurdish population, see section II, below).

This ''see-no-evil'' approach to U.S. weapons trading has survived into the 1990s. The last four times the United States has sent troops into combat they have faced adversaries that received U.S. arms or military technology in the period leading up to the conflict, yet the Clinton Administration's arms transfer policy review stubbornly refused to take into account the very real possibility that U.S.-supplied weapons may be used for purposes contrary to U.S. interests. As if to

underscore the business-as-usual tone of the Clinton approach, an official involved in the policy review has indicated that under the Administration's new guidelines, not a single one of the hundreds of major U.S. arms sales of the past fifteen years would have been rejected.[12] The administration's decidedly upbeat perspective on arms sales was summed up early on by Lt. General Teddy Allen, the former Director of the Pentagon's Defense Security Assistance Agency, during testimony to Congress in June 1993: ''Many friends and allies depend on U.S. defense equipment, services, and training to deter, and when necessary, defeat, armed aggression.''[13] When it finally released the results of its arms export policy review in February of 1995, the Clinton Administration described the five key goals of its policy as follows:

(1) To ensure that our military forces can continue to enjoy technological advantages over potential adversaries;

(2) To help allies and friends deter or defend themselves against aggression, while promoting interoperability with U.S. forces when combined operations are required;

(3) To promote regional stability in areas critical to U.S. interests, while preventing proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and their missile delivery systems;

(4) to promote peaceful conflict resolution and arms control, human rights democratization and other U.S. foreign policy objectives;

(5) to enhance the ability of the U.S. defense industrial base to meet U.S. defense requirements and maintain long-term military technological superiority at lower costs. [14].

The idea of controlling the spread of U.S. weaponry to ensure that U.S. exports do not sustain ongoing wars, fuel regional arms races, or strengthen potential U.S. adversaries is only obliquely hinted at in the Clinton administration's priority list; the underlying assumption is that U.S. weapons transfers go to potential ''coalition partners'' to be used for strictly defensive purposes. Despite recent evidence to the contrary, the possibility that today's partner could be tomorrow's adversary doesn't seem to enter into the administration's thinking.

To further underscore how small a role the potential risks of U.S. weapons exports will play in executive branch decisionmaking, Clinton Administration officials have indicated that the contribution of a given transfer to the defense industrial base will now be an explicit factor in deciding whether to go ahead with the sale. This could mean that the fact that a deal might extend Lockheed's production run for the F–16 fighter or sustain General Dynamics' assembly line for the M–1 tank will carry greater weight than whether these weapons are being provided to unstable regimes. [15].

Not surprisingly, the claim that U.S.-supplied arms are only used defensively has also been made repeatedly by executives and lobbyists in the defense industry. For example, Don Fuqua, president of the Aerospace Industries Association, made the following claim in a November 1994 article entitled ''Merchants of Peace'': ''during more than half a century, no American soldier ever faced any significant American military equipment used by a hostile power.'' [16] This industry argument has been echoed in academic circles as well, most notably in an article by Ethan Kapstein of the John M. Olin Institute for Strategic Studies at Harvard which appeared in the May/June 1994 issue of Foreign Affairs:

''. . . there is strong evidence that countries relying on American weaponry have not started wars with their neighbors. Contrast that record with the one compiled by countries that have purchased their weapons from Russia, Western Europe, or Third World suppliers. To cite the most egregious example, Iraq, which attacked Iran in 1980 before turning on Kuwait a decade later, had purchased its weapons primarily from Russia and France.

''Why American arms should be used primarily for defensive purposes is an interesting question. The most likely reason is that countries reliant on the United States fear being cut off and forced to look elsewhere if they misbehave.''[17]

The question of whether U.S. weapons transfers are as overwhelmingly constructive and stabilizing as this version of the conventional wisdom claims they are deserves closer scrutiny. As the next section will demonstrate, the sheer volume of U.S. arms shipments to areas of conflict calls into question the notion that these transfers have exerted a uniformly positive or predictable influence on local, regional, and international security.

II. U.S. Weapons at War

A comparison of the Pentagon's own data on deliveries of weapons through the U.S. Foreign Military Sales (FMS) and Commercial Sales (CS) programs over the past decade with a list of 50 significant wars that were under way during 1993–94 indicates that U.S. weapons exports have played a major role in fueling the ethnic and territorial conflicts that have become one of the most difficult security challenges of the post-Cold War era [18]:

In the past ten years, parties to 45 current conflicts have taken delivery of over $42 billion worth of U.S. weaponry;

Of the significant ethnic and territorial conflicts going on during 1993–94, 90% (45 out of 50) of them involved one or more parties that had received some U.S. weaponry or military technology in the period leading up to the conflict;

In more than half of current conflicts (26 out of 50), the United States has been a significant arms supplier, accounting for at least 5% of the weapons delivered to one party to the dispute over a five year period;

In more than one-third of all current conflicts (18 out of 50), the United States has been a major supplier to one party to the dispute, accounting for over 25% of all weapons imported by that participant in the most recent five year period;

Despite the popular perception that it is U.S. policy to cease deliveries of weapons once a conflict is under way, as of the end of 1993 (the latest year for which full statistics are available) the United States was shipping military goods and services to more than half (26 out of 50) of the areas where there were wars being fought.

The data outlined above demonstrate that contrary to the assertions of key policymakers, academic analysts, and industry lobbyists, the United States is sustaining the warfighting capabilities of a substantial number of the parties to the world's current conflicts. In a number of volatile areas the United States has been the primary supplier to governments that are involved in either internal or regional conflicts. In cases where the United States has supplied a majority of a client government's imported weaponry over an extended period of time, it is likely that some U.S. systems will be utilized in future conflicts involving these nations (see Table I, below)

Among the most serious conflicts in which the United States has been the primary weapons supplier are Turkey, Morocco, Somalia, Liberia, Kenya, Zaire, Pakistan, Indonesia, the Philippines, Haiti, Guatemala, Colombia and Mexico. Official U.S. weapons deliveries to Haiti, Guatemala, Liberia, and Zaire were cut off as of the early 1990s, but U.S. deliveries to conflict zones in Turkey, Morocco, Somalia and Kenya have actually increased over the past few years. In the case of Somalia, the increase is explained by the fact that a new government has been installed as a result of a UN peacekeeping mission in that nation. But continuing U.S. deliveries to Morocco, Turkey, and Kenya have no such rationale: in these cases, U.S. arms are shoring up regimes that have been intransigent in their pursuit of military solutions to sensitive ethnica and territorial disputes. Last but not least, in both Haiti and Guatemala, legislative attempts to terminate U.S. military assistance were subverted by the implementation of covert aid programs that were actually larger than the overt programs that were eliminated by Congress (see sections II and III for further discussion).

TABLE I—AREAS OF CONFLICT IN WHICH THE U.S. HAS BEEN A PRIMARY WEAPONS SUPPLIER

Region (and recipient)	Percent of total arms imports received from the United States	
	1987–91	1991–93 [1]
Southern Europe:		
Spain	85	86
Turkey	76	80
Middle East/North Africa:		
Israel	99	91
Morocco	26	76
Egypt	61	89
Sub-Saharan Africa:		
Chad	27	25
Somalia	44	100
Liberia	40	[2]0
Kenya	25	100
Zaire	17	0
Asia:		
Pakistan	44	3
Philippines	93	75
Indonesia	38	33
Latin America:		
Guatemala	86	[3]0
Haiti	>25	[2]0
Colombia	28	19
Brazil	35	40
Mexico	77	64

[1] The overlap in years covered by the two columns (1987–1991 and 1991–1993) is a function of the way the data is reported in the two most recent editions of the ''World Military Expenditures and Arms Transfers'' report. For a brief description of the nature of the conflicts in each of these nations, see Appendix A, Table I, below.

[2] The Arms Control and Disarmament Agency (ACDA) reported no arms transfers to Haiti or Liberia from any source during 1991–1993; this does not necessarily mean that there were no transfers of any kind—it is likely that there was some black market trading in light weaponry that was not detected by the intelligence sources that serve as the basis for ACDA's data.

[3] It has recently been revealed that the Central Intelligence Agency continued to make millions of dollars in payments to Guatemalan military and intelligence officials after U.S. military aid was officially cut off in 1991; it has yet to be determined whether some of this money was used to import weaponry.

Source: U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, ''World Military Expenditures and Arms Transfers'', 1991–92 and 1993–94 editions, Table III.

While data on the total volume of U.S. weapons supplies to areas of conflict is readily available, specific information on how U.S. weaponry is being put to use in today's wars is harder to come by. This is in part because neither the media nor the armed forces have made it their business to identify the specific types of weaponry utilized in a given conflict or to document the origins of these armaments. Even if gathering such data was a priority, the reality of warfare, particularly multi-sided civil conflicts involving light weaponry, would make it difficult to obtain comprehensive information. Nonetheless, accounts in the mainstream and specialty press have uncovered a number of recent examples of how U.S.-supplied weaponry is being put to use on the battlefield, and a number of arms control and human rights researchers have recently begun a concerted effort to gather more information on the patterns of deliveries of light weaponry to ethnic conflicts. The following examples are illustrative of the ways in which U.S. weapons are being utilized in current conflicts: a more comprehensive accounting would require more open reporting of the nature of U.S. weapons transfers to these areas.

Turkey: Turkey received over $6.3 billion worth of military equipment and services from the United States between F.Y. 1984 and F.Y. 1993.[19] The United States supplied 76% of all weapons imported by the Turkish government between 1987 and 1991, a figure which increased to 80% for the period from 1991 to 1993. The majority of U.S. weapons supplies to Turkey have been paid for by U.S. taxpayers as part of an extensive military aid program that has provided over $5 billion in assistance from F.Y. 1986 through F.Y. 1995.[20] Turkey has also received large deliveries of U.S. weaponry for free or at minimal cost as part of the NATO ''cascading'' program, which involves redistributing surplus weapons rendered redundant by the Conventional Forces in Europe Treaty (CFE).[21] Last but not least, a number of U.S. weapons systems are produced in Turkey under coproduction and licensing agreements with U.S. firms, including Lockheed's F–16 fighter plane and the FMC Corporation's M–113 armored personnel carrier.[22]

There have been reports in the international and Turkish press indicating that U.S.-supplied weaponry has been used extensively by the Turkish government in its war on the Kurdistan Worker's Party (PKK) in southeastern Turkey. A wide range of U.S. systems, including F–16, F–4, F5, and F–104 fighter aircraft, Cobra and Black Hawk helicopters, cluster bombs, and M–60 tanks and M–113 armored personnel carriers have been used in the conflict, which has claimed over 15,000 lives since 1984.[23]. The Clinton Administration and other supporters of the Turkish government have argued that the PKK is a terrorist organization, not a legitimate political movement. However, regardless of their views on the PKK, most independent observers agree that the politico-military strategy of the Turkish government—strafing and depopulating entire villages in the southeast—entails unnecessary suffering and repeated violations of the human rights of civilian noncombatants. Human Rights Watch has reported that as of October 1994, the Turkish government has depopulated as many as 1,400 villages and hamlets and displaced several hundred thousand people in its prosecution of the war against the PKK.[24] Major encounters involving U.S.-supplied weaponry have included May 1993 bombing raids in the Karliova valley that utilized F–4 fighter plans and Cobra helicopters to kill 44 Kurdish fighters and a January 1994 incursion into Iraq to bombard PKK camps with cluster bombs, 500- and 2000-pound bombs dropped from F–16 and F–4 aircraft.

The Turkish government's March 1995 invasion of Northern Iraq marks the latest chapter in its quest for a military solution to the Kurdish question. A Turkish government spokesperson proudly described the cross-border raid by 35,00 troops as ''the biggest military operation in the history of the Turkish Republic.''[25] Ironically, the Turkish attack targeted the same sector of Iraq in which the United States had been enforcing a ''no fly zone'' as part of the United Nations-backed Operation Provide Comfort, an effort designed to protect Iraqi Kurds in the area from Saddam Hussein's regime. Because the United States is far and away Turkey's largest supplier of weapons and military aid, Turkish Prime Minister Tansu Ciller cleared the operation with President Clinton by telephone before sending her military forces into Iraq. White House spokesperson Mike McCurry reported that the President accepted Ciller's explanation that the raids were strictly aimed at PKK ''terrorist bases'' in Northern Iraq, and that Clinton expressed ''understanding for Turkey's need to deal decisively'' with the rebel group.[26]

In a move that may prompt debate for some time to come, President Clinton and the Pentagon also ordered U.S. military personnel in Northern Iraq to ''stand down'' from enforcing the no fly zone against Turkey aircraft for the duration of Turkey's intervention. when a reporter asked Pentagon spokesperson Dennis Boxx whether the Pentagon was ''uncomfortable'' over the fact that a U.S. ally was ''beating up on . . . the same people we've been trying to protect from Iraq for a number of years,'' Boxx argued that Turkey was taking great care to focus its attacks on PKK terrorist strongholds. When he was asked where U.S. enforcement of the no fly zone would be rendered inoperative for the duration of the Turkish intervention in Northern Iraq, Boxx implied that it would, noting that ''it's simply better not to put these people at risk [U.S. military personnel involved in Operation Provide Comfort] until this has been resolved.'' The chilling implication of Boxx's remark is that the Pentagon actually feared that if U.S. forces had tried to enforce the no fly zone against the Turkish military, Turkish forces would have engaged in an air war against U.S. troops, using U.S.-supplied aircraft. It was almost as if the Pentagon spokesman was acknowledging that Turkey had intimidated the U.S. into allowing its Iraqi incursion to go forward unhindered.[27]

As has been the case in its major anti-Kurdish operations of the recent past, Turkey's offensive in Northern Iraq has relied heavily on U.S.-supplied equipment. Reports in the European press have indicated that Turkey's air war against the PKK (and against a number of Kurdish settlements and refugee camps) in Northern Iraq has been conducted almost entirely with U.S.-designed fighter planes such as the McDonnel Douglas F–4, the Lockheed F–104, and the Lockheed Martin F–16. Other U.S.-supplied aircraft such as the Textron-Bell Cobra helicopter gunship and the United Technologies/Sikorsky Black Hawk troop transport have also been used in support of Turkey's move into Iraq.[28]

U.S. support of the Turkish intervention is based on the assumption that it is a carefully crafted defensive operation aimed at wiping out PKK bases in Iraq, with little or no negative impact on Kurdish civilians. But press reports from the area have raised serious doubts regarding Turkey's claim that it has been mounting a ''surgical strike'' against terrorists. Turkey's ongoing war against the PKK, both in Northern Iraq and Southeastern Turkey, is looking increasingly like it may become that nation's Vietnam: a draining, divisive, and ultimately unsuccessful effort to defeat a nationalist movement by military means. An April 2nd news analysis piece by John Pomfret of the Washington Post—appropriately entitled ''Turkey's Hunt for the Kurds: the Making of a Quagmire?''—captured the dilemma faced by Turkish troops in Northern Iraq as they attempted to sort out Kurdish PKK militants from Kurdish civilians (both Turkish and Iraqi) in the area:

''. . . by embracing a military answer to what it considers a terrorist question, Turkey risks bogging its army down in a vicious cycle of incursion and withdrawal, followed by guerilla counterattacks and more incursions again. Such a cycle, Western officials have said, would only empty government coffers overtaxed by an ailing economy and a similar counterinsurgency operation within Turkey.''[29]

A western relief worker underscored the futility of Turkey's military strategy when he told Pomfret ''you can't wipe out a terrorist operation that operates on two continents by attacking the mountains. It's like killing a fly with a sledgehammer.'' Turkish soldiers reported a conundrum similar to that faced U.S. forces in Vietnam—an inability to distinguish friend from foe. One soldier told the Post ''we have a big problem because we don't know who is a villager and who the PKK is . . . we can't do a thing.''[30]

Unfortunately, contrary to the soldier's report, Turkish troops did plenty of things in Northern Iraq, including a number of documented cases of killings and displacement of Kurdish civilians. There is no way of knowing at this point whether these were isolated incidents or part of a larger pattern of abuse, because at a number of key stages in the conflict Turkish military commanders limited access to the combat zones on the part of both journalists and relief workers.[31] At the end of March, during the second week of the Turkish invasion, residents of the Iraqi village of Beshile reported that their village had been bombed and burned to the ground by Turkish forces. Fevzi Rashid, a 43 year old farmer who witnessed the Turkish attack, described it to a reporter from Reuters news service as follows:

''First the planes bombed our village. Then soldiers came some days later and burned our houses. Yesterday they came again and fired at the village with rockets and mortars.''[32]

Turkey's claim to be targeting only PKK terrorists has been further undercut by assertions by the Iraqi National Congress, the Iraqi Kurdish organization that controls most of the territory impacted by the Turkish invasion, that on the very first day of the invasion ''Turkish soldiers . . . arrested hundreds of refugees as suspected followers of the Kurdish Workers' Party.''[33]

Although the Clinton Administration firmly held to its position that the Turkish invasion would be limited in duration and narrow in focus, one expected withdrawal date—Turkish Prime Minister Tansu Ciller's April 19th visit to Washington—came and went with no final timetable for withdrawal in sight. A partial pullback of Turkish troops in late April of 1995 still left at least 10,000 Turkish troops inside Iraq, and there is some dispute even now as to whether all Turkish troops have cleared out of the area (see discussion below). In contrast to the policy of Germany, which has cut off all weapons shipments to Turkey in response to the Iraqi incursion, the Clinton Administration's position on the Kurdish question appears to be ''Turkey right or wrong.''[34] The U.S. arms industry has officially weighed in on the side of the Turkish government's tactics as well, in the form of a comment by Joel Johnson, chief lobbyist for the Aerospace Industries Association, to the effect that Turkey's military plan was no different from what other global and regional powers have done in similar circumstances:

''It must be acknowledged that the Turks have not invented Rolling Thunder. We used B–52s to solve a guerrilla problem [in Vietnam]. The Russians used very large weapons platforms [in Afghanistan]. And the Israelis get irritated on a reasonably consistent basis and use F–16s in Southern Lebanon. One wishes that it didn't happen. Sitting in the comfort of one's office, one might tell all four countries they're wrong. It's a lot easier to say that here than when you're there and it's your military guys who are getting chewed up.''[35]

Setting aside for a moment the obvious moral issues raised by massive bombing raids as a tool of modern warfare, it must be pointed out that Johnson's statement glosses over a key strategic point: in two of the three examples he cites, Vietnam and Afghanistan, the ''Rolling Thunder'' tactic was employed by great powers that were ultimately defeated militarily and politically by

smaller, better motivated nationalist forces. Even staunch allies of the current Turkish regime might find reason to advise Prime Minister Ciller to abandon her country's current military strategy vis-a-vis Kurdish separatist forces.

In response to a growing international outcry against the Turkish government's tactics in its war against the PKK, the Clinton Administration has repeatedly urged Turkey to stop its indiscriminate approach of bombing and depopulating entire villages. congress has gone beyond rhetoric by withholding 10% of Turkey's U.S. military aid for F.Y. 1995 pending a report on abuses against civilians by the Turkish military. In December 1994, Human Rights Watch published a report entitled ''U.S. Cluster Bombs for Turkey?'' which called for a reversal of a plan to provide advanced U.S.-built CBU–87 cluster bombs to Turkey on the grounds that the weapons might be used against civilians. As a result of the pressure generated by the report, the cluster bomb sale has been shelved for the moment.[36]

Despite these efforts to restrict the flow of U.S. arms to Turkey's war against the PKK, the United States remains Turkey's number one weapons supplier, and Turkey's inhumane warfighting tactics continue. As of the first week of May, 1995, Turkish officials claimed to have removed all of their troops from Northern Iraq, but Prime Minister Ciller has stated in no uncertain terms that she retains the right to invade the area again if Turkey detects further PKK activities there.[37] So far, moves to curb Turkey's use of imported weaponry have had no discernible impact on Ciller's approach to the Kurdish problem: she told members of her governing coalition in early April that ''we have one thing to say to those who threaten us about using their arms when they should be standing by us—we will use our right to defend ourselves under any circumstances. You can keep your weapons.''[38] Maybe it's time for President Clinton to take Prime Minister Ciller up on her offer.

Afghanistan: Beginning during the late 1970s under the Carter Administration and accelerating during the 1980s under the Reagan Administration, the United States supplied rebel factions in Afghanistan with an estimated $2 billion in covert military assistance.[39] This effort has been widely cited as one of the great success stories of the Reagan Doctrine of arming anticommunist rebels, and there is no question that U.S. weapons supplies contributed to the ability of Afghan guerrilla fighters to drive Soviet forces out of their country. Unfortunately, the longer term consequences of U.S. arms supplies to Afghan forces have been far more problematic. Since Soviet troops withdrew from Afghanistan in February 1989, U.S. weapons have helped to sustain a vicious civil war amongst competing rebel organizations inside Afghanistan. In addition, systems supplied to the Afghan factions for purposes of fighting off Soviet forces are now being resold on the international market, turning up in conflicts where they were never intended to be used.

As Ted Galen Carpenter of the Cato Institute has noted, ''[e]ven before they ousted the Soviet-backed government from power in April 1992 feuding mujahadin guerrilla units spent almost as much time battling each other as they did fighting the communists.'' Far from setting the stage for a period of peaceful reconstruction and reconciliation, the fighting inside Afghanistan actually intensified after the Soviet-supported regime was overthrown—2,000 people were killed in one three-week period in August of 1992, and by the spring of 1994 600,000 people had been displaced from the capital city of Kabul. Much of the equipment used on each side of the Afghan civil war comes from stocks supplied to the various rebel factions by the CIA during the 1980s. [40]

The violence sparked by U.S. weapons and training to the Afghan rebel movements extends far beyond Afghanistan. An Algerian government official has described the existence of a ''floating army'' of Islamic fundamentalist fighters who received weapons and training in Afghanistan starting in the 1980s, and are now mounting terrorist attacks on U.S.-backed governments in Algeria, Egypt, Israel, and Saudi Arabia. [41] This international network of armed Islamic fundamentalists that the CIA helped to create has struck in the United States as well: two of the men convicted in the 1993 bombing of the World Trade Center had received weapons and explosives training from CIA-backed rebels in Afghanistan prior to their attack in New York. And these two men may not be the only examples of U.S. covert aid backfiring. According to David Whipple, the former head of counterterrorism at the CIA, ''some of the people who are actual or potential terrorists in this country are former guerrilla fighters in Afghanistan.'' And it now appears that the suspects in the recent murders of several U.S. embassy employees in Karachi, Pakistan are also suspected of having ties to the CIA's Afghan weapons pipeline.[42]

One of the most dangerous lingering side effects of the CIA's Afghan weapons trafficking has been the proliferation of U.S.-built Stinger missiles. The Stinger, a shoulder-fired antiaircraft missile that can be used to shoot down anything from a fighter plane to a civilian airliner, has been described by Senator Dennis DeConcini as ''the ultimate terrorist weapon.'' [43] Afghan rebel commanders have been putting their U.S.-supplied Stingers up for sale to the highest bidder in the international arms bazaar, and there have been reports that some of the weapons have now turned up in such unlikely places as Iran, Libya, Qatar, and North Korea. [44]. The CIA was so disturbed by these reports that they put up $65 million for a Stinger ''buyback'' plan; so far the program has only succeeded in driving up the price that Afghan forces can get for the missiles to two to three times their original price, while recovering very few of the missiles. [45].

The shortsighted attitudes of U.S. policymakers involved in creating the Afghan weapons pipeline were summarized by Edward Juchniewicz, the CIA's associate director for covert operations during the Reagan Administration:

''The Iranians have already captured or otherwise obtained some Stingers and continue to accumulate them. I can understand why people are exercised. I wouldn't want one to hit the airplane I'm on . . . [but] one makes the assumption when one goes to battle that one's equipment will be captured by the enemy. So unfortunately, we lost some Stingers, and now our enemy has one of our best weapons.''[46]

What Juchniewicz fails to acknowledge is that the Stingers that were transferred to Iran were not captured by an enemy in battle; they were provided to Iran by Afghan rebel forces that had been considered friends of the United States.

While the spread of U.S.-supplied Stinger missiles poses an ongoing threat because of their possible role in augmenting the capabilities of terrorist organizations, the tens of thousands of tons of light weaponry that the CIA funneled to Afghan factions through its contacts in Pakistani intelligence services may pose an even more serious risk to the stability of South Asia. Analysts of the Afghan conflict have reported that during the 1980s the United States purchased literally hundreds of thousands of combat rifles from such diverse sources as China, Turkey, Egypt, and Israel and passed them on to Afghan rebel groups.[47] However, as British researcher Chris Smith has noted, many of these weapons were siphoned off along the way, because the Afghan pipeline was ''extremely badly organized and poorly thought out,'' to the point that it ''leaked profusely and virtually ruptured.'' As a result, the Northwest Frontier area of Pakistan is dotted with a series of open air weapons marts that are doing a brisk business reselling weapons that were originally intended to go to Afghan rebel forces. Pakistani intelligence officials have been running guns to Islamic fundamentalist forces in the India province of Kashmir, increasing the level of violence of that conflict and undermining efforts to encourage India and Pakistan to come to a diplomatic resolution of the Kashmir issue. Sikh militants fighting in the Punjab region of India have large quantities of Chinese Type 56 assault rifles of the kind that were supplied in large numbers by the CIA to the Afghan war, indicating a likely spillover of the Afghan pipeline into this conflict as well. U.S.-supplied weapons have also been utilized by Islamic fundamentalist fighters engaged in a civil war against Russian-backed government in the former Soviet republic of Tajikistan.[48]

In reviewing the evidence of the spread of U.S.-supplied guns and ammunition that was originally intended for the Afghan war, Human Rights Watch has observed that ''[t]he single most important factor in the introduction of small arms and light weapons into South Asia was the effort by the U.S. and Pakistan to arm the Afghan mujahidin resistance.''[49]

Indonesia: Governed by one of the world's longest enduring military rulers, General Suharto, Indonesia also has one of the worst human rights records of any major U.S. weapons client. There is direct evidence that some of these human rights violations have been carried out using U.S.-supplied equipment.

In addition to restrictions on freedom of the press, freedom of assembly, and labor rights within Indonesia, the Indonesian government has sustained an illegal military occupation of neighboring East Timor for nearly 20 years. In November of 1991, two U.S. journalists, Allan Nairn and Amy Goodman, witnessed a massacre carried out by Indonesian troops in the Timorese capital of Dili. The troops, armed with U.S.-supplied M–16 rifles, opened fire on a memorial mass and procession in honor of a young Timorese man who had been murdered by the Indonesian army for attempting to speak out about human rights abuses in East Timor.[50] Human rights abuses by Indonesian forces have continued up to the present, both in East Timor and within Indonesia; a recent summary of Indonesia's record of Human Rights Watch described ''a pattern of abuse . . . characterized by military intervention in virtually all aspects of Indonesian public life and by the arbitrary exercise of authority by President Soeharto.''[51]

The massacre in Dili and subsequent actions of the Indonesian military have sparked calls by the public and the Congress for a cutoff of U.S. military assistance, training and sales to the Indonesian government, but so far these demands have only been partially met. In October of 1992 Congress cut off U.S. assistance to Indonesia under the International Military Education and Training (IMET) program. In 1994, the Clinton administration announced that it would stop permitting arms sales or export licenses to Indonesia for deals involving small arms or crowd control equipment.[52]

Despite these steps, there continues to be a significant flow of U.S. weapons to Indonesia, adding to the more than $583 million in U.S. weapons deliveries to that nation from F.Y. 1984 through F.Y. 1993. In 1993, the last year for which full data is available, U.S. deliveries to Indonesia through the Pentagon's Foreign Military sales program and commercial sales licensed by the State Department topped $34 million. And the most recent statistics from the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency demonstrate that for a five year period ending in 1991, the U.S. supplied 38% of all weapons imported by the Indonesian government; for the period from 1991 to 1993, the U.S. share of Indonesia's weapons imports dropped slightly, to 33%. As this report was going to press, Defense News reported that the Clinton Administration was seriously considering giving clearance for a multi-billion dollar sale of F–16 fighter aircraft to Indonesia; the article reported some ambivalence within the administration, noting that ''White House officials . . . realize they must tiptoe around congressional sensitivity over killings and arbitrary arrests in the former East Timor.''[53]

Other examples: In addition to these specific examples of the utilization of U.S.-supplied weapons in active areas of conflict, there is strong circumstantial evidence to indicate that U.S. systems have either already been used or may yet come into play in a host of other wars. The mere fact that U.S. weapons have been delivered to 45 of the 50 current localities that are in the midst of significant conflicts in one strong indication that U.S. weapons are involved in many of today's wars.

Moving form statistical evidence to actual cases, a few recent examples should suffice to demonstrate the myriad ways in which U.S. weaponry may be used in ethnic and territorial conflicts.

Guatemala has been on the front pages of American newspapers in recent months because of revelations that CIA-financed Guatemalan military officers were involved in the murders of Efrain Bamaca Velazquez (a Guatemalan rebel leader who was the husband of Jennifer Harbury, an American lawyer and anti-war activist), and Michael DeVine, an American citizen who owned a farm in Guatemala before he was killed in 1990. Ironically, it took the deaths of an American and the husband of an American citizen to focus widespread media attention on the routine use of U.S. arms to promote murder and torture in Guatemala. As R. Jeffrey Smith and Dana Priest noted in a Washington Post piece that ran after the revelations of CIA complicity in these two deaths, ''while U.S. public attention was distracted by civil wars in El Salvador and Nicaragua, the CIA and U.S. military trained and equipped anti-communist military forces widely believed to have killed more than 100,000 peasants during a decades-long simmering insurgency, according to U.S. intelligence, military, and diplomatic officials.'' Once the Cold War aura of anti-communist ''legitimacy'' is removed from these activities, an objective view of the behavior of U.S.-backed Guatemalan forces reveals that they have been engaged in a campaign of systematic terror against their own people for over three decades.[54]

As if the obscene spectacle of U.S. government funds supporting the murder of a U.S. citizen were not evidence enough that U.S. arms policies towards Guatemala have gone seriously awry, subsequent revelations about the CIA's role in Guatemala raise even more troubling questions.

From 1986 through 1991, the United States accounted for 86 percent of all weaponry imported by the Guatemalan military. In response to ongoing human rights abuses in Guatemala in general and the murder of Michael DeVine in particular, U.S. military assistance to Guatemala was officially suspended by the Bush Administration in 1990. As far as the public, the media, most members of Congress, the Secretary of State, and even the U.S. ambassador to Guatemala were concerned, this cutoff of military aid meant that the U.S. government's role in arming and financing the Guatemalan military had been brought to an end. This reasonable assumption turned out to be dead wrong.

In the wake of the revelations about the Guatemalan military's role in the murders of Michael DeVine and Efrain Velazquez, Tim Weiner of the New York Times revealed that from the moment official U.S. aid to Guatemala was suspended in 1990, the CIA immediately initiated a multi-million dollar program of payments to key Guatemalan military and intelligence officials. The payments, which were allegedly aimed at ''maintaining good relations'' with Guatemalan security officials, totaled $5 to $7 million per year, more than twice the level of the public U.S. military aid that was terminated by the Bush Administration. Among the recipients of CIA funds was Col. Alpirez, the principal suspect in the murders of Michael DeVine and Efrain Velazquez.[55]

In addition to the secret CIA payments, investigative journalist Allan Nairn has uncovered documentation of 144 separate sales of rifles and pistols to Guatemala from U.S. sources, all of which occurred after the 1990 aid cutoff.[56]

As the Clinton Administration and the Congress proceed with separate investigations of the Guatemalan arms scandal, they will have to consider new, tougher safeguards over the CIA's role in the covert arming and financing of foreign military and intelligence services. Otherwise, there will be no guarantee that the will of the President, the Congress, or the public will be respected in future arms sales relationships. The CIA's conduct in Guatemala brings to mind a remark made by former New Hampshire Senator Warren Rudman with respect to another covert arms trafficking scheme run amok, Iran/contra: ''If you carry this to its logical extreme, you don't have a democracy any more.''[57]

When Mexico moved to put down the rebel uprising in the southern state of Chiapas in early 1994, they initially used some of the nearly three dozen helicopters that the United States had supplied to the Mexican Attorney General's office for use in anti-narcotics activities. Under questioning from Congress, Assistant Secretary of State Alexander Watson acknowledged that ''USG-supplied helicopters were being used in Chiapas,'' but argued that their use was acceptable because ''[s]enior officials assured our Embassy that the helicopters were use in a logistical, noncombat role.''[58] Since a ''logistical'' function for the U.S.-supplied helicopters could include the militarily essential task of transporting troops and equipment to the front, the assertion regarding a ''noncombat role'' is misleading at best.

In March of 1994, the San Antonio Express-News reported that the Mexican government was ''quietly importing millions of dollars worth of riot control vehicles across the Texas border, apparently in preparation for any civil unrest after the late-summer presidential election.'' The systems imported from the United States included the 17-ton Cobra riot control vehicle, equipped with water cannon and dye guns that can be used to ''mark'' troublesome demonstrators for later identification by the police; and the 12-ton Textron armored water cannon, which can spray with an impact of 120 pounds at a range of up to 50 feet. Pro-democracy activists in Mexico roundly condemned the sale. Apparently, the vehicles have yet to be utilized to put down any major demonstrations, but given the continued political turbulence in Mexico they may yet be used for that purpose.[59]

In February of 1995, Newsday reporter Ray Sanchez reported that U.S.-supplied Black Hawk helicopters were being used to ferry troops to Chiapas in the Mexican government's abortive attempt to round up the top leadership of the Zapatista movement. There is a strong possibility that U.S. weaponry will be used again if there is further civil strife in Mexico: the Mexican government has taken delivery of over $300 million worth of U.S. weaponry over the past decade, and U.S. deliveries accounted for over three-quarters of Mexican weapons imports in the most recent five year period for which information is available.[60]

The Bush Administration's initiative to utilize military assistance to help Andean nations fight the ''war on drugs'' has led to a number of documented instances of the use (and abuse) of U.S.-supplied weaponry in conflicts having little or nothing to do with the problem of drug interdiction. As the Washington Office on Latin America (WOLA) noted in its 1991 report ''Clear and Present Dangers; The U.S. Military and the War on Drugs in the Andes'', under the impetus of the Bush policy ''the Andean region has supplanted Central America as the main locus of U.S. military activity in the hemisphere.'' In the first three years of the 1990s, Colombia, Peru, and Bolivia were slated to receive more U.S. military assistance than all of Central America combined, with the rationale of providing equipment and training that could be used to fight drug trafficking in those countries. Despite rhetoric about shifting its emphasis toward reducing demand for drugs in the United States, the Clinton Administration has carried on the Bush policy of providing substantial amounts of military assistance to Andean, Central American, and Caribbean nations for use in anti-narcotics efforts.[61]

In Colombia, Black Hawk helicopters and Textron/Cessna A–37 counterinsurgency aircraft that were supplied as part of the Bush Administration's September 1989 emergency antidrug aid package to that nation were used just a few months later in a series of bombing raids against the village of Llana Fria that resulted in the displacement of 1,400 peasants. The Colombian military claimed that the raids were aimed at leftist guerrilla forces—clearly not a purpose that was covered in the original rationale for the emergency U.S. weapons shipments. To make matters worse, a report by the Washington Office on Latin America (WOLA) indicated that ''witnesses claim that the attacks were not aimed at guerrilla camps, as the military said, but at civilian settlements.'' In a statement that proved to be prophetic, WOLA Executive Director Alexander Wilde warned in a June 1990 congressional hearing that funneling U.S. aid to the Colombian armed forces under the guise of fighting drugs would just ''further fuel the crisis of human rights abuse [in Colombia] . . . and undermine political stability, by strengthening the Colombian armed forces.'' Five years and hundreds of millions of dollars in U.S. military aid later, Colombia has made little progress in stemming the flow of cocaine from its territory to the United States; in fact, in March of 1995 the Clinton Administration stopped just short of cutting off all U.S. aid to Colombia as punishment for the current government's lackluster efforts to bring members of the drug cartels to justice.[62]

When tensions between Ecuador and Peru erupted into a full-scale border war in January of 1995, it marked the latest case in

which the United States has provided substantial amounts of weaponry to both sides of a conflict.

Ecuador received over $111 million in U.S. Military equipment between F.Y. 1984 and F.Y. 1993. U.S. shipments accounted for more than 33% of all Ecuadorean weapons imports in the most recent five year period, and 50% of all such shipments from 1991 through 1993. In the five years following the announcement of the Bush Administration's Andean antidrug initiative, Ecuador has received $21 million in security assistance from the United States, including military grants and training, giveaways of excess U.S. Defense equipment, and balance of payments assistance under the Economic Support Fund program (ESF).[63] A passage on the aid program for Ecuador in the 1993 edition of the joint Pentagon/State Department Congressional Presentation on Security Assistance provided an ironic foreshadowing of precisely how the U.S. Weaponry provided to that nation for the fight against drugs would prove useful in its 1995 jungle border war with Peru:

''The proposed FY 93 FMF [Foreign Military Financing] program will provide vehicles, aircraft spare parts, and communications equipment to improve military mobility in remote regions. It will also provide weapons and ammunition.''[64]

This increased mobility apparently proved useful to Ecuadorean forces during the early weeks of the war, as they seized a decidedly remote border zone in the Amazon jungle.

When Peru counterattacked to win back the captured territory, its armed forces were also well equipped with U.S. Weaponry. Although U.S. Military aid to Peru has been an on again, off again affair in recent years due to questions raised by Peruvian President Alberto Fujimori's imposition of martial law, the United States still managed to ship $136 million worth of military equipment to Peru between F.Y. 1984 and F.Y. 1993. In all, U.S. sources supplied 6% of Peru's total arms imports between F.Y. 1987 and F.Y. 1991, increasing slightly to 8.5% between 1991 and 1993. Protestations over Fujimori's record notwithstanding, the United States supplied over $293 million in security assistance to Peru between F.Y. 1990 and F.Y. 1994, mostly in the form of cash payments under the Economic Support Fund (ESF) program.[65] A presentation to Congress on the F.Y. 1992 aid proposals for Peru provides a capsule summary of the kinds of assistance and training that the United States has attempted to provide to the Peruvian government and armed forces in the period leading up to the 1995 border war with Ecuador:

''The proposed FY 1992 FMF [Foreign Military Financing] program will provide individual troop equipment, small arms and heavy weapons and ammunition, communications equipment, vehicles, river patrol boats and spare parts for previously-provided aircraft and helicopters. ESF [Economic Support Funds] will provide balance of payments support and fund alternative development activities in coca-growing areas and judicial reform activities. IMET [International Military Education and Training] will provide professional military education, technical, management, and special police antinarcotics training, and training to improve military and police human rights practices.''[66]

Important elements of this ambitious aid program were sidetracked in April of 1992 when President Fujimori imposed martial law, but previous U.S. weapons and training (not to mention hundreds of millions of dollars in aid provided under the Economic Support Fund program) left a substantial mark on the shape and size of the Peruvian armed forces. In a February 1995 briefing for foreign correspondents at the presidential palace in Lima, Fujimori noted that one of the Peruvian aircraft that was shot down in the air war with Ecuador was an A–37 attack plane, a U.S. counterinsurgency aircraft that is manufactured by the Cessna division of Textron and nicknamed the ''Dragonfly.''[67]

In Asia, the fastest growing arms market in the world, U.S. weapons are playing a central part in a critical conflict as well.

The government of the Philippines has been waging counterinsurgency campaigns against the New People's Army (NPA) and several other indigenous guerrilla movements for over two decades. The United States has taken sides in this civil war by supplying the Philippine government with over $619 million worth of U.S. weaponry over the past decade. The U.S. supplied 93% of the Philippine government's arms imports from 1987 through 1991, dropping to 75% for the period from 1991 through 1993.[68]

While there has been no detailed accounting of the role of U.S. weapons and training in the civil war in the Philippines, it is clear that at least some of the equipment being supplied by the United States has direct applications to counterinsurgency, and that the United States government has gone to some effort to obscure this fact. For example, when the United States made its first report to the United Nations arms register in 1993, it indicated a delivery of nine ''combat aircraft'' to the Philippines, with no further description. When the Philippines reported on its weapons imports for that same year, they indicated receipt of 19 (not nine) combat aircraft, and they identified the planes as Rockwell OV–10A Broncos, an aircraft designed specifically for counterinsurgency missions. [69] In early April, the International Herald Tribune reported that Philippine forces had used U.S. supplied Broncos to conduct bombing raids against Muslim guerrilla forces near the city of Zamboanga. [70]

The war in Afghanistan is not the only instance of U.S. covert weapons assistance being misused long after the original purpose of that assistance has passed. In Angola, where the U.S. provided approximately $250 million in covert weapons shipments to Jonas Savimbi's UNITA movement between 1986 and 1991, U.S.-supplied systems were utilized extensively in UNITA's efforts to shoot its way into power and overturn the results of U.N.-sponsored elections. A November 1994 report by Human Rights Watch notes that ''U.S.-made 106mm recoilless rifles mounted on four-wheel-drive vehicles have been particularly popular with UNITA.'' The report also recounts Angolan government assertions that they have captured U.S.-made antitank missiles, mortars, and grenade launchers from UNITA forces. As in Afghanistan, UNITA forces in Angola also received Stinger antiaircraft missiles from the United States during the 1980s, although the Bush Administration apparently got the Stingers back from UNITA by swapping them for ''less sensitive lethal equipment.'' [71] As of early 1995, it appeared that UNITA was finally prepared to put down its arms as part of a United Nations sponsored demobilization plan; but the question remains whether the Angolan civil war could have been ended years sooner with considerably less loss of life if the United States and other major arms suppliers hadn't provided hundreds of millions of dollars worth of armaments to both sides in that twenty year conflict.

Last but not least, when a civil war erupted in Yemen at the end of 1994, reporting focused on Soviet-origin weaponry utilized by the government of Yemen, along with the possibility that some of it had been maintained with the assistance of Iraqi advisors. Less attention was paid to the fact that the Yemeni government also had access to 11 F–5E fighters, 50M60A1 tanks, and 70 M113 armored personnel carriers that it had inherited from the government of North Yemen (a former U.S. ally) when North and South Yemen merged. Despite reports that the U.S. government withheld spare parts for U.S. systems during the conflict, at least four of the F5–Es and an unknown number of the U.S.-supplied tanks and armored personnel carriers were utilized in the conflict. [72]

III. Strengthening Potential Adversaries: The Boomerang Effect

One of the most striking features of U.S. arms sales policy since the end of the Cold War has been the regularity with which U.S.-supplied weapons have ended up in the hands of U.S. adversaries. The last four times the United States has sent troops into conflict in substantial numbers—in Panama, Iraq, Somalia, and Haiti—they faced forces on the other side that had received U.S. weapons, training or military technology in the period leading up to the outbreak of hostilities. While representatives of arms exporting companies have argued that this ''leakage'' of U.S. weaponry to potential adversaries has been minimal (see section II, above), the statistical evidence tells a different story.

Panama: When President Bush ordered U.S. troops into Panama in December of 1989 to capture Panamanian President Manuel Noriega and bring him back to the United States to face trial on charges of drug trafficking and money laundering, they faced a Panamanian defense force that had been to a considerable extent made in the U.S.A. Panama received $33.5 million in U.S. weaponry under the FMS and commercial sales programs during the 1980s, and the U.S. accounted for 44% of Panama's weapons imports in the five years leading up to the invasion. Equally important, a large part of the Panamanian officer corps had been trained by the United States military: from 1950 through 1987, 6,695 Panamanian military personnel received training under the Pentagon's International Military Education and Training program (IMET), at a cost of $8.3 million.[73] Although U.S. troops encountered minimal resistance in their effort to capture Noriega, the Panama invasion was the first incident in a disturbing pattern that has characterized every major U.S. military intervention since the end of the Cold War: U.S. forces going into battle against forces that have been armed or trained by their own government.

Iraq: Despite recent efforts by the defense industry and the Clinton Administration to argue that the United States did not arm Iraq in the period leading up to the 1991 Gulf War, there is ample documentation demonstrating that the Reagan and Bush administrations supplied critical military technologies that were put directly to use in the construction of the Iraqi war machine. There is also strong evidence indicating that the executive branch's failure to crack down on illegal weapons traffickers or keep track of third party transfers of U.S. weaponry allowed a substantial flow of U.S.-origin military equipment and military components to make their way to Iraq.[74]

The differences in perception regarding the degree to which the United States government helped to arm Iraq center around the fact that the most significant U.S. contributions to the Iraqi military complex were not through direct transfers of guns, tanks, helicopters, or other finished weapons systems, but rather through supplies of so-called ''dual use'' technologies. This misunderstanding was at the heart of the misleading press coverage of the Justice Department's investigation of the BNL affair, a scandal involving provision of U.S.-guaranteed loans to

Iraq by the Atlanta branch of Italy's state-run Banca Nazionale del Lavoro. For example, a headline in the New York Times announced that ''Inquiry Finds No U.S. Involvement in the Iraqi Arms Buildup,'' and the Washington Post reported that the Justice Department's lead investigator, John Hogan, had asserted that ''Washington appears to have authorized the sale to Saddam only of some communications gear and a single pistol.'' In fact, the Justice investigators made it clear in their summary of findings that their mandate was not to assess the extent to which U.S. exports may have contributed to Iraq's military production capabilities but rather to ''determine whether chargeable crimes could be proved beyond a reasonable doubt.'' The report went on to note that ''[b]ecause our inquiry was limited in that way, this report is not intended either to criticize or to approve of any policy decisions.''[75]

To craft a policy for the future that avoids ''another Iraq,'' it is necessary to undertake precisely the task that the Justice Department's investigators viewed as outside their purview: a critical analysis of the policy-making process regarding transfers of militarily useful equipment to the Baghdad regime during the period from 1985 through 1990. As for the types of equipment that were approved for sale to Iraq, the Justice Department report acknowledges that hundreds of dual use items with applications to military production were approved for export to Iraq in the five years prior to the Gulf conflict of 1990–91. The Iraq issue was never about pistols—it has always been about the transfer of weapons production technology.

The first step in understanding the United States contribution to the Iraqi military buildup prior to the 1991 Gulf War is to look at the concept of dual use technologies. Dual use items include everything from unarmed light aircraft or helicopters that can be adapted to military uses, to instruments of torture like thumbscrews, to equipment like computers, machine tools, and measuring devices that can be applied to the production and testing of civilian or military products. Between 1985 and 1990, the U.S. Department of Commerce granted licenses for more than $1.5 billion in dual use exports to Iraq, more than $500 million of which was delivered before the outbreak of the Gulf War in August of 1990.[76] Under pressure from Congress and the public, in March 1991 the Commerce Department released a list of the dual use licenses it granted for exports to Iraq in the five years leading up to the conflict. Even a casual perusal of the list makes it evident that many of these items were put directly to work in Iraq's military research and production network. In addition to items that were licensed for export to obvious military end users like the Iraqi Air Force or the Iraqi Atomic Energy Agency, the list included numerous licenses for equipment that was being sent to Saad 16, a military production complex south of Baghdad that is known, among other things, as the center for Iraq's research and production work on ballistic missiles.[77] Congressional investigators later learned that even this list, which revealed significant U.S. contributions to Iraq's defense industrial base, was incomplete and misleading; at least 68 entries had been changed to obscure their military applications.[78]

While the Commerce Department's licensing process provided the most direct channel for U.S. assistance to Iraq's military buildup, there were also significant transfers of U.S. military technology and knowhow through indirect channels. When Chilean arms dealer Carlos Cardoen decided to sell Iraq $400 million worth of cluster bombs along with the technology for Iraq to build its own cluster bomb factory, he apparently did so with the acquiescence of several agencies of the U.S. government. According to Nasser Beydoun, a Lebanese-born arms dealer who worked as Cardoen's U.S. representative, the CIA was aware of the deal but ''looked the other way'' because Cardoen and his associates had been helpful in a covert CIA plan to provide missile technology to South Africa. In addition, investigators for ABC News discovered that in 1986 the U.S. Patent Office had improperly granted Cardoen a patent for his own version of a U.S. cluster bomb design, at a time when Chile was ineligible to receive cluster bombs from the United States.[79] Howard Teicher, who served on Ronald Reagan's National Security Council from 1982 to 1987, has made even more explicit charges of U.S. involvement in Cardoen's scheme to ship cluster bomb technology to Iraq. In a recent sworn statement filed in federal court in Miami, Teicher asserts that under the direction of William Casey, the CIA ''authorized, approved, and assisted'' Cardoen's effort to give cluster bombs to Iraq, because Casey believed that the weapons would be ''the perfect force multiplier'' for Iraq to fight off Iran's strategy of sending ''human waves'' of attackers against Iraqi positions during the Iran/Iraq war.[80] Whether due to oversight or wilful negligence, U.S. government agencies helped smooth the way for Cardoen's transfer of U.S.-origin cluster bomb know-how to Iraq.

Another major source of weapons for Iraq was Canadian-born artillery specialist (and naturalized U.S. citizen) Gerald V. Bull. During the 1970s Bull ran his firm, the Space Research Corporation, on a 10,000 acre site on the Vermont/Canadian border. It was here that he developed the technology for the G–5 155mm howitzer, a state-of-the-art artillery piece notable for its extensive range. Bull received considerable help at key stages in his career from various agencies of the U.S. government. Before he set up his U.S.-based company, he was granted U.S. citizenship under a rare special act of Congress sponsored by Sen. Barry Goldwater (R–AZ). During the period when Bull was perfecting his howitzer design, Space Research benefited from millions of dollars worth of contracts from the U.S. Army. According to former CIA Angola station chief John Stockwell, in the mid-1970s Bull was assisted by the CIA in setting up a lucrative deal with to supply howitzers, artillery shells, and howitzer production technology to South Africa for use in its war against the government of Angola. When this deal was uncovered, Bull was prosecuted for violations of U.S. arms export laws and served four and one-half months in the U.S. federal prison at Allenwood, Pennsylvania. However, the Customs Service investigator who made the case against Bull has argued that the Justice Department let Bull off relatively easily because his illegal acts were linked to a CIA covert operation.

After Bull was released from prison in 1980, he set up shop in Belgium, marketing his howitzer technology to a customer list that included both China and Iraq. Because Bull was a U.S. citizen and his howitzer technology was developed in the United States, he was required under U.S. law to receive clearance from the State Department's Office of Munitions Control in order to market this system internationally; despite his prior conviction for violating U.S. export laws, the State Department readily granted Bull clearance to sell his guns on the world market. Iraq ended up purchasing Bull-designed G–5 howitzers from both South Africa and Austria. In the case of the Austrian sales, U.S. officials were aware that the guns were being sold to both Iran and Iraq, by lodged protests with the Austrian government only with respect to the sales to Iran. Bull's most ambitious project, helping Iraq to build a ''supergun'' that would allegedly have been capable of launching a projectile from Baghdad to Tel Aviv, was cut short when he was assassinated in March of 1990. [81]

One final example of U.S. government complicity in the arming of Saddam Hussein is the case of Sarkis Soghanalian, who for years worked as an arms dealer for Iraq out of offices based at the Miami airport. Among the deals that Soghanalian worked on from his U.S. base were a successful scheme to send 26 Hughes MD–50 helicopters to Iraq and a failed deal to procure Romanian uniforms for Iraqi military forces. Soghanalian has maintained publicly that his arms deals with Iraq were not challenged during the 1980s because key U.S. government agencies were ''in on the deal,'' a claim that is lent some credence by the fact that he operated so openly as an arms procurement agent for Saddam Hussein without any interference from U.S. intelligence or law enforcement agencies. He was finally convicted on charges of illegally selling helicopters to Iraq in the fall of 1991, long after his services as one of Saddam Hussein's most valued arms brokers had been rendered irrelevant by Iraq's defeat in the Gulf War. [82]

When he learned of the details of U.S. government acquiescence in Gerald Bull's various illegal arms transactions at the height of the Gulf conflict, Rep. Howard Wolpe (D–MI) reacted angrily, with a statement that could just as easily been applied to the whole executive branch approach to private arms dealers and producers like Cardoen, Bull, and Soghanalian:

''The bottom line here is that because we have been so lax in our enforcement of American laws we are now finding American-made technology in the hands of the Iraqi forces that are pointing their cannons at American soldiers. That's outrageous.'' [83]

Somalia: The U.S. arms supply relationship with Somalia presents a textbook case of what can go wrong when short-term political interests outrank long-term strategic considerations in U.S. arms transfer decisionmaking. From the end of the Carter Administration in 1979 through beginning of the Bush Administration in 1989, the regime of Maj. Gen. Mohammed Siad Barre received roughly $1 billion in U.S. military and economic aid, including $154 million in weapons deliveries under the foreign military sales and commercial sales programs. U.S. arms deliveries accounted for 31% of Somalia's arms imports from 1985 to 1989, making the United States Somalia's top weapons supplier during the period leading up to the overthrow of the Barre regime and the outbreak of clan warfare in Somalia.[84]

The rationale for U.S. arms aid to Somalia was pure Cold War geopolitics. The Carter Administration decided that Somali ports and airfields would be useful as stepping stones for a potential military intervention in the Middle East by the new U.S. Rapid Deployment Force (since renamed and reorganized as the Central Command). The Carter and Reagan Administrations justified this new arms relationship with Somalia (which was a Soviet arms client during the 1970s) as a straight quid pro quo: U.S. arms were swapped for access to Somalia military facilities such as the port of Berbera. An added argument for supplying the Somalia regime was the fact the Somalia's larger neighbor, Ethiopia, had recently fallen out of the U.S. orbit and allied itself with the Soviet Union. A run through the executive branch's justifications to Congress from the 1980s for shipping weaponry to Somalia provides a virtual catalog of wishful thinking regarding how U.S. arms supplies might somehow turn

around what was obviously a rapidly deteriorating security situation. Time and again, despite mounting human rights abuses and an emerging civil war, Pentagon and State Department officials justified the arms flow to Siad Barre's regime on the grounds that it would ''foster stability.''[85] the most unintentionally ironic statement of the U.S. policy of ignoring instability in Somalia and pressing ahead with military-related assistance was offered by the Bush Administration in a 1991 presentation to Congress:

''Prior to the civil war, ended by a January 1991 coup, we urged the Siad Barre government to improve human rights, undertake real political reform and promote national reconciliation. * * * Despite the adverse impact of the civil war and the coup of U.S.-Somali relations, our interests in the region remain the same. The new Somali government has expressed an interest in resuming bilateral relations, and may be willing to undertake several democratic reforms which we support''.[86]

This analysis was offered in support of offering U.S. military training to the new Somali government. A new round of fighting within Somalia ensured shortly thereafter, and a year and one-half later President Bush sent U.S. troops to Somalia as part of a United Nations force charged with imposing some semblance of order upon rival armed factions that were threatening the delivery of humanitarian relief to a beleaguered and malnourished Somali populace. From 1991 to 1993, the United States has supplied 100% of all new weaponry imported by Somalia's governing coalition.

When Siad Barre was overthrown in January of 1991, much of the weaponry that the United States had so diligently supplied to his government during the 1980s fell into the hands of the rival factions that carried on the civil war that served as the rationale for the dispatch of U.S. troops to that nation in December of 1992. Despite the usual assertions that U.S. weapons deliveries to Somalia were largely ''defensive'' or ''nonlethal'' equipment, the U.S. provided significant quantities of small arms, including 4,800 M–16 rifles, 84 106mm recoilless rifles, two dozen machine guns, 75 81mm mortars, and an unspecified quantity of land mines. Larger weaponry included 24 M–113 armored personnel carriers, 18 155mm towed howitzers, and 448 TOW anti-tank missiles. The smaller items on this list, including the M–16s, machine guns, recoilless rifles, and land mines, were precisely the kinds of weaponry that were utilized by the forces of the warlord Mohammed Farah Aideed and other Somali factions in their fighting with U.S. and United Nations troops posted to Somalia. While the U.S. was far from the only supplier to add to the atmosphere of armed chaos that took hold of Somali society, U.S. weapons delivered during the 1980s played a significant role, first in supporting the regime of Siad Barre in its campaign of terror against his own population, and then in supporting the warfighting capabilities of the Somali factions involved in the civil war that carried on after Barre was overthrown.[87]

Haiti: When President Clinton decided to dispatch U.S. troops to Haiti in late 1994 to clear the way for the restoration to power of Haiti's elected leader, Jean Bertrand Aristide, most of the media attention was focused on the last minute shuttle diplomacy carried out by former President Jimmy Carter retired Gen. Colin Powell, and Senator San Nunn. There was very little discussion of the historic U.S. role in arming and training the Haitian military and intelligence forces that United States troops were sent to keep in check. From F.Y. 1984 to F.Y. 1993, the United States delivered $2.6 million worth of weaponry to Haiti under the FMS and commercial sales programs. This seemingly modest amount was significant by the standards of Haiti, which maintains 7,000 personnel in its armed forces and spends on average only about $50 million per year on its military budget. Of equal importance, during the past ten years the United States has trained 164 members of the Haitian officer corps. In addition, from 1986 through 1991, U.S. intelligence agencies were secretly arming and training key military and intelligence officials in Haiti at a cost of up to $1 million per year, allegedly for the purpose of assisting in the interdiction of illegal narcotics. Taking into account these secret weapons shipments, total U.S. arms deliveries to Haiti during the period from 1987 through 1991 exceeded 25% of total Haitian arms imports. Key U.S.-designed equipment in the Haitian military's inventory include six Cadillac Gage V–150 Commando armored personnel carriers (a vehicle specially tailored for ''riot control''), two Cessna 337 aircraft armed with rockets, and a variety of naval equipment and small arms. [88]

While the Haitian mission proceeded remarkably smoothly, with minimal U.S. casualties, the question remains whether past U.S. supplies of arms, training, and intelligence resources to a series of military-dominated regimes in Haiti may have unnecessarily complicated Haiti's transition to democracy, calling forth an intervention that might have been prevented if sounder arms transfer decisions had been made by the United States during the 1970s and 1980s.

IV. Taking Control: Reforming the Arms Transfer Decisionmaking Process

Contrary to recent claims of the Clinton Administration and other key participants in the arms export debate, U.S. weapons are decidedly not limited to responsible suppliers who are using them strictly for legitimate defensive purposes. When 90% of the world's ongoing conflicts involve parties that have received U.S. weaponry; when the last four major U.S. troop deployments have been against adversaries that received arms, training, or military technology from the United States; and when U.S. weapons are utilized to kill innocent civilians and abuse human rights in Indonesia, Turkey, Angola, and Guatemala, something is clearly wrong with the arms transfer decisionmaking process. This section makes specific recommendations for promoting greater accountability in arms transfer decisions, in the hopes of preventing a repetition of the disastrous arms deals that have been documented in this report.

Recommendation 1: Pass the arms transfer Code of Conduct bill

In February of 1995, Senator Mark Hatfield (R–OR) and Representative Cynthia McKinney (D–GA) reintroduced legislation calling for the establishment of a Code of Conduct for U.S. weapons transfers (bill number H.R. 772 in the House and bill number S. 326 in the Senate). Under the Code, governments that engage in aggression against their neighbors, violate the human rights of their own citizens, come to power through undemocratic means, or refuse to participate in the United Nations arms register would not be eligible to receive weaponry from the United States. If the President wanted to make an exception for a specific country on national security grounds, he would have to ask Congress to pass a bill providing an exemption for that nation.

The benefits of the Code of Conduct would be twofold. First, it would place considerations and the character of a given arms receipt and how that nation might use U.S. weaponry up front in the arms transfer decisonmaking process, preventing sales to unstable regimes in the process. Second, even in cases where the President sought an exemption, members of Congress would be forced to go on the record for or against, providing a measure of public accountability that rarely occurs that rarely occurs under current law.

Under current procedures, if a major arms sale does not involve the provision of U.S. assistance, Congress can choose whether or not to vote on the deal; failure to vote signals acquiescence in the sale. Of the 50 to 100 major arms sales notified to Congress each year, the vast majority of them are not subjected to a vote, scrutizined in hearings, or debated on the floor of the Congress. And in the more than twenty years since Congress first acquired the power to vote down arms sales, it has never successfully done so. There have been a few ''close calls'' such as the 1981 Saudi AWACS sale. There have also been a few cases where the executive branch has withdrawn a deal or reduced it in size to avoid a battle with the Congress, such as the 1986 decision by the Reason Administration to forgo additional sales of F–15 aircraft to Saudi Arabia (a decision which was reversed by the Bush Administration when it offered the Saudis 72 F–15s in 1992). But on the whole, the current system has allowed tens of billions of dollars in arms sales to be made every year with very little in the way of congressional scrunity or public input. The Code of Conduit bill would correct this deficiency by stimulating the kind of vigorous public debate that should be a fundamental requirement for making decisions on transfers of weaponry that can have dangerous and unforeseen consequences for United States and international security.[89]

Recommendation 2: Provide more detailed reporting on U.S. transfers of arms and military technology, and press for other nations to do the same.

Although the United States generally discloses more information on sales of arms and military technology than any other major weapons supplying nation, there are still a number of significant gaps in reporting that to make it difficult (and in some cases impossible) to assess the potential impacts of U.S. transfers to a given regime.

At the high end of the trade, prospective sales of fighter planes, tanks, and advanced attack helicopters, and other sophisticated systems are routinely reported to the Congress for its approval or disapproval. However, this information is not always made readily available to the public in a timely fashion. During the 1970s, the unclassified portions of all major proposed arms sales were routinely reprinted in the Congressional Record, thereby allowing interested members of the public to inform themselves about prospective weapons exports and make their voices heard to the Congress when it would still make a difference (Congress currently has thirty calendar days to disapprove or acquiesce in a given sale). This practice was discontinued in the early 1980s, allegedly because of Pentagon concerns that releasing this data would reveal too much information about the ''order of battle'' of U.S. weapons clients. In the interests of stimulating an informed debate, Congress should return to the practice of printing the details of all major arms sales proposals in the Congressional Record.[90]

At the mid-to-low end of the trade, there is no longer any regular U.S. government reporting on the trade in small arms or ''light weaponry''—the rifles, mortars, light vehicles, land mines, and ammunition that are frequently the weapons of choice in today's ethnic conflicts and civil wars. This was not always the case. Up through fiscal year 1980, the State Department issued an annual report under Section 657 of the Foreign Assistance Act that listed every item of military

equipment delivered from the United States to any foreign country in the prior fiscal year, ranging from rifles and bullets on up to advanced combat aircraft. The report was discontinued during the Reagan Administration, but the information upon which it was based is still regularly collected by the Pentagon's Defense Security Assistance Agency and the State Department's Office of Defense Trade Controls. The section 657 report should be reinstituted as an annual publication, to provide a tool for keeping track of potential abuses of U.S.-supplied weaponry by undemocratic regimes or nations at war with their neighbors. The report should be widely disseminated in the Congress, the media, and among interested members of the general public.[91]

Finally, a full accounting of U.S. arms transfer policy must include regular, detailed reporting on U.S. transfers of so-called ''dual use'' equipment—items such as advanced machine tools and computers, measuring instruments, or unarmed light helicopters and aircraft. These items can either be adapted for military use, or, more importantly, utilized to build advanced weapons systems. If Congress and the public had been aware of the particulars of the nearly $1.5 billion in dual use export licenses that the Commerce Department granted to companies seeking to sell equipment to Iraq during 1985 through 1990, some of the more dangerous items on the list might not have been approved for sale. In keeping with the findings of a 1991 Congressional review of U.S. export procedures in the wake of the Persian Gulf War, legislation should be passed requiring the Commerce Department to make public the details of its dual use licensing decisions, including the type of equipment and company involved, the value of the proposed sale, and the institution within the recipient country slated to receive that equipment.[92]

If these steps toward greater transparency regarding U.S. transfer of weapons and militarily useful technology are implemented, the United States will be in a much stronger position to press for increased reporting by other major suppliers.

The United Nations arms register currently excludes reporting on important categories such as small arms and dual use technologies. The Clinton Administration should press to have small arms added to the UN arms register, so that the weapons of choice in today's ongoing wars are covered by this important international monitoring mechanism. For dual use items, in addition to pressing for consultation on sale of major items in the context of developing a successor regime to the Cold War-era Coordination Committee on Multilateral Export Controls (Cocom), the administration should press for some form of international, public reporting system on dual use sales. This might take the form of an annual report by the members of a Cocom successor regime detailing major dual use licenses granted during the previous year, or a voluntary reporting mechanism that could run in parallel to the United Nations arms register.

Recommendation 3: The Pentagon and the intelligence community should publish regular reports on the use of U.S.-supplied weaponry in ongoing conflicts

All too often, U.S. weapons are supplied on a ''fire 'em and forget 'em'' basis: the decision to sell is made basis on short-term political, strategic, or economic considerations, with little thought given to how these arms might be used a few years down the road. The classic cases of this syndrome are the ''runaway weapons'' that U.S.-backed Afghan rebel forces have been putting up for sale on the world market during the 1990s and U.S. arms supplies that fell into the hands of eventual U.S. adversaries in Panama, Iraq, Somalia and Haiti (see sections III and IV, above). In an attempt to prevent this ''boomerang effect'' from repeating itself in the future, Representative Cynthia McKinney sponsored a successful amendment to the Fiscal Year 1995 Department of Defense Authorization bill requiring the Pentagon to report annually on how proposed arms transfers might create ''increased capabilities'' on the part of potential adversaries, and how they might ''pose an increased threat'' to U.S. forces in some future conflict. The amendment also requires the Pentagon to ''present alternative strategies for regional security based on mutual reductions in the size, spending, and capabilities of forces and among agreements among arms supplying nations to join the United States in reducing or halting military cooperation activities.''[93] Representative McKinney's amendment represents an important first step toward shifting the terms of the debate over U.S. arms transfers toward consideration of the long-term dangers of unrestrained weapons trading rather than the apparent short-term political and economic payoffs of a given arms deal.

As a further step in the right direction, the Pentagon and the Central Intelligence Agency should be required to file annual reports on how U.S.-supplied weaponry is being put to use in current conflicts, either by the original recipients, or as the result of unauthorized transfers to third parties. These reports could serve as a running record of the consequences of past U.S. weapons trading activities, and they would hopefully inject a note of caution into Congressional debates over new proposed transfers. The institution of this reporting mechanism would mark a sharp break from past practice, which indicates that in some instances the intelligence community hasn't even been keeping close tabs on its own covert weapons shipments, much less reporting them to the Congress or the public. For example, the Justice Department's final report of its investigation of the U.S. role in arming Iraq contained the following troubling description of the CIA's handling of information on its arms sales activities: ''Is one instance, it took the CIA two months to identify the intended recipient of weapons shipped at the CIA's request.''[94]

Recommendation 4: Outlaw covert weapons shipments

From Iran/contra to the arming of Iraq to the ongoing proliferation of weapons originally intended for Afghan rebel movements, covert weapons trafficking has been the driving force behind a series of unmitigated foreign policy fiascoes.

Whatever rationale there may have been for covert weapons trading during the Cold War, it is no longer a viable policy instrument in today's unpredictable international security environment. The cases of covert weapons trading gone awry that have been documented in this report—Afghanistan, Iran/contra, Iraq, Guatemala, and Haiti—provide ample indication that secret wheeling and dealing in weapons does more harm than good, both by subverting the democratic conduct of U.S. foreign policy and by damaging U.S. credibility and standing in the international community. As part of his restructuring of the CIA, President Clinton should shut down its covert operations directorate and press for legislation outlawing all forms of secret weapons trading by any U.S. government agency.[95]

Recommendation 5: The Clinton Administration (or its successor) should vigorously pursue a policy of multilateral arms transfer restraint designed to limit sales of conventional weaponry to regions of conflict or repressive regimes

Contrary to the findings of the Clinton Administration's new conventional arms transfer policy, Presidential Directive 41, limiting the spread of weaponry to regions of conflict should be the paramount priority governing U.S. arms transfer decisions in the post-Cold War era. Economic and defense industrial base concerns should take a back seat to efforts to construct a multilateral arms export control regime that can serve as a tool for preventing conflicts, and for limiting their duration and severity once they break out. At a time when the United States controls 72% of new arms sales agreements with the developing world, U.S. leadership remains an essential prerequisite for any meaningful multilateral arrangement for limiting the flow of conventional armaments.[96]

FOOTNOTES

1. On this point see Lora Lumpe, ''Arms and No Influence,'' Arms Sales Monitor, No. 27, Washington, DC, Federation of American Scientists, November 30, 1994; and Dr. Louis J. Samuelson, editor, The Management of Security Assistance (Wright Patterson Air Force Base, Dayton, Ohio: April 1991), p. 51.

2. Richard F. Grimmett, Conventional Arms Transfers to the Third World, 1986–1993, (Washington, DC: Congressional Research Service, July 1994).

3. The list of fifty conflicts was compiled by the author, drawing upon the following sources: Ted Robert Gurr, ''Peoples Against States: Ethnopolitical Conflict and the Changing World System,'' International Studies Quarterly, Vol. 38, No. 3, September 1994, pp. 347–377; Peter Wallensteen and Karen Axell, ''Mayor Armed Conflicts,'' in SIPRI Yearbook 1994 (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994), pp. 81–95; and David Binder and Barbara Crossette, ''As Ethnic Wars Multiply, U.S. Strives for a Policy,'' New York Times, February 7, 1993. The list utilized in this study includes all ''major conflicts,'' defined by SIPRI as ''prolonged combat between military forces of two or more governments, or of one government and an organized armed group, and incurring the battle-related deaths of at least 1,000 people during the entire conflict. This study also covers all but a handful of the smallest wars covered in Gurr's list of ''Serious and Emerging Ethnopolitical Conflicts in 1993–94.'' Gurr's list uses a more inclusive standard, namely deaths incurred ''directly through fighting or massacres or indirectly through starvation, disease, and displacement, from the beginning of its current phase through mid-1993.''

4. Wallensteen and Axell, op. cit., p. 80.

5. Because the Peru-Ecuador border war erupted in January of 1995, it is not covered in the statistical appendix, but it is discussed in the text (see section II, below).

6. Outside of the major producers in the developed world—the United States, Russia, Germany, France, Italy and the United Kingdom—there are only a handful of nations that can be considered self-sufficient (or nearly so) in armaments production. If one considers only smaller, less sophisticated systems such as rifles, mortars, and light military vehicles, the number of countries with significant indigenous production capabilities increases to perhaps two to three dozen. But even in these cases it is clear that arms imports have a substantial impact on the levels at which violent conflicts can be sustained. Unfortunately, trade in small arms (also referred to as ''light weapons'' by some analysts) is the least well documented aspect of the international arms trade, even though it probably accounts for the bulk of the weapons systems that are actually utilized in current ethnic conflicts. For two recent accounts of the state of the small arms trade, see Jeffrey Boutwell, Michael T. Klare, and Laura Reed, editors, Lethal Commerce: The Global Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons (Cambridge, MA: American Academy of Arts and Sciences, 1995); and Swadesh Rana, Small Arms and Intrastate Conflicts (New York: United Nations Centre for Disarmament Affairs, February 1995). In addition, the Arms Project at Human Rights Watch has done pathbreaking case studies on the trade in small arms that have been used in massacres and systematic human rights violations, most notably Arming Rwanda: The Arms Trade and Human Rights Abuses in the Rwandan

War (New York: Human Rights Watch Arms Project, January 1994).

7. This narrow emphasis on preventing transfers to ''rogue states'' is at the heart of the Clinton Administration's approach to arms sales, as embodied in Presidential Directive 41, which was released in February of 1994; in addition, the Clinton foreign policy team has maintained the Bush Administration double standard of denouncing Russia and China for particular weapons deals they have entered into the Middle East and Asia at the same time that the United States dominates the overall arms market in each of these regions. For a critical analysis of the ''rogue state'' strategy, see Michael T. Klare, *Rogue States and Nuclear Outlaws: America's Search for a New Foreign Policy* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1995).

8. It is a commonplace in discussions with representatives of U.S. industry and arms sales policymakers in Washington to hear the refrain that ''the French will sell to anybody,'' or words to that effect. While criticism of French arms transfer policy is certainly justified by France's recent record of providing arms that were used in devastating wars such as the 1991 Gulf conflict and the slaughter in Rwanda, Paris is hardly the only world power that needs to reexamine its weapons export practices.

9. Richard M. Nixon, *The Real War* (New York: Random House, 1980), p. 197.

10. On aggression by U.S. arms clients during the Nixon era see William D. Hartung, *And Weapons for All*, (New York: HarperCollins, 1994), pp. 25–26.

11. Steven R. Weisman, ''Reagan Lifts Ban on Sending Israel 16 Jet War Planes,'' New York Times, August 18, 1981; and Lee Lescaze, ''Reagan Lifts Ban on Delivery of 16 Jets to Israel,'' Washington Post, August 18, 1981.

12. On this point see Chapter 13, ''Clinton Policy: Arms Control or Business As Usual?'' in William D. Hartung, *And Weapons for All* (New York: HarperCollins, paperback edition, 1995).

13. Statement of Lt. Gen. Teddy G. Allen, Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, before the Subcommittee on International Economic Policy, Trade, Oceans, and Environment of the Committee on Foreign Relations, United States Senate, June 16, 1993.

14. Wording of the administration's policy goals is taken verbatim from ''Fact Sheet: Conventional Arms Transfer Policy,'' White House Press Office, Washington, DC, February 17, 1995.

15. Ibid. See also Thomas E. Ricks, ''Arms Sales to Take Into Account Effect on Industry,'' The Wall Street Journal, November 16, 1994.

16. Don Fuqua, President, Aerospace Industries Association, ''Merchants of Peace,'' Aerospace Industries Association Newsletter, Volume 7, Number 5, November 1994, p. 3.

17. Ethan Kapstein, ''America's Arms Trade Monopoly,'' Foreign Affairs, Vol. 73, No. 3, May/June 1994, p. 18.

18. See appendix A, Table I for details on U.S. transfers to fifty current conflicts. Data used for this analysis is drawn from two principal sources: U.S. Department of Defense, Defense Security Assistance Agency, *Foreign Military Sales, Foreign Military Construction Sales, and Military Assistance Facts as of September 30, 1993* (Washington, DC: DSAA, 1994), tables 2 and 6; and U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, *World Military Expenditures and Arms Transfers, 1991–92* (Washington, DC: U.S. GPO, 1994), Table III. For further details on sources, see the footnotes to Table I in Appendix A, below.

19. See Appendix A, Table I.

20. Human Rights Watch Arms Project, *U.S. Cluster Bombs for Turkey?*, (New York: Human Rights Watch, December 1994), p. 9.

21. Ibid., p. 11; see also British American Security Information Council, *Fueling Balkan Fires: The West's Arming of Greece and Turkey*, Project on the Arms Trade Report 93.3, (Washington, DC: BASIC, 1993), and British American Security Information Council, ''US-German Arms Exports and Greece at a Record High,'' May 20, 1994.

22. For an overview of Turkey's military industrialization drive and the role of U.S. and other foreign firms in helping to sustain it through coproduction and licensing deals, see Gulay Gunluk-Senesen, ''An Overview of the Arms Industry Modernization Program in Turkey,'' in *SIPRI Yearbook 1993: World Armaments and Disarmament* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993), pp. 521–532.

23. For the best review of the evidence on the Turkish armed forces use of U.S.-supplied systems against the PKK, see *U.S. Cluster Bombs for Turkey?*, op. cit., pp. 4–6.

24. Human Rights Watch/Helsinki, *Turkey: Forced Displacement of Ethnic Kurds from Southeastern Turkey* (Washington, DC: Human Rights Watch, October 1994), p. 4.

25. ''Turkey Unleashes a Massive Raid on Kurdish Bases in Turkey,'' *International Herald Tribune*, March 21, 1995.

26. Ibid.

27. Department of Defense News Briefing by Dennis Boxx, March 21, 1995, official DoD transcript.

28. ''Turkey Unleashes,'' op. cit., note 25; ''Turkish Army Readies Final Assault on Kurd Pockets,'' *International Herald Tribune*, March 25–26, 1995; and John Barham, ''Turkish Army Invades Iraq to Strike at Turkish Bases,'' *Financial Times* (London), March 21, 1995.

29. John Pomfret, ''Turkey's Hunt for the Kurds: The Making of a Quagmire?'', *Washington Post*, April 2, 1995.

30. Ibid.

31. ''UN Evacuates Kurds from Path of Turkey's Offensive,'' *International Herald Tribune*, March 27, 1995; ''Turkey Plays Down Criticism of Assault,'' *International Herald Tribune*, March 29, 1995; and Pomfret, ''Turkey's Hunt,'' op. cit.

32. Suna Erdem, ''Iraqi Kurds Say Turkey Torched Their Town,'' *Washington Post*, March 30, 1995.

33. ''Turkey Unleashes,'' op. cit.

34. ''Germany Withholds Materiel Over Drive on Kurds,'' *International Herald Tribune*, March 30, 1995.

35. David Morrison, ''Turkish War Concern for America,'' National Journal, April 15, 1995.

36. U.S. Cluster Bombs for Turkey, op. cit., pp .9–10; and Thomas W. Lippman, ''Rights Group Seeks to Block Proposed Cluster-Bomb Sale to Turkey,'' Washington Post, December 28, 1995.

37. ''Turkish Aid Says Troops Have Left Iraq,'' New York Times, May 5, 1995. The article actually cites conflicting reports from two different Turkish officials—Turkish Defense Minister Mehmet Golhan is quoted as saying ''We have no one there . . . We have withdrawn them all and we only have security measures on the border.'' However, the article goes on to indicate that ''Deputy Prime Minister Hikmet Cetin said . . . that a few troops still remain in Northern Iraq, but he did not give details.''

38. John Pomfret, ''Turkish Premier Assails Kurdish Attack's Critics,'' Washington Post, April 5, 1995.

39. Kenneth Katzman, ''Afghanistan: U.S. Policy Options,'' Congressional Research Service Issue Brief, November 29, 1993, p. 15.

40. Ted Galen Carpenter, ''The Consequences of Afghanistan,'' World Policy Journal, Vol XI, No. 1, Spring 1994, p. 77.

41. Jim Hoagland, ''No More Frankensteins,'' Washington Post, July 13, 1993.

42. Tim Weiner, ''U.S. Will Try to Buy Antiaircraft Missiles Back From Afghans,'' New York Times, July 24, 1993; on the ties of the World Trade Center suspects to Afghan weapons training camps, see Caryle Murphy, ''U.S. Policies Trouble Egypt,'' Washington Post, August 1, 1993 and Tim Weiner, ''Blowback from the Afghan Battlefield,'' New York Times Magazine, March 13, 1994.

43. William D. Hartung, ''Proliferation's Profiteers,'' CEO/International Strategies, February/March 1993.

44. Molly Moore, ''Missile Buyback Stumbles,'' Washington Post, March 7, 1994; and Tim Weiner, ''U.S. Will Try to Buy Back Antiaircraft Missiles from Afghans,'' op. cit.

45. David Rogers, ''U.S. to Buy Back Some of Missiles Held by Afghans,'' Wall Street Journal, January 15, 1993.

46. Weiner, ''U.S. Will Try to Buy Back . . .,'' op. cit.

47. Human Rights Watch Arms Project, India: Arms and Abuses in Indian Punjab and Kashmir, (Washington: Human Rights Watch, September 1994), pp. 5–11.

48. Christopher Smith, ''Light Weapons: The Forgotten Dimension of the International Arms Trade,'' in Brassey's Defence Yearbook 1994 (London: Center for Defence Studies, 1994), pp. 280; and Human Rights Watch, India: Arms and Abuses, op. cit., pp. 12–13; and Kenneth Katzman, ''Afghanistan: U.S. Policy Options,'' op. cit., p. 8.

49. Human Rights Watch, India: Arms and Abuses, op. cit., p. 5.

50. Matthew Jardine, ''Weapons for Genocide in East Timor,'' San Francisco Examiner, May 31, 1993; and Allan Nairn, ''A Narrow Escape from East Timor,'' USA Today, 11/21/91.

51. Human Rights Watch, Human Rights Watch World Report 1995 (New York: Human Rights Watch, December 1994), p. 157.

52. Ibid., p. 162; and Human Rights Watch, Human Rights Watch World Report 1993 (New York: Human Rights Watch, December 1992), pp. 177–178.

53. For the sources of the statistics cited in this paragraph, see appendix, Table I; for the quote on the potential sale of F–16s to Indonesia see ''F–16 Sale to Indonesia Gains Wider Support,'' Defense News, May 1–7, 1995.

54. R. Jeffrey Smith and Dana Priest, ''In Washington: Covert Aid Undermined Public Outrage,'' Washington Post, April 2, 1995.

55. Tim Weiner, ''Guatemalan Agent of CIA Tied to Killing of American,'' New York Times, March 23, 1995; Tim Weiner, ''CIA's Workaday Cloak,'' New York Times, April 5, 1995; and Tim Weiner, ''Retracting Words, White House Halts CIA Money to Guatemala,'' New York Times, April 5, 1995.

56. Alan Nairn, ''CIA Death Squad,'' The Nation, April 17, 1995.

57. The Warren Rudman quote is cited in Michael T. Klare and Peter Kornbluh, Low Intensity Warfare: Counterinsurgency, Proinsurgency, and Antiterrorism in the 1980s (New York: Hill and Wang, 1988), p. 19.

58. ''Mexico: The Uprising in Chiapas and Democratization in Mexico,'' Hearings Before the Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, U.S. House of Representatives, February 2, 1994 (Washington, DC: U.S. GPO, 1994), p. 103.

59. John MacCormack and Carmina Danini, ''Mexico Importing Riot Control Vehicles,'' San Antonio Express-News, April 27, 1994.

60. Ray Sanchez, ''Mexican Army Maneuvers In—Crackdown Overshadows Elections,'' New York Newsday, February 13, 1995; see also Appendix Table I.

61. Washington Office on Latin America, Clear and Present Dangers: The U.S. Military and the War on Drugs in the Andes, (Washington, DC: WOLA, October 1991), p. 1.

62. Testimony of Alexander Wilde, Executive Director, Washington Office on Latin America, to the Subcommittee on Western Hemisphere Affairs, Committee on Foreign Affairs, U.S. House of Representatives, June 6, 1990; Daniel Williams, ''Colombia Remains Ally in Drug Fight,'' Washington Post, March 2, 1995; and ''No Hail to Colombia,'' (unsigned editorial), Washington Post, March 6, 1995.

63. Data on U.S. aid and arms transfers to Ecuador is from U.S. Department of Defense, Defense Security Assistance Agency, Foreign Military Sales, Foreign Military Construction Sales, and Military Assistance Facts as of September 30, 1993 (Washington, DC: DSAA, 1994); and U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, World Military Expenditures and Arms Transfers, 1991–92 (Washington, DC: U.S. GPO, 1994), Table III.

64. U.S. Department of State and U.S. Department of Defense, Congressional Presentation on Security Assistance, F.Y. 1993, (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of State/Department of Defense, 1992), p. 156.

65. Information on U.S. military assistance and arms transfers to Peru is taken from appendix Table I; data on assistance under the Economic Support Fund program is taken from U.S. Department of Defense and U.S. Department of State, Congressional Presentation, op. cit., editions for F.Y. 1990 through F.Y. 1994.

66. U.S. Department of State and U.S. Department of Defense, Congressional Presentation for Security Assistance, F.Y. 1992 (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of State/Department of Defense, 1991), p. 252.

67. James Brooke, ''Ecuador and Peru Trade Air Strikes Along the Border,'' New York Times, February 12, 1995.

68. See appendix Table I.

69. United Nations Register of Conventional Arms: Report of the Secretary General (New York: United Nations General Assembly, October 11, 1993), pages 83 and 111.

70. ''Philippine Planes Bomb Guerrillas,'' International Herald Tribune, April 21, 1995.

71. Human Rights Watch Arms Project, Angola: Arms Trade and Violations of the Laws of War Since the 1992 Elections (New York: Human Rights Watch, November 1994), p. 47.

72. Philip Finnegan, ''Yemen's Iraqi Use Irks U.S., Defense News, December 5–11, 1994.

73. U.S. Department of Defense, Defense Security Assistance Agency, Foreign Military Sales, Foreign Military Construction Sales, and Foreign Military Assistance Facts as of September 30, 1990 (Washington, DC: DSAA, 1991); and United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, World Military Expenditures and Arms Transfers, 1990 (Washington, DC: U.S. GPO, 1991), Table III.

74. See statements by Joel Johnson and Don Fuqua of the Aerospace Industries Association (referenced in footnotes 16 and 17, above).

75. John M. Hogan, BNL Task Force Final Report—Report to the Attorney General, (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, October 21, 1994—released to the public in January of 1995); Neil Lewis, ''Inquiry Finds No U.S. Involvement in the Iraqi Buildup,'' New York Times, January 24, 1995; and Serge F. Kovaleski and R. Jeffrey Smith, ''Justice Department Find No BNL Conspiracy,'' Washington Post, January 24, 1995.

76. Michael Wines, ''U.S. Tells of Prewar Technology Sales to Iraq Worth $500 Million,'' New York Times, March 12, 1991.

77. U.S. Department of Commerce, ''Fact Sheet on Export Licensing for Iraq,'' with attached computer printout, March 1991.

78. Statement of Henry Gonzalez, Chairman, Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, U.S. House of Representatives, at Hearings Before the Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. House of Representatives, on the Issue of Appointing a Special Counsel on Matters Relating to Iraq, June 2, 1992, p. 7; and Congressional Record, March 16, 1992, pp. H1274–H1282.

79. Andy Pasztor, ''Investigators Say Chilean Dealer Smuggled U.S. Weapons to Iraq,'' Wall Street Journal, November 20, 1991; ABC News Nightline, show 2609, transcript, May 23, 1991; Kenneth Timmerman, The Death Lobby: How the West Armed Iraq, (New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1991), pp. 167–170 and 250; and ABC News 20/20, ''Made in the U.S.A.,'' February 1, 1991.

80. Dean Baquet, ''U.S. Supplied Arms to Iraq, Ex-Aide Says,'' New York Times, February 5, 1995.

81. For a capsule history of Gerald Bull's arms trafficking activities and his relationships with various U.S. government agencies, see William D. Hartung, And Weapons for All (New York: HarperCollins, 1994), pp. 195–197 and 235–236.

82. Hartung, op. cit., pp. 189–90 and 236–237.

83. ''The Man Who Made the Supergun,'' Frontline transcript, (Boston, MA: WGBH–TV, February 12, 1991).

84. William D. Hartung, ''Somalia and the Cycle of Arms Sales,'' Christian Science Monitor, February 22, 1993; U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, World Military Expenditures and Arms Transfers 1990, op. cit.; and Richard F. Grimmett, ''Somalia: Arms Deliveries,'' Congressional Research Service Report for Congress, October 28, 1993.

85. U.S. Department of State and U.S. Department of Defense, Congressional Presentation on security assistance programs, op. cit., editions for F.Y. 1980 through 1992.

86. Congressional Presentation, op. cit., F.Y. 1992 edition, p. 273.

87. See Appendix A, Table 1; and Grimmett, ''Somalia: Arms Deliveries,'' op. cit.

88. See Appendix Table I; Tim Weiner, Stephen Engelberg, and Howard French, ''CIA Formed Haitian Unit Later Tied to Narcotics Trade,'' New York Times, November 14, 1993; and Jane's Defense Weekly Global Update: Flashpoints and Conflicts, August 1994, pp. 21–24.

89. For a brief history of Congressional procedures for reviewing arms sales, see Chapter 3, ''Congress Steps In,'' in William D. Hartung, And Weapons for All, op. cit. pp. 45–62; and Richard Grimmett, Executive-Legislative Consultation on U.S. Arms Sales (Washington, DC: Congressional Research Service, 1982).

90. As of the early 1980s, it was still possible to construct a list of major U.S. arms sales proposals by tracking the announcements of new letters of offer that were reprinted in the Congressional Record; for an example of an analysis conducted using this data, see William D. Hartung ''Weapons for the World Update—1982,'' New York, Council on Economic Priorities, 1982, it is still possible to track major U.S. arms sales through a combination of Pentagon press releases and notices in the industry press, but this method can result in time lags that limit the ability of the public to learn about major sales proposals and make their views known to Congress before the 30 day period within which Congress can vote down a sale has passed. For current efforts to track major arms sales, wee the ''Deals in the Works'' section in Lora Lumpe, ed., Arms Sales Monitor (Washington, DC: Federation of American Scientists, published 8 to 10 times per year); and Sarah Walkling. ACA Register of U.S., U.S. Arms Transfers, (Washington, DC: Arms Control Association, February 1995).

91. The idea of reinstituting the section 657 reports has been put forward in recent years by a number of non-governmental organizations, including Human Rights Watch, the British American Security Information Council (BASIC), and the Project on Demilitarization and Democracy, See Natalie J. Goldring and Ottfried Nassauer, ''Available Sources and Data: The Trade in Light Weapons,'' paper prepared for the American Academy of Arts and Sciences Conference, ''International Trade in Light Weapons,'' February 24–25, 1994; and Stephen D. Goose and Frank Smyth, ''Arming Genocide in Rwanda,'' Foreign Affairs, Vol. 73, no. 5, September/October 1994, pp. 86–96.

92. Strengthening the Export Licensing System: First Report by the Committee on Government Operations (Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1991), pp. 40–53.

93. Lora Lumpe, editor, Arms Sales Monitor, No. 27, (Washington, DC: Federation of American Scientists, November 30, 1994), p. 9.

94. John M. Hogan, ''Addendum to the BNL Task Force—Final Report,'' (Washington, DC: United States Department of Justice, 1995), p. 3.

95. Caleb Rossiter of the Project on Demilitarization and Democracy suggested prohibiting covert arms supplies and training in his February 22, 1994 testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee's Subcommittee on International Economic Policy, noting that ''[C]overt aid programs corrupt the recipient precisely because they are covert and have no leverage . . . If we are to engage in aiding foreign forces, we should do so openly.'' A summary of Rossiter's testimony appears in Lora Lumpe, editor, Arms Sales Monitor, No 24, (Washington, DC: Federation of American Scientists, March 15, 1994), pp. 4–5.

96. See White House Press Office, ''Fact Sheet: Conventional Arms Sales Policy,'' and ''Fact Sheet—Criteria for Decisionmaking on U.S. Arms Exports,'' February 17, 1995; and Richard Grimmett, Conventional Arms Sales to the Third World, F.Y. 1986–F.Y. 1993, op. cit.

APPENDIX A: U.S. ARMS DELIVERIES TO AREAS OF CONFLICT, 1984–1993

Region/Conflict (Major conflicts in bold) [1]	U.S. deliveries, 1984–1993 ($ millions) [2]	Last year U.S. Arms delivered [3]	Percent of imports provided by U.S. 1987–91/1991–93 [4]	Other suppliers [5]
Europe:				
1. **Former Yugoslavia** (Conflicts in Croatia and Bosnia/Herzegovina)	$163.4	1991	13/0	Russia, Germany, Slovakia, Iran, Egypt, Saudi Arabia.
2. Spain (Govt. vs. Basque Separatists)	4,003.6	[6] 1993	85/86	France.
3. **United Kingdom** (British forces and protestant paramilitary groups vs. IRA).	6,318.5	1993	100/95	
4. **Russia** [7] (Conflicts in Chechnya and North Ossetia)	None			NA.
5. Moldova (Conflicts in Dniester region)	None			NA.
6. **Georgia** (Conflicts in Abkhazia and Southern Ossetia)	None			NA.
7. **Turkey** (Govt. vs. Kurdish separatists)	6,302.8	1993	76/80	Germany.
Middle East/North Africa:				
8. **Azerbaijan** (Conflict with Armenia over Nagorno/Karabakh)	None			NA.
9. **Iraq** (Conflicts with Kurdish groups in the North and Shiite Muslim groups in the South).	4.4 [8]	1989	<1/0 (see [8])	Former Soviet Union, China, France.
10. **Israel** (Vs. Palestine intifada through mid-1993 and vs. Hamas)	9,544.1	1993	99/91	
11. **Algeria** (Govt. vs. Islamic militants)	105.2	1993	1/0	Former Soviet Union, Egypt, China.
12. Morocco (Moroccan govt. vs. Western Sahara independence movement; UN referendum to be held).	404.0	1993	26/76	France, other West European suppliers.
13. Egypt (Govt. vs. Islamic militants)	7,227.9	1993	61/89	France.
14. **Sudan** (Govt. vs. Sudanese People's Liberation Army)	155.6	1989	9/0	China, Middle Eastern suppliers, Italy.
15. Yemen (Civil war, North vs. South)	50.6	1991	1/0 [9]	Former Soviet Union, China.
16. **Iran** (Govt. vs. Kurdish separatists, Mujahaddin guerillas)	Covert sales, value undisclosed [10]	NA	NA/0	Russia, China, European suppliers.
Sub-Saharan Africa:				
17. Mauritania (Govt. vs. black minority)	1.5	1992	<1/0	Former Soviet Union.
18. Mali (Govt. vs. Tuareg ethnic group)	.2	1993	<1/0	Former Soviet Union, Middle Eastern sources.
19. Chad (Ongoing civil war between Anakaza and Bideyet ethnic groups)	50.3	1993	27/25	France.
20. **Somalia** (Multi-sided clan warfare)	109.3	1991	44/100	Italy.
21. Senegal (Govt. vs. Diola tribe)	13.6	1993	11/100	France, other European suppliers.
22. **Liberia** (Govt. & West African peacekeeping forces vs. rebels led by Col. Charles Taylor).	33.4	1990	40/0	Former Warsaw Pact, Middle Eastern sources.
23. Togo (Govt. vs. opposition forces, including members of Ewe tribe)	1.9	1993	<1/0	Latin American sources.
24. Nigeria (Military-dominated govt. vs. pro-democracy forces; Hausa vs. Yoruba ethnic conflict).	82.4	1993	9/2	Italy, Czechoslovakia, Former Soviet Union, France.
25. Uganda (Govt. vs. rebels based in Northern Uganda)	10.6	1993	5/100	Former Soviet Union, Italy.
26. **Rwanda** (Hutu-dominated govt. vs. Tutsi minority; govt. overthrown by Rwandan Patriotic Front in 1994).	1.4	1993	<5/0	China, France, Egypt, Uganda, South Africa.
27. Burundi (Ethnic conflicts between Hutu & Tutsi ethnic groups)	.6	1993	<1/0	Former Soviet Union.
28. Kenya (Ethnic conflicts in Rift Valley region sparked by supporters of President Moi).	100.2	1993	25/100	U.K., France.
29. Zaire (Multiple rebellions vs. regime of President Mobutu)	55.9	[11] 1990	17/0	China, France.
30. **Angola** (Govt. vs. UNITA rebels)	250–300	NA	NA/0	Former Soviet Union (to Angolan govt.).
31. **South Africa** (Govt. & Inkatha Party supporters vs. ANC, through mid-1993; radical white ultra-nationalists vs. ANC govt.).	8.3 [13]	1988	NA/NA	See [13].
Asia:				
32. **Tajikistan** (Govt. vs. Islamic opposition)	Rebels have rec'vd U.S. weapons that were originally supplied to Afghan rebels by the CIA [14].	NA	NA/0	NA.
33. **Afghanistan** (Civil war among competing ethnic factions)	$2B in covert military assistance provided by U.S. to Afghan rebel factions, 1980–1991.	1991	NA/0	Former Soviet Union, Saudi Arabia (financier).
34. Pakistan (Govt. vs. secessionist movements in Sindh and NW Frontier Province; conflict with India over Kashmir).	1,801.7	1993	44/3	China.
35. **India** (Govt. vs. secessionist forces in Kashmir; govt. vs. Sikh militants in Punjab; govt. vs. secessionists in Assam; Hindu-Muslim conflict in state of Uttar Pradesh).	316.6	1993	1/0	Russia, U.K., West European suppliers.
36. Bhutan (Govt. vs. ethnic Nepalese rebels)	0.2	1992	<1/0	NA.
37. **Sri Lanka** (Govt. vs. Tamil insurgents; Sinhalese militants)	8.6	1993	7/0	China.
38. **Bangladesh** (Govt. vs. Chittagong Hill People's Coordination Association)	16.7	1993	4/5	Former Soviet Union, China.
39. **Myanmar (Burma)** (Govt. vs. Karen separatists, Islamic opposition)	6.2	1989	1/0	China.
40. China (Govt. vs. Tibetan independence movement; govt. vs. Muslim secessionists in Xinjiang province).	423.9 [15]	1993	8/1	Russia.

APPENDIX A: U.S. ARMS DELIVERIES TO AREAS OF CONFLICT, 1984–1993—Continued

Region/Conflict (Major conflicts in bold) [1]	U.S. deliveries, 1984–1993 ($ millions) [2]	Last year U.S. Arms delivered [3]	Percent of imports provided by U.S. 1987–91/1991–93 [4]	Other suppliers [5]
41. **Philippines** (Govt. vs. New People's Army)	619.3	1993	93/75	Italy.
42. **Cambodia** (Govt. vs. Khmer Rouge)	Covert assistance to rebel factions during 1980's; reports of U.S.-supplied Thai army transferring weaponry to Khmer Rouge [16].	NA	NA/0	Former Soviet Union, China.
43. **Indonesia** (Govt. vs. independence forces in East Timor; govt. vs. separatist movement in Northern Sumatra).	583.3	1993	38/33	Germany, Netherlands, U.K., other European suppliers.
44. Papua New Guinea (Govt. independence movement on Bougainville island)	None			Former Soviet Union.
Latin America:				
45. **Guatemala** (Govt. vs. Guatemala National Revolutionary Unity)	35.8	[17] 1993	86/0	Israel.
46. Haiti (Govt. and paramilitary forces vs. democracy movement, through mid-1994; new govt. and UN forces vs. paramilitary groups 1994 on).	2.6 [18]	1992	[19] >25/0	Latin American sources.
47. **Colombia** (Govt. vs. Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia; govt. vs. National Liberation Army).	647	1993	28/19	Brazil.
48. **Peru** (Govt. vs. Shining Path guerrillas; govt. vs. Tupac Amaru revolutionary movement).	136	[21] 1993	6/8	France, Former Soviet Union.
49. Brazil (Govt. vs. indigenous peoples of Amazon region)	528.8	1993	35/40	Germany, France.
50. Mexico (Govt. vs. rebel movement in Chiapas)	301.2	1993	77/64	

[1] This table reviews U.S. arms transfers to a list of fifty significant ethnic and territorial conflicts that were under way during 1993 or 1994. The informed reader will note that some of the conflicts listed here have since been resolved and/or reduced in intensity (for example, in South Africa and Angola), while other, new conflicts are not covered (such as the January/February 1995 Peru-Ecuador border war). For an explanation of how the list of conflicts was arrived at and the sources used in making that determination, see footnote 2 in the text, above. Countries listed in bold print represent major conflicts that have resulted in 1,000 or more battle-related deaths since the outbreak of the war.

[2] Unless otherwise noted, figures in this column are based on U.S. deliveries under the Pentagon's Foreign Military Sales (FMS) program and the commercial arms sales program (which involves items on the U.S. Munitions List and requires a license from the State Department); the source of the data is U.S. Department of Defense, Defense Security Assistance Agency, ''Foreign Military Sales, Foreign Military Construction Sales, and Military Assistance Facts as of September 30, 1993'' (Washington, DC: DSAA, 1994). One of the main limitations of this data source (a limitation common to all other major compilations of data on the arms trade) is that it does not include covert arms sales or sales to non-government recipients such as militias, guerrilla movements, and rebel organizations that are major players in the majority of today's ethnic and civil conflicts.

[3] The figures on the last year U.S. arms were delivered is based on data on deliveries under the FMS and commercial sales programs in ''Foreign Military Sales . . . Facts,'' op. cit. In many cases commercial arms sales are allowed to continue even after the U.S. government has cut off military aid and/or sales under the Pentagon's Foreign Military Sales programs.

[4] Data on the percentage of a nation's imports provided by the United States is drawn from United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, ''World Military Expenditures and Arms Transfers,'' 1991–92 and 1993–94 editions (Washington, DC: U.S. GPO, 1994 and 1995), Table III. The column on % of deliveries provided by the U.S. is divided into two time segments (1987–91 and 1991–93) separated by a slash. The one year overlap (1991 is covered in both series) is a function of ACDA reports the data in its 1991–92 and 1993–94 reports. The ACDA data are not directly comparable to the data on deliveries listed in column 2, because they cover a different range of equipment. The Pentagon's delivery figures include items considered to be weapons by virtue of their inclusion on the U.S. Munitions List. The Arms Control and Disarmament Agency (ACDA) report uses a broader definition that includes ''weapons of war, parts thereof, ammunition, support equipment and other commodities designed for military use . . . Dual use equipment, which can have application in both military and civilian sectors, is included when its primary mission is identified as military.'' Dual use equipment is by definition ''not'' included in the Pentagon's figures on deliveries under the FMS and CS programs. The time lag between the currency of the data on U.S. deliveries listed in column 2 and the ACDA data on the U.S. proportion of deliveries to each of the governments involved is a function of the slower schedule for the release of the ACDA data, which is no doubt in part a function of the greater difficulty of compiling information on arms deliveries and purchases by every nation in the world. As noted in note 2, above, the percentages listed here represent the proportion of weapons imported by the governments involved in each conflict that came from U.S. sources; there are no comparably reliable figures on supplies to non-state actors such as rebel movements and private militias. Listings of 0%* are marked with an asterisk to denote the fact that according to ACDA's figures the country in question received no arms imports from any governmental source during the period covered—this does not mean that there were no weapons deliveries at all, but rather that there are no known deliveries by governments (i.e., weapons may have flowed through covert or private channels).

[5] Unless otherwise noted, identifications of other major suppliers are drawn from two sources: U.S. ACDA, ''World Military Expenditures and Arms Transfers,'' Table III, op. cit., and Ian Anthony, Paul Claesson, Elisabeth Skons, and Siemon T. Wezeman, ''Arms Production and Arms Trade,'' in ''SIPRI Yearbook 1993: World Armaments and Disarmament'' (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994), Table 10B.3. Countries listed as other suppliers provided approximately 10% or more of a recipient government's imported weaponry in the most recent multi-year period covered by one or both of these sources. Since the periods covered begin before the breakup of the Soviet Union, all transfers involving constituent states of the former Soviet Union are identified as ''former Soviet Union.'' In the case of ongoing arms transfer relationships, Russia is by far the most active arms exporting nation amongst the former Soviet Republics, although its total deliveries in recent years have been only a fraction of the levels achieved by the Soviet Union during the 1970s and 1980s.

[6] Since the main data source for this table only goes up through 1993, an indication that the last U.S. delivery was in 1993 does ''not'' mean that U.S. arms shipments have been halted, but rather that as of the end of 1993 the nation in question was an active, ongoing weapons client of the United States.

[7] Human rights monitors have reported war-related deaths in Russia's intervention in Chechnya at levels as high as 20,000 to 25,000; although some observers have argued that these figures are an overstatement, there seems to be no question that this qualifies as a major conflict (based on a standard of 1,000 or more battle-related deaths).

[8] This figure for U.S. arms deliveries to Iraq does not include the $500 million in dual use items shipped to Iraq from the United States between 1985 and 1990, nor does it encompass covert shipments or sales of U.S. equipment via third parties. For a summary of these U.S. contributions to the Iraqi war machine, see the discussion of Iraq in section IV of the text, above.

[9] U.S. arms supplies to North Yemen from as early as 1978–79 made their way into the government arsenal of the combined state of Yemen formed by the merger of North and South Yemen; these shipments are not reflected in this table. For further discussion of this point, see section III, above.

[10] According to the final report of Iran/Contra special prosecutor Lawrence Walsh, the Oliver North/Richard Secord ''enterprise'' that ran the Iran/Contra arms operations for the Reagan Administration took in over $47 million and delivered substantial quantities of military equipment to Iran, including over 1,000 TOW anti-tank missiles; on this point, see Lawrence E. Walsh, ''Final Report of the Independent Counsel for Iran/Contra Matters, Volume I: Investigations and Prosecutions'' (Washington, DC: Office of the Independent Counsel, August 4, 1993). In addition, according to a 1986 report in ''Aviation Week and Space Technology,'' (Paul Mann and James K. Gordon, ''Iran Secures Operational Gains from U.S.-backed Military Aid,'' ''AW&ST,'' November 17, 1986), a Reagan Administration official involved in Middle East affairs asserted that ''at U.S. instigation Iranians bought critical radar and landing gear components that at times . . . enabled Iran to double the number of sorties flown by its McDonnell Douglas F–4 aircraft against Iraq.''

[11] For many years Zaire served as a conduit for U.S. covert arms supplies to rebel forces fighting against the Angolan government. It is not known precisely how much of this U.S. assistance may have been siphoned off to bolster the military forces of the Mobutu regime in Zaire. For a discussion of the role of Zaire in the Angolan arms pipeline, see Lucy Mathiak, ''Light Weapons and Internal Conflict in Angola,'' in Boutwell, Klare, and Reed, editors, ''Lethal Commerce,'' op. cit., pp. 89–90.

[12] The range of values cited for U.S. covert arms shipments to Angola in the 1980s is based on Human Rights Watch Arms Project, ''Angola; Trade and Violations of the Laws of War Since the 1992 Elections,'' op. cit., p. 47 (for the $250 million estimate); and Mathiak, op. cit., p. 89 (for the $300 million estimate).

[13] This figure does includes only officially sanctioned exports licensed by the U.S. government. There is considerable anecdotal evidence to indicate that a number of U.S.-based firms made shipments of weaponry and weapons components to South Africa during the 1970s and 1980s in violation of the United Nations arms embargo on the apartheid regime.

[14] On this point see Katzman, op. cit., ''Afghanistan: U.S. Policy Options,'' note 28 in the text.

[15] U.S. arms deliveries to China were suspended by the Bush Administration in response to the 1989 Tiananmen Square massacre, but the Clinton Administration has been flirting with the idea of reopening military exports to China, beginning with dual use items.

[16] There have been recent reports to indicate that the flow of weapons to the Khmer Rouge from Thailand and China has been cut off, starting some time in 1994 (cite new Human Rights Watch report).

[17] Although U.S. military aid and commercial arms sales to Guatemala were cut off in December of 1990 because of the Guatemalan government's record of human rights abuses, modest commercial deliveries continued through 1993, as did military-related aid under the ''international narcotics control'' segment of U.S. security assistance. See ''Human Rights Watch World Report 1993,'' op. cit., p. 117–118.

[18] Deliveries to Haiti listed here exclude $500,000 to $1 million per year in covert military aid supplied to Haitian military and intelligence forces between 1986 and 1991.

[19] This figure takes into account the provision of $3 to $6 million in military-related assistance justified as anti-narcotics aid (see note 18).

Dear Code of Conduct Supporter:

I would like to thank those who voted for the ''Code of Conduct'' during the markup of HR 1561 on May 11. The close vote (18–17) and the 101 cosponsors demonstrate the commitment and support for the ''Code.'' It is one of the most important reforms of the arms export process in two decades.

I will be offering the ''Code'' as a floor amendment to HR 1561 on May 24. I urge your support as we move this legislation forward.

Let's end the ''Boomerang Effect'' on our armed forces and take a serious step toward underscoring America's leadership role in the new world order and ending our role as the world's number one gun dealer.

We must live up to our claim to protect human rights, foster democracies and promote peace and stability. The arms sales of today are the ''Boomerangs'' of tomorrow. Vote for the ''Code of Conduct'' Amendment and end our role as the client for tyrants!

Sincerely,

CYNTHIA MCKINNEY,
Member of Congress.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, May 23, 1995]

IT'S TIME THE U.S. STOPPED ''BOOMERANG'' ARMS SALES—AN AMENDMENT TO FOREIGN AID BILL WOULD BAN WEAPONS FOR DICTATORS

(By Cynthia McKinney and Caleb Rossiter)

A defining moment in post-cold-war foreign policy will come today when the House of Representatives takes up the ''Code of Conduct'' amendment to the foreign aid bill. The Code of Conduct would ban US arms sales to dictators, human rights abusers, and governments not participating in the United Nations arms trade register.

On May 11, the code was narrowly defeated in the House International Relations Committee by an 18-to-17 vote after a heated debate. The vote on the House floor will be the first time in 19 years that Congress debates which countries should be permitted to receive our weaponry.

The code's surprisingly strong showing came despite the opposition of the Aerospace Industries Association, which represents arms-exporters whose political-action committees gave $7.5 million to candidates in the last election cycle. The Clinton administration also weighed in heavily against the amendment, with Assistant Secretary of State Wendy Sherman appearing before the committee and distributing a letter ''firmly opposing'' passage of the code while supporting its principles.

Congress is getting involved in arms restraint for the simple reason that successive administrations have failed to show leadership. In 1993, the administration approved a record $12.9 billion in arms sales to developing countries, three times the sales to all other countries combined. More than 90 percent of those weapons went to dictators. Then in February, 1995, the president issued a directive that, for the first time, makes corporations' financial health a factor in arms sales decisions.

As the Pentagon buys less, arms-makers pressure the government to keep production lines open by approving strategically questionable sales abroad. In fact, arms sales to developing countries have doubled since the fall of the Berlin Wall.

The arms industry claims that the increase in sales saves jobs. As defense industry profits and CEO salaries rise, however, layoffs of

line workers have increased almost in direct relation. Even worse for the American economy, one-third of all sales are paid for by the taxpayer through foreign aid. ''Offset'' agreements that help purchasing countries co-produce weapons and sell commercial products in America displace as many workers as the arms sales save.

Hence, we are giving bullies bigger sticks, even though in the past they have used them against their own people and the United States. We have already seen this ''boomerang effect'' from past sales to armed forces that oppressed their citizens. In the last four overseas US engagements—Panama, Iraq, Somalia, and Haiti—our troops faced the very weapons we sold to those dictators who were once our friends. In Somalia, we spent $2 billion and two dozen American lives trying to clean up the mess that flowed from our $200 million in arms sales.

Who among today's favored customers are tomorrow's Somalias and Iraqs?

If the House passes the Code of Conduct, maybe we will not have to find out. Until then, arms transfer policy will be business as usual—big business as usual.

Cynthia McKinney (D) of Georgia is the primary House sponsor of the McKinney/Hatfield Code of Conduct Bill. Caleb Rossiter is the former deputy director of the Congressional Arms Control and Foreign Policy Caucus.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS,
Washington, DC, May 10, 1995.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: During the full International Relations Committee mark-up of the foreign aid authorization, my colleague on the Committee, Cynthia McKinney, will be offering as an amendment her ''Code of Conduct on Arms Transfers'' bill (H.R. 772). I urge your support for this important reform of the arms sales process.

The amendment establishes a Code of Conduct for recipients of U.S. military exports and training. The President would decide which countries meet the specific language of the four criteria: promotes democracy, protects human rights, not engaged in aggression, and participates in the U.N. arms trade register. Countries not meeting the criteria would require a waiver agreed to by both the President and Congress.

At present, the decision on whether a country should be eligible to receive U.S. weapons is made by the executive branch alone. The Code of Conduct is really a congressional responsibility act that restores the balance that existed in the original Arms Export Control Act before a Supreme Court decision on an unrelated case invalidated its review procedures.

Arms transfers to undemocratic countries have been the Achilles heel of U.S. foreign policy. Many times we have spent scarce foreign aid cleaning up after conflicts fueled by our own arms transfers; many times we have seen our own troops face weapons we sold to once-friendly dictators. This bill creates a presumption against such transfers while providing a channel for a joint decision to approve them if national security requires.

I have attached for your review a description of the bill, which includes answers to questions about it. Thank you for your consideration of the McKinney amendment.

Sincerely,

HOWARD L. BERMAN,
Member of Congress.

AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL, USA,
Washington, DC, May 10, 1995.

Dear Member of the House International Relations Committee:

As a member of both the House International Relations Committee (HIRC) and the Congressional Human Rights Caucus you are in a strategic position to help stem the flow of U.S. weapons to countries who violate the human rights of its citizens. The ''Code of Conduct on Arms Transfers Act'' sponsored by Representative Cynthia McKinney (D–GA), will be presented to the HIRC as an amendment to ''Division C'' of the Foreign Aid Reorganization bill (H.R. 1561) as early as tomorrow. I urge you to vote in favor of this provision.

As an ally in exposing and stemming human rights violations, you recognize the importance of governments accepting accountability. Under this legislation, recipients of U.S. weapons and security assistance would have to vigorously investigate, discipline, and prosecute those responsible for violations, as well as take other positive measures to combat gross violation of internationally recognized rights.

The Code of Conduct would require the President to make an annual certification of countries eligible to receive U.S. weapons. Arms would be prevented from going to countries that are undemocratic, violators of human rights, engaged in armed aggression, not full participants in the U.N. Register of Conventional Arms. If a country does not meet the criteria, transfers can still be made if it is found to be in the interest of U.S. national security.

Amnesty International continues to investigate countries known to have committed human rights violations and their receipt of U.S. security assistance. The Code of Conduct offers another avenue to make violators of human rights accountable for their actions. We urge your support on this important legislation.

Sincerely,

JAMES O'DEA,
Director, Washington Office.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 9, 1995.

Dear International Relations Committee member:

As you may be aware, our colleague, Rep. Cynthia McKinney, will offer an amendment to attach the Code of Conduct for international arms sales to the Foreign Aid bill later this week. It is my hope that you will join Rep. McKinney, myself, and almost 100 of our colleagues in supporting this timely and reasonable legislation.

Often times, international terrorists acquire U.S.-supplied weapons through pro-American dictators, aggressors, and human rights abusers. A prime example of this was the supplying of Afghani rebels through Pakistan and Saudi Arabia. Moreover, the arms we supplied to the Shah of Iran eventually ended up in the hands of Khomeini and his global terror network. We must stop the boomerang effect which ends up placing U.S. troops, and even U.S. civilians, at the risk of being attacked by our own weapons.

The guiding principle of the Code is that U.S. arms should not be provided to countries that are undemocratic, violate human rights, or are engaged in acts of aggression. However, the United States currently provides 73 percent of all arms to the third world, many of which have not yet held a free and fair election or do not adhere to internationally accepted standards of human rights.

Congress owes it to the American people to play a stronger role in reaching decisions over the transfer and sale of weapons to rogue nations. While the Code is not a ban on arms sales, it will increase congressional oversight and public scrutiny of arms sales.

Once again, I urge you to support Rep. McKinney's Code of Conduct amendment in the International Relations Committee.

Sincerely,

ELIOT L. ENGEL,
Member of Congress.

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT AND WORLD PEACE,
Washington, DC, May 10, 1995.

Hon. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN,
Chairman, International Relations Committee, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN GILMAN: I write to express our concerns about H.R. 1561. I enclose a letter, which the U.S. Catholic Conference has co-signed, which opposes proposals to cut drastically development assistance and U.N. peacekeeping, and questions the wisdom of restructuring that could weaken development and human rights programs.

The enclosed letter does not address our strong support for continued U.S. funding for overseas assistance and protection for refugees, the main provisions for which are contained in a separate State Department Authorization Bill, H.R. 1564. It is our understanding that the International Relations Committee plans to vote on consolidated H.R. 1561, which incorporates these other provisions, rather than allowing them to be considered separately. We regret this decision as it leaves us in the uncomfortable position of opposing a consolidated bill that, in our view, is still fundamentally flawed but which contains provisions we would wholeheartedly endorse were they to be considered on their own merits.

In addition to these concerns, I would like to raise two additional matters related to this legislation. First, I encourage you to support the Code of Conduct on Arms Transfers, an amendment that will be offered to H.R. 1561. In his recent encyclical, The Gospel of Life, Pope John Paul II condemned the arms trade as ''scandalous.'' That weapons of war are bought and sold almost as if they were simply another commodity like appliances or industrial machinery is a serious moral disorder in today's world. The predominant role of our country in sustaining and even promoting the arms trade, sometimes for economic reasons, is a moral challenge for our nation. The foreign aid cuts in H.R. 1561 are another example of our country's increasing reluctance to share its economic resources in support of sustainable economic development, while we remain the dominant supplier of weapons to the developing world.

The Code of Conduct is important for two reasons. It imposes appropriate conditions for arms transfers: respect for democracy and human rights, non-aggression, and participation in the U.N. Register of Conventional Arms. And it would bring greater openness and public accountability to decisions to transfer arms by forcing these decisions to be more openly debated in Congress. The Code could thereby improve prospects that the United States would more strictly enforce and strengthen controls on arms transfers and would reduce substantially its role in this deadly trade.

Third, we are concerned about proposals to absorb the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency (ACDA) into the State Department. While we do not normally comment on matters of government reorganization, we are concerned that placing ACDA within the State Department will reduce the prominence of critical arms control and disarmament issues at a time when they are already receiving less attention than they have in the past. There is an urgent need to implement existing arms control agreements, to move toward deeper reductions in

nuclear weapons, to stem nuclear proliferation, and to control conventional weapons, such as landmines. Maintaining ACDA's independent voice in foreign policy making is more likely to ensure that this important arms control agenda receives the attention it needs.

Thank you for considering these various concerns about the legislation currently before the International Relations Committee.

Sincerely,

DREW CHRISTIANSEN,
Director, Office of International Justice & Peace.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 8, 1995.

Dear House International Relations Committee Member: The ''Code of Conduct Arms Transfer Act,'' restricts arms exports to countries that are undemocratic, do not abide by basic international human rights standard, and are engaged in acts of armed aggression.

Today—given the new world order—it is in the best interest of the United States to encourage the development of stable, democratic, and economically viable allies that respect the fundamental human rights of its citizens.

While there are current restrictions on exports of U.S. arms to countries that demonstrate a ''gross and consistent'' pattern of human rights abuses, these restrictions are seldom enforced. In fiscal year 1994, the State Departments' annual ''Country Reports on Human Rights Practices,'' showed that the U.S. sold weapons to at least four nations that had significant human rights abuses. These four nations purchased $6.2 billion in arms—nearly half of the total $12.9 billion sold. Additionally, $2 billion in U.S. grant money or subsidized U.S. loans to these nations was used to purchase arms.

It is time for Congress to become more proactive in protecting international human rights. We need to end arms exports to those nations that fail to respect the dignity and fundamental well-being of their citizens.

Your vote on May 11 for the Code of Conduct is a vote for the protection of basic human rights.

Sincerely yours,

DONALD M. PAYNE,
Member of Congress.

PROJECT ON DEMILITARIZATION AND DEMOCRACY
Washington, DC, May 5, 1995.

THE MCKINNEY-HATFIELD CODE OF CONDUCT ON ARMS TRADE: RESTORING THE CONGRESSIONAL ROLE IN THE ARMS TRANSFER PROCESS

This is the first major reform of the arms export process in two decades. Prior to enactment of the Arms Export Control Act in 1976, there were virtually no restrictions on the executive branch's arms transfers. Congress, led by Sen. Hubert Humphrey, enacted the Arms Export Control Act in response to record transfers of arms by Secretary of State Henry Kissinger. The Shah of Iran and President Marcos of the Philippines were among the leading recipients. Today's record U.S. transfers to undemocratic and unstable governments similarly threaten our interests in democracy and development abroad.

The Arms Export Control Act originally gave Congress a major role in reviewing proposed arms transfers, but the Supreme Court's decision in the unrelated ''Chadha'' case in 1983 eliminated that role. The AECA gave each House of Congress the ability to block a proposed transfer by passing a resolution. The Supreme Court ruled such ''one-House vetoes'' unconstitutional, declaring that Congress can only change policy by enacting laws, not by taking such partial steps as passing one-House resolutions. As a result, for the past 12 years, Congress could only block a sale by passing a resolution in both Houses and enacting it over a presidential veto, all within 30 days. In terms of time alone, this is nearly impossible. Congress has never enacted such a resolution, and rarely even takes up a resolution opposing an arms transfer, because there is no meaningful chance to succeed.

The Code of Conduct legislation would restore Congress to its earlier role as an equal partner in arms transfer decisions, by requiring congressional approval for sales to countries not meeting the Code's standards. Under the Code legislation, the President would certify countries for eligibility each year. The President could request a one-year waiver for a country not meeting the Code's standards (for democracy, human rights, aggression, and the U.N. arms trade register). Both Houses of Congress would have to approve the waiver, either by enacting a foreign aid bill containing the waivers, or by enacting a separate law. The Congressional Research Service has studied the Code of Conduct process, and declared it constitutional.

CALEB ROSSITER,
Director.

MAY 9, 1995.

DEAR MEMBER OF THE HOUSE INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS COMMITTEE: The undersigned arms control, development, religious, human rights and veterans organizations are writing to voice support for the ''Code of Conduct on Arms Transfers'' bill sponsored by Representative Cynthia McKinney (D-GA) and close to 100 other members. A full committee vote on the Code, as an amendment to the Foreign Aid bill, is expected this week. We urge you to vote in favor of this provision.

The Code of Conduct would require the President to make an annual certification of which countries are eligible, under four criteria, to receive U.S. weapons. To be eligible to receive U.S. weaponry a country cannot: grossly abuse human rights; deny democratic rights; or attack a neighbor or its own people. Also, countries must participate in the U.N. Register of Conventional Arms to be eligible. By creating these criteria weapons will be kept from countries that are bad risks and, it is hoped, the Code will induce undemocratic and aggressor nations to improve their current practices.

This bill is neither a ban nor a moratorium on arms sales. If, for national security reasons, the President wants to sell weapons to countries that are not certified, a majority of Congress must vote to approve the arms transfer. Under the current system, Congress can only vote to stop an arms sale. Under the Code of Conduct Congress can, after careful scrutiny, determine which countries are vital to U.S. security interests and should therefore be eligible to receive arms. The Code also underscores Congress' Constitutional power to regulate trade with foreign nations.

History has shown that sometimes American weapons last longer than U.S. friendships with foreign governments. In Panama, Somalia and Haiti, U.S. troops faced forces that has been equipped with American weapons. The Code of Conduct is an attempt to reduce the likelihood that the men and women of the armed forces will be affected by this ''boomerang effect'' of the arms trade. Only by closely examining the circumstances surrounding a pending arms sale can Congress hope to minimize the chance of an American soldier being injured by an American weapon.

Furthermore, in a time of tough budgetary decisions, continuing to spend billions of dollars each year in foreign aid to support arms transfers flies in the face of budget cutting measures. Reducing arms transfers would be a prudent way to cut federal spending while contributing to our national defense by keeping advanced weapons out of the hands of future potential adversaries.

As the world's leading arms supplier, the U.S. must demonstrate restraint and international leadership regarding weapons sales to undemocratic nations. The Code of Conduct provides the President and Congress an opportunity to take the first step to reduce the potential for conflict and to prevent harm being done to lives and livelihoods. We urge you to contact Representative McKinney's office to be listed as a co-sponsor of the Code and to vote in favor of this amendment when it comes before the full committee later this week.

Sincerely,

John Isaacs, President, Council For a Livable World; Howard Hallman, Director, Methodists United for Peace With Justice; Peter J. Davies, U.S. Representative, Saferworld; Steve Goose, Program Director-Arms Project, Human Rights Watch; Deborah Walden, Director of Policy and Programs, Women's Action For New Directions; Edith Villastrigo, National Legislative Director, Women Strike for Peace; Tim McElwee, Director, Church of the Brethren; John B. Anderson, President, World Federalist Association; Robin Caiola, Co-Director, 20/20 Vision; James Matlack, Director-Washington Office, American Friends Service Committee; Lora Lumpe, Director-Arms Sales Monitoring Project, Federation of American Scientists; Joe Volk, Executive Secretary, Friends Committee on National Legislation; Caleb Rossiter, Director, Project on Demilitarization and Democracy; Monica Green, Executive Director, Peace Action; Mark B. Brown, Acting Director-Lutheran Office for Governmental Affairs, Evangelical Lutheran Church in America; Vice Admiral John Shanahan, Director, Center for Defense Information; Maurice Paprin, President, Fund for New Priorities in America; Darryl Fagin, Legislative Director, Americans for Democratic Action; Jerry Genesio, Chairman/Executive Director, Veterans for Peace; Greg Bischak, Executive Director, National Commission for Economic Conversion and Disarmament.

MAY 8, 1995.

COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MEMBER: The officers, directors and members of Veterans for Peace urge you to support passage of the McKinney-Hatfield Code of Conduct on Arms Trade (H.R. 772). We understand the bill may be offered as an amendment to the Foreign Aid Authorization bill later this week.

Veterans for Peace (VFP) is a national membership organization of U.S. military veterans, including decorated veterans of both World Wars, the Korean and Vietnam Wars, and many other conflicts and skirmishes. Our members include retired officers and enlisted men, some of whom served twenty or more years. Many are graduates of military academies, a number are former POWs. One, a pilot during the Vietnam War, languished in the Hanoi Hilton for eight years. Two are recipients of the Congressional Medal of Honor, dozens received Silver and Bronze Stars for valor, and hundreds were awarded the Purple Heart for combat

wounds. The work of VFP is primarily educational: to raise awareness of the great costs of preparing for war and of war itself in comparison to the alternatives of international behavior.

The Code of Conduct legislation should have universal support, if for no other reason than the increasing phenomenon of U.S.-made arms returning to threaten our own U.S. forces. There are other reasons to support the bill. For example, it would substantially help:

Keep arms from dictators and countries using weapons in aggression against neighbors or even their own people;

Restore needed Congressional power and responsibility in the area of arms trade and control;

Protect the U.S. jobs currently being destroyed by the application of so-called ''offset'' agreements, by which defense contractors promote foreign goods in order to secure arms sales.

Thank you for your consideration of these important issues, and, hopefully, for your support of H.R. 772.

Sincerely yours,

JERRY GENESIO
Chairman and Executive Director
(USMC/1956–62).

CENTER FOR DEFENSE INFORMATION,
May 8, 1995.

THE MCKINNEY-HATFIELD CODE OF CONDUCT ON ARMS TRADE: ENSURING THE SAFETY OF U.S. MILITARY FORCES

The Clinton Administration's recent arms sales policy states that the impact on defense jobs must be taken into account when exports are considered. One wishes that the same consideration was extended to the impact on the lives and wellbeing of American service personnel. The current laissez-faire status quo in the international arms trade, where increasingly any conventional weapons sale is deemed permissible as long as it purports to make a profit for its manufacturer, is creating a self-generated danger—the possibility that our service men and women will someday be fighting nations or groups who obtained U.S. weapons and technology.

Many of our former current and arms customers—Panama, Iran, Iraq, Israel, numerous Arab countries, Taiwan, South Korea, Pakistan, and India are in highly volatile parts of the world or have undemocratic governments. Thus our arms and technology sales potentially create—as in the Gulf—the very threat our own forces may someday confront. Furthermore, the threat we are building by our arms sales also justified the continued inflated military spending for even newer equipment to counter the items we have sold others.

Even the Pentagon now officially acknowledges that it faces the prospect of American weapons being used against U.S. military personnel. In the latest Annual Report of the Secretary of Defense to the President and Congress Secretary William Perry writes, ''In general, threats encountered in MRCs [Major Regional Conflicts] would be standing armies of foreign powers, armed with mixes of old and modern weapons systems. . . Thus, U.S. forces must be prepared to face a wide variety of systems, including some previously produced in the United States.'' [author's emphasis, p. 170]

A comparison of the Pentagon's own data on deliveries of weapons through the U.S. FMS and commercial sales programs over the past decade with a list of fifty significant wars that were under way during 1993–94 indicates that U.S. weapons exports have played a major role in fueling the ethnic and territorial conflicts that have become the primary post-war security challenge as indicated by the Pentagon's own Bottom-Up Review and National Military Strategy. These are the same types of conflicts U.S. forces are most likely to be deployed to in the future.

Parties to 45 current conflicts have taken delivery of over $42 billion worth of US weapons in the past decade.

Out of the fifty significant ethnic and territorial conflicts going on during 1993–94, 90% (45 out of 50) of them involved one or more parties that had received some US weapons or military technology in the period leading up to the conflict.

In more than half of the fifty current conflicts (26 out of the 50), the United States has been a significant arms supplier, accounting for at least 5% of the weapons delivered to one party to the dispute over a five year period.

Areas where U.S. weapons are most likely to be utilized in current or future conflicts include southern Europe; the Middle East and North Africa; Sub-Saharan Africa; Southwest and Southeast Asia; and Central and Latin America.

This data raises serious questions about the claim that US weapons are only used for defensive purposes. As a weapons supplier to fully 90% of the areas where wars are now going on and a major supplier to more than one-third of these areas, it is clear that the US is bolstering the warfighting capabilities of a substantial number of the parties to the world's current conflicts. It does not take a stroke of genius to realize that these capabilities can just as easily be used against U.S. soldiers, sailors, and airmen. It is a sad irony that the current U.S. arms trade policy confirms the words of cartoonist Walt Kelly's character Pogo when he said, ''We have met the enemy and he is us.''

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 8, 1995.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: The House International Relations Committee will mark up HR 1561, the Foreign Aid and Reorganization Bill this week. I will offer HR 772, the Code of Conduct Arms Transfer Act as an amendment to Title 31 of Division C. The ''Code'' now has 99 cosponsors in the House and would provide guidelines for arms exports—prohibiting transfers to governments that are undemocratic, violate human rights, or are engaged in acts of armed aggression.

The ''Code'' would not ban all arms sales. Sales and transfers would continue in the national interest of the United States and to those nations which meet the ''Code's criteria.'' Today's exports could be tomorrow's nightmare for American forces. In the last four US deployments—Panama, Iraq, Somalia, and Haiti—American troops faced armies strengthened by US materiel and technology. In 1993, of the 14.8 billion in US arms sales, 90 percent were purchased by nations that do not meet the Code's guidelines.

Americans throughout the nation support the ''Code''—with more than 227 citizen's organizations endorsing its principles and 96 percent of Americans demanding an end to arms sales to dictators.

Let's stop the ''Boomerang effect.'' Vote for the ''Code of Conduct on May 11!''

Please contact Robin Sanders at 51605 with questions or concerns.

Sincerely,

CYNTHIA MCKINNEY,
Member of Congress.

FRIENDS COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL LEGISLATION,
May 10, 1995.

House International Relations Committee,
U.S. House of Representatives Washington, DC

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: Does the United States need a Code of Conduct on Arms Trade? Who answers Yes to that question?

Vietnam Veterans of America Foundation; Amnesty International; Human Rights Watch; Lutheran Office for Governmental Affairs; Maryknoll Justice & Peace Office; Federation of American Scientists; Bread for the World; Committee for National Security.

Institute for Food & Development (Food First); United Methodist Church, General Board of Church & Society, Peace with Justice Program; American Baptist Churches, USA; Center for Defense Information; Physicians for Social Responsibility.

More than 250 other national and regional organizations have endorsed the principles for a Code of Conduct on Arms trade.

Humanitarisn aid, human rights, arms control, economic development, women's religious, and veterans' agendas, all would benefit from a Code of Conduct on Arms Trade. That is why the Code is popular with a growing grassroots movement for nonproliferation of conventional weapons.

The Friends Committee on National Legislation urges you to vote for the Code of Conduct on Arms Trade when the House International Relations Committee considers the amendment by Representative McKinney on the Foreign Aid Authorization bill.

Sincerely,

JOE VOLK.

BRITISH AMERICAN SECURITY INFORMATION COUNCIL.

To: Members of the House International Relations Committee.
From: Bronwyn Brady and Susannah Dyer, BASIC.
Re: Arms Transfer Amendment to Foreign Aid Bill.
Date: 10 May 1995.

It has come to our attention that the Committee is scheduled to vote on the Code of Conduct on Arms Transfers as an amendment to the Foreign Aid Bill. Your consideration of this legislation coincides with a parallel initiative being pursued in the European Union.

Congress now has the opportunity to join its partners in the European Union as they seek to implement similar controls. According to the US Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, Europe and the United States together sell over 90% of the world's weapons. Focusing narrowly on maintaining market share, no country has been willing to take unilateral steps toward control, fearing it will lose export markets to competitors. Therefore, it is vital that as the world's leading suppliers, the EU and the United States work together to implement restraint. Cooperation will prevent either US or European companies from undercutting one another in pursuit of sales.

Tomorrow in Brussels, the European Code of Conduct will be launched, calling on the EU to adopt stricter controls on weapons exports. This Code builds on the eight existing criteria on arms exports already agreed by member states in 1991–92. These criteria stress that weapons exports should take into consideration: the purchasing country's human rights record; the internal and regional stability of recipient states; and the effects of weapons purchases on the recipient country's economy.

A number of members of the European Parliament have declared their support for this initiative, highlighting the need for a coherent and controlled approach to European weapons exports, and encouraging the Parliament to press for the Code. In addition,

the proposed Code has already been endorsed by almost 50 NGOs across Europe, including Save the Children and Medico International. In the lead-up to the review of the Maastricht Treaty in 1996, it is critical that an effective EU arms export control regime be an integral part of an EU Common Foreign and Security Policy.

In addition to the US and European Code of Conduct Initiatives, similar measures have also been pursued in other international fora. In November 1994, a proposal was tabled at the United Nations, calling for a Code of Conduct for international conventional arms transfers with a view to promoting restraint. These efforts will continue in both working groups and the General Assembly. In addition, the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) agreed a series of ''Principles Governing Conventional Arms Transfers'' in December 1993, requiring member states to consider human rights, and reiterating ''their strong belief that excessive and destabilizing arms buildups pose a threat to national, regional, and international peace and security''. It is clear that there is growing international consensus regarding the urgent need to restrain the international weapons trade.

In its position as the world's leading exporter of weaponry, the United States has a special responsibility to provide a global leadership in the area of restraint. Passage of the Code will encourage the United States to work in concert with its allies to control the spread of weapons to rogue regimes and regions of conflict. This will prevent scenarios such as the one which unfolded in the Gulf War, where US troops faced weapons supplied to Iraq by both the United States and its European allies.

As your European counterparts begin developing a harmonized EU arms export policy, we urge you to support the Code of Conduct amendment and demonstrate US leadership in promoting unified international restraint of the global weapons trade. Please feel free to contact our office in London or Washington for further details on the European initiatives described above.

UNITARIAN UNIVERSALIST
ASSOCIATION OF CONGREGATIONS,
Washington, May 10, 1995.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: Unitarian Universalist Association of Congregations, strongly supports the Code of Conduct on Arms Transfers bill introduced by Rep. Cynthia McKinney and Senator Mark Hatfield that would place restrictions on the sale and transfer of conventional weapons by the United States to dictators.

We think that the present U.S. arms sales policy which permits the sale of arms to governments which abuse internationally recognized human rights; engage in aggression against their own people or other nations; and do not participate in international efforts to control arms is not in our national interest, fuels regional and local conflicts and aids and abets undemocratic governments.

The Arms Export Control Act of 1976 (AECA) gave Congress the power to review proposed U.S. arms exports using a human rights standard. Unfortunately, the AECA has not stopped a single arms transfer since it became law. The Supreme Court in 1983 found the Congressional mechanism whereby either House could block such sales to be unconstitutional. The McKinney-Hatfield Code of Conduct bill would return to Congress a mechanism for participating in the decision making process on U.S. arms transfers.

We respectfully urge you to support the McKinney measure when it comes before the Committee. The Code of Conduct on Arms Transfers has gained more support among the Unitarian Universalist grassroots than any other legislation we have worked on.

The time has come for charting a new U.S. arms sales policy that puts our country on the high ground and sets an example for the international community to match.

Sincerely,

ROBERT Z. ALPERN,
Director.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

(Ms. WOOLSEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the code of conduct amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Georgia, and I would like to commend her for her tireless work on this important issue.

As written, our current arms transfer policy is reckless and dangerous. Over the past decade, we have sent weapons to countries who have turned around and used them against our sons and daughters in the Armed Forces. We have provided ammunition for governments who oppress their people and commit acts of aggression against the international community. U.S. arms transfer policy must be more responsible.

In the debate over military spending and foreign policy, we continue to hear that ''the cold war is over, but the world is still a dangerous place.'' Mr. Chairman, our current arms transfer policy is making the world an even more dangerous place. I thought we fought the cold war in order to make the world safe for democracy and human rights, not dangerous for U.S. soldiers and innocent citizens worldwide.

Opponents of this measure argue that the United States should not restrict itself to selling arms only to countries who promote democracy and protect human rights. They suggest that we should be allowed to sell weapons to countries which may not fit these categories, but who are friendly to the United States.

Mr. Chairman, Members of the House, Manuel Noriega used to be friendly. Iraq used to be friendly. Why do we refuse to learn that even the Devil can be friendly if he wants to make a deal?

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the McKinney amendment and reject the current reckless arms transfer policy.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. WOOLSEY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to add my support for what the gentlewoman said for the McKinney amendment. This is a restrained and sensible set of guidelines which reinvolve the Congress in the way that it used to be in the process of arms transfers before the Supreme Court decision knocked that process out and made us essentially irrelevant.

This provides waiver authority. There may be times when a country that is bad on human rights or a country that is not democratic should get some of our assistance for other, larger kinds of considerations.

□ 1245

There is waiver authority here. Come to Congress, let us go through that process. I think it is a sensible, restrained approach to try and deal with the causes of regional instability in so much of the world and the fueling of an arms race.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to express my support for the amendment offered by my colleague, the gentlewoman from Georgia, [Ms. MCKINNEY].

This amendment establishes a code of conduct for recipients of U.S. military exports and training. It gives the President the authority to decide which countries meet the four responsible criteria: promote democracy, protect human rights, not engaged in acts of aggression, and participants in the U.N. arms trade register. Those countries which do not meet the criteria would require a waiver agreed to by both the President and the Congress.

As we apply conditions on our military aid to other countries, so should we apply conditions to our weapons exports. It is outrageous that in our last four overseas United States engagements—Panama, Iraq, Somalia, and Haiti—our troops were threatened by weaponry that we sold to various dictators who were once our friends, and later our enemies.

As the only superpower in the world, it is imperative that the United States set the standard for responsible leadership. Congresswoman MCKINNEY's amendment would ensure our moral leadership by prohibiting the sale of arms to those countries that are undemocratic, violate human rights, or are engaged in acts of armed aggression.

Arms transfers to undemocratic countries which past administrations have courted for a variety of reasons, have often come to haunt us. We have spent precious human and financial resources cleaning up after conflicts which were fueled by our own arms transfers. Our own children have been endangered by the very same weaponry that we sold because of short-term foreign policy interests. This legislation will protect our children in the future by creating a presumption against such transfers, but does establish a thorough, responsible review process for those sales that are in our best interest.

Mr. Chairman, I ask the Members to support the McKinney amendment.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I find myself in a kind of an uncomfortable position because I do not particularly like some of the ways that the President has conducted

foreign policy, and I did not particularly like the invasion of Haiti or the way he conducted our operations in Somalia and lost a bunch of American lives, but here is one case where I do agree with the President. The President has to have some leverage and be able to conduct foreign policy, and many times his ability to negotiate with countries that are buying U.S. arms is one way that he can get the job done.

So the President of the United States, Mr. Clinton, is against this particular amendment. In this particular case, I concur with him because I think it hamstrings him in one respect, as far as his ability to conduct foreign policy is concerned.

But, in addition to that, there is another economic issue that needs to be taken into consideration. If anybody believes that a country that wants to buy weaponry is going to not buy it simply because they cannot buy them from the United States, they are just barking up the wrong tree. France sells weapons, Great Britain sells weapons, a number of countries sell sophisticated weaponry. If they do not buy them from the United States of America, then certainly they are going to buy them from some place else.

It will have an adverse economic impact on many segments of our society. If you go out to California and take a look at the aircraft industry, it is in a depressed state. It is starting to come out of it now because of the commercial sales. The fact of the matter is if you put these kinds of constraints on the sales of these kinds of materials, you are going to have an impact on industry in this country, and there are going to be a lot of people lose their jobs and those jobs will go overseas to manufacturers of this equipment in foreign countries.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the sentiments that the gentleman from Indiana is showing in terms building up our own economic base here at home. It is a legitimate concern.

This amendment does not say that we cannot sell arms to Third World countries, nor does it say we cannot sell arms to other countries throughout the world. All it says is that when there are human rights abuses, when there are gross inequities in terms of how the country that is trying to purchase arms treats its neighbors, is overly aggressive in those issues, in terms of spending far too much money on its own arms industry rather than looking out after its own people, that the United States ought to take those issues into account.

It gives the President the flexibility of overruling these on a national security basis, and in any given year. So I think it does provide the kind of flexibility that is necessary to address the concerns the gentleman from Indiana has articulated, but it does put us into the immoral position that we are currently in where we are actual selling arms to our neighbors that end up using those arms, or to our friends that end up using those arms against us when we get into conflict.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I disagree simply because the President of the United States has the ability right now to put pressure on those countries by not allowing arms sales to them. As a matter of act, the President has exercised that authority already in a number of countries. If you followed what has been going on in the past several years, you will find there are a number of countries that even purchased equipment from the United States and the President has not allowed those purchases to go forward.

So he does have some latitude. It is a Democrat President. He is asking for this authority to be maintained. Whether it is a Republican or Democrat, I would support it.

The fact of the matter is there is an inconsistency as far as our foreign policy is concerned. There are many pieces of legislation which I have sponsored, regarding human rights abuses in India, for instance, that have not passed this House because the minority now, then the majority, would not support them.

So I find it kind of interesting that here is the President of the United States wanting to protect his ability to conduct foreign policy and, because of human rights issues, his party is trying to stop it, while at other times in our history when we were fighting for human rights abuses to be removed on other pieces of legislation, we could not get that support.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. If the gentleman would yield further, maybe this kind of legislation would actually improve and get the kind of result that you were looking for in terms of your amendment with regard to Pakistan.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Not Pakistan. India.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. With regard to India in times past. The fact of the matter is, if we had a uniform policy instead of the hodgepodge policy that we have today, I think we would get the moral leadership of the rest of the world to support us, as we have seen today in the European Parliament, which is taking up legislation very similar to this.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I appreciate the gentleman's contribution. In a perfect world we might have a consistent foreign policy worldwide. But as the gentleman well knows, we do not have a perfect world; we have an inconsistency in foreign policy. That is why the President, whether Republican or Democrat, has to have latitude in conducting that foreign policy that includes the ability to stop arms sales or allow those arms sales to go forward.

I am very sympathetic to the human rights abuses issue being raised here.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BURTON of Indiana was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I am very sympathetic to the human rights issue being raised here. This is a very, very complex world. It is a dangerous world. Even though the so-called cold war is over, we still have to have a foreign policy that will allow us to be able to deal with friends to make sure that they have the ability to defend themselves.

I might add one more time, if we do not sell them these weapons, we will make sure that they will buy them someplace else. Let us allow that the President of the United States will be able to make these determinations where necessary and at the same time protect American jobs by not letting them go overseas.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. If the gentleman will yield further, the fact is that I have worked very closely with Members of the Republican side in the Committee on Banking and Financial Services to structure amendments that are very similar to this dealing with funding for the World Bank and the IMF, which have received bipartisan support. The question is whether or not Members of this body want to provide this authority in the Presidency or whether or not we want to establish this as a national policy for this country.

We have gotten bipartisan support for such a policy in times past, and I would hope we would gain support on the Republican side for this well-thought-through amendment that the gentlewoman from Georgia [Ms. MCKINNEY] is offering.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] has again expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BURTON of Indiana was allowed to proceed for 30 additional seconds.)

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Let me just end up by saying that we have asked time and time again that there be a stronger voice by the Congress in the conducting of foreign policy, and the Administration has found that they do not want that to be accomplished. They wanted to keep that power in the executive branch, and I understand that. And we have not been successful in making those changes.

In this particular case, I think the President's arguments are well founded, and I, as a Republican, find myself once again in a difficult position, but I am supporting the President in this particular case.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MILLER of California. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

I rise in strong support of this amendment. I think it is very important that we consider it. I would hope we would pass it.

The gentleman is right. It is not a perfect world, but we have got to strive to make it a better world.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the amendment offered by my colleague, the gentlewoman from Georgia [Ms. MCKINNEY].

The United States has long been an arms merchant to the world, Mr. Chairman, but this amendment is not about the quantity of arms sales. This amendment is about who we sell arms to and who makes these decisions.

At the present time, except in rare circumstances, the executive branch alone decides what countries are eligible to receive weapons. This process has resulted in arms transfers to undemocratic countries that use our arms to maintain their own control and to oppress their own people, and in recent United States military operations overseas, in Panama, Iraq, and Somalia, our troops had to fight against hostiles armed with the very weapons we previously sold to them.

We sold $200 million in weapons to Somalia. We spent $2 billion fighting soldiers armed with these weapons, many times at the destruction of the U.S. soldiers and citizens.

This amendment brings Congress into the arms sales process without tying the hands of the President. This amendment sets reasonable criteria that have to be met before arms can be transferred, including promoting democracy, protecting human rights, participating in the U.N. arms trade register, and refraining from aggression. A waiver is provided for countries that do not meet this criteria if the national security requires.

Mr. Chairman, the McKinney amendment is a very sound amendment. It is reasonable and responsible reform. It restores the balance of power in arms sales between the legislative and the executive branches. It helps secure responsible decisions in this important policy area.

Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentlewoman from Georgia [Ms. MCKINNEY] for bringing forth this wonderful amendment, and I strongly urge its passage.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Let me commend the sponsor of the code of conduct amendment, and let me try to be as brief as possible, Mr. Chairman.

I rise in support of this amendment. I think that we cannot divorce American ideals from American foreign policy, and in the area of arms sales, I do not think we would want our contribution and our legacy to the world to be that we have sold arms to everyone and allowed for the continuation of the practice of war as almost a permanent vocation in this world.

So I would hope that we would support the McKinney amendment and the companion effort in the Senate because I think it moves us in the right direction, and even though it may be a debatable matter in some people's minds, I think that for all of us, if we want to be on the right side of history on this issue, that we should, in the final analysis, find ourselves voting favorably for the McKinney amendment.

Mr. SALMON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is offered in good faith. But it is slightly misnamed. This amendment is not about human rights, and this amendment is not about foreign policy. This amendment instead is about a philosophical difference that exists within the Congress.

Some in this body simply believe that all arms sales to our allies are wrong in all cases. They believe that helping our allies defend themselves and helping them defend our vital interests amounts to exporting violence.

□ 1300

I disagree. Often selling arms to our allies may mean we do not have to send U.S. troops, and that makes sense for Americans.

Moreover, responsible arms sales have for many years played an important role in our Nation's foreign policy.

Obviously, opponents of arms sales to our allies could not hope to enact a complete ban on the practice, so they have come up with this lesser amendment.

But we should not artificially restrict our arms sales to our allies, or hold them hostage to interpretations of vague definitions contained in this amendment.

I welcome continued debate on whether we should ban all arms sales to other nations. But this back door effort at beginning such a ban today, should be defeated.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MICA].

Mr. MICA. Mr. Chairman and my colleague, I just want to make a couple of points and rise in opposition to the amendment that has been offered here this afternoon.

First of all, this does address the human rights violation question, and none of us favor any type of human rights violations anywhere in the world or by any of our allies, but the matter of fact is that this amendment is not a realistic amendment, and it is not a needed amendment. I say to my colleagues: First of all, if you want to look at human rights violations, just refer to—and I invite all my colleagues to do this, and other folks that are listening—read the Amnesty International human rights violation reports. You find actually one of the countries that is cited is the United States. Not only is the United States cited, but you also have Israel, Egypt, Turkey, and, if this amendment passed, I think you really would jeopardize the status of peace efforts in the Middle East if this was properly applied according to the language in the amendment, and again I think it serves no purpose. We must work against human rights violations wherever they occur, and human rights violations are not condoned by this Congress.

Let me also point out that a major flaw in this amendment is the President already has the authority. Maybe the other side of the aisle or the sponsor does not trust the President of the United States, but in fact under current law the President of the United States is required to even notify Congress before there is an arms sale in the appropriate committee of Congress.

So first of all, it is not a realistic amendment, and it is not an amendment that recognizes that there are human rights violations, whether it is in the United States or with our allies that are sometime recipients of these arms; and, second, the amendment has no purpose because the President really already has the authority, and the Congress is, in fact, notified when there are these arms sales pending. So it is not a needed amendment, and it is not a useful amendment, and I urge its defeat.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of this amendment authored by the gentlewoman from Georgia [Ms. MCKINNEY].

This amendment is about the new world order. The United States has emerged as the undisputed political, economic, and military leader of the world.

With the end of the cold war, the old ways of doing international business—especially military business—are no longer adequate. This is a time to reevaluate. It is a time for America to live up to the promise of its creed—across our borders as well as within them.

This Nation must not support dictators. It must stand strongly against human rights abuses. We have the capacity—through diplomatic pressure, business opportunity, and military arms relationships—to make the world safer for its citizens. The United States should exercise that power. This, Mr. Chairman, is what the McKinney amendment is all about.

We only need to look at the recent past to find examples of good intentions gone bad in the U.S. arms sales.

Many people have heard about the recent, gross violations of human rights in Turkey. Turkey happens to be one of the largest recipients of United States military aid. Former Assistant Secretary of Defense Lawrence Korb testified yesterday that Turkey's rulers

have used United States-supplied F–16's, Black Hawk helicopters and M–60 tanks against its own Kurdish population.

The United States also militarily supplies human rights abusers in Indonesia and Malaysia. Unfortunately, we are considering more aid to the Government of Indonesia—despite widely reported human rights abuses by the Indonesian military against East Timor.

In the not quite so recent past, this country felt forced to stop a military exercise by Iraqi leader, Saddam Hussein. We had a major war—risking the lives of thousands of soldiers—against Iraq, a country which had always been a human rights abuser, and which had been the recipient of U.S. aid, including military aid.

Too many times in this country's history, we have been short-sighted policy in our arms export policy. Too many times, short-term military alliances have led to long-term human rights disasters, or worse.

The McKinney amendment does not preclude military assistance to any country. If the President and Congress agree that an arms sale is in the national security interest, that sale would be allowed.

However, the McKinney amendment would establish basic, humane, and appropriate standards for the conduct of U.S. military export policy. These standards are common sense standards such as requiring our military exports to go to countries which hold free and fair elections; such as being sure our sales go to countries which do not engage in gross violations of human rights, and making sure that our arms exports do not go to countries which engage in illegal acts of armed aggression.

If there was ever a time when this country could justify working with human rights abusers to further some longer-term strategic objective, that time is surely past. This country, without any serious military threat to our security, now must face its responsibility, and act as the world's moral leader. The McKinney amendment would apply a moral test to U.S. foreign policy.

Let us assert our role as a moral leader in the world. Support the McKinney amendment.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

(Mr. BEREUTER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the McKinney amendment. I agree with some of her concerns, but not the solutions embodied in the amendment.

Certainly, Mr. Chairman, during the cold war the two superpowers did transfer billions of dollars of weapons to the developing world every year as a part of their strategic competition. With the dissolution of the former Soviet Union and excess conventional military equipment flooding global markets, I believe it is essential to find a way to stop the spiral of militarization. An overarmed developing world not only has a terrible human cost, it is also contrary to American interests in fostering democracy, building political stability, and enhancing growing global economy, and I think those are some of the gentlewoman's concerns, and I certainly agree with them.

In my mind the solution to the problem of militarization in arms transfer must be a multilateral one. It would do us, nor the developing world, any good if we reduce exports only to find the gap filled by other suppliers. Yet it is also clear that multi-lateral solutions require U.S. leadership both by the President and by the Congress.

Congress has already begun to address the need for arms restraint, enacting several measures which I support, including, No. 1, encouraging the President to establish a multilateral arms restraint regime; No. 2, imposing a moratorium on the export of antipersonnel land mines and calling on the administration to negotiate a worldwide ban on their deployment; and, No. 3, calling on the administration to oppose multilateral lending to countries who refuse to reduce military spending in concert with their neighbors.

That brings me to the amendment at hand.

Mr. Chairman, I am in strong agreement with the sentiments, as I said, which were expressed in the amendment which express the view that we should not sell arms to countries that are democratic, that do not respect human rights, and that do not promote peace and stability. Where I have problems with this amendment is that it mandates, at least as I read it, that human rights, democracy, and participation of the U.N. arms registry of conventional arms be the only criteria that should govern our arms transfers. To say that these criteria should be paramount in evaluating a particular transfer is, I think, going too far. This is too restrictive in my view. Arms transfers serve important foreign policy and national security objectives. That can contribute to regional stability and help deter aggression. They can even foster interoperability should U.S. Assistance ever be required as in the Desert Storm operation.

Human rights and the democratic make up of recipient governments ought to be among the criteria in making a final decision on a proposed transfer. In some cases they may be the primary criterion, but not in all cases. The President must be able to weigh all relevant criteria to reach sensible, sound decisions on the merit of each proposed transfer.

Moreover, the amendment would require the President to certify annually those nations that qualify for arms transfer according to these criteria. Transfer to other countries could only be made if the President certifies to Congress that such a transfer is in the national security interests of the United States and the Congress enacts a law approving such an exception or if the President determines that an emergency exists under which it is vital to the interests of the United States to provide the transfer. If the President cannot meet this very high standard, quote, that an emergency exists, end of quote, then this amendment would force the Congress to enact a resolution of approval for arms sale. This, of course, turns the current system of congressional review of arms transfer on its head, a system that I, for one, do not think to be broken.

Now, I do believe the author of this amendment has made a very serious effort to modify the language to address concerns of limiting Presidential flexibility by inserting new language under which countries could receive arms if they were violating the criteria in the bill if the President determines that an emergency exists, so there is that flexibility for the President. I would only point out this is a very high standard and one that I think cannot be met, at least not in very many instances. The President's room to maneuver is largely circumscribed, so in my view the modification does not fix one of the fundamental flaws of the amendment.

I want to correct the conclusion here that I think supporters of the amendment may be making. The Congress, contrary to what the supporters——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BEREUTER was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. BEREUTER. The Congress, contrary to what the supporters of the amendment are seeming to be saying, currently has a very important role in determining which sales are made. In many ways, tangible or not so tangible, the Congress influences the sales about which the administration ends up notifying the Hill. There is an elaborate consultation procedure which we will not find in the formal statutory law whereby the administration vets possible sales with the appropriate committees. Members and staff briefings are convened on proposed sales that are controversial, and, contrary to what some may think, the administration backs off and drops proposed sales, not just this administration, but that has been the trend and the practice.

So, it is incorrect, I think, to argue that we have no role under the current process. The administration and the Congress are in constant dialogue about arms transfers which are conducted in accordance with the Arms Export Control Act. The Congress significantly influences arms transfers in direct and practical ways through the years beginning with consultation on the Javits report. Critics of arms transfer point to the fact that Congress

has never enacted a resolution of disapproval on arms sales. That is not a correct measure. In fact, congressional passage of such a resolution would represent a breakdown of the existing process, not a measure of its success. The fact that we have not passed a resolution then is evidence that in fact the consultation process is working.

□ 1315

Now, I have gone on at length here because I think this is a serious amendment with much merit. But the author of this amendment is committed to the issue, and I commend her. But for the reasons I stated, I cannot support it in its current form, and I would urge a ''no'' vote for all of my colleagues.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge a ''no'' vote.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, will wonders never cease, where my colleague from Georgia and I are standing together on an issue in this body?

Let me note that the cold war is over. I would not have supported this amendment if it had been 10 years ago. I believe that now is the time for us as a Nation to seriously consider what our policies are around the world in a different light than what we did 10 years ago during the cold war.

This amendment puts Congress squarely in the decisionmaking process. My good friend, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER], just suggested there is a process that is taking place right now, but it is just not codified. It is not set down solid in legislation.

Well, I believe that now that the cold war is over we can afford to take this decisionmaking process about what kind of countries that we will be dealing with, especially arming to the teeth, what kind of countries we will be selling our sophisticated weaponry to, is a decision in which the Congress can play a legitimate and verifiable role, and that we can be held accountable to our own people for the moral basis of the decisions that are being made by our Government in this area.

When the cold war was on, we left these decisions up to the President of the United States, and I supported that, because we were up against an enemy that wanted to destroy our country. I was, as many of you know, a member of President Reagan's staff for 7 years. I felt it appropriate that the President had the right to counter Soviet moves that were aimed at putting us in a vulnerable situation to a military threat, without necessarily having to come to Congress and have the issue debated on for weeks.

We are not in that situation today. In fact, during the cold war, human rights were secondary in many of the cases in our dealings with foreign countries. In many cases, if we were not dealing with such a hostile and horrible enemy as the communists, we should have been ashamed of ourselves in dealing with the tyrants we were dealing with. But just like in the Second World War when we allied ourselves with Stalin, we allied ourselves in the cold war against the communists with some unsavory characters.

That is no longer the case. The cold war is over, and today human rights should play a more important role in our decisionmaking process than it did when we were under attack. If a country is crucial to our national security, even besides the fact we are not in the cold war, this amendment provides us the ability to say well, you may not be up to our democratic standards, and indeed we want you to be more democratic and respect human rights, but we will put you on an exception list. You are acceptable because you are crucial to the national security interests of the United States.

I would imagine we might debate countries like Saudi Arabia, who I believe is crucial to the security of the United States, and other kingdoms where people in those countries are more inclined toward having a kingdom than a democracy. That would be a legitimate decision we could make. I have no doubt this Congress is capable to working with the President to determine which nondemocratic countries are crucial to our national security.

This gives the President in fact leverage even in those countries to secure more human rights for their people, when now the President cannot just say well, the Congress is forcing me and thus have a dialog with these countries.

Now, I may, as I say, disagree with the proponents of this amendment on many issues in terms of what countries we are dealing with, but the principle is sound. Let me say this in terms of the practicality. When Ronald Reagan became President of the United States, we decided we were no longer going to be just anti-Communist and support anti-Communist regimes. I believe that was the turning point in the cold war.

When Ronald Reagan made human rights and democracy the issue against the Communists, when he turned away from just supporting dictators who are anti-Communist but instead went to the people of then the Soviet Union and other countries under Communist domination and said we in the West do believe in democracy and we are willing to support those people who are struggling for freedom, and we established the National Endowment for Democracy, that is when the cold war turned around.

In the long run, that proved the downfall of communism. It was the practical thing to do. In the short run, it gave us some problems, because there were some anti-Communist dictatorships which basically were on our side. This too will be practical if we have guts enough to stand for our principles.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRABACHER] has expired.

(On request of Mr. BURTON of Indiana and by unanimous consent, Mr. ROHRABACHER was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROHRABACHER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman made one salient point in his comments. He said during the Reagan administration, in which he served, that the felt the President should have this latitude, because of the critical time problems that the President should not have to mess around with Congress for 3 or 4 weeks when he might have to make a quick decision.

What makes the gentleman think that will not happen at some point in the future with some future President?

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, the cold war is over. The fact is that today we should not be operating under the same rules as when our country was targeted by a very powerful enemy that meant to destroy us. We now can afford to bring the moral questions into play, and we should, the human rights questions, the democracy questions. This is what America can stand for, and if we do, we will have the allegiance of young people around the world, rather than the fear of those young people of their own regimes that might be armed by our people. That is the way America should be. That is the strength. Abraham Lincoln said, ''Right makes might.''

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the gentlewoman from Georgia's amendment to H.R. 1561, the McKinney Arms Code of Conduct. The Arms Code of Conduct is a rational approach. It implements a coherent and comprehensive arms control policy. This legislation would prohibit U.S. military assistance and arms transfers to foreign governments, unless the President certifies that the foreign government adheres to a national code of conduct.

In order to be eligible for military assistance, the gentlewoman's amendment specifically requires that the foreign government head be elected through a fair and free elections process; that the country respect human rights and not be engaged in any aggression which violates international law; and must fully participate in the U.N. Register of Conventional Arms.

The United States is the sole superpower in the world and the world's undisputed leader in arms exports. Today, U.S. firms dominate more than 70 percent of the international arms sale market, up from 57 percent in 1991. According to the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency's 1993–94 report, World Military Expenditures and Arms Transfers, the United States sold $10.3

billion in arms exports worldwide, compared to our closest competitor, which is Great Britain, which racked up $4.3 billion in sales. In 1994 alone, the U.S. taxpayer paid more to subsidize weapons sales than we paid for the Federal elementary and secondary education programs.

Ninety percent of the significant ethnic and territorial conflicts in the world in the last 2 years involve one or more parties which had received some type of U.S. weaponry or military technology in a period leading up to the conflict. Additionally, in the war with Iraq there were countless documented and verified instances where U.S. troops faced the enemy who was armed with U.S. based technology and weaponry.

Mr. Chairman, as the world's leading exporter of weaponry, the United States has an implicit responsibility to provide global leadership on this issue by formulating a policy of restraint. While the world's arms market is a lucrative venture, no country has been willing to take up unilateral steps toward control, fearing loss of exports to market competitors. Therefore, it is vital as the world's leading supplier, that the United States take responsibility for initiating a comprehensive and a rational approach to controlling arms sales, which will prevent repeat scenarios, such as those that occurred in Iraq where United States forces faced weapons supplied by the United States.

I urge my colleagues to support the adoption of the McKinney Arms Code of Conduct amendment. This amendment is supported by 103 cosponsors, Democrats and Republicans alike, including the chair of the Senate Committee on Appropriations. Approving this legislation will be one of the most significant steps this body takes to enhance our national foreign policy.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. WYNN].

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I also rise in support of the McKinney amendment. I think it is a very responsible amendment. I comment her for introducing it. Quite simply, it seems to me in the absence of the cold war we have lost our way in terms of foreign policy. Foreign policy is supposed to advance our interests, our long-term interests, in the global community. To do this, however, we cannot be passive. We have to have some standards and objectives to pursue.

It seems to me our objective ought to be encouraging diplomatic solutions around the world and discouraging warfare and the use of weapons around the world. The McKinney amendment represents sound policy advancing our foreign policy interests, because it sets a specific criteria on which we can evaluate arms sales. Democracy, adherence to human rights, the absence of aggression, and participation in the U.N. Registry of Conventional Arms, all give us a sound basis on which to evaluate who we ought to be selling arms to. It is correct policy because it gives us leverage. It enables us to leverage those people who are buying our arms in the direction that we wish them to go.

It is also good policy because it imposes moral values. People throw that around. We ought to have moral values in U.S. policy. Well, opposing human rights violations, promoting democracy, and opposing aggression represents the best of moral values.

I am not naive. There are certainly circumstances that are exigent that will require changes in this policy. The bill addresses that. It has a national security exception which the President can utilize. It also has an emergency waiver which the President can utilize. But it seems to me we have got to quit being passive and reactionary and understand what advancing our interests really means. I urge adoption of the McKinney amendment.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, today I rise in support of the code of conduct amendment that is offered by my friend and colleague, the gentlewoman from Georgia [Ms. MCKINNEY]. The code of conduct will be the first major reform of U.S. arms transfer policy in almost two decades.

The code of conduct highlights guiding principles on human rights and democracy which I believe are important to America's leadership role in the post-cold-war era. This amendment would help stem the flow of U.S. weapons to countries that violate human rights of its citizenry and fail to respect international human rights standards. The code of conduct offers an avenue for America to make violators of human rights accountable for their actions if they wish to continue to receive U.S. arms sales.

Mr. Chairman, two-thirds of all the foreign military sales went to countries described by the State Department Country Reports on Human Rights Practices as human rights violators, with undemocratic governments. The code of conduct is supported by some 275 national organizations who believe that human rights should play a key role in our arms export policy.

Mr. Chairman, I will never forget some years back when I made a trip to Croatia when it was under siege. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] and I got into a place by the name of Vukovar. Vukovar was surrounded by Serb artillery and tanks. We went there to try to bear witness to peace and to try to encourage the people there. We followed it up with meetings with President Milosevic and others. But I remember looking at shell casings and bomb casings that littered the streets, dozens of bomb casings, and they were U.S. made.

Now, some people can say ''Oh, big deal. That doesn't really matter. We sell it to them and how they use it is their business.'' But it greatly distressed me to know that people, innocent civilians, were being destroyed by the dropping of these 500-pound bombs. I remember bringing that issue to the attenetion of our National Security Adviser, Brent Scowcroft. He surely agreed. He said, ''Yeah, we sold those bombs, and other kinds of military hardware to the former Yugoslavia,'' which had a disgusting human rights record.

Now, I think we need to be more serious about who we are willing to sell arms to. This code of conduct may not be perfect. It may be liable to additional change as it makes its way through conference, should it pass. There are reasonable objections by reasonable people about what ought to be a part of this, whether or not the national security exemption is the best and most properly drawn way of proceeding. But I think it makes a clear statement that it will not be business as usual. Arms sales ought to be conditioned and human rights ought to matter.

Unfortunately, we have had hearings in the Committee on Human Rights, the Subcommittee on International Operations and Human Rights which I chair, two human rights hearings. Amnesty International came forward and told us in this administration, the Clinton administration, human rights is an island, disconnected from policy considerations.

□ 1330

We have seen it in a myriad of other issues like the most-favored-nation status for China and other kinds of human rights considerations. There is a disconnect. This tries to, at least in the selling of arms, which kill people, we try to make sure, the gentlewoman from Georgia [Ms. MCKINNEY] tries to make sure that, if we are going to sell arms, that human rights is a significant factor.

I thank the gentlewoman for offering the amendment.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I rise to offer my strong support of the amendment offered by my colleague and good friend the gentlewoman from Georgia, [Ms. MCKINNEY].

Mr. Chairman, I recall one of the fundamental concerns raised by one of our great Presidents in our time—the late President Dwight Eisenhower. Before leaving the White House and in one of his speeches—President Eisenhower warned our nation of the everincreasing power and influence of the industrial military interests in our country.

Now don't get me wrong—I want our military industry complex to produce weapons and military equipment that meet our national security interest too—but the question is how much and to whom should we sell these weapons?

Mr. Chairman, everyone here in this Chamber knows that our Nation is the

largest producer and exporter of military equipment and weapons of war. It is time that our national leaders need to be more sensitive about exporting and selling of weapons of war to kill and maim other human beings.

Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentlewoman for introducing this amendment, and I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I include for the RECORD the following article:

[From the Washington Post, May 24, 1995]

ARMS SALES 'CONDUCT CODE' OPPOSED—STATE DEPARTMENT SAYS PROPOSAL COULD IMPINGE ON POLICY AND FRIENDLY NATIONS

(By R. Jeffrey Smith)

The Clinton administration declared yesterday that it opposes a ''code of conduct'' drafted by some members of Congress to block U.S. arms sales to countries that commit human rights abuses or are not democratic.

At a Senate hearing, Undersecretary of State Lynn E. Davis criticized the proposed code on grounds that its rigid criteria for arms sales would impinge on the administration's authority to decide foreign policy and could force a cutoff of military aid to friendly nations in regions important to U.S. interests.

The code, which is scheduled to come up for a vote on the House floor today, was crafted by Sen. Mark O. Hatfield (R-Ore.) and Rep. Cynthia McKinney (D-Ga.) to stanch estimated annual sales or gifts of billions of dollars worth of U.S. arms to countries that the sponsors claim are not upholding important U.S. values. At the hearing, Hatfield particularly criticized recent U.S. arms sales to Malaysia, Indonesia and Turkey, which he said had each engaged in recent human rights abuses.

The proposed code states that U.S. military assistance and arms transfers should be provided only to nations with governments chosen by free elections that protect basic freedoms and are not engaged in ''gross violations of internationally recognized human rights.''

It also bars aid to nations engaged in illegal acts of armed aggression and to nations that do not register their arms transactions with the United Nations. The president could waive these restrictions for any country, but only with congressional approval.

The code has collected 102 sponsors in the House, but last week it missed gaining the International Relations Committee's endorsement by a one-vote margin. Hatfield has vowed to try to attach it to a foreign aid or defense appropriations bill this year.

Davis told a Senate Appropriations subcommittee that while the administration supports the ''principles'' expressed by the code, it ''simply cannot agree to this weighting of criteria'' for deciding on individual arms sales.

Instead, she said, the administration prefers its own policy of selling arms based on ''national security,'' as spelled out in flexible language approved by President Clinton in February.

Under this policy, Davis said, no single criterion such as respect for human rights ''takes precedence over another.'' Arms transfers can be made to nondemocratic nations if they promote regional stability or help prop up failing U.S. defense companies that produce key military technologies.

Although McKinney has charged that 90 percent of the $12.9 billion in U.S. arms sales approved last year went to countries that Washington classifies as nondemocratic, Davis said the ''vast majority [went to] . . . allies, major coalition partners, and European neutrals.''

Davis confirmed that the administration is considering offering F–16 jet fighters to Indonesia, despite recent evidence of fresh abuses by Indonesian military forces in East Timor.

Assistant Secretary of State for Human Rights John Shattuck, who appeared with Davis, said ''we are paying close attention to Indonesia's human rights situation and will take this into consideration'' in deciding on such sales.

With regard to Turkey, he said ''we are, as you know, gravely concerned about the use of [U.S.-made] military material, particularly cluster bombs'' during Turkey's military assaults on Kurds in southeastern Turkey and northern Iraq.

But Shattuck did not say whether the use of these arms would affect future sales to Turkey, which he described as ''a crucial NATO ally.''

Lawrence J. Korb, an assistant secretary of defense in the Reagan administration who is now at the Brookings Institution, testified later that Turkey's use of F–16s, Black Hawk helicopters and M–60 tanks against the Kurds indicated that many U.S. arms transferred overseas ''are used not against the foreign enemies of the U.S., but against the indigenous populations.''

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I will not take the whole 5 minutes. I would just like to put some facts on the table.

Right now under the Export Control Act, the Congress of the United States can stop sales. In the past when the President, any President, has started to go ahead with arms sales and he found opposition was rising under the Export Control Act that was passed by the Congress of the United States, they have pulled in their horns and they have renegotiated those sales deals with these foreign countries. So we already have the authority in law to do what is being talked about today. The only difference is we are turning the process around. That hamstrings the President of the United States in his conducting of foreign policy. That is a mistake

Ten years ago, the United States controlled only 15 percent of the arms sales. My colleagues who spoke on the other side are absolutely right; we do control a large part of arms sales today, but that is because the Soviet Union has disintegrated. Ten years ago, they controlled 50 percent of the arms sales worldwide, and they sold to countries like Iraq, Iran, and Libya. We are not selling to those pariah countries, but they did.

Now that they have fallen apart, our percentage of the market has gone up, but we are still below, way below, where we were 10 years ago. So while our percentage is higher, our actual sales are lower. So the bottom line is this. Simply put, we have the control in the Congress to stop any arms sales that we want to under the Export Control Act. We do not need this legislation.

Second, we should not hamstring the President of the United States in his conducting of foreign policy. And third, the economic concerns that I talked about awhile ago are real, because there are other countries who will sell this equipment to foreign governments if we do not. Along with those sales will go American jobs.

I think those points should be considered by my colleagues. We have the authority to deal with this problem already. We do not need this amendment. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Georgia. I can tell you that in the course of my service in Congress, too often we have seen instances where we have taken the scarce resources of the United States, bought military weaponry, sent it to corners of the world and then find not too much later that it has been turned either on our country or on our allies.

These so-called boomerang sales are addressed directly by the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Georgia. I think her amendment is a step in the right direction. I rise in strong support.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentlewoman from Georgia.

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to correct for the record some misstatements and misrepresentations that have been made about this amendment.

First of all, this amendment does not ban arms sales to any country. Second, if there is a problem with this amendment in terms of human rights, it is not that this amendment will fail because it does not address human rights well enough; it will fail for other reasons.

Let me just begin to say what some of those reasons are.

One is that we are spending millions of dollars to quell regional strife that we, in turn, are the fomenters of. First of all, we are fomenting murder and rampage around the world by fueling conflict, by arming potential adversaries, that is the boomerang effect that my colleague just spoke about, by promoting territorial expansion and crossborder aggression and also by facilitating terrorism and repression. And, in fact, as we learned recently, the CIA funded Jihad school over in Afghanistan trained two of the suspects in the World Trade Center bombing.

Second, we are violating our own law. The law states that it shall be the policy of the United States to exert leadership in the world community to bring about an arrangement for reducing the international trade in implements of war. We are violating our own policy.

And then finally, why is that the case? It is the case because in the Washington Post story by Jeffrey

Smith in today's newspaper, it says that the present administration takes the tack that arms transfers can be made to nondemocratic nations if they help to prop up failing U.S. defense companies.

So the bottom line, once again, is the amount of money that is being spent in failing U.S. defense industries.

Finally, I would just like to compliment and thank those people who have worked so hard on behalf of this amendment. They are the over 200 grassroots organizations that have gone around the country in support of this amendment, the strong support of our colleagues who have spoken here this afternoon and who have cosponsored this amendment, and finally the strong staff work of Robin Sanders who put it all together.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman. I want to echo her comments. It is a false economy for us to believe that we are encouraging exports and creating American jobs by these arms transfers and in questionable situations, because, as the gentlewoman alludes to, many times we find in the future even greater expenditures are necessary because of this so-called boomerang effect. We send guns to the wrong people. They turn on us. They shoot at us and they shoot at our friends.

What the gentlewoman is trying to do is to minimize that possibility. She has the strong support of so many organizations, including the U.S. Catholic Conference and others, and I hope my colleagues will take her amendment very seriously and join me in supporting it.

Ms. FURSE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Arms Trade Code of Conduct.

The House International Relations Committee nearly passed this historic piece of legislation in its markup last week, where it failed by a margin of just 18 to 17. A Gallup Poll released in February found that only 15 percent of those queried supported our Government selling military equipment to other countries.

The European Union and the United States together sell 90 percent of the world's weapons. No country has been willing to take unilateral steps toward control, fearing it will lose export markets to competitors. Therefore, it is vital that as the world's leading suppliers, the European Union, and the United States work together to implement restraint.

Fortunately, the European Parliament has started that process already. In January of this year, the European Parliament passed a resolution calling on the European Union to immediately implement a coherent and comprehensive arms export control policy at the Union level. A measure similar to this amendment before us today is being considered by the European Union at this time.

As the world's leading exporter of weaponry, the United States has a special responsibility to provide global leadership in the area of restraint.

As to the issue of jobs in the United States, we must weigh the limited economic benefits of expanding arms exports against the larger costs to the economy as a whole. Arms exports do nothing to address the fundamental problems of lagging U.S. competitiveness in nonmilitary industries. Furthermore, arms exports undermine peaceful conflict resolution upon which world trade, economic growth, and long-term job creation are based.

Administration policy states that the impact on defense jobs must be taken into account when exports are considered. Well, Mr. Chairman, I wish we would extend the same consideration to the impact on the lives and well-being of American service personnel. Our laissez-faire approach to arms sales creates a self-generated danger—the possibility that our service men and women will someday be fightings nations or groups who obtained U.S. weapons and technology.

Even the Pentagon now officially acknowledges that it faces the prospect of American weapons being used against U.S. military personnel. In his latest Annual Report to the President and Congress, Secretary of Defense Perry writes that ''threats encountered in major regional conflicts would be standing armies of foreign powers, armed with mixes of old and modern weapons systems. * * * Thus, U.S. forces must be prepared to face a wide variety of systems, including some previously produced in the United States.''

With its current policy, the United States is bolstering the warfighting capabilities of a substantial number of those fighting today's conflicts. It does not take a stroke of genius to realize that these capabilities can just as easily be used against U.S. soldiers, sailors, and airmen.

It is a sad irony that the current U.S. arms trade policy confirms the words of cartoonist Walt Kelly's character, Pogo, when he said, ''We have met the enemy and it is us.''

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the Code of Conduct on Arms Transfers and commend my colleague from Georgia, Representative CYNTHIA MCKINNEY, for bringing this important legislation to the floor today.

Since 1990, the United States has been the top-selling merchant in the international arms bazaar. We have dominated the global arms market by sending billions and billions of dollars worth of all types of weaponry to some of the world's worst human rights abusers and most corrupt and repressive regimes. Sophisticated combat weapons exported from the United States, such as armored personnel carriers, antitank missiles, and specialized rifles, have found their way into the hands of notorious international troublemakers and fueled conflicts raging throughout the world.

Placing short-term economic interests above crucial security concerns and fundamental human rights principles has serious consequences, both for our stature as a world leader and for the safety of U.S. military personnel engaged around the world. By cashing in on profits from arms sales abroad without closely scrutinizing potential customers according to criteria like the ones outlined by Representative MCKINNEY, we risk incurring substantial security and human costs. During the Gulf war and in Somalia, for example, the safety of many of our men and women in the Armed Forces was threatened by weaponry sold by our own Government. Moreover, skyrocketing arms sales have contributed to regional arms races, which in turn force us to increase spending to deal with greater threats to our national security.

As we continue to adjust to the realities of the post-cold-war world, we need to revise our philosophies concerning foreign military sales. With the dissolution of the Soviet Union, many of the principles which guided our arms export policies in the past no longer are relevant. The provisions of the Code of Conduct on Arms Transfers will establish a sensible, much-needed framework for making decisions about what we send abroad and to whom. The United States should take a leadership role in forging new policies and encouraging new thinking in this area.

Being the world's No. 1 weapons supplier is a very dubious distinction. As we approach the start of the 21st century, we should re-evaluate the priorities which have placed us in this category and look to the Code of Conduct as a model.

Again, I would like to thank Representative MCKINNEY for all her hard work on behalf of this important issue. I strongly support this initiative and urge my colleagues to vote for the McKinney amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Georgia [Ms. MCKINNEY].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 157, noes 262, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 351]

AYES—157

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Beilenson
Berman
Bishop
Boehlert
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brown (CA)
Brown (OH)
Bryant (TX)
Cardin
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Danner
DeFazio
Dellums
Diaz-Balart
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Dornan
Durbin
Ehlers
Engel
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fields (LA)
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Ford
Frank (MA)
Furse
Gephardt
Gordon
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Jackson-Lee
Jacobs
Johnson (SD)
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Lantos
Leach
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lincoln
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lowey
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Markey
Martinez
McCarthy
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Morella
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Orton
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Porter
Poshard
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reynolds
Richardson
Rivers
Rohrabacher
Rose
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sawyer
Schiff
Schroeder
Scott
Serrano
Skaggs
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Stark
Stokes
Studds
Stupak
Tanner
Thompson
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Tucker
Velazquez
Vento
Volkmer
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Williams
Wise

Wolf
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates
Zimmer

NOES—262

Allard
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bentsen
Bereuter
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blute
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brewster
Browder
Brown (FL)
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Camp
Canady
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chapman
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clinger
Coble
Coburn
Collins (GA)
Combest
Cooley
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cunningham
Davis
de la Garza
Deal
DeLauro
DeLay
Deutsch
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Fox
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Frost
Funderburk
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hancock
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Hostettler
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kelly
Kennelly
Kim
King
Kingston
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaFalce
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Linder
Livingston
Lofgren
Longley
Lucas
Manzullo
Martini
Mascara
Matsui
McCollum
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
McNulty
Metcalf
Mica
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Murtha
Myers
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Ortiz
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Paxon
Payne (VA)
Petri
Pickett
Pombo
Portman
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Riggs
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roukema
Royce
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Schaefer
Schumer
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stearns
Stenholm
Stockman
Stump
Talent
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas
Thornberry
Thornton
Thurman
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Upton
Visclosky
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff

NOT VOTING—15

Andrews
Bateman
Calvert
Cubin
Fazio
Hansen
Kleczka
McDade
Meyers
Miller (FL)
Moran
Olver
Peterson (FL)
Scarborough
Sisisky

□ 1358

Mr. COX and Mr. DICKS changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. REYNOLDS, DOOLEY, and EHLERS changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BEREUTER

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, amendment No. 26.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by BEREUTER: At the end of the bill, add the following:

DIVISION D—ADDITIONAL PROVISIONS

TITLE XLI—PUBLIC LAW 480

SEC. 4001. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR TITLE III.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 3242 of this Act, there are authorized to be appropriated $25,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1996 and 1997 for the provision of agricultural commodities under title III of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (7 U.S.C. 1727 et seq.).

(b) AUTHORITY TO TRANSFER AMOUNTS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, amounts authorized to be appropriated by subsection (a) may be used to carry out title II of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (7 U.S.C. 1721 et seq.).

SEC. 4002. REDUCTION IN AUTHORIZATIONS FOR CERTAIN UNITED STATES INFORMATIONAL, EDUCATIONAL, AND CULTURAL PROGRAMS.

Notwithstanding paragraphs (1) and (3)(F) of section 2106 of this Act, the following amounts are authorized to be appropriated to carry out international information activities and educational and cultural exchange programs under the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961, Reorganization Plan Number 2 of 1977, the United States International Broadcasting Act of 1994, the Radio Broadcasting to Cuba Act, the Television Broadcasting to Cuba Act, the Board for International Broadcasting Act, the Inspector General Act of 1978, the North/South Center Act of 1991, the national Endowment for Democracy Act, and to carry out other countries in law consistent with such purposes:

(1) SALARIES AND EXPENSES.—For ''Salaries and Expenses'', $445,645,000 for the fiscal year 1996 and $423,080,000 for the fiscal year 1997.

(3) EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL EXCHANGE PROGRAMS.—For ''Hubert H. Humphrey Fellowship Program'', ''Edmund S. Muskie Fellowship Program'', ''International Visitors Program'', and ''Mike Mansfield Fellowship Program'', ''Claude and Mildred Pepper Scholarship Program of the Washington Workshops Foundation'', ''Citizen Exchange Programs'', ''Congress-Bundestag Exchange Program'', ''Newly Independent States and Eastern Europe Training'', ''Institute for Representative Government'', and ''Arts America'', $67,265,800 for the fiscal year 1996 and $67,341,400 for the fiscal year 1997.

Mr. BEREUTER (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

□ 1400

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, the budget neutral Bereuter amendment restores the $25,160,000 to the current funding level of the Food for Development United States food assistance program for fiscal year 1996 and 1997. This is the Food for Peace Program, title III.

The current funding is $157 million. The legislation before us cuts it to zero. What I am attempting to do is to take $25 million from the USIA, the U.S. Information Agency's education and cultural exchange programs, and restore at least $25 million to the title III program.

The Bereuter amendment helps ensure that U.S. foreign assistance is directed to the world's most deserving aid recipients, starving people in famine- and war-stricken countries.

Mr. Chairman, the U.S. food assistance has been reduced by 24 percent in the last 2 years. In March the United States told other food donor countries that we would decrease our minimum commitment of food aid from 4.47 to 2.5 million metric tons. Over the past decade, the United States has provided between 6.5 and 8 million metric tons. The Bereuter amendment, through authorizing $25 million for the Food for Peace Program, still represents a 50-percent cut in the President's fiscal year 1996 budget request.

U.S. food assistance funds are spent here in the United States on agricultural commodities, processing, bagging, enrichment, internal transportation, port facilities and shipping. My amendment is supported by the merchant marine organizations.

I am pulling the $25 million in this amendment from USIA's education and cultural exchange programs and administrative accounts. The Congressional Quarterly May 6, 1995, article pointed out a $2 billion international exchange program, ''They have exploded into a hodgepodge of seemingly duplicative and overlapping overseas activities.''

Mr. Chairman, I think it is an appropriate place for us to move $25 million to the Title III Food for Peace Program so it is not completely zeroed out. It is important for humanitarian reasons. It is important for our domestic purposes, as well, and it keeps a commitment we have made. It still cuts the President's request by 50 percent. I think that is too much, but $25 million seems to me at least to be a start back up the hill.

I urge my colleagues to strongly support the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS], the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture.

(Mr. ROBERTS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the gentleman's amendment to restore the $25 million in funding for title III of the Food for Peace Program.

I think it is essential, as the gentleman has pointed out, that we fund

all titles of the Food for Peace Program. The amendment does not increase spending. Let me emphasize that to all of my colleagues. It cuts spending responsibly without really gutting the program.

Last year marked the 40th anniversary of the Food for Peace Program. It started in the Eisenhower years. It started with a gentleman who formerly represented the district I have the privilege of representing now, Mr. Cliff Hope, Sr.

We on the Committee on Agriculture have a very keen interest in making the Food for Peace Program as sound and as effective as possible. We are going to work very closely with the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], the chairman, and the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER], and the rest of the committee to see that the Food for Peace Program effectively and efficiently meets its goals.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. EMERSON], chairman of the Subcommittee on Department Operations, Nutrition, and Foreign Agriculture, intends to hold hearings on this program. We intend to address any concerns with the program as a whole in the 1995 farm bill.

I urge support in regards to the Bereuter amendment. I thank the gentleman for his leadership in this regard.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. EMERSON].

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Nebraska for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I, too, rise in strong support of his amendment. I wonder if we could have a brief colloquy here.

I am concerned that the most basic fundamental humanitarian assistance, food and medical assistance, be maintained in the posture that it currently sits; that is to say, immune from politics and the whims of the State Department. I would like some assurance that it will remain a tool of the PVO's who are so committed in the administration of the most fundamental humanitarian assistance.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentleman, we have done our best to assure that in fact we have an increase in the title II program which is most important. Sometimes, as the gentleman knows, however, we have to take from the title III program for those title II-related humanitarian programs. This amendment I am offering will continue to provide us that flexibility.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BEREUTER was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, I will come back to the gentleman from Missouri in a second, but I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], the chairman.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to join with the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. EMERSON] and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS] with regard to their concern on the Public Law 480 proposal. We want to make certain that we keep that at reasonable levels. It is an important program. I want to assure the gentleman we will do our best to make certain it is going to be effectively administered.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for that assurance, and I yield back to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding further.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is very important to point out that what we are talking about here is fundamental humanitarian assistance, food that goes to people when they are starving to death. We are not talking about pouring money down a rat hole here, or giving some Ambassador the opportunity with the use of taxpayer dollars to build the Taj Mahal.

We are talking about keeping starving people alive. I think that point needs to be made, and I think an understanding of the fact that the Food for Peace Program is part of the foreign assistance program is a fact with which most Americans are unfamiliar.

I mean, most Americans, I believe, would think that we are just throwing money willy-nilly around the world for no good purposes, and I happen to be one who believes that most Americans think that when there are people who are starving, they ought to be fed.

I thank the gentleman for his contribution to this cause, and I look forward to continuing to work with him to pursue our mutual interests in this subject area.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his strong statement. He is exactly right. This is the program that ends up putting food in people's mouths across the world, in the most terrible situations that we have seen so much in our electronic media.

The gentleman is a former ranking member of the Hunger Committee, he knows well how directly this food assistance has been provided in Ethiopia and Somalia and other places. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a strong ''aye'' vote.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROWNBACK TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BEREUTER

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BROWNBACK to the amendment offered by Mr. BEREUTER: Strike section 4002 of the Bereuter Amendment and insert the following:

SEC. 4002. REDUCTION IN AUTHORIZATIONS FOR CERTAIN UNITED STATES INFORMATIONAL, EDUCATIONAL, AND CULTURAL PROGRAMS.

Notwithstanding paragraphs (1), (3)(F), (4)(A), and (5) of section 2106 of this Act, the following amounts are authorized to be appropriated to carry out international information activities and educational and cultural exchange programs under the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961, Reorganization Plan Number 2 of 1977, the United States International Broadcasting Act of 1944, the Radio Broadcasting to Cuba Act, the Television Broadcasting to Cuba Act, the Board for International Broadcasting Act, the Inspector General Act of 1978, the North/South Center Act of 1991, the National Endowment for Democracy Act, and to carry out other authorities in law consistent with such purposes:

(1) SALARIES AND EXPENSES.—For ''Salaries and Expenses'', $445,645,000 for the fiscal year 1996 and $402,080,000 for the fiscal year 1997.

(2) EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL EXCHANGE PROGRAMS.—For ''Hubert H. Humphrey Fellowship Program'', ''Edmund S. Muskie Fellowship Program'', ''International Visitors Program'', ''Mike Mansfield Fellowship Program'', ''Claude and Mildred Pepper Scholarship Program of the Washington Workshops Foundation'', ''Citizen Exchange Programs'', ''Congress-Bundestag Exchange Program'', ''Newly Independent States and Eastern Europe Training'', ''Institute for Representative Government'', and ''Arts America'', $82,265,800 for the fiscal year 1996 and $62,341,400 for the fiscal year 1997.

(3) RADIO CONSTRUCTION.—For ''Radio Construction'', $70,164,000 for the fiscal year 1996 and $52,647,000 for the fiscal year 1997.

(4) INTERNATIONAL BROADCASTING ACTIVITIES.—For ''International Broadcasting Activities'', $311,191,000 for the fiscal year 1996 and $246,191,000 for the fiscal year 1997.

Mr. BROWNBACK (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. Chairman, my amendment has been agreed to by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER] and a copy of it has been shared with the minority.

What my amendment simply does is it spreads the $25 million in cuts around a little bit further than what the Bereuter proposal has. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER] suggests cuts to USIA salaries and exchanges, and my amendment would lighten those cuts in the salaries and exchanges areas and broaden the reductions to radio construction and broadcasting.

What we are attempting to do by this is to support what the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER] is doing to put this money into the hunger programs, to be able to feed those who are starving, but spreading around a little bit more the cuts in the USIA program. That is what my amendment to the Bereuter amendment would do. I would ask for it to be considered.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWNBACK. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman my colleague and my neighbor for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I have no objections to the additional flexibility he provides to USIA and where those cuts must come to make this basic amendment budget neutral. I thank him for his initiative.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. Chairman, with that, I would hope that we could vote on this because I think it does do what most people would like, let the USIA agency be able to take care of this within its own, and that would be then supportive of the Bereuter amendment to put $25 million in additional food aid program.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWNBACK. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the proposed amendment by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. BROWNBACK] that has been accepted by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER], the proponent of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. BROWNBACK] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER].

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER], as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WYNN

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WYNN: In section 3414 of the bill (in subsection (e) of section 711 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961)—

(1) in paragraph (1) of such subsection (e), strike ''$3,000,000'' and insert ''$15,000,000'';

(2) redesignate paragraph (2) of such subsection as paragraph (3); and

(3) insert after paragraph (1) of such subsection the following new paragraph:

''(2) USE OF AMOUNTS FOR LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN.—Of the amounts authorized to be appropriated under paragraph (1) for fiscal years 1996 and 1997, $12,000,000 for each such fiscal year shall be made available for the sale, reduction, and cancellation of loans, or portions thereof, for countries in Latin America and the Caribbean.

Mr. WYNN (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I am proposing today is a very straightforward one that addresses our economic interest in Latin America. This amendment would put $12 million into a debt relief program for Latin America and the Caribbean.

Yesterday in the course of our debates, we cut money out of a fund called International Organizations, which is dues-assessed, International Organizations. I wan to take a portion of that money, $12 million, and put it toward debt relief.

I believe in so doing we can advance our economic interests. One of the things I said a little earlier today was this: that in a post-cold war era, we have to understand that our foreign policy ought to advance our interests. We have specific interests in the Western Hemisphere in terms of encouraging and expanding trade opportunities.

Why? Because these trade opportunities in our own backyard can create jobs in the United States. But unfortunately the debt burden in many of our neighboring countries in Latin America and the Caribbean is a major factor in inhibiting economic growth and decreases the absorptive capacity. In other words, they cannot trade with us because they are paying off these very old debts. A debt relief program would help address this concern.

To be eligible for this program, these countries would have to meet specific economic and political criteria included in existing legislation for the region.

These requirements include an IMF program, a World Bank program, significant investment reform and normalized relations with commercial creditors. In addition, eligible countries must have governments which have been democratically elected, are not in gross violation of human rights, and have supported our efforts to combat narcotics and terrorism. In other words, we want to deal with friendly, democratic countries that are working with us and have normalized economic conditions.

Why are we doing this? Debt reduction provides a catalyst for Caribbean and Latin American countries undertaking economic reforms and liberation programs.

□ 1415

Debt reduction is specifically important for small countries in the Caribbean, where most debt is bilateral. In Jamaica, for example, debt service continues to consume more than 49 percent of the government's budget. Debt relief will accelerate trade links by freeing vital foreign exchange reserves that otherwise would have be used for debt service. These reserves can now be used to import products from the United States.

For example, with 70 cents of each dollar buying U.S. goods and services in the Caribbean, debt reduction in the region can stimulate significant U.S. exports. Think about that, 70 cents of every dollar in that region is spent on our goods and services. We need to do business with them.

After a decade of economic adjustment and reform, many countries in Latin American and in the Caribbean are enjoying their best economic prospects. Policy reforms in these countries and the resulting economic stability encouraged will help our economic ties with these countries. Total trade between the United States and Latin America and the Caribbean has grown since 1987. There has been a steady growth in terms of both imports and exports.

Latin America is the fastest-growing U.S. export market in the world, and the only region where the United States now enjoys a trade surplus.

Open markets also promote economic development in poor Latin American countries. This will help them stem the flow of illegal immigration to the United States. My colleagues are going to hear my colleagues from across the aisle say well, perhaps these are laudable goals, but we just cannot afford it, but I think that argument misses the boat.

In the business of economic trade and foreign policy we have to promote our long-term interests. It is terribly shortsighted not to spend this small amount of money, only $12 million from our own backyard to ultimately create jobs for our own people.

They can either spend the money on debt service or they can spend the money buying U.S. products. Debt reduction, especially for heavily indebted countries of the Caribbean basin, will send an important signal of U.S. commitment to democratically elected governments in the region.

I would like to urge all Members of the House to consider the importance of our regional neighbors, to consider the importance of trade in terms of our long-term economic picture, and begin to think of foreign policy as a proactive endeavor and not just a reactive endeavor and not just an area where we can find some savings here.

I think in that context Members will find this amendment is certainly reasonable, modest in the amount of money involved, but the long-term investment will certainly serve America's economic interests.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

(Mr. GILMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, this is a budget-breaking amendment. It simply adds money to the bill without reducing funding elsewhere.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] gave us clear direction to cut this bill, and we did so yesterday under the Brownback amendment by reducing our spending by an additional over $400 million. This amendment earmarks funds. The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, Mr. LIVINGSTON, has made it clear to all of us that the Committee on Appropriations would oppose such earmarks.

Furthermore, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. WYNN] is seeking to add

funds to a new and untested program. And I would like to note that already in the bill we authorized $3 million for fiscal year 1996, and $3 million for fiscal year 1997, to do what the gentleman is suggesting. It is a total of $6 million for an initial start on this program to begin operations in a limited way.

Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to oppose the Wynn amendment even though it has a worthy endeavor as its objective.

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. Let me emphasize first to my colleagues the amount of money that I am proposing to expend is less that the amount of money that was in the bill when it came out of committee. There is not one nickel more than came out of the committee in its original form.

Had I gone ahead of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. BROWNBACK] yesterday, I would have proposed moving $12 million out of the international organizations account. Unfortunately, because he moved ahead of me, he took $400 million out across the board. I am only suggesting that of that $400 million he would remove that we preserve $12 million to advance our economic interests in the region. But clearly this is not a budget-buster in any form or fashion.

I would have to reiterate to the chairman that I believe that this is also an opportune time to advance our interests in that region.

It seems to me that all of our foreign policy positions to date have been reactive. Nothing has been done to advance or leverage the direction in which we want to go. Nothing has been done to create new jobs or new trade markets.

Mr. GILMAN. If I may reclaim my time from the gentleman, the gentleman I think is incorrect in that he does specifically add $6 million to this proposal, without any offsets. So that creates a budgetary problem for us, and it is for that reason that we are opposing the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. WYNN. If the gentleman will yield further, I would say that all of the money I am proposing to spend comes out of the money that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. BROWNBACK] has already cut, so it is not any additional money added on. The money has already been cut. I am just suggesting it be moved into a second area.

Let me make one comment about appropriations. I feel very strongly about this. This is an authorization bill. We are the Committee on International Relations. We are the ones who ought to set foreign policy that we recommend to our colleagues in the Congress. We should not let the appropriators dictate to us what direction this money should be spent. The purpose of the authorizing bill is just the opposite, to give direction in terms of our priorities. We studied this issue. We need markets in Latin America and the Caribbean. It seems to me our directive to appropriators ought to be this is a worthwhile purpose. It does not bust the budget. It does not exceed what we came out of committee with.

Mr. GILMAN. If I may reclaim my time, once again I would like to submit that the gentleman has a worthy purpose, but he has not provided any offset. Mr. BROWNBACK's measure put us in conformance with the budget so we would not meet a budgetary problem.

Moreover we are trying to work very closely with the Committee on Appropriations so we are not spinning our wheels here and so our authorization measure will be finally met with approval by the Committee on Appropriations.

So, I think since this is a new program, I will be pleased to work with the gentleman in the future to see if we can work out a better method of funding for the gentleman's worthy objective.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. I think the gentleman from Maryland is making a very worthy initiative here. What you have in the context of the total bill is very, very sharp reductions for all of Latin America. There is very little in this bill which sends a favorable signal to Latin America. The gentleman from Maryland is merely requesting $12 million, as he has requested.

This is a terribly important amendment from the standpoint of the Caribbean. Our economic interests in that region are growing very, very rapidly and the gentleman from Maryland has called that to our attention again and again, and that is one of the fastest-growing markets for us in the world. So the $12 million is a very modest move, it is an important signal to countries that are much neglected in this bill, and I commend him for it and I support the amendment.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I would just like to follow up on Chairman GILMAN's remark that this may well be a worthy purpose, but I want the people of this House to know that we already have $3 million authorized for 1996 and 1997 for this program. What this amendment would do is to add another $12 million to this bill, and that is going in the wrong direction. We need to go in the opposite direction.

I will soon be offering an amendment to make some additional cuts, but while this may be a worthy purpose, it would earmark some $12 million additional for Latin America. And as I mentioned, we already have authorized in 1996 and 1997 $3 million to authorize this program. So we are going along with the Treasury initiative. That is why we authorized the program.

There are many, many good programs, but we have to draw fine lines, and the fine line we drew was to start this program and authorize it at 1996 and 1997 levels at $3 million, and what the gentleman wants to do in this amendment is add $12 million onto that. This is in the wrong direction, so I would have to be constrained to ask the House to vote against this particular amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. WYNN].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 125, noes 297, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 352]

AYES—125

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Berman
Bishop
Bonior
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant (TX)
Cardin
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Coyne
de la Garza
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Dicks
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Edwards
Engel
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Frank (MA)
Frost
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gonzalez
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hamilton
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hoyer
Jackson-Lee
Jefferson
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
LaFalce
Lantos
Lewis (GA)
Lofgren
Lowey
Maloney
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
McKinney
Meek
Menendez
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moran
Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Pelosi
Rangel
Reed
Reynolds
Richardson
Rose
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sawyer
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Skaggs
Slaughter
Stark
Stokes
Studds
Tejeda
Thompson
Thurman
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Tucker
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates

NOES—297

Allard
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Camp
Canady
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chapman
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clinger
Coble
Coburn
Collins (GA)
Combest
Condit
Cooley
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cunningham
Danner
Davis
Deal
DeFazio
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dingell

Doolittle	Kasich	Rahall
Dornan	Kelly	Ramstad
Doyle	Kennelly	Regula
Dreier	Kildee	Riggs
Duncan	Kim	Rivers
Dunn	King	Roberts
Durbin	Kingston	Roemer
Ehlers	Klink	Rogers
Ehrlich	Klug	Rohrabacher
Emerson	Knollenberg	Ros-Lehtinen
English	Kolbe	Roth
Ensign	LaHood	Roukema
Eshoo	Largent	Royce
Everett	Latham	Salmon
Ewing	LaTourette	Sanders
Fawell	Laughlin	Sanford
Fields (LA)	Lazio	Saxton
Fields (TX)	Leach	Scarborough
Flanagan	Levin	Schaefer
Foley	Lewis (CA)	Schiff
Forbes	Lewis (KY)	Schroeder
Ford	Lightfoot	Seastrand
Fowler	Lincoln	Sensenbrenner
Fox	Linder	Shadegg
Franks (CT)	Lipinski	Shaw
Franks (NJ)	Livingston	Shays
Frelinghuysen	LoBiondo	Shuster
Frisa	Longley	Sisisky
Funderburk	Lucas	Skeen
Furse	Luther	Skelton
Gallegly	Manzullo	Smith (MI)
Ganske	Martini	Smith (NJ)
Gekas	Mascara	Smith (TX)
Geren	McCarthy	Smith (WA)
Gibbons	McCollum	Solomon
Gilchrest	McCrery	Souder
Gillmor	McHale	Spence
Gilman	McHugh	Spratt
Goodlatte	McInnis	Stearns
Goodling	McIntosh	Stenholm
Gordon	McKeon	Stockman
Goss	Meehan	Stump
Graham	Metcalf	Stupak
Greenwood	Mica	Talent
Gunderson	Miller (FL)	Tanner
Gutknecht	Minge	Tate
Hall (TX)	Molinari	Tauzin
Hancock	Montgomery	Taylor (MS)
Harman	Moorhead	Taylor (NC)
Hastert	Morella	Thomas
Hastings (WA)	Myers	Thornberry
Hayes	Myrick	Thornton
Hayworth	Nethercutt	Tiahrt
Hefley	Neumann	Torkildsen
Heineman	Ney	Traficant
Herger	Norwood	Upton
Hilleary	Nussle	Volkmer
Hobson	Obey	Vucanovich
Hoekstra	Orton	Waldholtz
Hoke	Oxley	Walker
Holden	Packard	Walsh
Horn	Parker	Wamp
Hostettler	Paxon	Ward
Houghton	Payne (VA)	Watts (OK)
Hunter	Peterson (MN)	Weldon (FL)
Hutchinson	Petri	Weldon (PA)
Hyde	Pickett	Weller
Inglis	Pombo	White
Istook	Pomeroy	Whitfield
Jacobs	Porter	Wicker
Johnson (CT)	Portman	Wolf
Johnson (SD)	Poshard	Wyden
Johnson, Sam	Pryce	Young (AK)
Jones	Quillen	Young (FL)
Kanjorski	Quinn	Zeliff
Kaptur	Radanovich	Zimmer

NOT VOTING—12

Calvert	Green	McDermott
Conyers	Hansen	McNulty
Cubin	Kleczka	Meyers
Fazio	McDade	Peterson (FL)

1445

The Clerk announced the following pairs: On this vote:

Mr. Conyers for, Mr. Calvert against.

Mr. Gene Green of Texas for, Mrs. Cubin against.

Ms. ESHOO changed her vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. MARTINEZ, HILLIARD, and PALLONE, Ms. DELAURO, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, and Messrs. WILSON, ORTIZ, BARRETT of Wisconsin, and DOGGETT changed their vote from ''no to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I was unavoidably detained and was not able to vote on the Wynn amendment, rollcall No. 352. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yes''.

□ 1445

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BEREUTER

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BEREUTER: In section 2104(a)(1)(A) (relating to authorizations of appropriations for migration and refugee assistance) strike ''$560,000,000'' and insert ''$590,000,000''.

In section 2104 strike subsection (a)(4), subsection (b), and subsection (d).

In section 2104 redesignate subsection (c) as subsection (b).

Mr. BEREUTER (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

(Mr. BEREUTER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, this Member rises to offer an amendment to section 2104 of H.R. 1561, along with my colleagues, Mr. LAMAR SMITH and Mr. OBEY, which would restore common sense to the bill's handling of the 47,000 Indochinese asylum seekers in refugee camps in Southeast Asia. While the issues here are, in one sense, emotional and complex, the justification for our amendment can be boiled down to one short sentence. Economic migrants have no claim to resettlement in the United States as political refugees and should return to their home countries.

The Bereuter-Obey-Lamar Smith amendment would allow the repatriation of Indochinese in Southeast Asian camps who have been determined by the U.N. High Commissioner on Refugees to have no, I repeat no, claim to refugee status. These migrants—at least 12,000 of whom are North Vietnamese—have been screened out by the UNHCR, i.e., they have been declared economic migrants, not political refugees.

Let me make one crucial point so there is no misunderstanding about the intent of this amendment. Since our departure from Vietnam in 1975 the United States has resettled more than 1 million Indochinese refugees. This Member has always supported that effort and continues to believe the United States must offer refuge to bona fide political refugees who have a well founded fear of persecution in Indochina, as elsewhere. This Member will work with others concerned about fair treatment of legitimate refugees, but this Member cannot support a program to give non-refugees the rights and privileges of bona-fide political refugees.

The language in this section appears to be doing just that by calling for the bulk of the 47,000 Indochinese in the camps to be, and I quote, ''offered resettlement outside of their countries or origin.'' Another fundamental issue in this debate is the role of the U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees. The legislation suggests that UNHCR can no longer be trusted to make fair and objective refugee determinations. If that is what the drafters intended, then I would ask them who should take over this international refugee determination role, the United States? Clearly, we cannot fill the breach. This is a very dangerous precedent, which could undermine future refugee efforts worldwide.

Let me take a minute to point out the problems I see with the existing language in the bill. Section 2104 calls for the resettlement of tens of thousands of Indochinese economic migrants to the United States. While the language does not name the United States explicitly as the resettlement country, there should be no misunderstanding about it—no other country would take them. The Governments of Canada and Australia, also home to thousands of Indochinese refugees, have told my office that they and the other resettlement countries would not be willing to take any of the screened out from the camps.

In addition to the immigration problems that this language would cause us, there are some real dangers in this legislation for the asylum seekers themselves. I must say that I have been somewhat surprised at the breadth and depth of concern about the legislation among the non-government organizations which advocate refugee rights and interests. Not only the U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees, but also the U.S. Committee on Refugees, Save and Children, World Vision, World Education, World Learning, and the Southeast Asian Resource Action Center have all make issued statements opposing major elements of this section. Many other groups have raised similar concerns with us orally. These NGO's with many years of direct experience working with Indochinese asylum seekers, have convinced me that the bill as written holds the following dangers.

This provision could prompt a new exodus of Indochinese seeking entry into the United States, putting them at risk on the high seas and swelling the refugee camp populations. My colleagues, you should be aware that last year, as reported in the New York Times, more than a thousand Vietnamese took to the sea when a false rumor was spread that Japan was offering employment opportunities. The bill's message of hope for resettlement in the

United States would likely have a similar effect on large numbers of Vietnamese.

The UNHCR and the refugee groups have expressed fears that the provision would increase the chance for violence in refugee camps by giving the 47,000 asylum seekers false hope for resettlement in the United States when the countries where the camps are located are unlikely to give us access to them and, even if they did, many of the asylum seekers would not be eligible for resettlement.

The bill would cause the absolute collapse of voluntary repatriation through which 72,000 Indochinese have already returned home without evidence of persecution. Now asylum seekers who can demonstrate that the negative screening decision of the UNHCR was mistaken can request reconsideration from U.S. officials or other resettlement countries in Vietnam.

Finally, for my colleagues who have an interest in refugee issues in other parts of the world, you should understand that this section would reduce the funds available for other refugee programs, such as for bona fide refugees from the former Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, by earmarking $30 million dollars to resettle economic migrants from Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos. Moreover, by conditioning use of these funds on unmeetable conditions, it is likely that the funding would disappear completely and not be available for any refugee programs.

In closing, let me reiterate what the Bereuter-Obey-Lamar Smith Amendment would do. It would:

Stop the resettlement of Indochinese economic migrants in the United States.

Make full refugee funding available for bona fide political refugees, for example from the Former Soviet Union and Eastern Europe.

Prevent a new outflow of boat people from Indochina seeking entry into the United States.

Allow the international voluntary repatriation program to proceed with U.S. assistance and under close U.S. monitoring.

Assist U.S. nongovernment agencies monitoring the migrants who have returned home to ensure that they are not persecuted.

Maintain U.S. refugee policy that only bona fide political refugees enter as refugees.

Support an international consensus on refugee determination and processing that prevents the United States from having to bear the full brunt of refugee programs all over the world.

Stop yet another example of refugee decisions being made without regard to costs for local communities to educate, train and assist the refugees.

I request your support for the Bereuter-Obey-Lamar Smith amendment to the refugee provisions of H.R. 1561

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF NEW JERSEY TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BEREUTER

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of New Jersey to the amendment offered by Mr. BEREUTER: Strike everything after ''$590,000,000'', and insert the following:

In section 2104(a)(4) (relating to authorizations of appropriations for the resettlement of Vietnamese, Laotians, and Cambodians) strike ''There'' and all that follows through ''who—'' and insert ''Of the amounts authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1996 under paragraph (1) there are authorized to be appropriated such amounts as are necessary for the admission and resettlement, within numerical limitations provided by law for refugee admissions, of persons who—''

At the end of section 2104 add the following new subsection:

(e) STATUTORY CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section may be construed to require or permit an increase in the number of refugee admissions for fiscal year 1996 from the numerical limitation for refugee admissions for fiscal year 1995.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, this amendment perfects the language of section 2104, which protects certain high-risk refugees from forced repatriation to Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia. This bill, as it currently stands, contains important language that will prevent United States tax dollars from being spent for the forcible repatriation to Vietnam and Laos of people who fought side by side with American forces.

Under current U.S. law, these people are refugees, and they are also our friends. They should not be forced back to the places where they were persecuted, but, at the very least, U.S. tax dollars should not be spent to force them back. Thousands of people who served on our side in the war and were later persecuted by the Communists on account of such service are now being detained in camps throughout Southeast Asia. The camps also hold Catholics, Protestants, Buddhists punished for religious observance, and others who served time in reeducation camps or new economic zones for their anticommunist views or activities.

Despite the strength of their claim to refugee status, almost all of these people are scheduled for repatriation to Vietnam and Laos within the next few months under a scheme known as the comprehensive plan of action. I suppose the comprehensive plan of action [CPA] was intended as a sincere effort to deal humanely with the Vietnamese boat people. Unfortunately, it has turned out to be just the opposite. First, the responsibility for deciding who is and who is not a refugee, which used to be done by United States and U.N. refugee interviewers, was transferred to local immigration officials who had no real experience or training. Big mistake. Some of the interviewers were not only incompetent but also corrupt. There are well-documented instances of local officials demanding money and sexual favors from refugees as a condition of favorable screening. And to the surprise of no one, almost nobody now is a refugee.

The Lawyers Committee for Human Rights visited and did in-depth analysis of the refugee process in Hong Kong. Their conclusion, after looking over several hundred cases, was the following: The entire screening process and review procedures remain seriously flawed. The process remains hostile to genuine refugees. Several international standards were ignored. Hundreds, perhaps thousands, of Vietnamese refugees have been wrongly rejected.

Because of unfair screening and defective screening, Mr. Chairman, our tax dollars are about to pay to send back soldiers who served for years in reeducation camps. They are going to send back anti-Communists, writers and poets, members of the underground resistance movement, and even people who work for the CIA.

□ 1500

They are going to send back Buddhist monks whose temples were shut down because they would not join the official church and Catholic nuns whose convents were violated. That is what U.S. taxpayers will pay for if the underlying amendment is adopted.

Mr. Chairman, a core provision of the CPA, the comprehensive plan of action, that has been deep-sixed, was that repatriation to Vietnam and Laos was to be strictly voluntary. The idea was that the United Nations would work with governments of these countries to make sure that it was safe, and then would work to convince the people in the camps that it was safe for them to return. Unfortunately, some of the people who returned were persecuted. In Laos some were even killed.

The U.N. monitoring program consists of only eight monitors for all of Vietnam and two for the country of Laos, along with support staff that has been hired through the Communist governments of these countries. So they have been unable to check up on most of the people who were returned.

Wonders of wonders, with government people interacting as translators and being there as part of this process, they never seemed to have discovered a single instance of persecution. I would ask my friends if you were in the situation of having been sent back against your will, and a so-called observer comes in, or repatriation monitor, to talk to you, and with that person happens to be a translator hired by the government, are you going to talk about harassment, knowing when they walk out the door you are going to be probably mistreated?

It reminds me of the visits to the POW camps during the Vietnam war when people would go over there to Vietnam, Hanoi, and elsewhere, and would meet with our prisoners. They would be told stories that there is no torture. Of course, those prisoners, our

POW's would not talk of torture. They would only go back to even more torture had they spoken the truth.

One of our POW's, you might recall, ingenuously with his eyes flashed out ''torture'' in Morse Code, getting the word out that indeed they were using torture against these people.

Mr. Chairman, somehow the people in the camp with this situation just do not believe there has not been a single instance of persecution.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey was allowed to proceed for 4 additional minutes.)

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, so the CPA soon ran out of volunteers. They then began selecting people to volunteer and imprisoning them when they refused. Sometimes they just dragged them into airplanes, sometimes literally kicking and screaming. If they know someone is going to resist, they may tranquilize him or her before putting them on the plane.

So the CPA has become a looking glass world in which refugees are not refugees and voluntary repatriation is not voluntary. Yet the United States has given over $150 million during the last 6 years. The language now in section 2104 that has been put there by myself and my good friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], the chairman of our committee, and other members of our subcommittee, would cut further funding to the CPA unless the United Nations and other countries involved agree to fix the program, to provide resettlement opportunities for a limited number of high-risk refugees, again the old soldiers, the nuns and others with compelling cases, within existing refugee allotments.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment I am offering today is a perfecting amendment to meet the objections raised by some, making it absolutely clear that this language in the bill would not mean the admission of large numbers of immigrants or even refugees. It provides explicitly that the provision should not be construed either to require or to permit an expansion of the numerical limitation on refugees beyond the number that it was allocated for 1995. It gives the State Department more flexibility in its refugee budget by eliminating separate authorization of funds for resettlement of people.

The State Department has been lobbying very hard against this provision. But after my perfecting amendment, the only thing to say to the State Department is take a hard look at these people in high-risk categories. If they are refugees under U.S. law, we should not hide behind an inadequate third country screening to pay for them to be forced back to persecution; second, no more money for the repatriation program until you can certify that it has been fixed and everyone has been given a fair screening and everyone that should be resettled has been resettled.

Mr. Chairman, I do hope that Members will support the Smith amendment to the Bereuter amendment. It has the support of a number of organizations in the refugee communities who are adamantly opposed to the Bereuter amendment and have come out as such within the last couple of days, the list of which I will talk about further.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Smith perfecting amendment.

(Mr. HYDE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I will be very brief. This is not a simple problem, but I think one of the darkest chapters in our country's history in this century was called Operation Keelhaul. It occurred in Europe after World War II when defecting Russians who were amassed in camps were forcibly repatriated in boxcars back, to return and never to be seen again. Our troops and our soldiers at gunpoint forced these people, who had fled from the tyranny of the Soviet Union, back into these boxcars. As I say, they were never seen again.

Forcibly repatriating people who have fled from their own homeland is an atrocious act. We ought not to countenance it. We ought to help people who have risked the seas and pirates and risked their lives to flee to what they thought was a safe haven, and then finding that we are participating in forcibly repatriating them.

These people deserve better. It is a matter of honor. They worked with us, they fought with us, they moved where we are, the land of liberty and freedom. We are not asking that they be repatriated to America. We are asking only that they not be forcibly returned to the places from which they fled.

A person born in a faraway country loves their homeland. If they could return, they would. But these people face all sort of dangers. They lived in reeducation camps. They have finally escaped. Now we are going to forcibly repatriate them? I hope my country never does that. If people want to leave tyranny and leave abuse and move towards the light of freedom, we should facilitate that, not inhibit it.

So I strongly support, and I do not criticize Mr. BEREUTER or Mr. OBEY or Mr. SMITH, they are as well-intentioned as anybody can be. But I just think they are dead wrong. We ought never at the point of a gun or barbed wire or anything else force people to go back from whence they have fled in terror.

So I hope the Smith amendment is adopted.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Smith perfecting amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I take a back seat to no one in this institution in terms of my concern about decent treatment for refugees. I think all who know me know that. But the fact is that section 2104 of this bill, in the original bill, sets aside $30 million specifically for the purpose of admitting for resettlement in the United States thousands of Southeast Asian refugees who do not qualify for legitimate refugee status. It also creates artificial incentives for those people to come to the United States rather than return to their homeland, because it in effect cuts off any aid to Southeast Asians who want to return to their homeland and need tiny amounts of help to do so.

In my view, that is wrong-headed. The amendment that Mr. BEREUTER and Mr. SMITH and I are trying to offer would eliminate that section of the bill.

Now, I am supporting and offering this amendment with these other two gentlemen for two reasons: First of all, I think the committee provision really breaks an international agreement which was made by the United States with 78 other countries. It makes no distinction between legitimate political refugees and persons who simply want to come to the United States for economic reasons. It also, I would point out, leaves local communities holding the bag for the cost of educating and training refugees who can often be very difficult to resettle and train, because some of them, for instance, do not even have a written language.

I want to get into the case of the Hmong, for instance. The United States Government has allowed more than 120,000 of the 400,000 Hmong who were living in Laos in 1975 to enter this country. There was a very good reason for the United States doing that. The Hmong had done our dirty work in Laos during the Vietnam War. When the government collapsed, we allowed many of them to come into this country because of the service they had provided to the United States during the war.

I understand that. But I would point out that the obligation that the United States has to recognize what people like the Hmong did for us is an obligation of the Federal Government. It is not an obligation of the county government, it is not an obligation of the municipal government. In fact, what we have now is the Federal Government in effect posing for political holy pictures by allowing into this country all of the refugees that we can allow in, but then transferring the responsibility to pay for the cost of those refugees to the States and local government. I do not believe that is an equitable arrangement.

It seems to me that if this committee wants to create the impression that it is allowing any and all refugees under this amendment to enter this country, then they ought to be guaranteeing that the Federal Government in fact is going to meet its responsibility by sharing the costs of educating and training those refugees. If it does not, the Federal Government is welching on

its commitment not only to those refugees, but to local communities as well.

I would also point out that if you adopt the Smith amendment to the Bereuter-Obey-Smith amendment, what you are doing in effect is creating false expectations and making a shambles of what an orderly refugee process is supposed to be.

I do not favor forcing a single refugee back into their original country if they do not want to go. I believe even in the case of refugees who have initially determined they want to go back to their country of origin, that in the case of the Hmong, which is the one case I know pretty intimately, it seems to me they ought to be given a chance to change their minds so that there can be no doubt that the United States is not forcibly repatriating a single refugee.

I did my graduate thesis on Operation Keelhaul. I am very familiar with it. It was an outrageous chapter in American history. I do not want to see us repeat that chapter. But neither do I want to see us in a soft-headed way simply appear to be doing a favor for refugees, when in fact what you will be doing is causing more turmoil in those refugee camps, causing more confusion, causing them to believe that the refugee program is now blown away and that they will therefore all have an opportunity to enter the United States.

I would point out or simply ask why we should be creating an artificial incentive so that not only do we make available resources to bring refugees to this country, but we also shut off, in effect, the resources necessary to allow refugees who want to return to their original country to do so.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. OBEY was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, it just seems to me in this instance the opponents of the Bereuter amendment are well meaning, but I think in my heart they are misguided. I would urge Members to reject the Smith amendment because it will simply leave a false impression out there, which will cause great additional turmoil in those refugee camps.

What we ought to be doing is saying to the Thai Government and other governments in the area, we ought to be asking them to help us in the process by which we give every refugee an opportunity to determine for themselves whether they want to be repatriated or whether they want to come to this country. We ought not be creating artificial incentives so that in the end they have no financial alternative to coming to the United States, unless this committee is willing to guarantee that it is the Federal Government that will then bear the financial burden of that decision. I do not think this committee is going to do that. Absent that guarantee, I think we ought to support the Bereuter amendment.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

(Mr. DAVIS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Smith amendment.

Mr. Chairman, many of the Vietnamese boat people and Hmong asylum seekers in Southeast Asia are facing imminent deportation to communist Vietnam and Laos. Many of them have been severely persecuted because of their U.S. ties during the war or because of their political or religious beliefs. However, many of them have been unfairly denied refugee status by local governments under a screening program established by the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees and heavily funded by the U.S. Government. This screening program is rife with corruption and other fundamental flaws. Among those already denied refugee status, there are some 100 religious leaders, thousands of former political prisoners and officers of South Vietnam, and many human rights activists and dissident intellectuals.

□ 1515

Classified as nonrefugees, they now face deportation to Vietnam. Many of them have taken their own lives to protest the injustices in screening to avoid deportation.

Thousands of Hmongs already recognized as refugees are also facing deportation to Laos. In my judgment, no U.S. contribution to the UNHCR should be used to finance such refoulement of refugees. Any use of United States money for the repatriation of Vietnamese boat people or Hmong asylum seekers must be conditioned on a fair review of their refugee claims.

I would like to review with the House who some of these individuals are, because you need to look sometimes beyond the numbers and the rhetoric to look at who are the individuals we are talking about that would be protected under the Smith amendment.

One of the people comprehensive plan of action would force back to Vietnam is a lady, a Sister K, a Catholic nun. Her father served as a counterintelligence officer for the Republic of Vietnam of Vietnam. After 1975, he was sent to a reeducation camp for more than 6 years.

In 1988, the communists raided Sister K's convent. They arrested her and the mother superior, who was accused of plotting against the government. The seminary was confiscated. Sister K was sentenced to 6 months at hard labor. She then went to live with her family, but in 1991 her father and other Catholics were arrested for planning to build a church. Sister K went into hiding and escaped from Vietnam. Sister K has been labeled an economic migrant by the Thai immigration inspector who was in charge or her interview under the comprehensive plan of action. She is scheduled to be forced back to Vietnam. Her story of persecution has been corroborated by her mother superior, who also eventually escaped to the United States and is hospitalized through the effects of the torture she underwent while in prison.

Another individual called Captain Tran was an officer in the Army of the Republic of South Vietnam. He served side by side with American troops. After 1975, he managed to evade capture and joined an underground anti-Communist resistance movement. Eventually the movement was uncovered by the Communist authorities. Many of its members were tracked down, viciously tortured, and executed.

The members of the movement who managed to escape then plotted the assassination of the Communist officer who had ordered the torture and extrajudicial killings. Captain Tran eventually escaped from Vietnam. But the Hong Kong authorities found him to be credible. They agreed that he had reason to fear punishment by the Communists upon return, but held that his participation in the counterrevolutionary plot was a nonpolitical crime and that made him ineligible for asylum.

Captain Tran is scheduled to be forced back to Vietnam this year under the comprehensive plan of action. Staff members of the House Committee on International Relations interviewed him and found him highly credible. He said he will commit suicide before returning to Vietnam.

Mr. Chairman, as a nation, I think we have to take steps that will bring about a fair, humane, and dignified solution to the Indo-Chinese refugee problem once and for all within United States laws and without any increase in quota or budget. So, Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Smith amendment and ask my colleagues to support it.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Bereuter amendment regarding Southeast Asian refugees. I have visited refugee camps in Thailand and Hong Kong over the last 20 years, most recently just last summer in Hong Kong. It is my observation that while the early refugees were certainly tied in with U.S. interests and support of our war efforts, the present refugees do not reflect this early perception by the American people and veteran organizations.

Most of the refugee population in the Hong Kong camps have been through a screening process and have been classified as economic migrants, or to put it explicitly many are northern Vietnamese fishermen who had nothing to do with supporting our war efforts.

The United States was a signature to the Comprehensive Plan of Action in 1989 which strengthened the principles of first asylum in Southeast Asia. For

example this program enabled the repatriation of Vietnamese, Cambodian, and Laotians back to their country of origin if not classified as a refugee. By this action countries like Thailand that had become weary of holding refugees were able to see the end of the tunnel, and stopped pushing back potential refugees into the sea. We all remember the terrible piracy and raping of women on boats that occurred. This new program helped to reduce such incidents. It also worked out agreements with countries that were the source of the migration like Vietnam to take back these people and encourage them to utilize internationally accepted immigration programs like the Orderly Departure Program that has allowed 500,000 to start new lives in the United States and other countries. While there may be some refugees who have been improperly classified, these cases could be reviewed with U.S. intervention under the flexibility of the present agreement.

Moreover, the root cause of the migration is the poor economic conditions in these countries, especially Vietnam. By continuing our agreement we encourage additional cooperation with Vietnam which will lead to increased cooperation on the POW issue and complete the normalization of relationships between our two countries.

The Bereuter amendment will also maintain funding to continue the Comprehensive Plan of Action. It will also send a signal that the United States remains a partner in this well-thought-out plan.

This will discourage those still detained in the Hong Kong camps from rioting. Over 200 were wounded yesterday in Hong Kong fighting with handmade metal spears according to this morning's edition of the New York Times. It is downright cruel for us to build expectancies that the United States will take these migrants as refugees. Support the Bereuter amendment and help to stop the bloodshed in Hong Kong.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, what is even worse is to send them back to possible death and torture at the hands of the Communist Vietnamese Government. Some of those people have been disappearing.

Mr. Chairman, I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF].

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I will be brief. I urge every Member to read the letter of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM] before they vote on this. The gentleman is going to speak, so I will not reiterate his letter. But his letter probably sums it up better than anything. In his letter he points out in the PS that the important provision in H.R. 1561 has been endorsed by the American Legion. This is what the American Legion says. They said:

These former members of the South Vietnamese armed forces who escaped certainly have great reason to fear being forcefully repatriated. All one needs to do is review the latest State Department report on human rights in Vietnam to realize that little has changed with respect to what happens.

We have talked to families in my area who have talked about their family members who have literally committed suicide. I think the gentleman is right, and I strongly support the Smith amendment. I think it will be very good for the country.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

I think it needs to be reiterated that human rights groups have reported several instances of people being hurt upon their return, jailing, interrogation about anticommunist political activities in the camps, discrimination in employment and housing, and in Loas the disappearance and the probable killing of Hmong leader Vue Mai.

The American Legion again, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF], brought the American Legion, relying on their own contacts with former Vietnamese comrades in arms who corroborate these accounts. One reason that the United Nations cannot find any persecution is that they have only eight monitors for all of Vietnam and only two for Laos.

I wanted to remind the membership we are talking about people that are going out with a support staff that has been hired through the Vietnamese and the Laotion Government. This is a situation where the person that is with the repatriation monitor is reporting to a government, and the government is hostile in many instances to these individuals. Who can blame them for not speaking openly after being forcibly repatriated in the first place? I do think there is underreporting as well.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, let me just end up by saying that there is an anti-illegal-immigration attitude in America today with justification. We have millions of people coming across the Mexican-American border for economic reasons, and that has caused a real problem with our economy in many States. But the fact of the matter is there are still people in this world who are fleeing Communist dictatorships, and to send them back to death or worse is a horrible thought. It is analogous to taking people who came across the Berlin Wall. It is a wrong-headed move. I hope my colleagues will support the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

□ 1530

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] has expired.

(At the request of Mr. OBEY and by unanimous consent, Mr. BURTON of Indiana was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, I very much respect the gentleman's concern about the refugees in question, but I would simply ask this: Why should we engage in a legislative process which in fact cuts off the assistance to refugees who do, on a voluntary basis want to go back to their own country? Why should we eliminate the financial assistance provided to those people?

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Chairman, because, with all due respect, I would say to the gentleman from Wisconsin, the process has been corrupted by money and sexual abuse, so some of these people are volunteering to go back out of coercion.

Mr. OBEY. If the gentleman will continue to yield, the fact is that under the process for Hmong refugees, each refugee will have to again resign a statement indicating that he or she is engaging in voluntary repatriation, and if they do not sign a statement, they are not repatriated. It seems to me the gentleman's statement is off base.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, this is part of the problem. If they do not sign the voluntary agreement, they are put in jail, in many instances. In Thailand six Hmong leaders, all of whom were screened in as refugees, but scheduled for voluntary repatriation to Laos anyway, were jailed because they were actively resisting voluntary repatriation.

Mr. OBEY. Tell the whole story.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. This is the whole story, if the gentleman will yield further. These people, we wonder why there may be people who may react, and I do not condone the violence, but when people come in in riot gear to tell these people ''It is time for you to be voluntarily repatriated,'' they react with an attitude.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] has expired.

(At the request of Mr. OBEY and by unanimous consent, Mr. BURTON of Indiana was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, let me simply ask the gentleman, why do we not also explain the fact that the same organization which is peddling those stories in fact is also raising funds by selling military, police, and civilian titles in their resistance army? Why do we not talk about the intimidation

from them that is going on within the Hmong community? There is intimidation going on on both sides.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, let me make clear to the gentleman that our embassy confirmed this story. I want to go back to something I said earlier on. The Refugee Committee of Lawyers for Human Rights has so blasted the process of screening they have changed international standards. The credibility is one where they are viewed with unbelievable skepticism before they even open their mouths. It is a flawed process.

We are saying that the President should certify, and if it is not a flawed process, then the money is okay, but if he can certify these people are being voluntarily repatriated, that is a different story.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BURTON of Indiana was allowed to proceed for 30 additional seconds.)

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, let me just end real briefly by saying this. If there is any doubt about these people being sent back to possible death, or worse, at the hands of the Vietnamese Communists, then we should err on the side of safety. That is the reasonable and humanitarian thing to do.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Smith amendment. We should not support the shameful forced repatriation of our allies who fought by our side during the Vietnam war. The gentleman's amendment would permit our Nation to end that period with honor and dignity.

The American Overseas Interest Act does not require one extra penny to be spent nor would it increase the number of refugees admitted to the United States. It merely disassociates the United States with sending people back to Vietnam and Laos who have genuine refugee claims because they fought with us during the war.

It is not accurate to speculate that it is safe for our allies to return to Vietnam and Laos. The U.N. repatriation monitoring process in place in Vietnam and Laos are run by Vietnamese and Laotian citizens hired in coordination with those Governments. In Laos 14 of the 18 UNHCR repatriation monitoring personnel are citizens of Laos hired by UNHCR with the coordination of the Laotian Government. In Vietnam 30 of the 38 UNHCR repatriation monitoring personnel are Vietnamese citizens hired by UNHCR with the coordination of the Vietnamese Government. It is no small wonder that it is claimed that there have been no cases of retribution. The Governments of those two repressive governments are investigating themselves. This is clearly a case of allowing the fox to guard the hen house.

It is for this reason that the American Legion and other veteran organizations support Mr. SMITH'S amendment and fully support the provision in the bill. Our military men and women who fought in Vietnam and in Laos are unanimously opposed to any effort to abandon our allies.

Permit me to read from a letter dated May 23 sent to me by John Summer, the executive director of the American Legion.

> The American Legion supports the initiative . . . which would provide for a reexamination of the refugee status of thousands of Vietnamese who fled their homeland out of fear of political reprisal, up to and including death.
>
> The American Legion considers it a debt of honor to strongly support your efforts to authorize the proper screening of those individuals who continue to be held in refugee camps in Asia, and to allow for the resettlement of those refugees who fought side-by-side with the American forces during the Vietnam war, as well as their families.

The United Nations will not allow our Hmong allies living in camps in Thailand and eligible under United States law to immigrate here, to leave the camps. Instead the Thai Government and the U.N. are using our funds to forcefully send our Hmong allies back to a dangerous fate in Laos.

The screening process of refugees administered by the comprehensive plan of action must be broadly reviewed in order to remedy unfair and otherwise defective status determination. The use of U.S. funds must be conditioned on a thorough review of this process. The American Overseas Interests Act would allow for such a review.

Accordingly, I strongly support the Smith amendment, and oppose the Bereuter amendment. Let us end this sad period of history in Vietnam and Laos with honor and dignity.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, I would ask the gentleman, does he really believe that Save the Children would be participating in forced repatriation? Does the gentleman really believe that? That is one agency we have provided the $1.5 million to to assist people who want to return to their own country.

Does the gentleman really believe Save the Children Foundation is in the business of forcing people to be repatriated?

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, we are not talking about Save the Children now, we are talking about the Vietnamese UNHCR personnel, the Laotian UNHCR personnel, who are apparently not doing an effective job.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, I would simply say that I sent two of my staffers into the region to try to determine what the facts were. They came back with many indications that the voluntary agencies involved do not support the elimination of the ability to assist people who want to go back to their own country.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I would ask the gentleman, does he believe there has not been one single case of retribution? We sent our own staff people over to look into the refugee camps, and they were refused entrance and examination.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman continue to yield so I could answer his question?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] has expired.

(At the request of Mr. OBEY and by unanimous consent, Mr. GILMAN was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I would, frankly, be surprised if there had not been any cases of retribution, because, after all, this is not heaven. However, the fact is that I do not oppose anybody's efforts to try to see to it that each and every refugee has an honest choice about where they want to go, but I do think it is softheaded for this Congress or for the American Legion or any other organization in this country to say ''Oh, yes, we will accept the system which will in fact bring financial incentives for all of them to come to the United States, and by the way, we will not provide the funds for it, and we will let the local units of government get stuck with having to support them.'' That is not good.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILMAN. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, it does not help this debate one iota for the gentleman to call it softheaded to say that the screening process was influenced. The overwhelming consensus by the human rights groups is that it is flawed.

Let me just, again, remind the gentleman, and this is not a conservative human rights organization, the Lawyers Committee for Human Rights Refugee Project concluded, and I quote, ''The entire screening process and review procedures remain seriously flawed.'' They went on to state: ''The process remains hostile to genuine refugees, and thousands may have been wrongly rejected.''

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Smith amendment to the Bereuter amendment.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Chairman, before I make any comments, I yield to my colleague, the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

I also support the Smith amendment, Mr. Chairman, and I would like to say how proud I am to be involved with a movement that would allow boat people to be treated as the refugees that they really are. There are thousands of these refugees lingering in miserable camps throughout Southeast Asia, waiting for freedom. I think we need to stand by our former allies and make sure that they are treated as the refugees they are.

Mr. Chairman, I remember a few years back refugees were forced out of the camps in Hong Kong, and a number of refugees committed suicide rather than return to the Communist regimes from which they fled. Mere economic refugees do not commit suicide when faced with repatriation.

Mr. Chairman, I know lawyers who have been involved in the Lawyers Committee on Human Rights. They tell me what the gentleman has said, that the process has been flawed. We need to stand by our former allies. I remember when Vietnam fell 20 years ago, the efforts I made to save those who were escaping from communism. We must not forget them today.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me, and I strongly urge support of the Smith amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. BERMAN] has expired.

(At the request of Mr. VENTO and by unanimous consent, Mr. BERMAN was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BERMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

(Mr. VENTO asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Smith amendment and the underlying intent of the bill.

It is really a difficult one. I understand the good intentions, but I think there has been a shadow over this process. The increased interest of the governments in camps, the Thai Government, to close refugee camps has, I think, rushed the process greatly. There has been repeated reports, and I mean extensive reports, even in the Minnesota papers, concerning mistreatment and abuse of individuals in these areas.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Smith amendment to the Bereuter amendment which would rewrite a provisions in the legislation. Specifically, I am very concerned that the Hmong currently in refugee camps in Thailand, first, that they are voluntarily returning, and second, that they receive whatever funding has been promised if they do repatriate. These people are returning to very difficult conditions in Laos and are in dire need of the minimal assistance being provided to them in order to survive. They are often sent to locations where they must glean a living from lands and communities with few resources. It is, however, vital that we support the non governmental organization and a truly objective UNHCR presence in Laos and Vietnam, because of the necessary monitoring to ensure the safety of those repatriated. There has been a great deal of trouble getting credible information out of Laos with regards to the Hmong.

The Hmong are in a special situation. It is my understanding that most of the Hmong have refugee status and therefore are already eligible for resettlement in the United States or another country. There are now reported less than 500 Hmong who have been determined to be ineligible for resettlement. Other reports indicate a much higher number. This legislation and initiative should be viewed as ensuring that the process is credible and that the resettlement decisions are voluntary.

Hopefully with the modifications now presented the Smith language will more precisely resolve the questions raised.

Certainly some groups opposed to funding repatriation assistance because of the possibility of persecution of the Hmong by the Laotian Government. Unfortunately, our own State Department has done a poor job of laying these fears to rest. The Hmong in the United States and those still in the refugee camps hear from the State Department that there is no need to worry about those who return to Laos at the same time they hear stories of Hmong who have disappeared or been shot. It has been extremely difficult to get satisfactory information or answers to specific circumstances hence this legislative language attempts to ensure certification of the circumstance, a common practice to verify or qualify support that Congress has written into law, certainly we can assume that the Clinton administration will proceed with dispatch and a good faith effort.

The Hmong are special because the large majority of them already have refugee status and are eligible for resettlement in the United States or another country. What the United States Government needs to ensure is that the Thai Government and other camp governments and the U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees is making a proper determination of the Hmong who are requesting resettlement. The Hmong are under considerable pressure from the Thai to repatriate because the Thai want to close the refugee camps and be done with this 20-year-old problem. We and certainly the Clinton administration and most in Congress don't want anyone to be forced to repatriate nor do we want to cut off aid for those who choose to return, who do not want to resettle in the United States or elsewhere.

Clearly, the situation of Hmong refugees in Thai refugee camps is an ugly and sad one which we would all gladly see resolved. It is crucial that these people be treated fairly, that they not be denied the opportunity to resettle in the United States or elsewhere because they have not previously chosen this option. Many of these people, although they suffered persecution by the Government in Laos, many in fact some would say most, hoped one day to be able to return to their native land. They stayed in the refugee camps, a bad place to live, because they dreamed that one day they would be able to return to life in their country. Now these people are being faced with a choice they must make now and they should be allowed to make the choice for which they are eligible.

The United States cannot neglect its obligation to the Hmong people who sacrificed lives and homeland to fight on the side of the United States in the Vietnam war. They cannot be allowed to forget those who are still suffering as a result of the Vietnam war. This amendment maintains the fragile status quo, a situation that much concerns the Hmong-Americans in Minnesota. Certainly, reports of serious human rights violations need to be fully resolved and rectified. Often the choice of Hmong within a refugee camp is being questioned as to whether such a person made a voluntary choice to return to Laos. That must be resolved. There can be no misunderstanding that when a refugee returns to his or her homeland that there basic rights and personal safety are secure. That funding and assistance provided for reintegration is necessary should be obvious. The certification process in this measure is viewed by my Hmong-American constituents as the last hope to rectify this situation that affects their family members. The hearings held in Congress and the letters written too often have left more questions than answers, therefore I oppose stripping the language from the bill, and am in support of the rewritten Smith amendment and the Hmong refugees.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BERMAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

(Mr. NADLER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Smith amendment. I want to simply state that I differ from my friend, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DUNCAN], in that we ought to protect refugees, whether they are refugees from communistic dictatorships or from any other dictatorships. They have the same human rights, and we ought to protect them.

Clearly in this instance the Smith amendment ought to be adopted, and the Bereuter amendment replaced, because we should protect these refugees, and because the so-called screening over there, most human rights observers and organizations have said is not adequate.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Smith amendment to the Bereuter amendment. If adopted without the Smith amendment the Bereuter amendment will make the United States complicit in the persecution of thousands of Southeast Asian refugees.

Forget the rhetoric of the nativism demagogues, the Bereuter amendment would not close any loophole in our immigration law, because none exists. In fact, it would shatter what is best and most balanced in our refugee policy.

Without Smith, the Bereuter amendment would eliminate language in the bill requiring that no one can be returned to Vietnam with the assistance of American taxpayer money until they receive a fair and impartial screening to determine if they are genuine refugees.

Is there something wrong with that?

The language of the bill is straightforward:

It provides up to $30 million for the relocation of Vietnamese, Laotian, or Cambodian refugees.

It prohibits the use of U.S. funds to repatriate those refugees unless the President can certify that bona fide refugees, and only bona fide refugees, have been offered, not even placed in but offered resettlement outside their countries of nationality. That means relocation anywhere else, not only to the United States.

It also requires the President to certify that the process of determining refugee status conforms to our basic commitment to fairness, honesty, and due process.

The bill does not, as you may have heard, require that all these refugees come to the United States. Read the bill, it's on pages 102–103.

The bill does not steal money away from refugees from the former Soviet Union. Eighty million dollars is set aside for that purpose on page 101.

So what is all the excitement about?

These refugees are not on U.S. soil; our Government is not running these refugee camps. Is it too much to suggest that we should not pay for their forced repatriation until we can be assured that they will not face persecution?

For those refugees who will come to the United States, this bill does not create any new refugee slots. In fact it does not even use all of the slots available. These are refugees who quality for resettlement, that is, refugees who are persecuted for their past affiliation with the United State or who have been persecuted on the basis of religion or ethnicity.

We must not abandon our commitment to honesty, fairness, and decency.

I know money for refugee programs is politically unpopular these days. At the very least we should agree that those scarce dollars that are available should not be used to move refugees involuntarily to their countries of origin to face persecution.

Mr. Speaker, I opposed the war in Vietnam. Many of our colleagues here supported that war, and some even fought there. Those differences still have the power to divide this Nation. The mere suggestion that some may come from the northern part of Vietnam sill seems to have the power to suggest to some Members that these refugees will make war on us when they arrive here. I think that, regardless of the stand you took 25 years ago, if you ever cared about the people of Southeast Asia, of if you were moved to take a stand on either side because the preservation of fundamental American values was important to you, then you must help adopt the Smith amendment. I urge a yes vote on Smith and no vote on Bereuter.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Chairman, this is a very complicated and important issue. There is a lot of right on both sides. The fact is the Orderly Departure Program and CPA have dealt with the problem of boat people, dealt with a way to allow people who are in fear of political persecution to leave Vietnam directly to resettle in countries, and have set up a process which, unfortunately, has been too flawed in the camps on the countries of first asylum to resettle in other countries.

The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], by his amendment, has taken a major step toward ameliorating concerns earlier expressed during committee debate on the language which is in the bill. He has softened the earmark, he has made it clear that the intention of his amendment is not to increase the number of refugees admitted to the United States above those currently permitted.

The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] are pointing out the potential problems with some of the restrictions in the language of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], or some of the requirements in the language. However, I, at least at this particular point in time, want to focus on energizing our State Department to get the UNHCR and the people in charge of that screening process to take a look at a number of cases where it is clear that people with a well-founded fear of persecution, if they were to be repatriated back to Vietnam, should have a chance to prevent what could be a catastrophe for them.

□ 1545

Between now and the conference committee, we can look at how to do this. I do not think every candidate should be rescreened. I do not think we want to end voluntary repatriation. I do not think we want to give the people in the camps false hopes about things that are going to happen.

I do not want them to think we want to embark on something which would become politically unsustainable in the United States, but the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE] and others were right. When you are talking about people who fought on our side, who were imprisoned for 10 years for political acts and now are talked about being sent back, you want to make sure that that is not being done in a fashion that is going to put their lives and their liberty in jeopardy.

I think the Smith language in the bill as modified now helps to send the message to the State Department, to the international community about our concerns about the flaws in the rescreening process and in the repatriation process and that between now—I actually hope this bill does not get to a conference committee, but if it were to get to a conference committee, we can deal with some of the problems that people have correctly pointed out.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific of the Committee on International Relations, I rise in strong opposition to the Smith amendment. It is well-intended but it is a disastrously bad approach.

The gentleman from California has said the section of the bill is made slightly better, by the amendment of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH]. The gentleman, Mr. BERMAN, was the person that raised the initial concerns about this section in the committee. I say this section of the bill is a disastrously bad approach. I do not use that language very often. I know that the intention of the gentleman from New Jersey is to be highly respected, and I respect it, too, but the results, the bloodshed, the tragedies that will result from this reversal of policy are just going to be extraordinary.

If we make this change in the refugee program in Southeast Asia the blood is going to be on our hands for the additional boats of refugees that are going to be launched. This section of the bill and the Smith amendment completely devastates the UNHCR-multinational Comprehensive Plan for Action which is being implemented.

Why is it that most of the refugee groups that have spoken out on the issue have spoken against the language in the bill and would speak, if they have not done so already, against the language offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] as an amendment to my amendment? It is because they understand that what you are unleashing here by approving the Smith amendment is a tragedy.

Mr. Chairman, we have heard many comments about forced repatriation. Of course no one is in favor of forced repatriation. We have accepted over 1 million Indochinese refugees into this country because we have a responsibility as our former allies to do so. We have done that generously. Now we have the UNHCR trying to get a reasonable hold on this economic refugee and boat people process. We have 47,000 refugees waiting there at this moment, which are categorized by the UNHCR as economic refugees.

I want to see any Member stand up in front of their local VFW chapter and American Legion chapter and say, ''We granted refugee status to economic refugees from North Vietnam, our former enemies.'' That is what I want to see you do. If you vote in favor of this amendment which guts my amendment offered for myself and for the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] and for the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SMITH], you are devastating the Comprehensive Plan for Action.

What about UNHCR? Is it a corrupt process? Well, no, it is not. Are there corruptive elements in it? Absolutely, there are.

Take a look at this. Since the screening process began in 1989, about 125,000 Indochinese have been screened under close supervision of the UNHCR. One-quarter of those screened, representing more than 31,000 asylum seekers, have been found to be bona fide refugees and have been resettled in the West. The screening process included the right to appeal directly to UNHCR, which did not hesitate to overturn bad screening decisions. In fact, it overturned 1,500 initial refusals.

While there are undoubtedly examples of error in such a massive screening process, the bulk of informed opinion, both government and NGO, disputes the assertion of mass fraud and corruption in the process. If you destroy this process by the Smith language in the bill, you have left the United States holding all of the responsibilities for the tide of refugees that you are about to launch. I ask you to think seriously about that.

What about the egregious cases that are mentioned and identified by the NGO's? I will work with my colleagues and the NGO's to press UNHCR and the State Department to be more active in seeking redress. I understand that at least 48 cases from the list have been successfully overturned, and more perhaps should be. But I caution my colleagues in the House, do not launch this wave of refugees.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEREUTER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask a specific question with respect to a specific group of refugees.

Right now, there are a lot of Hmong refugees trapped in Thailand. Some of them want to go back to Laos. A lot of them want to come to the United States. And a lot of them, if given the opportunity, would prefer to stay in Thailand.

I would simply ask this question of those who are supporting the Smith amendment. If this country today unilaterally takes this action, and sends a message to refugees around the world that we are about to absorb all of the refugees discussed under this amendment, and if under those circumstances the Thailand Government then decides against allowing those Hmong refugees to resettle in Thailand, are we really doing those Hmong refugees any good?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER] has expired.

(On request of Mr. OBEY, and by unanimous consent, Mr. BEREUTER was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, I continue to yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

Mr. OBEY. Are we not in fact by this action today going to make it highly unlikely that the Thai Government would in fact make that third option available to those Hmong refugees? And does that not in fact mean, just as the gentleman says, that the United States is going to unilaterally assume onto its own shoulders all of the burden for the turmoil that will result and all of the financial burden that will result as well?

It just seems to me that if we want to change the screening process, we ought to focus on demands to change the screening process. We should not in the process blow up an international agreement unilaterally, which this language does.

Mr. BEREUTER. I thank the gentleman. That is exactly what it would mean with respect to the Hmong refugees. About 2 months ago, I wrote to the State Department in support of the Hmong. I now understand an agreement is being worked out with the Thai Government to grant us access to the Hmong in the camps later this year. But if we blow it up by this action today, that is gone.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], the committee chairman, asked me in his absence to make a unanimous-consent request. I do that in concluding my remarks.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on the pending amendments and any amendments thereto be limited to 30 minutes, to be controlled by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] for 15 minutes, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] for 7½ minutes, and myself, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER], for 7½ minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, there are a number of us who have been patiently waiting to engage in this debate and we are not about, when we have constituents and their families whose fate is at the mercy of the outcome of this, to agree to that kind of a unanimous-consent request when we have had no time, when certain Members have continued to ask for more time, more time and more time so they can conduct their discussions at our expense. At this point, I object, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I have heard a lot of emotional debate today and I would just like to try to put this in some perspective. I do not serve on this particular committee, but I have served on the Immigration and Refugee Subcommittee for over 14 years. I personally have visited the Hmong camps, I have personally visited Hong Kong, I have been there more than once, and I think I have some feel for the history of this matter since about 1980.

The story that I would like to tell a little bit of to put it in perspective is the story of the way in which the decisions were being made back in the 1980's with regard to how we screened people in and out among these groups of boat people and the Hmong and so on. In the very early 1980's, there was a very strict screening. President Reagan when he came into office, was in office a couple of years, and some of us reported to him from our visits over there that this was a major problem, that indeed the standards being used to screen in were not allowing those to come in who had been those who had assisted us during the war, who were truly people who have credible fears of persecution, and so on and so forth.

So in light of that, in 1983 President Reagan adopted a command performance, if you will, from our Immigration and Naturalization Service and the State Department, for how we were going to handle the screenings of refugees to come in from over in that part of the world. That series of standard criteria, if you will, were later adopted into statute in what is known as the Lautenberg amendment.

It is those criteria which the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] has offered and put in the bill which is underlying this today and which we are trying to defend on this side, and I must reluctantly oppose my good friend, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER], because he wants to strike that more liberal standard, if you will.

That standard prevailed, this standard I am talking about, for nearly 6 years, until 1989, when this comprehensive plan was adopted. It is only since the comprehensive plan has been adopted that the U.S. screeners are out of the picture pretty much, and all of the UNHCR folks are doing the screening we are hearing the complaints about.

We do not want to let everybody in. The standard that Ronald Reagan promoted and adopted and we operated under for 6 years is the standard that we simply want, those of us supporting the Smith and the underlying bill position want to have adopted at least for 1 year, to look at the group that we are talking about forcibly repatriating in many cases. Let's screen them under that standard.

Let me tell you what the preferences are to that standard, the presumption almost that they still have to prove credible fear:

Former officials of the government in the south existing prior to the takeover in 1975, and we are talking about Vietnam, national and local officials.

Former members of the military of the government in the south existing prior to the takeover in 1975.

Catholics and Buddhist monks. Now, there might be some of them, a very tiny few of them, from the north. I think they are going to be the only ones you hear today who could be even under this list.

Persons formerly or presently employed by the United States or Western institutions, or persons educated in the West.

Persons required after the takeover in 1975 to undergo reeducation in reeducation or labor camps, or who were imprisoned or sent involuntarily to new economic zones because they were considered politically or socially undesirable.

Ethnic Chinese.

Montagnards.

Chams.

Accompanying members of households or persons falling into any of the preceding categories.

The same type of list, I am not going to read it, is there for the Laotian and the Cambodian situation.

We are not talking about just letting everybody in who is an economic refugee. With all due respect to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER], that is not what this whole debate is about.

What those of us who believe in the underlying bill and believe in the modest amendment that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is offering today want to see happen is that for at least a year, maybe two if it takes it, that we take a look at the boat people from Hong Kong, the Hmong who are over in Thailand, the others in the camps in Malaysia, and judge them and have them judged by the standards that were on that list in 1983 to 1989, so that we can be satisfied in our consciences as American people that we have indeed allowed those to come out who really should and not be sending those back that would be sent back in harm's way.

A lot of us just do not have confidence in the current process. We have seen too many examples where it is not working. I do not see the harm in it. I personally do not see the draw of the boat people, that we are going to draw a whole bunch more people out with this.

The standard is pretty darn clear and it is pretty narrow. It is not economic refugees, again, with all due respect. It is substantially below the 40,000 figure some have used that would ever be allowed in under this standard. I suspect a very small number, comparatively speaking, would actually qualify under this Lautenberg or this Ronald Reagan standard, which is really what it is. It would be a modest number of people who would be ultimately screened out.

Again, we are not actually going to accomplish this necessarily because the underlying proposal simply says we are not going to provide money for the comprehensive plan anymore. We are not going to be a party to what we think is wrong unless these standards are adopted and used in the screening process. That is all it does.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM] has expired.

(On request of Mr. BEREUTER, and by unanimous consent, Mr. MCCOLLUM was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I appreciate his expertise and his experience.

Mr. Chairman, I have two questions for the gentleman. I will ask them both first and let the gentleman respond.

First of all, the gentleman said we may need a year, perhaps two years. What happens when the country of first asylum begins to fail to cooperate, an action which I fully expect to take place immediately?

The second question: In light of the fact that even a small rumor floated that there were jobs available in Japan caused a boat flotilla of over 1,000 people to leave. They had to be rescued from the sea. Given that example, why does the gentleman think we are not about to launch a major exodus of boat people?

Mr. MCCOLLUM. First of all, I do not personally believe we are going to launch any major exodus, because the amount involved in this as far as what the changes are concerned is modest. They are not comprehensive like the gentleman I know in all due respect believes; I understand he does.

Second, I believe, yes, there is a chance that Thailand and some of the other countries, Hong Kong perhaps, will not accept this standard that we would say we will impose. If we do not provide them the money, they may very well forcibly send a lot of these folks on back, anyway, and I think that that may very well continue to happen. I do not know.

But I do not want my name and the name of this Congress and the money of the American people being spent for the kind of forcible repatriation that I believe is going on with a substantial number, not all, but a substantial number of these folks.

□ 1600

I in good conscience, and I think most of the Members who are on our side of this issue are really voting with that in mind, and we believe the downside is not as great as the upside of what we are doing. There is some risk, but I think it is a modest risk.

Mr. BEREUTER. If the gentleman will yield one more time, the UNHCR I believe the gentleman understands, has screened in 125,000 Indochinese. And then when we had the appeals process for those screened out at least 1,500 were screened in. So in fact it is not a totally corrupt process and it isn't a hopeless process for legitimate political refugees.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Reclaiming my time, I realize they have done a modestly good job, maybe a good job in some cases, but there have been enough reports to this Member and experienced staff, including one sitting beside me in the gentleman's committee that have not been able to get the answers to satisfy this Member that convinces me there is a corruption in its process and there is something going on I cannot condone. While some may have been good, all of it has not been good. It is my personal belief, with all due respect to the gentleman, if we need to give it a second look, we will give it, and if it does not work, so be it. But we owe it to the people involved and all those who came out in the past and that have been allies of us in the process and in the long since Vietnam period to do this, in my judgment, and that is why I feel as passionate about it as I do.

I think we need to give them the one more chance. I urge an aye vote for the Smith amendment as a major alteration and as the gentleman said, it will change your amendment. It restores the basic bill to what it should be, allowing all of the refugees to come in under the existing ceiling now so we would not be taking in any additional, and at no additional cost, I submit.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I have friends on all sides of this debate. But I rise in strong support of the Smith amendment and sadly against the Bereuter amendment, and I do so not only as a matter of intellect but with some measure of heart.

It was in the Central Highlands 27 years ago this summer when the village chieftain of a Hmong tribe, the Montagnard mountain people, wound a small piece of cheap silver around my wrist, and I have not had it off in 27 years. And I promised him I would not take it off until, as he put it, the Communists stopped kidnaping, killing, and abusing his people.

Now we have finally gotten around to treating native Americans with respect simply because they were here first by 10,000 to 20,000 years. The Hmong people are perfectly analogous to our American native Indian tribes in this country. And they have been terribly abused.

And it is not only for them but for the Vietnamese, and all of the other various backgrounds in that small abused country for almost two centuries of Laos that I speak.

Once about every 10 years, Mr. Chairman, so this may be the last time I will be sitting in the front bench, I will look at these Roman letters that are cut into the front bench of our clerks and our leadership. It reads union on the eastern end and peace on the western side, but these three words I think are apropos to this debate—justice, tolerance and liberty. Most of them, even the economic refugees, are yearning for freedom and for liberty so badly that it enables them to be horribly abused.

I have been fascinated that all sides here agree there is abuse. We are arguing over how much abuse. To ask a man to give you his daughter for sexual abuse, a type of coercive rape over seeking liberty, is probably the most offensive sex crime that you could possibly imagine. To keep upping the ante from a few hundred dollars to thousands of dollars. I have gotten names of people here that I will not put in the RECORD, because we have a defense mechanism in this well where we can name people, and I am not prepared to do it outside of this Chamber so I will not use their names. But they are colonels, higher ranking men, hired by the United Nations refugee people to operate in this screening process. Some of these high-ranking men will make families in the camps put together their money and fly a leader all the way down to the capital of Indonesia, to then be told that half his family will get refugee status but the other half,

generally including wives and daughters, will have to submit to more bribes if not to this form of coercive rape.

I think it is terrible that screening officials have charged as low as $400 U.S. dollars, demanding U.S. currency, up to $4,000 and there have been substantiated cases as high as $10,000 or $12,000.

I have been to Southeast Asia eight times while the war for freedom was going on, twice to Hanoi as a Congressman and several times to go back to those camps. My oldest of my five children, my daughter Robin, spent a year in those camps in 1980 and 1981. She saw abuses then, Mercedes Benz cars arriving from Bangkok, air-conditioned cars extorting money from those people. This corruption has been going on for 14 years. I do not care if it is 3 percent, 5 percent, or 10 percent. My evidence shows me it is even more than that. We have got to come to a screeching halt here.

Of course we do not like to see people fashioning spears and stakes. God forbid they get hold of guns to fight for their liberty as this country has done. There are excesses and innocent people in Hong Kong who are law enforcement authorities that have been terribly wounded, but the whole process, we must step back from it and look at it. The Smith amendment is the best way to do it.

As the gentleman from Florida, Mr. MCCOLLUM, did not point out in his letter, but the gentleman from Virginia, FRANK WOLF, who is an absolutely sterling person in this Chamber in either party on these human rights issues, pointed out that the American Legion is asking us to step back from this process. I have never found people in any American Legion hall, with all due respect to the gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. OBEY, to be soft-headed. Far from it. I think what we have got to do is give these people the benefit of the doubt that they have put their lives at stake, on the road and more often at sea, have fielded Thai raping, pirates. They have fielded shark attack, dehydration and at least 700,000 or 800,000 people drowned on the high seas.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DORNAN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I want to make clear when I used the term soft-headed I was referring to Members of Congress, not members of the American Legion.

Mr. DORNAN. I will try not to take that personally. As a member of the American Legion I guess I have a pass on that. I would urge to rarely vote ''no'' on my good friend the gentleman from Nebraska, Mr. BEREUTER, and ''yes'' for my friend, the gentleman from New Jersey, CHRISTOPHER SMITH.

[From the Washington Times, May 22, 1995]

U.S. BANKROLLS CORRUPT U.N. PROGRAM

Since 1989, the United States has contributed roughly 150 million dollars to a United Nations program that screens refugees for resettlement and non-refugees for repatriation. This screening program is, however, seriously corrupt and has placed numerous refugees at risk. It affects thousands of U.S. citizens whose tax dollars have gone into financing it, ironically.

In Indonesia, for instance, screening officials have charged asylum seekers 500–4,000 U.S. dollars for refugee status at the initial screening stage. At the final appeal stage, the price goes as high as $10,000–12,000.

The head of the corruption racket is none other than Colonel Wim Roesdi, Chairman of the Indonesian Task Force, in charge of Vietnamese asylum seekers. He has even opened a bank account under the name of Obrien Sitepu, his right-hand man, at Chemical Bank, New York to collect cash directly from U.S. relatives of the asylum seekers.

Several lawyers working for the U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) to oversee the screening process also took part in the racket. Rahmad Irwan, representing UNHCR on the Refugee Status Appeal Board, is known to have demanded both money and sexual favors from asylum seekers in exchange for refugee status. He then shared the proceeds with his Indonesian counterparts on the Appeal Board.

In a number of instances, the boat people had to offer their wives and daughters for several nights or longer, sometimes for weeks, as part of the deal. Many refugees with strong persecution claims have been denied refugee status because they could not afford the bribes or because they refused to offer their wives or daughters.

In some cases, U.S. relatives were required to travel to Jakarta to pay cash directly to Colonel Roesdi. Some female relatives had to satisfy his sexual demands in addition to the cash.

A number of officials affiliated with U.S. consular offices are also involved. For instance, Sumarno, an Office Manager of the Joint Voluntary Agency—a U.S. agency funded by the State Department and operating out of U.S. consular offices—routinely proposed deals to U.S. citizens who came to visit their relatives in Galang Camp. Several U.S. citizens have denounced his criminal activities to U.S. consular officials but were met with bureaucratic indifference. Meanwhile, their relatives in Galang Camp suffered retaliation by the Indonesian authorities. They have become victims of threats and physical abuses, and their correspondences have been intercepted and confiscated.

As a consequence of corruption, those with cash as well as collaborators, operators, and mistresses of screening officials are recognized as refugees and resettled. On the other hand, genuine refugees with compelling claims but without money to pay, or who refuse to offer their wives or daughters to screening officials, have often been denied refugee status and now face deportation.

Many religious leaders severely persecuted in Vietnam, have been ''screened out'' because they have nothing to offer. For instance, Ven. Thich Thanh Lien, Chief Representative of the Unified Buddhist Church of Vietnam in Galang Camp was denied refugee status despite his strong refugee claims. In 1993, his disciples and colleagues in the United States and other countries had to pool money to pay Colonel Roesdi $7000 to get the screening decision reversed. Similarly, Ven. Thich Minh Hau, another Buddhist monk, was granted refugee status only after his disciples paid $5000 to the screening authorities so as to prevent his deportation to Vietnam. Several other monks are less fortunate. They have spent the past seven months in prison awaiting eventual deportation to Vietnam, where their Church had been outlawed.

Thousands of former political prisoners, human rights activists, resistance fighters, who had been imprisoned for their U.S. ties during the war or because of their political beliefs have also been denied refugee status.

In a number of instances, screening officials intentionally screen in only have of the family. Once resettled, they must pay to get the rest of their family out. Those who do not have the means to pay have to accept indefinite separation from their loved ones,

Many boat people recently resettled have offered to testify. A number of former UNHCR lawyers have gone public. In late 1993, Simon Jeans, formerly with UNHCR in Indonesia, publicly denounced the flawed screening system. In his words, ''several refugees whose status had been accepted by UNHCR officials were turned down by Indonesian officials after failing to come up with the cash.''

Another lawyer, who established the screening program in Indonesia but who later resigned, reported that ''the reason why corruption was possible to such an extent in Indonesia was that the UNHCR leadership in that country was never interested in enforcing qualitative standards in screening.

Despite the many appeals by asylum seekers and refugee advocates and the many undeniable evidences, UNHCR has steadfastly denied any wrongdoing by its own officials or local screening officials. Instead, the agency has invested considerable resources into silencing protesters and into explaining away the egregious screening decisions.

The United States ends up bank rolling a corrupt U.N. program, which victimizes not only victims of persecution in Vietnam but also thousands of U.S. citizens who have been coerced into paying bribes to screening officials. Those who refuse to cooperate have seen their relatives abused and threatened by camp officials. Some of their relatives have committed suicide to protest the injustice or to escape deportation to Communist Vietnam.

It is time to stop the tragedy and save lives.

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

(Mr. GUNDERSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I think I am as much of an establishment guy or at least accused of that as any of my colleagues, and I come here today with the highest respect for the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], and frankly, I think they are partially right. But it is the part where they may not be right that drives me to this particular debate and why I rise in such strong support for the Smith amendment.

The fact is that we are dealing with either an intentional or an unintentional misinformation game, and people's lives are at stake as this game goes on.

I want Members to know that last fall the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], the distinguished chairman of this committee, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LEACH], and myself wrote a letter to the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. We wrote that letter because six members of the Hmong community who were in the

Ban Napho camp had tried to provide a petition to Mr. GILMAN's staff raising their concerns about the repatriation process. Those six gentlemen were as a result of that effort arrested, and they were taken to a prison or an immigration detention center at Suan Phlu.

Now we wrote asking about them, and we received a letter back on December 7 which said: ''Their well-being, like that of other persons of concern to UNHCR, are monitored by full-time UNHCR personnel. You might be interested to know that the persons concerned are in good health and are receiving preferential treatment, including English classes. They are only complaining of boredom.''

Why do I tell Members that? I tell them that because between Christmas and New Year's of this past year a member of my staff and five other staff people gave up of their holidays to go over to Thailand and to try to investigate the circumstances. They were able to get in during visitation hours to that detention center, and while they were there they were able to talk to these six individuals. Do you know what these six individuals told them? They told them that there had only been one visit over the entire 4-month detention process by anyone from the U.N. High Command on Refugees. They had only been out of their cell once, and that was when a friend from the Ministry of Interior came to visit them. No one from the United States Embassy, despite our requests, had been there to visit them, and the U.S. Embassy was only 2½ blocks away. They were quarantined in a small cell of 18 people. They were required to sleep on concrete floors with only a towel as their bedding. They were given only two meals a day of bamboo and rice. They were given no medical care at all. Two people complained of fevers and two others complained of ulcers.

Now, I tell you all of that because as this debate was emerging last week, our State Department sent a new letter regarding this same situation at which they said, ''Although the six were taken to Suan Phlu, they were still considered refugees by the Thai Government and UNHCR. They were well treated and their welfare was monitored by the UNHCR.''

I do not enjoy calling people like our State Department or the UNHCR liars, but I have to tell my colleagues when we are talking about truth, when we are talking about justice, when we are talking about people's lives, both of these agencies are misrepresenting the truth.

I do not doubt for 1 second that what the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] are suggesting is that there is some room for some problems that need to be resolved. But let us not kid ourselves about this debate this afternoon. This is a debate that is going to be heard around the world, because this is a debate about whether the United States Congress approves of the forced repatriation procedures as they are ongoing at this very moment, and if we reject the Smith amendment, Members will reject the hopes and the lives of many people of the Hmong community to torture and in many cases eventual death.

I would suggest that since we voted on the Desert Storm resolution and the vote to send our troops into hostility and harm's way, it is this vote this afternoon on the Smith amendment which will affect more lives of more individuals than any vote since that time.

I plead with Members for the sake of these people who stood with us as our friends, support the Smith amendment.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Chairman I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I think that we have had a good debate on this amendment this afternoon, and I compliment the previous speaker from Wisconsin. I think that his heart is in the right place, and like him and many of you I have been contacted by our Hmong community, and our hearts go out to them. But we also have an obligation to our own people and our own taxpayers.

We are being flooded with legal and illegal immigrants in this country. Now we are going to open up the borders. In fact we do not have borders over our own country anymore. We are going to take in tens of thousands of economic refugees again.

Yes, we should help these people in the camps. We should look out for them. They did stand with us. But the war was 20 years ago. How many more are we going to bring into this country? Yes, we would like to bring everybody into America, but that is not possible.

This is well-intentioned, but we cannot allow a new outflow of boat people. Is that fair to these people, to give them hope to bring them on the high seas again? This would not be in their best interests.

Yes, we also have to consider our own people. You know who is going to pay for this. We had unfunded mandates we passed in the first 100 days. These people coming into local communities, who is going to educate them, who is going to train them? This is going to cost a lot of money. I heard here in debate before that we have 1 million that we have brought into the country. How many more can we absorb?

□ 1615

Yes, the Hmong are good citizens. We have a million here now. How many more can we absorb? How many more can we assimilate?

We have an obligation to our own people, too, and we have to draw fine lines, our own people, your taxpayers and mine. The American people are a people with a great heart, but we must also have a level head, and that is why this is a good amendment. It is an amendment with a heart, but it is also an amendment with reason, and that is why I am for the Bereuter-Obey amendment.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of last words.

I rise in support of the Bereuter-Obey amendment and against the amendment by my friend, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. Chairman, there are two very fine Vietnamese restaurants in Arlington, Cafe Saigon and Nam Viet. They are owned by a Vietnamese gentleman who served South Vietnam in the army. In fact, he was imprisoned afterward, tortured.

I met with him in my office, as he is a constituent, on Friday. He showed me dozens of pictures. One of those pictures was of the chief of intelligence for the South Vietnamese army, who is a very wealthy man now. He is a consultant to the Vietnamese Government. He showed me any number of other pictures of people who had been very active in high-ranking positions for the South Vietnamese army who had been considered enemies of the people on the fall of Saigon but are now very much a part of society and the economy. He showed me pictures of him standing in Hanoi, pictures of him standing in every place that we would have thought was off limits.

He explained that he was able to travel anyplace. He went over there because he has helped to set up an orphanage for Vietnamese children, particularly the Amerasian children, the children of American GIs, who had been orphaned who are left in Vietnam, and he told me, Mr. Chairman, that the real need is for American involvement, not for us to turn our backs and continue trying to punish Vietnam. He felt his country and his people had been punished enough, that it is now time for healing, it is time for people like him and others like him to participate in Vietnam's economy.

He feels very strongly that the people who are living in very difficult conditions in refugee camps ought to be repatriated back to Vietnam to see, as he did, the changes that have occurred in Vietnam, to realize that time marches on, that the Vietnamese people now are far more focused on the future, a fairly bright economic future, than they are obsessed in the past.

There seem to be more people in this country who are looking upon Vietnam with the blinders of the past than there are in Vietnam itself. This body time and again has made wrong decisions with regard to that country. That country has suffered a great deal. I do not want that country to be a Communist nation, but when you trace the history, we were in many ways complicit with what occurred.

I am not going to go through a whole history at this point, but I think we would be far better off taking a constructive role, helping Vietnam develop a free enterprise economy, develop a democracy at some point,

which I think is possible, and work with them to show them how important protection of human rights is to us and should be to them. We can only do that when we have face-to-face contact with the Vietnamese people.

That is why the Bereuter-Obey amendment is the appropriate, constructive one, and I think the Smith amendment, with all due deference to my friend from New Jersey, is focused too much in the past and past bigotries and does not take into consideration the enormous progress that has been made in the last few years.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 266, noes 156, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 353]

AYES—266

Ackerman
Allard
Andrews
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Berman
Bevill
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brewster
Browder
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Camp
Canady
Chabot
Chambliss
Chapman
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Coble
Coburn
Collins (GA)
Condit
Cooley
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cunningham
Davis
de la Garza
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dooley
Doolittle
Dornan
Doyle
Dreier
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Evans
Everett
Farr
Fawell
Fields (LA)
Flake
Flanagan
Foglietta
Forbes
Fox
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frisa
Funderburk
Ganske
Gekas
Geren
Gilman
Goodling
Graham
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hancock
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hinchey
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jackson-Lee
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Lantos
Largent
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lincoln
Linder
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Longley
Lowey
Lucas
Manzullo
Martini
Mascara
McCollum
McCrery
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
McKinney
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Mineta
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Murtha
Myers
Myrick
Nadler
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pastor
Paxon
Peterson (MN)
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Pryce
Quillen
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Regula
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Sabo
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Schumer
Scott
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Stockman
Stupak
Talent
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thornton
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Torricelli
Towns
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zimmer

NOES—156

Abercrombie
Archer
Baldacci
Barrett (WI)
Barton
Bass
Beilenson
Bereuter
Bilbray
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant (TX)
Cardin
Castle
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Combest
Costello
Coyne
Danner
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Duncan
Durbin
Ensign
Eshoo
Ewing
Fattah
Fields (TX)
Filner
Foley
Ford
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Furse
Gallegly
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon
Goss
Green
Greenwood
Hamilton
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Hilliard
Horn
Houghton
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnston
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Klug
LaFalce
Latham
Laughlin
Lewis (GA)
Lightfoot
Lipinski
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
McCarthy
McDermott
Meehan
Meek
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Moran
Morella
Neal
Obey
Olver
Pallone
Parker
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Petri
Pickett
Ramstad
Reed
Reynolds
Richardson
Riggs
Rivers
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rose
Roth
Roukema
Rush
Sanders
Sawyer
Schroeder
Sisisky
Skaggs
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (TX)
Stearns
Stokes
Studds
Stump
Tanner
Thomas
Thompson
Thornberry
Thurman
Torres
Traficant
Tucker
Visclosky
Ward
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates
Zeliff

NOT VOTING—12

Calvert
Conyers
Cubin
Fazio
Hansen
Kleczka
McDade
McNulty
Meyers
Peterson (FL)
Quinn
Watt (NC)

□ 1649

Messrs. EWING, MANTON, THORNBERRY, STEARNS, BARRETT of Wisconsin, JACOBS, MATSUI, and MEEHAN, and Ms. WOOLSEY changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no''.

Messrs. ALLARD, LAZIO of New York, BONO, JOHNSON of South Dakota, UPTON, MARTINI, BACHUS, HOYER, NETHERCUTT, PETERSON of Minnesota, BROWDER, HALL of Texas, STENHOLM, MONTGOMERY, CRAMER, CONDIT, BEVILL, MCHALE, TAUZIN, BISHOP, TOWNS, CHAPMAN, SPRATT, HOLDEN, KILDEE, PASTOR, THORNTON, TORKILDSEN, WILLIAMS, POMEROY, WISE, DE LA GARZA, PORTER, and EDWARDS, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye''.

So the amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER], as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HASTINGS:

At the end of the bill add the following new title:

TITLE XXXVI—ADDITIONAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 3601. ADDITIONAL AUTHORIZATION FOR THE DEVELOPMENT FUND FOR AFRICA.

Notwithstanding section 3221(a)(2) of this Act, $802,000,000 is authorized to be appropriated for each of the fiscal years 1996 and 1997 to carry out chapter 10 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2293 et seq.).

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment today to increase by $173 million the Development Fund for Africa account. This additional $173 million will restore this account to the current funding level.

The Development Fund for Africa was established by a bipartisan majority in 1987. Why? Because development aid is clearly in our long-term interest. Development assistance ensures that underdeveloped economies become stable friends and future trading and business partners.

The Development Fund for Africa has been critical to supporting the transition in South Africa, crucial in turning around Africa's economic decline, has helped bring about market liberalization efforts in some 20 countries, and has addressed basic issues such as girls education, vaccinations against curable diseases, and halting the spread of AIDS.

The Development Fund for Africa helps develop the physical infrastructure, the human resource base, and the rule of law structures which provide a safe and hospitable locale for American businesses to operate successfully. The Development Fund for Africa was specifically created to target development resources efficiently in countries that both need the assistance and have the potential to become self-sufficient economies which can later buy our products.

Cuts in the Development Fund for Africa account would undercut our efforts to strengthen export markets and fledgling democracies in southern Africa; undermine our ability to prevent Somalia-like crises and famine; and diminish support for democracy building to countries in political transition, allowing countries like Mozambique and Angola (which are on the cusp of recovery) to slip into chaos and crises similar to Rwanda.

Those who would dismiss Africa as being unimportant are taking a narrow, shortsighted view of American interests. We are making a long-term investment in Africa, and we know from our own experience that the United States benefits directly from the development which foreign aid helps fuel.

We hear a lot of talk about Africa being a sinkhole for foreign aid and that the U.S. has no reason to remain engaged in Africa.

But I am not sure that many Members are aware that South Africa played a key role in the recent indefinite extension of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty.

U.S. engagement, and U.S. assistance, has played an important part in the emergence of South Africa as a democratic partner for the United States.

South Africa's role in the NPT conference shows that our support is already bringing dividends.

Nor are many Members aware that American exports to Africa are growing faster than U.S. exports to Europe and that U.S. trade with Africa exceeds our trade with the former Soviet Union.

It is in our national interest to prevent crises like we have witnessed in Rwanda and Somalia, which together cost us $2.25 billion in emergency assistance funds. Preventive diplomacy will help us avoid these crises.

Aid to Africa is not only in our self-interest, it is consonant with our national values. We have a long and proud tradition in this great country of helping the needy both home and abroad. Emergency aid is invaluable for relieving human suffering, but sustainable development assistance is critical to breaking the cycle of dependency and despair by addressing the root causes of poverty.

We have unavoidable responsibilities around the world. Some of the problems around the world which currently demand our attention are problems of our own making. Our foreign policy goal for the past 40 years was the dissolution of the communist system. We have been largely successful in achieving this goal, but the repercussions of the breakup mean that there is both a political and financial vacuum in many troubled spots. Now that we have forced so many countries to abandon either their type of government or their support system, do we now say, ''Sorry, you're on your own? We can't help?'' I don't think so.

Senator Claude Pepper of Florida was the only Member of Congress to criticize the isolationist mood in the U.S. Congress when Hitler began toppling nations in 1939. Senator Pepper argued that it was the responsibility of all mankind to intervene in the face of evil. Senator Pepper said, ''when a few men are wronged and the force of brutality and the jungle are let loose, when civilization is denied and godliness and goodness scorned, that is no private war, that is a war against man. Hence, to vindicate those things for which good men stand, good men everywhere must stand together against wrong, not only wrong to a chosen few, but wrong to any man, woman or child.''

To ignore our responsibilities to nations less fortunate, to refuse to share our bounty, to silence our teachers, to shut out friends who cry for our help, these are crimes against humanity. The American people are not that cruel, nor should we be. I beg my colleagues, support the Hastings amendment.

□ 1700

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it is with great reluctance that I rise to oppose this amendment to increase the funding level for aid to Africa.

If we had an unlimited amount of money to allocate to foreign aid, I would join Mr. HASTINGS in supporting $802 million for the Development Fund for Africa.

Mr. HASTINGS has been a good friend, both as a fellow member of the Florida delegation, and, as one of the most active members of the Subcommittee on Africa.

Whenever we have a subcommittee meeting—not just at the hearings or formal briefings, but in the many informal, private activities we have, such as meetings with foreign officials or the local members of the African diplomatic corps—I can always count on Mr. HASTINGS to be there and to be a very active participant.

And, as someone who is new to the assignment on the Africa Subcommittee, I have found that Mr. HASTINGS is a very valuable resource as I study the issues of American policy toward Africa.

But we don't live in an age of unlimited resources.

We live in a time of fiscal austerity and we have to make the hard decisions on how to allocate limited resources among the various spending priorities.

It was in that context of competing priorities that the committee, while considering the bill at our mark up sessions, gave a great deal of attention to the funding of the Development Fund for Africa.

While the budget climate required that all programs contribute their fair share to the deficit reduction effort, we cut aid to Africa less than other development assistance programs.

Aid for Latin America and the Caribbean, areas of the world also of great concern to every member of the Florida delegation, has not been protected with funds destined as a separate line item in this bill.

What will happen is that by raising the aid for Africa without specifying the source of the funds, eventually it could hurt the poor nations of the Caribbean and Latin America whose development assistance programs will be cut or perhaps other areas will be cut.

This has been the history of the aid program over the last few years—as other regions of the world have received increased development assistance funding, at least some part of the money to provide that assistance has been taken from the aid programs in Latin America and the Caribbean or other areas of the globe.

I think this would be a mistake.

We are trying to help countries in the Caribbean to improve their standard of living, just as we are trying to help Africa, Latin America, Europe and on and on.

Economic development programs in Latin America are an important part of our overall efforts to control the illegal immigration and drug trafficking that has had an impact on the people of Florida and other southern States.

There was an intensive debate in Committee, and the bill's funding level of $629 million for the Development Fund for Africa is one that was given great care.

We had to find other programs in the bill and forced them to accept disproportionately large cuts in order to provide this level of aid to Africa.

I should note that the Development Fund for Africa is not the only source of funding for aid programs in Africa.

It is important to keep this in mind.

President Clinton has the authority to take funds from the PL–480 program and channel PL–480 resources to Africa.

He also has the authority to allocate general development assistance funds and apply them to projects and programs in Africa.

In addition to the DFA funding, Africa projects are funded by A.I.D., through its Global Programs Bureau and out of regular Development Assistance funding.

About $60 million a year in Peace Corps programs, and a quarter billion dollars of PL–480 programs, are also provided to Africa each year.

One should, in the current climate of cutbacks in all programs, allow the administration some flexibility in managing these program cuts.

Increasing the funding for Africa will actually deprive President Clinton, and his Secretary of State, of the flexibility they need to manage the program cutbacks in accord with their foreign policy needs and priorities.

I therefore urge Members to vote against this amendment.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, I ask most respectfully, is the gentlewoman aware that the accounts that she identified are all being cut as well?

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Chairman, absolutely, we agreed. That is part of the basis of my speech. All of the programs are being cut.

In fact, the Africa program, in relation to the other programs that are being cut, is not nearly cut as much. I think that is the point that I was making; all of the programs are cut, just as we are cutting domestic programs, so we should cut foreign programs.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE].

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support restoring the development fund for Africa to its current funding levels which is good for people and for business and for all of America.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the Development Fund for Africa. The DFA protects some of the most vulnerable people on earth. And efforts to slash it by $173 million are simply unacceptable.

As you know, Mr. Chairman, the African continent represents one of the last untapped markets in the world. And the continent has seen tremendous progress, with new democracies taking root throughout:—South Africa being the most shining example.

If the DFA is cut by $173 million, not only will ordinary people suffer, but the U.S. image as a world leader will be seriously damaged:

The aid program to South Africa—a role model of evolutionary change with respect for market economics—will be undermined. Should the United States cut and run after campaigning against apartheid for so long?

The AIDS epidemic will worsen—an estimated two million additional people will become infected with HIV due to cutbacks in U.S.-supported programs.

Programs that help prevent hunger by investing in sustainable farming will be decimated.

And the expansion of United States exports to the African continent, which now amount to over $4.4 billion, will be hindered.

Mr. Chairman, U.S. aid is not a give away; it's an investment that brings about exports to the developing world—exports which amount to 40 percent of all U.S. exports.

But for there to be a market there needs to be healthy, educated and economically productive societies. Slashing the DFA to bits will not accomplish that goal. Not at all.

That is why I am cosponsoring this amendment, along with some of my distinguished colleagues on the International Relations Committee, to raise the DFA to the fiscal year 1995 level of $802 million.

Strangely enough, while this bill slashes lifesaving programs like the DFA, we are finding room to increase our military sales program.

Unlike the DFA, this is not a program geared to help people that are starving, or are in the midst of democracy building. Maintaining aid to Africa is within our responsibility as a world leader and it is the least that we can do for people who are deserving of our assistance. I strongly urge your support for this amendment.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, as a member of this subcommittee, the Subcommittee on Africa, I know how heartfelt this amendment is. I congratulate the author of this amendment. I agree that the people of Africa need help. I would like to support my friend from Florida in his efforts to help deserving people in Africa. Like everyone else, I have a question, however. Where is the money going to come from?

If my colleague could offer a corresponding cut and make his amendment budget neutral, then possibly we could all support his amendment. But just to come in with a blank amendment is not going to get the job done. It is only a wish list.

If instead the money must come from the taxpayers packets, then I must oppose the amendment. I cannot agree to add $173 million to the budget deficit. It is clear as a bell that there are many worthwhile programs, but that is how we got into this budget mess that cries out today for a solution. So let me reiterate; the goals here are laudable, but the ladder to the goal is missing.

If the 167 million can be found in other programs, if we can find the money in other projects, then I think this would be an amendment that we should go with. But this Congress cannot abide and adhere to every Member's wish list.

On my way into the Capitol this afternoon I was looking again. Is there any money growing on the trees? And to everybody's surprise, I must say I did not find any money growing on trees. Until that happens, i.e., money grows on trees, we must find money from sources in this bill. Reallocate or find new funds.

Again, the goals of this amendment are laudable. I appreciate what the gentleman is trying to do. But the question remains, the $173 million, where will it come from?

Therefore, without the funding, I must be opposed to this amendment.

Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, at the markup of the full committee, I made probably the improprietous observation that this bill is racist. And I want to point out that it is not racist through malice, it is racist through ignorance. The fact is that I do not think that many of the Members of the full committee have any idea about Africa.

For the last 2 years, I chaired the Subcommittee on Africa of the Committee on International Relations. I toured 26 countries during that period of time. Each time I went, I asked Members of the minority party, then Republicans, to accompany me. In fact, I begged them to come with me to Africa, and in that 2-year period not one ventured to travel.

In the majority report to this bill, they refer to ''Africa did this'' and ''Africa did that.'' You would think that Africa was a country in itself. I made the flip remark in the committee that someday I am going to expect a Republican to come up to me and ask me where the capital of Africa is. But would we say the same thing about Asia? Would we say Asia did this and Asia did that and, therefore, let us cut off relief to this entire continent?

My colleagues, this is Africa. This is a continent four times larger than the United States. It is a continent that has over 56 countries in there, and it is a continent which is exploding with democracies.

Let me go around there. Let us start out with South Africa, the jewel of the crown. South Africa now is an emerging democracy. It has $100 billion in GNP. You can just go around the continent. Botswana. Botswana has surplus now in its treasury. Malawi just ended up having its elections and is a democracy.

Zimbabwe. Mozambique is coming out of a depression there. Uganda, Idi Amin's country, is now a democracy there and is trading with the United States.

Tanzania. Look at the French francophone countries, Chad, Niger, Benin, Carte de Vois, Burkina Faso, Senegal, Mali, all of these countries want to have better relationships with the United States and are breaking away from the French codes there and will be great trading partners.

Look at Ghana. Jerry Rawlings now in Ghana is trying to settle the dispute in Liberia, a great ally there and a great trading partner.

□ 1715

Namibia down here, free elections, and a democracy. Seychelles, Mauritius, Eritrea, such a new country it is not even on my map here. Eritrea is a democracy which we will trade with. Next year, see Angola come around. Angola can feed this entire continent. Zambia, Central African Republic, the

Congo and even Kenya. Look at 1997, where Liberia, our colony in this continent and our responsibility, will probably be a democracy, along with Ethiopia and Nigeria.

My friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ROTH], at the committee meeting said ''Gee, Egypt is in Africa.'' Of course it is in Africa. Egypt gets about $1.5 billion. I might point out, though, that Egypt is not sub-Saharan Africa. Egypt is not black Africa, which I came up with the phrase, this being racist. Egypt is not in the jurisdiction of the subcommittee on Africa. Egypt is not under the Assistant Secretary of State for Africa. Egypt is now considered the Middle East. Let us talk about sub-Saharan Africa.

We now have the development fund for Africa. The development fund for Africa is $600 million for 600 million people. There is where I think it is immoral. That is why I feel this bill is immoral.

If we want to get the funds for this, last night the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON], said ''We can cut the State Department by 5 percent and nobody will be harmed.'' Why not cut the Defense Department by 5 percent, that is $12 billion 5 million, and it can underwrite the entire foreign affairs bill that we are stripping to pieces here today.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly support the Hastings amendment. I think these funds should be restored, or we are going to lose Africa. We are going to lose a great trading partner. We are going to lose 28 emerging democracies, which we have pumped money into, and we are seeing results for the first time.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. Our visitors in the gallery are admonished not to applaud during the debate.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

First of all, Mr. Chairman, I am very sympathetic to the remarks made by my colleague, the gentleman from Florida. I do not believe anybody in this Chamber is racist, but I do believe there are problems in Africa that should be addressed. We are trying our best to do that. We are sending $629 million there this year, and $614 million next year. This amendment would, over a 2-year period, increase by $360 million the amount of money that is going over there.

I notice we have a lot of young people visiting with us today. Many of them applauded. Many of us in this Chamber are very concerned about their futures, because we know if we do not get control of Government spending in this country, that at one point, some point in the future, we are going to have a debt so great that the interest on the debt alone is going to gobble up a lot of our tax dollars, and their quality of life will start to deteriorate. We have to get control of Federal spending, so we have to make hard choices.

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? I would like to know why he is cutting student loans.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. The school lunch program was increased 4 percent per year. We are just sending it back in block grants, we are not cutting it. We are cutting the rate of growth. However, that is another subject.

The fact of the matter is we have to control spending. That means we have to make hard choices. I am very concerned about the people in the Sudan. My colleague, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF], has been down here on the floor talking about that.

We have met with some of the people from the Sudan about the horrible atrocities that are taking place, and the people starving to death over there. We worked very hard to get food aid in there. We did the same thing in Somalia. However, we cannot cut the defense budget to take care of those problems. The fact of the matter is the defense budget has been used in large part for a lot of the new military forays and objectives in Somalia and in Haiti, and we have used an awful lot of our military money in those areas.

The budget is so strapped in that area that we have a lot of people who are in the military whose quality of life is already suffering. We all know that. In fact, some of those people have been on food stamps, people in our own military. We have to be careful when we start talking about cutting the defense of this Nation.

Mr. Chairman, let me just get back to the case at hand. We need to set priorities. Make no mistake about it, Africa is a priority. Maybe it should be a higher priority, but as my colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin, said a while ago, let us find the money someplace else. If we can find it someplace else and we can do it, then I do not have any problem with doing that in conference committee.

The fact of the matter is that at this point, $629 million, plus $5 million for the Africa regional peacekeeping force, $1.1 million for the Organization of African Unity, $10 million for Angola, or $5 million, and some other funds from other areas of government, is about all we can afford.

I would just like to say to my colleagues, we are doing what we can. This is a lean, mean foreign affairs budget, foreign aid package, but it is one that I think is realistic and one that deals with the problem.

I would like to end up by saying one other thing. I think the last speaker that spoke on the Democrat side alluded to the fact that Angola in a few short years could take care of the whole continent. There are a number of countries in Africa that are mineral-rich. They have large resources. They have diamond mines, all kinds of minerals. As a matter of fact, during the cold war, 11 minerals that we had to have to survive as a Nation only came from two sources, the Soviet Union, and the southern part of Africa. Yet, because of the wars and because of lack of democracy over there and because of the problems, those minerals and those things that would make them self-sufficient have not been mined.

Therefore, rather than just throwing money at the problem, we as a Nation need to be working with those governments to bring about the democracy that my colleagues have talked about, so they can start taking care of themselves, so we can wean them away from the United States foreign aid program. We cannot take care of the entire world indefinitely. We are the only superpower left, we do have responsibilities, but the amount of money we have in this budget is realistic. I think this amendment, therefore, should be defeated.

Mr. FOGLIETTA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this important amendment which would restore funding for the Development Fund for Africa.

The African continent is in a state of transition. This transition holds great promise as well as peril for the people of Africa and the community of nations. In South Africa, we have witnessed the peaceful transition to a multiracial democracy. In Rwanda, untold innocents have been killed in the struggle between rival Hutus and Tutsis.

Despite the challenges, I believe that Africa's future can be one of peace and economic prosperity.

However, they will need our help.

The Development Fund for Africa has proven to be a successful economic development tool which has enabled many nations to begin the transition to free market economies and stable democratic institutions. This proven program has made valuable investments which have greatly improved health care services, expanded educational opportunities and boosted small business development.

Several years ago, Mozambique was embroiled in a vicious civil war. Last year, with the help of American assistance, free and fair elections were held and ninety percent of registered voters went to the polls.

In Guinea, American assistance and training programs have helped to increase elementary school attendence by 43 percent. In the country of Mali, agricultural production has doubled since 1981 with the help of American technical assistance.

These are the building blocks of a stable continent—a community of nations which can help advance American interests in the world and can become an important trading partner.

Working in partnership with the people of Africa we have made great progress. With a relatively small investment—representing roughly 0.05 percent of our 1.5 trillion budget, we can continue this work and build a bright future.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the people of Africa and

American interests in this important part of the world by supporting this amendment.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by my colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HASTINGS] and others. I believe it is shortsighted to think that we can promote democracy, encourage world peace and expand trade opportunities in America, while pursuing a policy of isolation. That is particularly true when it comes to developing nations—nations that may hang in the balance—when it comes to their tilt towards democracy. I have been encouraged, in recent years, by the growing number of African nations that have converted to democracy, and, I believe, foreign aid has been a vital element in those conversions.

I also believe that foreign aid is particularly critical to the expansion of trade opportunities. Although, I believe that the policies we pursue to encourage the expansion of trade should be evaluated, an across-the-board budget cutting is an unwise position. Unfortunately, the House-passed budget resolution and the Senate committee budget resolution propose the elimination or major reduction of the International Trade Administration, the Trade Development Agency, the Eximbank and agricultural export promotion programs. The Overseas Private Investment Corporation [OPIC] would be privatized. On top of that restructuring, the bill we are now considering, H.R. 1561, would reduce the amount of foreign aid authorized by $1 billion, and would eliminate three agencies—The Agency for International Development, the U.S. Information Agency and the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. The functions of those agencies would be moved to the Department of State. The Senate version of the bill had proposed moving the functions of the U.S. and Foreign Commercial Service to the Department of State and combining the Eximbank, the Trade Development Agency and OPIC into one quasi-independent agency. Those provisions, however, did not survive committee consideration last week and are not now included in the Senate bill.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think we should lose sight of the fact that, compared to other, major industrialized nations, the United States ranks last in terms of the percentage of gross national product [GNP] devoted to exports. There seems, therefore, to be little wonder that we have a growing balance of trade deficit when Britain, France, Canada, Italy, Germany, and Japan, spend more per thousand dollars of gross national product than we do. The irony of these proposals is that this radical change comes at a time when our export promotion programs and, presumably, our foreign aid programs, are helping to produce unprecedented gains in peace and commerce. In the area of agriculture, for example, we now export about one-third of the products we produce. Last year, farm and farm-related exports generated more than $100 billion in economic activity for America, producing nearly 1 million jobs here. With respect to merchandise trade, farm production actually generates a trade surplus which, this year, is expected to be some $20 billion. In North Carolina, farm and farm-related jobs constitute at least one-fifth of the employment and, on average, 25 to 30 percent of the revenue. It, therefore, greatly concerns me when I see proposals to impose deep cuts in foreign development for Africa programs which provide opportunity for trade. We should not blindly cut programs in our march toward a balanced budget by the year 2002. We should pass a budget bill that aims at a balanced budget. I support that goal.

We must be certain that our actions do not further weaken the United States as we seek to compete in an increasingly competitive global marketplace. This is not 1946, Mr. Chairman. America no longer maintains the dominant position we once held in the world marketplace. We are being dramatically outspent by other nations whose goal is to promote their products and replace us whenever they can. Perhaps, even more importantly, Mr. Chairman, I believe we can best achieve security in this Nation by interacting economically with other nations. Foreign aid and economic interaction with other nations is not a giveaway, it is a sound and prudent investment in our own security. The best way to avoid war is to promote peace. An effective way of promoting peace is to engage in commerce and finance with the World community. The Hastings amendment focuses on mineral rich and strategically important Africa—a continent where democracy can flourish. By investing in Africa now, we can assure that we will continue and expand trade with them in the future. And, by investing in Africa now, we establish relationships that will be vital if the security of the United States is threatened. Support the Hastings amendment.

Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

(Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Hastings amendment to restore the $802 million level for the Development Fund for Africa.

In order to put this subject in perspective it would be helpful to look at the three periods in recent Africa history that have bearing on changing the course of events for Africa. First, the independence era in the early 1960's when the continent was freed of their colonial masters, and leaving them without adequate resources and preparation for their new freedom.

Second, during the cold war, when Africa was used and abused. Used by both the Soviet Union and the United States to fight hot wars on African soil. The most symbolic were in Angola, Ethiopia, Eritrea, and Somalia, and you know there were others.

Abused, because we ignored humanitarian principles, and turned our eyes away from corruption and human rights abuses when it seemed in the interest of winning.

It now would seem fair that preferential rehabilitation assistance is needed to right the wrongs of the past, even though they may have been justified in winning the cold war.

We really were not very good teachers in preparing Africa for our grand plans of multi-party democracies and free markets economies to be operated free of corruption.

Measures of the quality of life in Africa have spiralled down in the last two decades, at the same time going up in other parts of the developing world. Many, like Vice President GORE, who read the Kaplan article in Atlantic Monthly were appalled at the condition of Africa, and determined to assist the continent. Unfortunately, others doubted Africa was even salvageable.

We are now a few years into the third period, which I would call the post cold war period. Armed conflict continues to afflict sub-Saharan Africa where fighting persists in Sudan, Liberia, and Sierra Leone, and we have our fingers crossed on Angola, despite the cease fire agreement. The potential for renewed outbreaks in Rwanda, Burundi, and Somalia is high, and other countries like Zaire and Nigeria are at risk. Human rights problems have been accelerated due to overpopulation and lack of sustainable development. However, all is not gloom and doom. There have been historic advances. In South Africa, Namibia, Botswana, Ghana, and other countries we could name.

I would also like to relate the historic Congressional Black Caucus efforts to reverse the inequalities of the past lead by former Congressmen Diggs, Dymally, and Gray, not to mention the contribution of RON DELLUMS in sponsoring the Anti-Apartheid Act which mobilized Americans against racial discrimination in South Africa. And, remember the late Mickey Leland, who gave his very life in pursuit of increasing the awareness of all Americans to the plight of our Africa.

I do not feel aid to Africa should be considered a partisan issue. Both the Republicans and Democrats have been most cooperative in preserving the Subcommittee on Africa when Congress was requested to scale down the number of committees. Africa, which usually comes last, was considered important by both parties. Members like former Chairman HAMILTON, Chairman GILMAN, Speaker GINGRICH, and HENRY HYDE were most helpful.

There are many Republicans on the Senate side like NANCY KASSEBAUM, Chair of the Senate Africa Affairs Committee, JAMES JEFFORDS, PAUL

COVERDELL. All have Africa's interest at heart.

Just think, Africa has almost 60 countries with a population over 600 million. If we do not adopt the Hastings Amendment this will leave us providing less than $1 per person in the neediest of all continents.

In closing I would like to quote Tony Lake, the President's national security advisor in a recent speech he made on May 3. He said:

> If the United States cuts aid to Russia, the pace of economic reform will be slowed and important American interests will be harmed. If the United States cuts Aid to Africa, while our interests are less effected, people will die.

I ask you—is an African life not worth the investment of a few more pennies per person to come back to the $802 million level for the Development Fund for Africa. Support the Hastings amendment and save African children.

□ 1730

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I have been informed that we have 5 speakers on the other side remaining and that we have several on this side.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment be concluded by 6 p.m. with the time to be equally divided on both sides.

The CHAIRMAN. On this amendment and all amendments thereto?

Mr. GILMAN. On this amendment and all amendments thereto, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. With 12 minutes on each side and the time to be managed by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HASTINGS].

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, preserving the right to object, if I could engage the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], the chairman, in dialogue further, I misunderstood the gentleman.

Did the gentleman say 12 minutes for each side total?

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, the total would be concluded by 6 p.m., with the time remaining to be equally divided.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, further reserving the right to object, I most respectfully will have to object because I do have a number of speakers that have been waiting, and I recognize that they, too, deserve an opportunity to be heard.

Mr. GILMAN. How many speakers does the gentleman have?

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Probably there are 6 additional speakers. I could ask them to curtail some of their remarks and doubtless they will be able to do that.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I will be pleased to reduce our time to 10 minutes and give the remainder of the time to the gentleman as long as we conclude by 6 p.m.

Would the gentleman find that acceptable?

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Further reserving the right to object, I would still need an additional 15 minutes, Mr. Chairman. If we could conclude by 6:15, then that would be acceptable.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, we will accept the 6:15 deadline, with the time to be equally divided.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HASTINGS] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I think since they have more speakers on the other side, I would reserve my time and allow the other side to proceed.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HASTINGS].

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. WYNN].

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the amendment of the gentleman from Florida to restore full funding to the Development Fund for Africa.

You have heard a lot of talk about how we cannot afford it. Let me set the record straight. For anyone who is under a misconception, foreign aid amounts to 1 percent of the United States budget.

I think we can afford it, because it is consistent with our long-term objectives. Someone said, ''Well, money doesn't grow on trees. Where are we going to get the money?''

I suggest that there are a lot of Republican pork projects laying around from which we can get the money. I suggest there are a lot of tax breaks for the wealthy from which we can get the money. At any rate, when you are only talking about a fraction, 1 percent, of the budget, it seems to me the money ought to be found.

I would like to talk today about some of the success stories involved in the Development Fund for Africa because I think they illustrate the point. Our foreign aid program ought to advance our interests. Our interests are reflected in these successes.

American exports to Ghana expanded by 73 percent between 1992 and 1993 as a result of U.S. programs that helped revise the investment code, remove regulatory bottlenecks and improve infrastructures.

In Zimbabwe, U.S. programs to strengthen the business climate have helped to formulate antitrust laws, lowered interest barriers for U.S. exporters, and investors.

Forty years ago we had a very different situation. Nine out of ten African countries were still under colonial rule. That is not true today. Today nearly two-thirds of the countries in Sub-Saharan Africa have or are in the transition to democratically elected governments.

In some of the poorest regions of Africa, U.S. support for childhood immunization and oral rehydration therapy has resulted in saving 800,000 children per year. We have had great successes.

But the important point today is we can have far greater successes if we make a very small investment. An investment has two benefits: First, it helps us avoid humanitarian crises which we may ultimately be called on to address. Second and most importantly, though, it opens new markets for U.S. goods. What does that mean? It means jobs for American workers.

I think we have an opportunity to advance our long-term interests, provide assistance with infrastructure in Africa, and create new open markets receptive to U.S. exports. We have got examples of our export situation improving dramatically in Africa. We need to take advantage of it. The money is there. It may not grow on trees but it is certainly available in this budget. I hope the House will concur and support the Hastings amendment.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to my friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ENGEL].

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Florida, for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, last November he was my colleague, along with the gentleman from Florida [Mr. JOHNSTON] and the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. JEFFERSON] on a trip to West Africa. We visited five countries in West Africa, and it was just unbelievable.

These countries, many of which were leaning toward the Soviet bloc during the 1960's, are now looking to the United States for aid and help. I said it the other day. I will say it again now. My colleagues, did we win the cold war to just throw it all away?

A little bit of U.S. money goes such a long way, No. 1, in helping democracy take root in these countries; No. 2, in making these countries effective as a trading partner with the United States; No. 3, in ensuring that these countries will continue to have friendly relations with the United States; and, No. 4, in ensuring that the United States will have influence in these countries.

The other side talks a lot about free market economies and business and whatever. I can think of no better way to spend our money than in these emerging African nations which will develop free market economies which will be good trading partners with the United States with just a little bit of help from us.

It makes no sense for me, and that is why I have problems with this bill. This is essentially an isolationist bill. We are retreating from our traditional role in the world. I know some people

say, well, America cannot be the policeman of the world. I do not think we can, either, but we certainly can help with technology. We certainly can help democracy take root.

My colleagues, it is to our benefit, it is to America's benefit. Seventy-five percent of all foreign aid moneys are spent right back in this country, stimulating our economy, helping us by creating jobs. One percent of our budget, that is all foreign aid is, and all we hear is cut, cut. It makes no sense whatsoever.

I am on the Subcommittee on Africa of the Committee on International Relations. I want to be on that subcommittee because I want to be part of a generation of Americans that does something for this continent, that shows a partnership with the countries of Africa. I can think of no more important place whereby America can establish democracy in these emerging republics.

Mr. Chairman, I support the gentleman's amendment to restore funding for the Development Fund for Africa to current levels. If I had my druthers, we would do even more. I hope my colleagues support this amendment.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to my colleague and neighbor in service, the distinguished gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. MEEK].

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, first of all, I have the greatest amount of respect and admiration for my colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HASTINGS] who has conducted himself so notably in his pursuit of fairness for Africa

Today we keep talking about cuts and reductions in the Development Fund for Africa. We all know that there must be cuts. The cuts are too deep, Mr. Chairman, for the development funds in Africa, because these deep reductions could prove to be penny wise and pound foolish, and we will need to respond to humanitarian emergencies, and it will be more costly than our investment that we make in development activities.

For example, Mr. Chairman, we have spent $2 in humanitarian aid for every $1 in development aid in the greater Horn of Africa in recent years. The record is already there. It has already been spent. We need to address some of the root causes and not the symptoms, and I am hoping that you are willing to do that for Africa as you have some other developing countries.

It is very, very important that you think of the image of providing lesser funds for Africa now when they were not even even in the very beginning. We did not have a Development Fund for Africa until the 1980's, and now that they are at the bottom of the list, it would show a greater strength if this Congress were to bring them up to par so then they could take a cut that would not ostensibly take away everything.

Foreign aid for Africa has never received full funding. That is really not an argument here.

It is not hard to imagine reductions severely compromising the many gains that you have made in helping create strong economies, reduce population growth and protect the environment in Africa. Deep cuts could also lead to the rapid destabilization of these early democracies, possibly resulting in untenable and costly human crises and conflicts.

This is not a situation in which the United States would want to find itself. It is very, very important that we protect our interests in Africa. Three of them. We want to help them develop the economies which will create exports, which we have heard before, and jobs here in the United States. We do not want to have any more Somalias or Rwandas which had a terrible cost in terms of human suffering and social significance.

The Development Fund for Africa is our main policy instrument in developing these interests. I think we should just be fair and be sure that the Development Fund for Africa does not keep the deep, deep cuts which you have done to them already.

□ 1745

Remember that to support the Hastings amendment; it is a good amendment.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Michigan [Miss COLLINS].

Miss COLLINS of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HASTINGS]. This amendment will restore funding for the Development Fund for Africa. Maintaining effective aid programs for Africa is in our national interests. The amount of development assistance we provide to Africa is so small, even a slight reduction in the Development Fund will have a drastic consequence that far outweigh any short-term savings.

Cuts of funding will prevent us from providing African countries with the resources needed to promote educational and economic opportunities for its people.

Africa is a potentially significant partner in world trade, thus it is in our national interest to assist African nations.

To the gentleman from Indiana who said that we must start getting African nations to wean off of aid from America so they can develop their own resources, I would like to say that two countries in this entire world get one-half the foreign aid; Israel gets $3 billion, and they have been getting that for the past 9 years or 10 years; Egypt gets $2 billion. I do not want that money cut, I want Israel and Egypt to get that money.

But we are talking about merely $802 million for 56 countries, a mere $802 million for 56 countries. Gentleman, $629 million is simply too little.

I urge my colleagues to support the Hastings amendment. The Development Fund for Africa must not be singled out to carry a disproportionate share of cutbacks simply to meet my colleagues' commitment to reduce the budget.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, how much time is remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. HASTINGS] has 8 minutes remaining.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Does my distinguished chairman have any additional speakers?

Mr. GILMAN. We have one more speaker on this side, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Do I have the right to close, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The manager of the bill has the right to close. The gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] has the right to close.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. That being the case, Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, to close the debate on our side, nowhere is the justification for foreign aid clearer and more compelling in terms of our national values than Africa. Africa is the final frontier for development. The great global challenges of tomorrow can be seen in the challenges facing Africa today, and even if I were to turn to the tragedy of disease which obviously foments within the confines of the rain forests in that great country, there are also many discoveries yet to be made in that same rain forest for medicinal purposes for the rest of the world.

If we give up Africa, the continent could well slide into chaos, we could find ourselves in a world of two distinct communities where the difference between the rich and poor become unbearably extreme, and that is not a world which we want for our children.

A lot of times my colleagues in this body need to have for them language couched in business terms. Let me see if I can do that briefly. In 1993 the United States exported more to sub-Saharan Africa, $4.8 billion precisely, than to Eastern Europe, which was $2.3 billion, or to the NIS, which was $4 billion, including Russia, where the United States exports a total $3 billion.

The current 1992 figures for sub-Saharan international markets, excluding South Africa, is $28.5 billion. If that market were to grow at a nominal rate of 3 percent a year in constant terms, it would double every 21 years, reaching a level of $83.2 billion in the year 2025. That market would exceed the size of Korea's market today.

I make those points for the reason that foreign aid is often thought of by the American people as a giveaway. But there is something else that is given away with foreign aid, and that is stability for American companies to do business.

In my district alone, there is one company that does $20 million a year of exports to the continent of Africa. There are numerous countries from Africa that provide immense resources ranging from crude oil to other minerals for this country. I ask my colleagues to stop looking at this continent as a battleground and to start looking at it as marketplace as rightly we should.

I have asked not that there be money taken from any account. I have asked merely that we restore to an account an amount for the Development Fund of Africa that was already in existence and is meager by comparison to the multiplier effect of the good that it does.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Florida [Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN], our ranking chairman of the Subcommittee on Africa.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Chairman, we have heard a number of Members come forward in support of this amendment. Unfortunately, I must remain opposed to the Hastings amendment. It is a budget buster. Without making corresponding cuts in other accounts, this amendment deviates from our plan to balance our Federal budget by the year 2002.

Many Members have talked about the importance of development in Africa. I agree. Chairman GILMAN agrees. That is why, in this bill, aid to Africa is cut less than any other region.

Those who say that the majority in this body do not care about Africa are wrong. As my good friend Mr. PAYNE noted, the majority kept the Subcommittee on Africa despite a reduction from seven subcommittees to five.

The Development Fund for Africa, the DFA, is maintained in this bill.

Mr. Chairman, the American Overseas Interests Act is an excellent bill. It keeps the United States engaged throughout the world, including the continent of Africa. It does so while complying with our plan to balance the Federal budget by the year 2002. Chairman GILMAN deserves great credit for this accomplishment.

I regret very much that I cannot support this amendment, but I firmly believe that this bill maintains our United States commitment to Africa.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I must oppose the Hastings amendment.

This amendment busts the budget, simply adds hundreds of billions of dollars back into the bill.

I support aid to Africa, and we added money for Africa above the level in the introduced bill because of our concerns, and the concerns of the gentleman. Our committee supported the Houghton amendment and added back even more funding for Africa. In the end we added $100 million back for aid to Africa above the amount introduced in the bill initially.

Therefore, reluctantly, while I support the proposals of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HASTINGS], I oppose his amendment.

We are underbudgeted because we did make those cuts. Under the bill, Africa was cut far less than all other development assistance. This amendment, offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HASTINGS], while well-intended, would add over a period of 2 years some $360 million in foreign assistance in this bill. In addition to all of the aid that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] mentioned such as peacekeeping, economic support, et cetera, we also provide funds for many U.N. programs, and we also provide food aid under title II of Public Law 480.

Our bill is within the constraints of our budget resolution, and will help to cut the deficit. But if we adopt the Hastings amendment, it will add substantially to deficit spending, forcing us to borrow even more.

Accordingly, I am urging my colleagues to oppose the Hastings amendment.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, all time on this amendment has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HASTINGS].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 141, noes 278, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 354]

AYES—141

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Berman
Bishop
Bonior
Borski
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant (TX)
Cardin
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Coyne
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Dicks
Dixon
Doggett
Durbin
Engel
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Ford
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gonzalez
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hamilton
Hastings (FL)
Hayes
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hoyer
Jackson-Lee
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kennedy (MA)
Kennelly
Kildee
LaFalce
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lofgren
Lowey
Maloney
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
McCarthy
McDermott
McKinney
Meek
Menendez
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moran
Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Pelosi
Pomeroy
Rangel
Reed
Reynolds
Richardson
Rivers
Rose
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sawyer
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Skaggs
Slaughter
Stark
Stokes
Studds
Stupak
Tejeda
Thompson
Thornton
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Tucker
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Ward
Waters
Waxman
Wilson
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates

NOES—278

Allard
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Camp
Canady
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chapman
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clinger
Coble
Coburn
Collins (GA)
Combest
Condit
Cooley
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cunningham
Danner
Davis
de la Garza
Deal
DeFazio
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dingell
Dooley
Doolittle
Dornan
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Fox
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Funderburk
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Geren
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hancock
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (RI)
Kim
King
Kingston
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Lincoln
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Longley
Lucas
Luther
Manzullo
Martini
Mascara
McCollum
McCrery
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Meehan
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Minge
Molinari
Montgomery
Moorhead
Morella
Myers
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Obey
Orton
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Paxon
Payne (VA)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Pryce
Quillen
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Regula
Riggs
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roukema
Royce
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stearns
Stenholm
Stockman
Stump
Talent
Tanner
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry

Thurman	Walsh	Wicker
Tiahrt	Wamp	Williams
Torkildsen	Watts (OK)	Wolf
Traficant	Weldon (FL)	Young (AK)
Upton	Weldon (PA)	Young (FL)
Vucanovich	Weller	Zeliff
Waldholtz	White	Zimmer
Walker	Whitfield	

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Fields (LA)

NOT VOTING—14

Calvert	Harman	Meyers
Conyers	Kleczka	Peterson (FL)
Cubin	Lantos	Quinn
Fazio	McDade	Watt (NC)
Hansen	McNulty	

□ 1819

Mr. EHLERS changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas changed her vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I rise to express my strong opposition to H.R. 1561, the American Overseas Interest Act, and the proposal to eliminate the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency (ACDA). This agency performs a unique advocacy role in formulating our nation's foreign policy. Under this legislation, ACDA's strong and knowledgeable voice on arms control and non-proliferation issues will be muted by a new State Department ''super-bureaucracy.''

The State Department performs the necessarily broad mission of advancing and protecting the global interests of the United States and its citizens. To accomplish its responsibilities, the State Department must consider many different issues as it formulates our Nation's foreign policy. On the other hand, ACDA's mission if sharply focused on strengthening our national security by advocating, formulating, negotiating, implementing, and verifying sound arms control, nonproliferation, and disarmament policies and agreements. As a result, ACDA is staffed with physicists, chemists, engineers, and other specialists who spend their entire careers dealing with one issue—arms control. To fold ACDA into the State Department would be a serious mistake. This nation needs ACDA to maintain a strong, independent voice for arms control.

Even if the State Department could match ACDA's arms control expertise, the goals of arms control and non-proliferation are sometimes at odds with the broader objectives of the State Department. In fact, if this bill had been enacted thirty years ago, we would not have a nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty [NPT]. In the 1960's, it was ACDA that pressed for the NPT. The State Department had opposed the original negotiations out of deference to friendly countries that wanted to explore the nuclear option.

I have listened to the arguments that, because the cold war is over, an independent voice for arms control is no longer needed. One only needs to look at the nuclear ambitions of North Korea and Iran or the recent gas attacks in Japan to understand the continued importance of battling the proliferation of nuclear, chemical, and other weapons of mass destruction. Some have also claimed that the reorganization proposed in this bill will save the taxpayers money. However, no study has identified any savings from eliminating ACDA. In fact, a recent Congressional Research Service study has found that merging ACDA into the State Department could actually cost $10 million.

Clearly, this legislation doesn't take into account the importance of having a strong and independent arms control and non-proliferation viewpoint within the United States government. Instead, it appears to me that organizational boxes are simply being moved in an arbitrary manner. I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill, ACDA must be protected.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to support a provision in the American Overseas Interests Act, which modifies section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export and Control Act to require greater congressional oversight and scrutiny of arms sales to the Government of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia until such time as the Secretary of State certifies and reports to Congress that the unpaid claims of American companies described in the June 30, 1993 report by the Secretary of Defense pursuant to section 9140(c) of the Department of Defense Appropriation Act, 1993 (Public Law 102–396; 106 Stat 1939), including the additional claims noticed by the Department of Commerce as page 2 of the report, have been resolved satisfactorily.

The $43.4 million claim of Gibbs & Hill, Inc. is one of the claims as yet unresolved. Gibbs & Hill was decimated by financial losses incurred in the design of the desalination and related facilities for the Yanbu Industrial City in Saudi Arabia in the late 1970's and early 1980's as a result of the Kingdom's failure to honor its contractual obligations and pay for additional work required of the company.

My involvement in this matter dates back almost 2 years. The company, which is a large employer in my district, approached me for assistance in having its claim paid through the Special Claims Process established for the resolution of claims of American companies which had not received fair treatment in their commercial dealing with the Government of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. This Special Claims Process was established between our Government and the Government of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, following congressional hearings on the unfair commercial practices of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia first held in the House Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East in May 1992. In response to my letter to Saudi Ambassador Bandar bin Sultan Abdulaziz of April 29, 1993, the Ambassador promised to spare ''no efforts in resolving this claim in an expeditious and fair manner.'' Since this date, the company, the Congress and the past and present administrations have received a series of promises and commitments from the Government of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia to resolve the claim favorably for Gibbs & Hill. The most recent commitment coming on October 6, 1994, one day prior to our country once again coming to the defense of the Kingdom when threatened by invasion from Iraq, in fulfillment of our commitment to our bilateral relationship.

I should note that I am not alone in my support of the full and prompt resolution of the Gibbs & Hill claim. More than 3 dozen Senators and Members of Congress, the President, the National Security Council, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and Senate Armed Services Committee, the Department of Defense, State and Commerce have all expressed their desire to see this claim resolved so as to successfully conclude the Special Claims Process.

On January 23, 1995, I expressed my growing frustration with the delaying tactics of the Saudi Embassy in fulfilling its commitment to the company, the Congress and our Government. I also noted that the failure of the Saudi Embassy to resolve this claim, under the mandate established by its own Government, was beginning to grow into a significant strain on the United States-Saudi relations. Again, this was a sentiment shared by numerous of my colleagues in the Congress, who wrote and communicated with the Department of State, and the Saudi Embassy in January of this year. In these communications, it was made clear that the delaying tactics of the Saudi Embassy would no longer be tolerated, and unless serious discussions were held between the company and the Kingdom leading to the full and prompt resolution of the claim, legislative alternatives would be considered to bring this matter to a close.

Despite several attempts to resolve the claim successfully, the Government of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia has shown no signs of cooperation. Therefore, I introduced H.R. 1243, which would focus its attention on resolving all the unresolved claims with the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. Under the leadership of Congressman CHRIS SMITH, this bill was made part of the American Overseas Interest Act. I hope in the long run we will focus on other remedies in our bilateral relationship with the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia to ensure the prevention of unfair treatment of any other United States company doing business with the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania) having assumed the chair, Mr. GOODLATTE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1561) to consolidate the foreign affairs agencies of the United States; to authorize appropriations for the Department of State and related agencies for fiscal years 1996 and 1997; to responsibly reduce the authorizations of appropriations for United States foreign assistance programs for fiscal years 1996 and 1997, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. GEPHARDT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask for this 1-minute for the purpose of inquiring of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules about the schedule for the rest of today and tomorrow.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEPHARDT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and let me

just say that there will be no more votes tonight. We will be in at 10 a.m. tomorrow morning. We will suspend 1-minutes. We will then go to conference on the Medicare select bill.

I would like to announce now also there will be an emergency meeting of the Committee on Rules to consider a second rule on the American Overseas Interests Act, H.R. 1561.

After we finish the Medicare select bill tomorrow morning, we will go back on the 5-minute rule on the remaining time on this American Overseas Interests Act.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Will the gentleman tell us what time he is intending to adjourn tomorrow?

Mr. SOLOMON. No later than 2:30.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York.

ACHIEVEMENTS IN AERONAUTICS AND SPACE DURING FISCAL YEAR 1994—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Science:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to transmit this report on the Nation's achievements in aeronautics and space during Fiscal Year 1994, as required under section 206 of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, as amended (42 U.S.C. 2476). Aeronautics and space activities involve 15 contributing departments and agencies of the Federal Government, as this report reflects, and the results of their ongoing research and development affect the Nation as a whole in a variety of ways.

Fiscal Year 1994 featured many important developments and changes in U.S. aeronautics and space efforts. It included 7 Space Shuttle missions successfully completed, 15 Government launches of Expendable Launch Vehicles (ELVs), and 4 commercial launches from Government facilities. Among notable developments in the ELV area were the launch of the Deep Space probe, Clementine, initial use of the Titan IV Centaur upper stage, and the first launch of the Taurus launch vehicle. Highlights of the Shuttle missions included the highly successful servicing mission for the Hubble Space Telescope (HST), which replaced several faulty parts and installed a sophisticated package of corrective optics to compensate for the spherical aberration in HST's primary mirror. Also, the flight of the Space Radar Laboratory began to provide information on environmental change, and a mission with a Russian astronaut, Sergei Krikalev, as a member of the crew signalled the beginning of a three-phased cooperative program in space between Russia and the United States.

In a year of tremendous accomplishments for the international Space Station, National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) developed an initial set of specifications that included Russian elements as part of the design. Russia's agreeing to join the 12 original participating nations as a partner resulted in the expansion of the existing Shuttle/Mir program into Phase I of the international Space Station program, which officially began with Sergei Krikalev's flight on the Shuttle. All of the partners held a successful systems design review in Texas in March, and in June Russia and the United States signed an interim agreement on the Space Station and a $400 million contract for Russian space hardware, services, and data. In August, the program completed a vehicle architecture review and in September, the Space Station Control Board ratified the recommendations it included. The redesigned Space Station costs $5 billion less than Space Station Freedom and still offers increased research capability and users flexibility.

In aeronautics, activities included development of technologies to improve performance, increase safety, reduce engine noise and other environmental degradation, improve air traffic management, lower costs, and help American industry to be more competitive in the world market. For example, high-speed research continued during Fiscal Year 1994 to focus on resolving critical environmental issues and laying the technological foundation for an economical, next generation, High Speed Civil Transport (HSCT). In this connection, the United States reached agreement with Russia to use the Tu–144 supersonic transport as a testbed for HSCT development. In addition, efforts in advanced subsonics focused on reducing aircraft and engine noise levels, on development of wind shear sensing devices, and on creating technologies that will improve general aviation aircraft.

In space science, astronomers using HST's revitalized optics discovered disks of protoplanetary dust orbiting stars in the Orion Nebula, suggesting that the formation of planets in the Milky Way and elsewhere may be relatively common. Also, HST's revelation of helium in distant constellations provides valuable information about the conditions in the universe during its initial evolution. The Spacelab Life Sciences-2, U.S. Microgravity Payload-2, and International Microgravity Laboratory-2 greatly increased our understanding of the role of gravity on biological, physical, and chemical processes. In biology, we learned that gravity affects the function of the neural connections between brain cells; this can have profound implications for rebuilding damaged brain cells due to strokes and diseases. In Earth science, the Space Radar Laboratories-1 and -2, plus the Lidar In-Space Technology Experiment payload, used powerful radar and laser technology to penetrate cloud cover and map critical factors on a global scale. Also, the highly successful launch of the Clementine Deep Space Probe tested 23 advanced technologies for high-tech, lightweight missile defense. The relatively inexpensive, rapidly-built spacecraft constituted a major revolution in spacecraft management and design; it also contributed significantly to lunar studies by photographing 1.8 million images of the surface of the Moon.

Additionally, on May 5, 1994, the White House announced that the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), the Department of Defense, and NASA were establishing a joint program to effect the convergence of civil and military polar-orbiting operational environmental satellite systems into a single operational program. Other White House announcements during the year included a policy for licensing U.S. firms by the Secretary of Commerce to operate private remote sensing systems and sell their images to domestic and foreign entities and a national space transportation policy that will sustain and revitalize U.S. Space transportation capabilities by providing a coherent strategy for supporting and strengthening U.S. space launch capabilities to meet the growing needs of the civilian and national security sectors.

Thus, Fiscal Year 1994 was a highly successful one for the U.S. aeronautics and space programs. Efforts in both areas have contributed significantly to furthering the Nation's scientific and technical knowledge, international cooperation, a healthier environment, and a more competitive economy.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 24, 1995.*

APPOINTMENT OF INDIVIDUALS AS MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE OFFICE OF COMPLIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, and pursuant to the provisions of section 301 of Public Law 104–1, the Chair announces on behalf of the Speaker and minority leader of the House of Representatives and the majority and minority leaders of the U.S. Senate their joint appointment of the following individuals to the Board of Directors of the Office of Compliance:

Mr. Glen D. Nager of Washington, DC, chairman, to a 5-year term;

Ms. Virginia A. Seitz of Washington, DC, to a 5-year term;

Mr. Jerry M. Hunter of Missouri, to a 4-year term;

Mr. James N. Adler of California, to a 4-year term; and

Mr. Lawrence Z. Lorber of Washington, DC, to a 3-year term.

There was no objection.

A VISION FOR AN AMERICA WITH MORE GRATITUDE

(Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address

the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Joey Hill, a winner of the South Carolina Voice of Democracy Broadcast scriptwriting contest in South Carolina. Joey Hill is the president of the student body at Southside High School in Greenville, SC.

In this year, on the theme ''My Vision for America,'' Joey wrote this: ''I have a vision for America. I long to see gratitude return to the hearts of our citizens. Too often we always want to play the victim, the person to whom the world owes a great debt. Although pointing the finger is easy and maybe even a little fun, we will, after continued pointing, find the consequences too great to bear, so we must change, and the key to change is gratitude.''

Mr. Speaker, I agree with Joey, that this is a time of change. We do not need to blame others and claim entitlement for past debts. What we need, instead, is a little gratitude for what has been given us. I am very proud to congratulate Joey today, and to enter his speech in the RECORD of today's proceedings, as follows:

MY VISION FOR AMERICA

''It's too hard.'' ''It's not fair.'' ''I never get the good things in life.'' ''The grass on the other side gets greener and greener while useless stubble sprouts on my side of the fence.'' Complaining; it seems as if it comes natural to Americans. Of the many purposes for which words could be used, complaints tiptoe off our tongues most often and that fact reflects badly on us. We always want to play the victim, the person who is never in the wrong, the person to whom the world owes a great debt. Although pointing the finger is easy, and maybe even a little fun, we will, after continued pointing, find the consequences too great to bear. So we must change, and the key to changing is gratitude. I have a vision for America. I long to see gratitude return to the hearts of our citizens. We must be grateful to those persons who came before us, who paved a smooth, scenic way for us to travel on through life and we must take advantage of the blessings they have won for our sake.

History is spotted with them. They are dubbed the movers and shakers—the somebodies. The people to whom the United States of America fall into unpayable debt. These persons struggled under the most uncompromising of trials to gain freedoms for this nation's citizens. Their names are many: Frederick Douglass, Susan B. Anthony, Sojourner Truth, Thurgood Marshall, Cesar Chavez, John Brown, Harriet Beecher Stowe, John Kennedy, Martin King, Malcolm X. Their voices spoke the same message, but in a myriad of ways. This message covered many topics: perseverance in the midst of a trial, retention of goodwill when the world gives you its worst, striving for excellence in the realm of education. These persons sincerely encouraged us to better ourselves. They gave us wisdom to live by. For example, Cesar Chavez stated to the world that ''the strongest act of manliness is to sacrifice ourselves for others in a totally nonviolent struggle for justice.'' Susan B. Anthony tested our sincerity about the equality of women with her establishment of temperance organizations. And every American has heard of the labors of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.—but many of Americans fail to understand the significance of his work. King courageously led a people who were punched, kicked, beaten, bitten by dogs, waterhosed, and murdered in some of the most inhumane ways so that we, the present day citizens of the United States of America—White, Black, Latino, Oriental, Indian, Native American—might be educated in the realm of culture; that we might not be discriminated against because of our culture.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. GOSS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

SAD NEWS FROM COLORADO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. MCINNIS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, once again I stand in front of my colleagues of the great House of Representatives bringing sad news from the State of Colorado. On Friday, April 28, 1995, a mad killer drove into a local grocery store in South Jefferson County. As he drove into that grocery store, he walked, and got out of his car, walked into the grocery store, shot his wife dead, then shot the store manager dead, and then a police officer, the first officer responding to the scene, Sgt. Tim Mossbrucker, was shot before he even knew what hit him.

□ 1830

Sergeant Mossbrucker was a father, he was a husband, he was an officer strongly admired by his fellow officers in Jefferson County. He was a young father. He was a father of five children, with a sixth child on the way.

Once again, a police officer has given his life in the line of duty, and, once again, as too often happens, his wife, Lynn, who in her own respects is a strong, wonderful woman, will be delivering their child without his presence.

Once again we have children who will be raised through life without their father, because their father gave his life in the line of duty. Lynn, his wife, tucked 3-year-old Alex into bed that Friday night, saying, ''A bad person hurt daddy bad—so bad that he can't come home.''

Lynn, his wife, will have to go through life maintaining the strength she has so far shown in life.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to read a poem that was presented at the service for this fine officer. First of all, for the officer, from mother to son.

MOTHER TO SON

God gave me a wonderful little pride and joy,
a bouncing baby boy.
And as he grew straight and tall,
he was always ready to give it his all.
A policeman he decided to be,
as he studied life sitting on my knee.
He exceeded far beyond expectation,
honest and smart, care and loving.
A little soul, entrusted to my care,
always helpful, his goodness he would share.
Growing straight and tall, a protector of life he became,
until one Friday morning an angel came.
Swift and graceful, taking him from me.
No more ''Hi, Mom,'' or sweet smile I would see.
A role model for his children had always been his fame,
but in the calm, a hero for his community he became.
Lovingly he left me, a strong young woman and the little flock of six,
all in all, a glorious mix.
But that's not all, I am truly blessed you see,
two more sons and a daughter gave to me.
They grew, too, in much the same way,
adding more to our family, making me proud every day.
With a husband, daughters, sons, grandchildren, parents and friends,
now ''our little hand.''
Steadfast and strong we make our stand.
Timothy Michael was your name,
it occurred to me long before you came into my life to stay.
I love you more than I can say.
God bless and keep my little boy,
my strong, straight and tall deputy son,
For your hard fought battle has been won.
Until some day when we meet again,
fighting the good fight as best we can.
Tim, guide us in God's great and wondrous plan.
Love, Mom.

The sergeant was a true professional, a true professional that was taken from us by a despicable killer. But we also had two other lives that were lost that day, and I should point out that 11 children as a result of this incident were left without a parent: Lynn, Matt, Erin, Annie, Alex, William, Moss, Iralee, Mark, David, and Mindy.

Mr. Speaker, all too often we have to appear in front of this body and speak of an officer, a man or woman in blue, who has given their life for the rest of us.

Mr. Speaker, I make these statements for the RECORD as a memorial and as a thank you from the United States of America, not only to the fallen officer, but to his strong wife and his wonderful children. I also include for the RECORD a tribute from Russ Cook, the Chief of Police of the Golden Police Department.

To the EDITOR:

Residents of South Jefferson County were shocked last week when they were awakened by a tragic crime, usually thought to occur in big cities. No one could have suspected that an angry and enraged killer was about to walk into their local grocery store and

gun down his wife, the store manager, and wound an innocent, unsuspecting pregnant woman. Sheriffs deputies were doing their job responding to the many daily calls where violence is anticipated and usually resolved by their skills and training. But Friday, April 28, 1995 was going to be different!

Certainly, Sheriff's Sergeant Tim Mossbrucker didn't know that when he turned into the parking lot of this sleepy little suburban grocery store, he would be gunned down in cold blood. I'm sure that other deputies responding did not know that they would be confronted by gunfire that was going to take the life of their colleague and friend.

How they must feel. You can rest assured that how they feel is how we all feel. What can be done about someone who has so much rage and anger that he is willing to cut down members of society by simply pulling a trigger?

I know that the entire law enforcement community shares the grief and sense of helplessness that must be felt by members of the Jefferson County Sheriff's Department. I, too, share the grief and despair that they are experiencing. Sadly, this will not be the last law enforcement officer we will put to rest; this is not the last time we will have innocent victims taken from us over senseless violence.

I would hope the next time you see someone who is willing to put his/her life on the line for little pay and lousy hours, you will tell them that you appreciate them and what they do. It is quite possible that each time they put on a uniform and start a tour of duty, it could be their last.

RUSS COOK,
Chief of Police, Golden Police Department.

May 2, 1995.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NETHERCUTT). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. OWENS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. DOGGETT addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. EHLERS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. EHLERS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GENE GREEN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

BIPARTISANSHIP NEEDED TO SAVE SOCIAL SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BRYANT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BRYANT. Mr. Speaker, I come here tonight with a stronger hope and brighter optimism for a sound and stable future for this country.

Bipartisanship is alive and well in the U.S. Senate, and we need more of it here in the House of Representatives.

I would like to take a few moments to commend Senators ALAN SIMPSON and BOB KERREY—two Senators of opposite parties—for their willingness to put politics aside and work together to save Social Security.

To me, the significance to be found in their effort is their realization of a big problem and their willingness to put partisan politics aside in order to go about the task of solving it.

Mr. Speaker, in Monday afternoon's issue of Congress Daily, Senator KERREY said, and I quote: ''I am the chairman of the Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee, and so it's possible for us to come forward and say the DSCC is not going to go out and attack Republican Senators for doing the right and responsible thing. We can take politics out of it.''

Senator KERREY also said, and again I quote: ''I will not put blinders on and say, 'well, I've got to attack somebody just because they're a Republican.''

Senator KERREY, if you're watching this, I thank you and applaud you for championing this crucial issue with someone from the other side of the aisle. The House of Representatives needs more bipartisanship like that of you and Senator SIMPSON.

Like Social Security, one of the most crucial issues facing this Congress is preventing Medicare from going broke for the millions of seniors who depend on it.

But no one seems to want to put politics aside, roll up their sleeves, and solve the problem.

Instead, all we've heard are criticisms and attacks.

What good are these attacks doing? What legitimate purpose are they serving?

None. Nothing. All the carping, all the complaining, all the criticisms, are doing not one thing to save Medicare.

In the May 29 edition of Newsweek magazine, it was reported that during a meeting of Democrats at the White House to discuss saving Medicare, Senator JOHN BREAUX suggested that Democrats join in a bipartisan commission to reform Medicare.

The article went on to report that many of those present in the meeting rejected the idea, instead opting to let Republicans take the heat on this crucial effort.

What kind of leadership is that? How can we make any real progress with that kind of an attitude coming from the other side of the aisle?

Senator BREAUX, you're right on target, and I appreciate your foresight of this important issue. We need more of that kind of thinking here in the House of Representatives. We're going to have to have it if we're ever to save Medicare.

It's time for Congress to come together and devise a plan to preserve Medicare, and don't worry about who saves it.

Saving Medicare won't be something that will take place overnight.

It will require vision and foresight by the policy makers. Any Medicare reform proposal Congress proposes must entail reasonable, flexible, and common-sense alternatives for those who may choose to seek their medical care another source, such as an HMO.

Saving Medicare will require understanding by the millions of seniors who depend on it. Any restructuring of Medicare will require some changes. But everyone must realize that if there are no changes, there won't be any Medicare.

And most importantly, saving Medicare will require everyone in this body to work together if we are to realize success in our efforts.

We cannot—we must not—waste our time haggling with each other about preserving Medicare, because in the next 7 years, father time will grant us no time outs, no reprieves, and no second chances.

The many millions of seniors who are depending on us to save Medicare cannot afford gridlock.

Like Senator KERREY said, ''we can take politics out of it.''

I hope everyone in Congress can come together like Senators SIMPSON, KERREY, and BREAUX. Together, we must devise a plan to save Medicare.

I urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to participate in the process of saving Medicare in a positive and constructive manner.

We owe the millions of seniors of this country who are depending on us, our best effort.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to avoid references to Members of the other body.

INCIDENTS AT UNITED STATES-MEXICAN BORDER SHOULD BE INVESTIGATED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. BILBRAY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Speaker, I have the privilege of representing the 49th District of California. I also happen to have the privilege of living in the southwestern corner of the United States, where the Pacific Ocean meets the Mexican border. Sad to say, I also happen to have to represent an area that is severely impacted by intrusion and incursions across the Mexican border, not only of illegal immigration, but those individuals that cross the border to perpetuate crime and theft.

Mr. Speaker, the problem is not just those of unorganized crime or organized crime, but the problem is actually of those who are invested with government authority in Mexico, participating in a program of theft and violence against the people of the United States and those in San Diego County.

This photo here is a good example of the problem. This is a federal Mexican police officer driving a United States stolen car, without even having the wherewithal to bother to take off the California license plate that was on the vehicle. This vehicle is stolen, and identified by the Federal agents as stolen, and still is being used on official business for Mexico's Government.

Now, this week we had a situation that I think has to be brought to attention here in Washington, D.C. Mr. Speaker, this week two Mexican Federal agents crossed over into United States territory at the port of entry and actually stopped members of the United States, citizens of the United States, with AK–47 weapons in their possession and took those individuals, tried to forcibly take those individuals back into Mexico. Our United States agents confronted them with their weapons drawn, and for a moment there was actually a standoff between Mexican Federal agents on United States soil and American Federal agents on United States soil, point-blank range, ready to have a shoot-out.

Thank the powers above that we did not have a tragedy here. But we did have a situation that really calls for attention, and that is the fact that U.S. citizens were ready to be forced off of U.S. territory by agents of a foreign government, with weapons, I want to point out, that are illegal, not only to be imported into this country but to be possessed in this country, and that is a fully automatic AK–47.

Now, the Mexican Attorney General has said these people are going to be handled, and our Government has turned them back over to Federal agents to be taken to Mexico City. I certainly want everyone in this capital and in Mexico City to recognize this Member will be watching this quite closely, along with my constituents.

Mr. Speaker, not only did that happen, but in the City of Coronado an individual was arrested who has been identified as being a state police officer in the act of stealing a vehicle from my district to export it to Mexico. Now, let us be frank. A lot of us support free trade, but this is not the type of free trade I or my constituents support. If we are going to export cars, we would like it to be paid for first.

Mr. Speaker, I want to point out that an interesting side note to this incidence at the border is the car that was being driven by the Mexican officials who tried to take the American citizens across the border was not only found to have alcohol and drugs in it, but actually happened to be a stolen American car being driven in this act.

Now, there was other instances that have occurred, again this week, where there were two individuals who identified themselves as being dealers for officials on the Mexican side who were Government officials, and they were being paid and reimbursed for that theft.

Mr. Speaker, this is another incident of the situation that our border is out of control. I am not speaking against the people of Mexico or their Government, as much as the fact that there are problems within their Government that we must insist be corrected.

There have been successes. I would like to announce that the State of Baja California Sur has cooperated with the United States, identified 300 cars for investigation, and actually have identified that 75 of those 300 cars are in fact stolen American cars. They have cooperated with U.S. officials, and those cars are now going to be returned to their rightful owners.

□ 1845

So there are successes, but the problem is that we have recognized a situation here to where we not only have crime crossing the border, but we have crime and violence crossing the border under the guise of government authority.

When my police officers in Coronado stop a car burglar and stop them in the act, I think it is quite inappropriate for my police officers to be greeted with a Mexican badge that says, you have to release me because I am a Mexican official.

Well, thank God our police officers do not play by that game. I will ask all my colleagues to pay attention to this issue, Mr. Speaker, and that this Nation pay attention. And I hope that we send a message to the White House and to Mexico City that these things have to stop now.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NETHERCUTT). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. SMITH of Michigan addressed the House. HIs remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. KINGSTON addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

MEDICARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to address my colleagues in the House about the very important issues facing our senior citizens. This has been a very senior-sensitive 104th Congress, and I am proud to say that under the leadership of individuals on both sides of the aisle we have been able to accomplish some very good things.

Most notably, we have been able to raise the income eligibility for those seniors under 70 who want to have income above $11,280 and earn it. Under our new legislation, they will be able to make up to $30,000 a year over the next 5 years without it being deducted from the Social Security.

In addition, we have rolled back the very unfair 1993 Clinton tax increase on Social Security. In addition, we have instituted the $500 elder care tax credit and the tax credit for the purchase of long-term care health insurance.

Now that brings us to the issue that was raised by my colleague and friend, Congressman BRYANT of Tennessee, about Medicare. We, in the Congress, want to do all we can to make sure we preserve and protect it for the 32 million of our Nation's senior citizens and 4 million persons with disabilities. But the Medicare spending, as you know, has gone up between 10 and 11 percent a year, whereas in the private sector health care is about a 4 to 5 percent increase a year, which tells many of us in Congress and those also watching to see what we will do that there really has been a great deal of fraud, abuse and waste in the system. If we do not take action to save Medicare, Mr. Speaker, by the year 2002, the Medicare portion of the FICA taxes for everyone will be raised 125 percent from the current level.

Seniors will face an increase in their annual premiums. We can stop that by preserving, protecting and improving our Medicare by making sure we control the rate of growth and also look to innovations with possibilities of the medical savings accounts and with managed care.

Last year we have seen that the Social Security Medicare board of trustees projected that the part A of the trust fund, the hospital care portion, would go broke by 1996. The trustees, who included Labor Secretary Robert

Reich, Health and Human Services Secretary Donna Shalala, and then Secretary Lloyd Bentsen of the Treasury, all members of the Clinton cabinet, said:

> The federal hospital insurance trust fund, which pays inpatient hospital expenses, will be able to pay for only about seven years and is severely out of financial balance in the long range.

The trustees, therefore, have logically called for prompt, effective and decisive action to save the fund from its own insolvency. As well the bipartisan commission on entitlement and tax reform, headed by Senator BOB KERREY and Senator John Danforth came to the same conclusion.

This impending disaster only came to light very recently. The Clinton administration had tried to sweep it under the rug. His fiscal year 1996 budget proposes no changes or solutions to Medicare's problems, and he even did not bring that up when he had the White House Conference on Aging. It was not even addressed by him.

As Medicare travels the road toward bankruptcy, President Clinton has been AWOL, absent without leadership, on this issue. He has even refused to participate in a bipartisan effort to save Medicare. Not until the Republicans had come forward to talk openly and honestly about how we can save, preserve and protect Medicare has the problem been described and the options been discussed.

House Republicans are determined to work with House Democrats to save Medicare by using new approaches, new management, new technologies to improve it, preserve it and protect it. Congress has an unprecedented opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to undertake a fundamental reform of this important Medicare Program.

One of the steps many of us are taking are Medicare preservation task forces, where we have senior citizens, people involved with AARP, RSVP, groups across our country like my own in Montgomery, Pennsylvania to make sure we include seniors in the solution. Seniors need to be served. We want to make sure we hear from them about options on making sure we protect it not only for seniors now but for generations to come.

The General Accounting Office has estimated that there is $44 billion that is wasted on fraud and abuse in the Medicare and the Medicaid funds. As much as 30 cents of every $1 is simply wasted or lost due to mismanagement.

House Republicans will increase Medicare spending under our proposal from $4,700 per retiree to as much as $6,300 per retiree by 2002. This is a 45-percent increase in Medicare spending per retiree.

We will preserve the current Medicare system but we need to develop a new series of options for our senior citizens so they can control their own future. I believe that by working together both sides of the aisle we can save Medicare, preserve and protect it so that we can provide the best possible health care at the lowest cost to our senior citizens so they can control their destiny. And we working together with them, we will in fact have a bright future.

TIMBER SALVAGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. TAYLOR] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, we are here today to talk about the Presidential veto of the timber rescission or timber salvage amendment that is part of the rescission package that has passed this House, passed the Senate, has been confirmed, from the conferees, by the House and is waiting confirmation in the Senate.

The President has promised to veto the entire rescission package, and that includes the timber salvage amendment. The salvage amendment was put together after considerable consultation with the Forest Service, with many groups; in fact, the final amendment reflected a good many suggestions from the White House itself, and still the White House wishes to veto the entire rescission package, including the timber amendment.

What we are talking about with the timber amendment tonight is to tell people what is going to be the result of that Presidential veto. First of all, we have to look at what is happening to our forests and what is happening to the jobs related to forest harvesting. Our forests are deteriorating in health because we are not managing them along the lines of our best scientific knowledge in forests. We have a well-funded special interest of environmental groups in Washington that take in over $600 million, and they take in that money by scaring people into thinking the last tree is going to be cut tomorrow or some other fantasy in order to bring those hundreds of millions of dollars in to themselves. This does not meet with true science or with what is actually happening in the forest.

The forests are deteriorating because of the bad management that has been pushed by these organizations creating the policy over the last several years.

The salvage amendment was an effort to try to return sensible environmentalism and sensible science back to the harvest of our timber. And what else is at stake? Is it better environmental policy for us not to harvest dead and dying wood in our forests, to lose tens of thousands of jobs because we do not allow that harvest, to make the people of our country have to use alternative resources other than wood? And what is the consequence of using alternative resources other than wood?

We will make this podium, these chairs, this table out of either wood, metal or plastic. If we make them out of plastic, then we have to import the oil from the Middle East. We have to fight to get it out, many times. We spill it several times along the way. The toxicity in the manufacturing is greater than it is in wood manufacturing. And it is much harder to recycle or to dispose of when its usefulness is over.

The same thing with metal. We dig it from the ground. A great deal of energy in the smelting process, and it is much harder to recycle than is the renewable resource of wood. Also, both of those items are finite resources; when they are gone, they are gone.

The renewable resource of wood managed on a perpetual yield basis can take our lands, our best suited lands for timber and grow over and over again the multitude of products that we need for all of our home products, paper, many resources that otherwise we would have to use finite resources.

Now, it is better for us to use the renewable resource of wood or use up our finite resources?

We are today importing over one-third of the timber that we need, over 16 billion board feet. Often this is harvested from far more sensitive environmental areas than we have available to us in the United States.

So by forcing these imports, we are damaging tropical rain forests in many cases and other more sensitive parts of land.

What we tried to do with the timber amendment, a bipartisan amendment that had the support of the United Brotherhood of Carpenters, the United Paperworkers International Union, Western Council of Industrial Workers, National Association of Home Builders, Realtors, Women in Timber and many other small business organizations. It was to craft language that would provide us with 59,000 more jobs during the three years in the timber communities. It would bring in an additional $2 billion in payroll for timber workers in communities all over this country. It would provide over $450 million in additional tax revenue, and it would put over $423 million returned to the Treasury directly. Two hundred three million dollars would be shared with the counties, mostly going to education, which is where the counties put funds coming from the harvest of timber.

It would also bring us a lower cost in fighting forest fires, which utilized $1 billion in Federal cost in 1994 and cost us 32 lives in this country fighting fire.

The President plans to veto this bill, the entire rescission bill and the timber salvage provision. That would put people back to work, reduce expenditures on forest fires, and improve forest health.

Included also was section 318 timber. Many people have said that the timber salvage bill is not needed because the Government has a process now for harvesting salvaged timber. It does. But it has been used in such a way by many organizations through the appeals

process, through delaying processes, that they render the harvest in salvaging of timber useless. If timber in the Northwest, in the Southeast, the Southwest, is not utilized within 6 to 24 months, then it usually is lost as far as any practical use and the ability to salvage it.

So it must be done quickly. Appeals and other actions by special interests in this country delay it for years.

For instance, the section 318 timber, it is in Washington and Oregon, this area has already met all the environmental requirements. This is green timber but it has not yet been released. It has been waiting since 1990, over 5 years. And this meets all the environmental requirements, and it meets, it has already been approved to move, but it has been held up for over 5 years while people in Washington and Oregon are without jobs.

I think the salvage bill itself provides an opportunity to review environmental laws. It requires the secretary of agriculture to see that those laws are followed; if he feels that a tract can be salvaged following the Environmental Species Act and the Forest Acts and some other group disagrees with him, they have the right to appeal. They cannot have endless appeals. They must appeal directly to a federal judge, a district court judge and they have 45 days in which the judge will hear the evidence and then make a ruling, and then that is the end.

If he feels the environment is endangered, then he can declare the sale unacceptable. If he thinks there is no environmental damage to be done, he can declare the sale to move ahead, and that is the end of the appeals process.

□ 1900

The Forest Service itself then puts together, through professionals, the sale, and puts it out to the highest bidder. There is no forest giveaway, there is a sale to the highest bidder for the timber to be utilized.

Mr. Speaker, the fact that this legislation brings in revenue, puts people back to work, uses our best science, and gives full protection for environmental laws should mean that the President should not veto this legislation, but should pass it.

Mr. Speaker, I will yield to some of the people affected by this. I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. DOOLITTLE].

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. I wish to acknowledge the gentleman's leadership on this salvage issue as a member of the Committee on Appropriations and a member of the conference committee. He is to be commended for the work that he has done.

Mr. Speaker, this will definitely result in a vast improvement for the quality of our forest health, which is so desperately needed in many parts of my district. In many parts of California and the Sierras, the percentages range up to one-third of dead and dying trees. A third of the Sierras in parts are dead and dying trees.

I believe the gentleman is the only licensed forester in the United States Congress, so the gentleman has an expertise that no one else really does, not to the degree that the gentleman does. He understands what happens when we have a forest fire, and the environmental damage that that does when it burns so hot. He understands that if we do not take this dead and dying timber while it still has commercial value, then the taxpayer is burdened by shelling out money out of, I guess, the general fund to go remove these trees. There is nothing to be regained in terms of repaying the Treasury.

Is that your understanding?

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. This is true, and not only that. I doubt if we could get that money expended, and the wood would not go to create jobs, in most cases, if it was harvested that way.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Yes, because it has a no value. So at that point they are just doing something to improve the health.

I would comment, we have had a highly slanted, unfair, biased report called the Green Scissors Report, which is a coalition of, I believe, Earth First and the National Taxpayers Union and Citizens Against Government Waste, which is, I think, just shocking in terms of the distortion that is in that report. One of the things they attack is so-called below-cost timber sales.

What I find interesting is that many of these self-professed groups that profess to protect the environment drag out the appeals process as long as they can, so they make sure that timber has no commercial value, and then, when money is spent to get rid of that timber to protect the health of the forest, I believe that counts against the overall tree program, and so it is bootstrapping. They make sure that it does not recover the costs, and then they try and show ''Look what pork barrel scandal support of industry we have here, because the taxpayer money is going to support the timber industry,'' when in reality, their own actions have guaranteed that result.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. METCALF], whose State is also involved in this, if he would talk to us about the impact in his area.

(Mr. METCALF asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, the President will soon have on his desk legislation that would make good use of a valuable natural resources. However, without the President's signature, this resource will rot away.

Tonight I will tell Members the story of just one tree, one in thousands in western Washington State. The Forest Service estimates that over $20 billion board feet of dead, dying, or downed timber is now in our forests. This tree on this picture and many others like it blew down in a windstorm on the Olympic Peninsula.

This is not an uncommon occurrence in this Washington State coast. While this tree grew in a region that is perfect for its growth, the unique combination of heavy rainfall, wet soil, and high winds caused trees like this giant 500-year-old growth Douglas fir tree to blow down. Thousands of these blown-down trees are lying on the forest floor right now.

However, this tree had a chance to be different. Mr. Jim Carlson, in the picture, tried to purchase this tree from the Forest Service, to be cut up in his sawmill and sold to the public. His sawmill used to employ about 100 people. The Quinault Ranger District refused to sell this tree to him. Mr. Carlson later came back to the Forest Service and asked to buy the tree, pay money for it, the lumber to be used in the construction of an interpretive building that he wanted to build on this ranch as part of an economic diversification project. This would have allowed Mr. Carlson to get into the tourism business which, as long as we are going to put him out of the timber business, seems to me about the least we could do.

The request was also denied, in spite of the fact that provisions for this type of sale were contained in the Grays Harbor Federal Sustained Yield Unit Agreement.

The taxpayers are the big losers in this story, though. This tree contained, just look at this tree, it contained 21,000 board feet of lumber. The sale of this tree by the Federal Government to Mr. Carlson would have brought the taxpayers, would have brought the Federal Government, $10,000 to $20,000. Mr. Carlson would have been able to manufacture that lumber from this one tree and sell it for approximately $60,000 on the retail market. That is the value of that one tree.

Mr. Speaker, the sad end for this tree came in a perfectly legal, though terribly wasteful manner. An out of-work timber worker, armed with a firewood permit and a chain saw, cut up this grand old giant for $5 a cord and paid about $115, $115 to the taxpayers of this Nation, instead of the $10,000 to $20,000 that that tree was worth when it fell.

The rest of the story, as Paul Harvey likes to say, is that this past year this timber worker had his home sold on the steps of the county courthouse, because he could not pay $932 in back taxes, while the Quinault Ranger District that would not sell him the tree for lumber did not have enough money to purchase the diesel fuel to run their road grader.

The extreme environmentalists oppose harvesting downed or diseased timber. For those who feel good to have that fine timber rot on the forest floor, for those people, I remind them that 15 billion board feet that lies there now will rot. There are no roads to get

to it. It is not accessible, and it will rot.

I feel good about the 6 billion board feet that we can salvage. The environmentalists claim these trees are necessary for the nutrients they provide to the forest floor. However, if we check with the forestry scientists, they will tell us that 90 percent of the nutrient value is found in the crown of the tree. That is what stays in the forest when you take out the lumber. It stays in the crown of the tree, while 80 percent of the fiber is found in he trunk. That 80 percent that we need, and which can be put to good use, contains less than 10 percent of the nutrient value.

It is possible, therefore, Mr. Speaker, to have the majority of the fiber we seek from these trees and at the same time leave the majority of nutrients behind. With a sensible salvage policy, we can have our cake and eat it too, and at a profit to the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, there are thousands of trees just like this one in the Pacific Northwest. When in full operation, Mr. Carlson could have run his mill with only 150 trees like this each year. He would employ 60 direct, full-time workers, with a payroll of over $1 million, from a yearly sales total of $7.5 million to $9 million. He would pay $200,000 to $400,000 per year in corporate income tax, he would pay $1 million to $2 million in Forest Service stumpage fees. That is what the Federal Government gets directly.

His employees would pay personal income tax of over $1 million. They would have complete company-paid medical care for themselves and their families. In addition, Mr. Carlson would employ up to 40 other people in subcontractor positions. These would include the loggers and those people that would help get the logs out of the forest.

To the State of Washington alone, this legislation would mean 7,500 man-years of direct, indirect, and induced employment. These are jobs we desperately need, as well as making wise use of a resource that would otherwise go to waste.

Sadly, if these giants are not harvested within 2 years of being blown down, or fire or disease-damaged, they are of no value as timber. They begain to deteriorate within 2 years. Thus, they are of no value to us as taxpayers. This is part of the emergency situation we face in our forests.

Unless the President signs this important legislation, giant trees like that will rot back into the forest floor from which they sprang. It is my hope that he can see the common sense in this legislation, and make the best use of our forest resources.

The forest communities all over the Pacific Northwest are dying. Our people are dying, in economic terms. This salvage timber opportunity is here now, and it is something that we deeply need in the State of Washington. We can wait no longer for consideration and meaningful action addressing this situation. We desperately need President Clinton to help by signing the bill which authorizes the timber salvage.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments. Of course, he has given an exact case, something very close to home, where individual lives are being impacted by a policy that does not realize science, and does not realize the reality of forest management, but is trying to pander to an elite group of special interests in Washington.

Mr. Speaker, I would say to the President of the United States that if he is serious about helping working people, and if he is serious about providing a balanced budget and providing resources to carry out a number of programs that he would like to see in that budget, then we have an opportunity here to restore hundreds of millions of dollars to the taxpayers, to the budget, and to put tens of thousands of people back to work.

I was mentioning a moment ago that we have section 318 timber that has been approved. If the President signs this bill, we will get the benefit of 8,942 instant jobs, in addition to the ones in the salvage bill, because part of the timber salvage amendment includes three phases. It includes the timber salvage portion, it includes the section 318 timber that has been approved and been waiting 5 years now, past all regulations, been waiting 5 years to be put on the market, and the option 9 that the President himself recommended.

With the 318 money we will put 8,942 people to work immediately, $313 million in additional payroll funds for timber workers, $47 million in additional tax revenue, $184 million returned to the Treasury, and $61 million to be shared with the counties for whatever uses they need and see fit.

Good-paying jobs are not government-trained jobs, they are reality, they are what is needed in the marketplace. We have 151 job training programs, yet here we could put tens of thousands of people back to work without the taxpayer training.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. HERGER], who also has a personal experience. He has a personal experience of what is going on in the mismanagement of forests in California.

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me, and for all of his hard work. I believe he is the only certified forester in the House of Representatives. I thank him for his leadership in this area.

Mr. Speaker, when the President threatened to veto the 1995 Supplemental Appropriations and Rescission Bill, H.R. 1158, he stated, among other things, that he ''really objected to the timber salvage provision of the bill.'' I was quite surprised to hear this, particularly in light of what the amendment stands for in terms of wildfire prevention, forest health, jobs, and the preservation of rural schools all over the country.

What I would like to do for the next few minutes, Mr. Speaker, is outline just what the President means when he says he objects to the amendment. That is, where his priorities lie, and what that means to the rural communities in my district in northern California and in other regions throughout the country.

□ 1915

Apparently the President is objecting to wildfire prevention and forest health.

Mr. Speaker, last year nearly 4 million acres of forestland nationwide and some 375,000 acres in my district alone were consumed by wildfire. This was due primarily to the excessive buildup of natural fuels, that is, dead and dying trees in our forests.

Mr. Speaker, of the 8 national forests in my northern California congressional district, I have areas where as much as 50 to 80 percent of the trees are dead and dying due to disease, insect infestation caused primarily because of 7 out of 9 years of severe drought. In fact, tree mortality in my district is so severe that the California State Board of Forestry has declared much of the area as a zone of infestation.

When these dead and dying trees ignite, they burn with such intensity that virtually everything in the forest, live trees, riparian habitat, owl nesting sites and even the soil is consumed. This kind of wildfire brings the health of the forest to its lowest ebb. Nature is unable to repair itself for years, even if man does everything within his power to help. Wildfire also does not discriminate between animal and human habitat.

Last year the city of Loyalton, for example, in my district was threatened to be burned to the ground 3 times by the same fire. Each time the town was spared by changing winds. Next year the families who live in Loyalton may not be so fortunate.

Our salvage amendment offered the President the tools to protect our forests and forest communities from this kind of catastrophe, but apparently the President finds this proposition objectionable. Apparently the President would rather see our forests and the towns adjacent to them, the Loyaltons in States throughout the country, blow up in fire storms than remove the dead and dying trees that cause this kind of disaster.

The President apparently also objects to putting unemployed people back to work. Mr. Speaker, since 1987, 51 mills have closed in northern California due to drastic decreases in Federal timber sales and the listing of the Northern Spotted Owl. Forty-two of these mills have closed since the beginning of 1990. Twenty-nine are in my district.

These closures have literally devastated many small timber-dependent communities. Thousands of workers have been dislocated, causing unemployment to exceed 20 percent in some

areas. Welfare rolls have ballooned and domestic violence has risen sharply. It has simply been a social travesty.

When the President held his Western Forest Health Summit in 1992, he promised to help these people. What has he done since then? Since he made his highly touted promises to the people of northern California, Forest Service timber sales in the region have fallen to approximately half of their 1992 levels and to approximately one-third of their historic levels.

Year 1995 looks even more bleak for the timber communities. Of the 20 timber purchasers which currently have outstanding timber contracts in the Klamath and Sierra Provinces of northern California, only 7 of these 20 will have outstanding contracts at the end of 1995. The bottom line is, the industry is being bled dry.

How ironic it is to consider that at the same time we have a desperate need to remove the dead and dying timber from our forests, we also have a work force in desperate need of jobs. Mr. Speaker, common sense says that we have the wherewithal to kill two birds with one stone, to save our forests and put a number of people back to work. But again, Mr. Speaker, the President apparently finds this objectionable. The fact is that he is turning his back on the promises he made in 1992 and to the people to whom he made them.

Finally, the President apparently also objects to infusing money for schools and roads into depressed rural communities which have not the money for either. Mr. Speaker, 25 percent of the receipts of all Federal timber sales are returned directly to counties to fund schools and road construction. Any county school superintendent in northern California would tell you of the devastating impact reduced timber sales have had on the schools in his or her district.

Plumas County, for example, has had its annual school budget cut by as much as $5.3 million from its 1992 levels. Siskiyou County has lost over $1.7 million annually since 1992. These drastic cuts to school budgets which are very small to begin with, Mr. Speaker, have forced school boards to eliminate some of the most basic scholastic programs which most school districts take for granted.

Our salvage amendment would give county school districts and road funds an infusion of a projected $380 million. This money would also help restore basic programs in rural schools. But, again, Mr. Speaker, the President apparently finds this proposition objectionable. Apparently his ''people first'' philosophy does not include children in poor rural communities.

So what does the President not object to? If he objects to fire prevention, job creation, and the preservation of rural schools, what does he not object to? He apparently does not object to continuing what he began the day he took office, an all-out war on the West spurred on by environmental extremists and special interest groups, a preservationist war that apparently he will continue waging until our forests are locked up completely and the enemy, the people who have lived and managed them for generations, have been vanquished.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. TAYLOR] for his leadership in having this special order and bringing this to the attention of not only the Members of the Congress but to the American people.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. I appreciate the gentleman's commitment to his constituency and the people of this country and his willingness to tell them the truth about what is happening in your district, and it is happening in districts all over the United States.

I would like to ask the gentleman a question. The President when he indicated that he would veto this bill, he made a statement, and I am quoting from it. He says, ''I object to this amendment which would basically direct us to make timber sales to large companies.''

The people who harvest the timber out in your area, are those the major companies, the Weyerhausers and the other larger corporations? In our area, it is mostly mom-and-pop outfits, they hire maybe under 100 people, they are people in the community, and most of those folks are right there in the community. These are not large companies. These are basic community small businesses.

Is that the case in your area?

Mr. HERGER. That is absolutely the case in our area. Again there is probably not any other industry that has as many small business type family organizations than in the timber business, that business which provides our Nation with our paper products, provides us with the wood products to be able to build our homes, to be able to have affordable homes, essential needs. Yet as the gentleman mentioned, these are primarily done by family small businesses.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. I would suggest that the President get away from the elite environment that he is surrounded by at the White House and go out and talk to these folks and see how many businesses are involved.

Major timber companies that have millions of acres of land do not need this to produce their forest products, but small businesses do. They are being devastated to the point of tens of thousands of jobs all over this country.

I think the gentleman brought our another point, homebuilding. The average cost of a home has gone up over $7,000 just over what has happened in the Pacific Northwest, and expected to go higher. We are using today metal studs for construction purposes as well as other metal components instead of the renewable resource of wood.

How can you possibly be an environmentalist and want to use a finite product that is hard to recycle, hard on the environment when it is brought in and smelted and produced as opposed to a renewable resource like wood, easily recyclable and can be used over and grown over and over again?

Mr. HERGER. I thank again the gentleman for bringing this out. Again we are talking about a renewable resource. As I mentioned earlier in my talk, I have some eight national forests, all or parts of them in my district. Of that part, during the time when we were under historic levels and were harvesting, approximately 75 percent were off-limits to any type of harvesting at all. They were in preserves, they were in national parks, in wilderness areas. So we really had about 25 percent of the pie that could be harvested, and through our California laws could not be harvested any more rapidly than they were growing back.

At this point, even that 25 percent has been locked up. Maybe there is about 5 percent or even less that we are able to harvest. Again, we are talking about a renewable resource. These steel studs that you are referring to or even in our grocery store, the plastic. Plastic is not renewable. Steel studs are not renewable. But yet our forest products are renewable. Again, it is a tragedy to our environment to see this happening, that not only are our forests rotting and burning but our communities are being deprived of their very livelihoods. Again, this is a tragedy, and I thank the gentleman for bringing this out.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. The gentleman makes another good point. We are not talking about any harvest in national parks. We are not talking about harvesting in wilderness areas or wild and scenic river areas. As you say, 75 percent of the national forests even are off-limits from this harvest. Only about 25 percent of the area which is already being used and harvested from a commercial standpoint, or at least eligible—it is not being harvested now—for harvesting will be impacted. A very small part, one-third, of this Nation's public lands that the Government owns today.

I would also remind, and I think the gentleman pointed out a moment ago, management of the forest and thinning of the forest is important for forest health, whether it is down wood or standing wood. There was a wire today, a green wire that came out that pointed out that aspen trees in New Mexico and Arizona are on a rapid decline.

It points out that in 1962, there were 486,000 acres and it is down to 263,000 acres now, a 46 percent decrease of aspen, and the primary reason is the aspen, and I am quoting from it, needs open spaces to grow. They need to clear the forests so the younger trees can grow out, and that can be done, according to this green wire, in several ways. One is by wood harvest. That is important in managing today's forest. If you are going to have a wealthy forest, it has to be managed, and harvest is part of that management.

I would go back and talk again about what the President said in his statement. He went on in addition to saying this was made up of large timber companies, we were directing the cuts in sales to large timber companies, and that is entirely false. I would say it is close to 99 percent of these companies that are going to be harvesting, that will be winning bids on forest sales, come from small family firms and would be classified as small businesses under all the definitions of small business.

He also mentioned there would be a subsidy to the taxpayer. The Congressional Budget Office saw no subsidy, the taxpayer was not subsidizing these sales. In fact, they saw tens of millions of dollars coming into the treasury, and I think we quoted from those figures a moment ago.

Then he went on to say that this legislation would essentially throw out all environmental laws, and that is ridiculous. If he would talk to his own chief of the U.S. Forest Service, he would tell them that the environmental laws are not being thrown out, that the Secretary is required to follow a number of the environmental laws. If there was no requirement for following them, there would be no reason for an appeal, and there is an appeal process.

I would go to the last segment in the salvage amendment, and, that is, that was inserted by the Senate. It was option 9 timber harvest.

□ 1930

The President himself went to the Pacific Northwest directly after his election and promised the people that he would start seeing that the forests there were being harvested. Now he cut the harvest down to approximately 20 percent of what it would be or what it had been in the past, but even that is not happening. The extreme elements who are influencing the administration are seeing that is not happening. Of the 1.2 billion board feet that were selected for harvest under Option 9, almost none of that timber has been cut since the plan was selected by the administration.

It was tested in district court, was upheld in district court in December, and the conference language would require that it now proceed and it would insulate it from further judicial review so that we do not have to subject the tens of thousands of employees to endless appeals on this process.

In real terms if we restore and bring the Option 9 procedures ahead, it would restore almost 19,000 jobs for timber workers in the communities in the so-called spotted owl areas, it would add $664 million in additional payroll for timber workers, it would add $54 million in additional tax revenue, and $360 million would be returned to the Treasury; $120 million would go to the counties to be shared as we mentioned a moment ago primarily for education.

Even the Forest Service estimates that if we do not proceed it may be years and years before option 9 can move ahead, and that in effect is the President denying the people even that part of his promise that he made in the Pacific Northwest.

We have a section that is called the 4–D areas, a provision that legitimizes future action for the administration's 4–D section on Endangered Species Act rulings for relief of small landowners which was also included by the conferees. When the administration finishes its 4–D rules, millions of small landowners will be out from under the ESA restrictions on timber harvesting. It would free up hundreds of thousands of board feet of new timber by small property landowners.

The acceptance of this provision was basically a good-faith attempt to show that Congress is willing to work with the administration's plan to utilize section 4–D of the ESA to provide relief for small landowners.

In other words, the President has made many representations. What we are trying to do is to bring those representations to fruition. Certainly the President can support that.

The President's veto means that the administration's commitment to provide relief in timber communities will not happen. The President's veto threat and comments on the timber provisions in the rescission bill is proof that his campaign pledge to put people first has been breached.

The number of jobs in the entire rescission bill, including the salvage portion, 318 and option 9, would create over 88,000 jobs; in other words, it would put that many people who have been unemployed this period of time back in their jobs all across this country. Instead of that, the President is willing rather to see that the forests rot or burn than to see that good silviculture, good management, forest health management is put in place.

I would remind him that his promise was to help bring economic activity back to the area. His veto of this legislation will kill that entirely. His signing of that bill will give 88,000 people across this country and primary in the Pacific Northwest immediate employment.

There are numerous opportunities for us to evaluate this bill. The Congress had hearings, the Committee on Agriculture and Committee on Resources had joint hearings before they requested that I sponsor this amendment in the Committee on Appropriations. We had debate in the Committee on Appropriations, we had debate upon the floor. There were 277 members of Congress who supported this bill; it was opposed by 149. It passed with almost two-thirds of this Congress' support. It passed in the Senate. It came back and was approved, the conference language in the House was approved overwhelmingly, as it will be in the Senate. And so, this is the people through their representatives speaking for what is needed in this country and what they want.

The President is vetoing it because he is being asked by a group of ill-informed special interests in Washington not to do it.

If you read the Wall Street Journal of 2 weeks ago last Friday you will see why. The environmental organizations in this town, the special interest to which I refer that take in the $600 million and lavish it out to political special interests, were polled as to their support. The report said they were basically left-leaning, 93 percent who support the President of the United States, voted for President Clinton in the 1992 election. And he now is reaching out to pander to that very elite special interest and forget 88,000 honest taxpaying citizens who can be put back to work immediately.

I would remind them of one other statement that was made by the group, an environmental group who spoke positively about the President's threat to veto, and I am quoting the Oregon-based Headwaters organization, and it said ''By preventing these clear cuts, President Clinton today saved the marble murrelet from extinction.'' Now that defies sensibility. We are talking about dead timber, we are talking about timber that in many cases has already blown over on the ground, we are talking about timber that has been burned, we are talking about timber that is insect-infested. Clearcutting dead and dying timber is ridiculous, and how you could have saved anything, the marbled murrelet from taking out salvaging dead timber remains to be seen.

I yield to the gentleman from California, Mr. RIGGS, whose district also is impacted by this legislation, who has real people who are suffering because of the policies of this administration and because of the veto threat of this administration.

Mr. RIGGS. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I commend him for his extraordinary leadership in helping to steer this very important piece of legislation properly called the emergency timber salvage amendment through the House and making sure it survived the House and Senate conference committee.

I want to tell the gentleman that I am dismayed to put it mildly that the President might specifically point to our emergency timber salvage amendment as grounds for vetoing the emergency supplemental appropriations and rescissions package, first of all because the bill as the gentleman well knows appropriates Federal assistance, Federal aid for disaster victims in California, many of whom live in my congressional district and were victims of last winter's severe flooding, but also because, frankly, we need to ensure a greater supply to timber, and what better source than the dead and dying trees on Federal forest lands for the independent mills in the north part of my congressional district, which are

very much a part of that regional economy, and the independent mills, frankly, are almost the backbone of our regional economy and have been beset by any number of pressures in recent years, not least of which is in my view an overregulation of our Federal forest lands and a moving away from utilizing those forest lands to produce a resource that the mills can then use to turn into products and to create and to save jobs.

Let me point out to the gentleman what I am sure he has already mentioned here tonight, and that is our amendment is vitally needed for fire-supression purposes and the health of the forests. Our amendment would save lives and save, frankly, the Federal Government millions of dollars in fire-suppression costs that have been spent combating these raging wildfires that have burned out of control particularly in the western United States in recent years.

Second, it would generate revenues for the Federal Treasury by again allowing the salvage harvesting of these dead and dying trees on Federal forest lands. Our amendment, which the gentleman was able to incorporate into the appropriations bill when it left the full committee, was actually one of the revenue-positive aspects of that piece of legislation, and was one of the measures that were used to pay if you will for the expenditures in the bill, not least of which again was Federal disaster assistance for emergency victims in California.

Second, I would like to point out, as again I am sure the gentleman has stressed here tonight, that our amendment is designed at taking some of these dead and dying and diseased trees out of Federal forest lands at a rate, frankly, that is far below the annual mortality rate on Federal forest lands, so what we have proposed here is a very reasonable amendment, one that is good for the environment, again good for forest health purposes, it is good forestry technique or silvicultural technique in that it allows the selective thinning of our forest lands targeting dead and dying trees, thinning those forest lands and managing those forest lands for again forest-health and fire-suppression purposes.

I must say I am perplexed by the President's position on this particular issue. It seems like his administration has been, frankly, talking on both sides of this issue. In fact the very day before the President mentioned in his veto threat our emergency timber salvage amendment as grounds for a potential Presidential veto I has been assured by our former colleague and the new Secretary of Agriculture, Dan Glickman from Kansas, that he as the Agriculture Secretary intended to do all that he could as a key representative of the administration to ensure that we began selling more timber off of our Federal forest lands, and as the gentleman pointed out in his opening remarks when he was kind enough to introduce me and yield ti me to me, my congressional district, the First Congressional District of northwest California, is home to all or part of four Federal forest lands. Our economy, our regional economy in northwest California is very much resource-dependent. We have traditionally relied upon the forest products industry as the primary source of steady, good-paying, industrial-type jobs, and, frankly, I would hope that the administration will reconsider their position, allow us to begin extracting that resource off of Federal forest lands for the benefit of our economies and the benefit of our local communities in our congressional district, in your congressional district, and in many congressional districts across the country.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Would the gentleman perhaps consider this question: If the President signs this rescission package, he will put 88,000 people back to work, and these are good, high-paying jobs, that is why we have at least three or four union endorsements here, we have the National Home Builders, we have many organizations endorsing this.

At a time when unemployment is relatively high across the country and especially high in the Pacific Northwest and other areas that would be impacted greatest by this, why would the President not sign a bill that would put 88,000 people back to work, would improve the forests' health, would actually by his own Forest Service admission, would really create a healthier forest? Why would he not do that?

Mr. RIGGS. If the gentleman would yield, I would be the last one to speculate for the administration on this particular question, and I know that the gentleman's question is somewhat rhetorical in nature. But he makes a very, very good point.

First of all we are talking about jobs that are not easily replaced in the local economies of resource-dependent communities. And I cannot fathom his motivation, except for the possibility that the President is afraid of frankly antagonizing a core constituency in the national Democratic Party, and that is the more militant environmental element which has made professional environmental activism a movement in America in recent years. They are the forces, the entrenched forces of the status quo on this particular issue. They are the ones that are frankly saying let those dead and dying trees rot on the forest floor rather than use those trees as a resource to produce a value-added product and again ensure good paying jobs in the forest products industry and the communities that depend on that industry as the primary source of their economic livelihood and economic well-being.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. A little while ago I mentioned the study that was published in the Wall Street Journal a couple of weeks ago pointed out this special interest in Washington of the environmental movement, and this is to be distinguished from genuine, honest, working people out there that are concerned about the environment. I have three children, I am concerned about the environment.

□ 1945

Many people across the country are concerned. I am talking a special interest here that takes in over $600 million by frightening people and does not come close to putting out the truth of what is happening. It is an organization that, according to the Journal report, is very far left. It voted 93 percent for Mr. Clinton in 1992. I know it is a special interest group that backs him.

But pandering to that group at the expense of these tens of thousands of wage earners out in that part of the country and doing it against the recommendations that he made himself, promises he made himself, with option 9 and other promises to get these people back to work, I cannot understand why he is picking this very left-wing group over this large part of America's working people, labor unions that want to go back to work, members, others, and I am just confused as to why this administration would pander to this small, elite group as opposed to mainstream America, why he would fly in the face of nearly two-thirds of the House of Representatives.

This was a bipartisan effort.

To get two-thirds, we had over 70 Democrats who voted and worked hard for the bill. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. DICKS] was particularly helpful to get the bill passed; the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON], others were involved in this, as well as the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS], and it is all of us who are looking to help these working men and women get their jobs back, high-paying jobs in most cases, to get them back in the mainstream economy, and here the President is threatening to do that, to veto it. He is threatening because of the pressure from a group that does not know a sourwood from a white pine.

I had one of them testifying in the Committee on Interior the other day who testified he was an environmental educator. After he told me all the things that were happening in the forest, the world was coming to an end, I tried to ascertain his qualifications. I found out he did not have a degree in anything, and his practical knowledge was void. I asked him what portion of the country was owned by the Federal Government. It is about a third. He did not have a clue. I asked him how many acres were in the U.S. Forest Service system. It is 191 million acres. He did not know. I asked him how much of that 191 million acres could be harvested today. He said it all could. Less than 25 percent of it can be harvested today.

What I am saying is, with that kind of misinformation, the President would do well to listen to the working men and women in California and Washington and Oregon and other parts of this

country as opposed to listening to a very elite special interest group that is giving him very bad information.

Mr. RIGGS. If the gentleman will yield, I think the gentleman makes an excellent point, and I would simply add that again the hard-core professional environmental element, which again has become, giving, I guess, the devil its due, a well-organized and well-funded movement in this country in recent years, having lost this debate through a fair and open process at the full Committee on Appropriations level when the bill was marked up, in fact, when the gentleman's amendment was voted on on an up-or-down basis, having lost the debate out here on this House floor when we debated at some length the merits of the gentleman's emergency timber salvage amendment, then employs a back-door mechanism, goes to the White House and convinces the certain figures in the President's administration that he really ought to veto this bill, which, as the gentleman pointed out, passed the House with strong bipartisan support, and I want to say that the President, frankly, is not, in my just intuitive sense here, he is not heeding his instinct. He is not doing what I think, frankly, he knows is the right thing.

I mean, after all, this is a President who campaigned on a promise of putting people first. Well, I want to point out to the President that the independent timber mills of this country have launched a new campaign called Putting Family Businesses First, so if the President met his campaign rhetoric, if he really does believe in putting people and families first, he can begin by reconsidering his threat to veto the gentleman's outstanding emergency timber salvage amendment.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. That falls in line with the President's declaration that these are large companies. These are not large companies. These are small, family-size businesses.

THE REAL ENVIRONMENTAL EXTREMISTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NETHERCUTT). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LEWIS] is recognized for 30 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], my friend and colleague.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I just sat here listening for the last hour as the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LEWIS] did, and my friend, the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mr. CLAYTON] talking about environmental extremists and environmental extremism.

The fact is that 70 percent of the American public wants to see not weaker but stronger environmental laws, and the real extremists and the real radicals in this environmental debate are not people that support the clean water laws and not people that support the clean air laws and not people that support public health laws, but the real extremists are a good many Republicans in this body who literally want to privatize some of the national parks, sell the national parks to large corporations, want to roll back a lot of the environmental laws, clean air laws, safe drinking water laws, laws that affect, that we have built a consensus in this country around that have given us the best public health in our history, that have given us the best, strongest laws in the world to protect our citizens against everything from breast cancer to tuberculosis. We have done that well in this country in the last 3 or 4 decades, something I am proud of.

I live in Lorain, Ohio. My back door looks out over Lake Erie. Twenty years ago, Lake Erie was declared dead in many parts. Part of the Cuyahoga River in Cleveland caught on fire.

Becuase of the efforts of the U.S. EPA, because of the commitment of a lot of people in Lorain, Cleveland, Medina, and all of northeast Ohio and other areas, we as a Nation were able to clean up that lake, so my daughters, Emily and Elizabeth, can now swim in Lake Erie, and other people, we drink the water, we can enjoy that lake recreationally, and it helps create jobs. It helps attract people to the Great Lakes to build their businesses and build their industries and employ people.

The extremists and the environmental issue are not those 70 or 80 percent of the American people that want clean air, pure food, safe drinking water for their children and their families and their grandchildren, but the people that want to sell off the national parks and allow the chemical companies and other polluters to write the laws that dismantle the best environmental laws in our history and the best environmental laws in the whole world, and that is what concerns me when I hear this kind of debate on the House floor.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. I say to my friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Brown] I must agree with you. There is nothing radical about wanting to know what is in the air we breathe, what is in the water we drink or what is in the food we eat. I thank the gentleman very much for his comments.

I yield to the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON].

CELEBRATING THE MOTOR-VOTER LAW

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I also want to applaud my colleague, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LEWIS] for organizing this special order and his dedication and commitment to the cause of voting and the rights of civil rights. He has an impeccable reputation, and those people who know of his record know that, indeed, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LEWIS] is a long-distance runner in the struggle for civil rights and the opportunity for basic rights that the Constitution affords all Americans, the right to vote for all our citizens.

He has faced all manner of discouragement, and yet he has never been discouraged. I just want to thank you, I say to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LEWIS], for not only this special order but for the life that you have lived and showing that America should be there for everyone and living the life that is exemplary, what you are. And so I am delighted to participate with you.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. I thank the gentlewoman for those comments.

Mrs. CLAYTON. The right to vote is a precious right because all rights derive from the voting right. Freedom of speech, which we know as the First Amendment, has far less meaning without the right to vote and to elect those persons who will uphold that fundamental freedom.

Freedom from illegal search and seizure, which we know as the fourth amendment, has little meaning if those who hold elective office do not stand up and protect those basic freedoms.

The term due process, the fifth amendment, providing important procedural safeguards, guaranteed by the Constitution, become mere words if those who we elect fail to protect them.

And the equality of treatment under the law, the 14th amendment, is a platitude we talk about that becomes a living reality only when, now only when, those we vote into office become champions of those rights.

The Constitution is a living and breathing document that gets its life from people we elect.

It is, therefore, clearly the best way to safeguard all of our rights is to exercise our most fundamental right, and that is the right to vote. And the first step in exercising that right obviously is to register. We in Congress have made registering to vote easy. The National Voter Registration Act of 1993, the so-called motor voter bill, was passed by Congress and signed into law by President Clinton May 20, 1993.

The motor voter act took effect January 1 of this year. It requires basically that we get our drivers license, we can register by mail, any time we get public services, those three areas allow us to register very easily. With this simplified registration, we expect citizens will register to vote.

Indeed, in North Carolina, since implementation of the motor voter law, some 88,000 new voters have registered, 88,000. The reason for the simplified registration procedure is actually to encourage more people to participate, and we know there has been a declining participation of citizens in elections, so we need to do that.

One author has said the deadliest enemy is not really those who live in foreign lands but really it is within ourselves. I want to say to you, JOHN, that the same thing could be applied to us in our own community or in our own private life: The deadliest enemy is not

without, it is within, and that deadly enemy that is within is those who would discourage the participation, and this would be apathy, idleness, inattention and indifference. And because of these enemies, only about one-fourth of those voting last November actually voted, and so, therefore, we had, what, the Contract With America as a result of that, apathy and indifference, although we have the right to register.

The majority of Americans did not vote for those who pressed for the Contract With America. The proponents offered it, nevertheless, but one-half of them accepted that, only one-half of that 25 percent who voted, but nevertheless if people had voted, it would have been a different study.

Compare the record with those who voted in Africa. When people voted in Africa, they stood in long lines to vote; they stood, and the weather was inclement. Some of the people were disabled themselves, but they wanted to vote so well that they would suffer personal indignities just to have the opportunity to vote, the threat of violence, even death, for those who were in South Africa. They wanted the opportunity to participate.

And I think, I would say to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LEWIS] that we, too, need to have that same sort of spirit that the right to vote guarantees all other rights, and unless we understand that very fundamentally, that the Constitution is indeed a living and breathing instrument and each of those elements are important, but unless we exercise our right to vote, we will not have people who will implement properly the Constitution.

Again, I want to thank the gentleman for the efforts you had in making the motor voter a reality and thank you for allowing us to participate with you on this anniversary.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Let me just thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina for those comments, those words, and for participating really in this special order tonight.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr BROWN]

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. It is my pleasure to join with the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON] and the gentleman from Georgia [Ms. MCKINNEY], and also the gentleman from Georgia, [Mr. LEWIS], celebrating the second-year anniversary of one of the things that I think was very positive, one of those most positive accomplishments of this dead in Congress, and that is the National Voter Registrations Act, which is the final jewel in opening up our political system to everyone in this country.

Unfortunately, there are some people that in this body want to repeal the National Voter Registration Act, and some Republican Governors around the country that do not want to implement it even though it is the most efficient, most cost-effective way to achieve universal voter registration in this society.

I was Ohio secretary of state for 8 years. One of my jobs was to encourage people and do all I could to get them to register to vote. We registered literally 1 million people over those 8 years. We were able to do it by using a lot of the motor voter registration at unemployment offices, registration at restaurants, reaching out all over to people in all walks of life, and it works.

Nationally, that is what is happening right now. we are reaching into all segments of the community, rich and poor, black and white, men and women, all across the board. We are seeing hundreds of thousands of people in State after State after State register to vote.

□ 2000

If we are going to be the kind of democracy that we need in this country that we have all striven for, it means we need to expand the number of people voting so everyone has a choice in selecting the next Congress, selecting the next President.

I say to the gentleman, ''I am proud to join with you, Mr. LEWIS, in your efforts to get more people registered to vote, whether it is—regardless of where those people are registered, whether it is a government office, whether it is a license bureau, whatever kind of place it might be, so that people more efficiently can find opportunities to register to vote all over our land. It has made a difference in registering millions of voters and expanding the electorate so we do, in fact, like most countries in the world, have universal suffrage so more and more people vote and choose our leaders.''

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman again for his efforts in bringing us the National Voter Registration Act.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. I want to thank my friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], for participating in this special order, for all of his good work to increase voter participation, long before I came to this body, as the Secretary of State of the great State of Ohio. I say to the gentleman, ''Thank you very much.'' On January 1 of this year, the National Voter Registration Act, known as motor-voter, went into effect. This month marks the two year anniversary of Motor Voter becoming law. Tonight I want to recognize the important role Motor Voter has played in registering voters and promoting democracy.

The motor-voter law allows citizens to register at motor vehicle bureaus, welfare offices and other agencies. The goal of the law is to simplify voter registration and encourage people to participate in the political process. After only 3 months, the results are in. Motor Voter is working.

In only 3 months, over 2 million citizens have registered or updated their registration. Motor Voter will add an estimated 20 million voters to the rolls by the 1996 election. Motor Voter would be an even greater success if all states complied with the law.

Unfortunately, some States have not complied with the Motor Voter law. They refuse to follow the law of the land. Even some Members of Congress oppose Motor Voter. They want to repeal this successful law.

Mr. Speaker, during an earlier period of my life, I put my body, my heart and my soul on the line to increase participation of all people in the political process. From the sit-ins to the Freedom Rides to the March on Washington, to the March from Selma to Montgomery, I and thousands of others worked for the civil rights of all Americans. We wanted to make one man, one vote—one woman, one vote—a reality. This was our cause.

In the history of our nation, we were not alone. Time and again, ordinary American citizens have risen in defense of one person, one vote. From the Minutemen at Lexington and Concord to Abraham Lincoln—from Susan B. Anthony to Viola Liuzzo—from Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., to James Chaney, Andy Goodman and Mickey Schwerner . . . people have given their heart, their soul—and often their lives—so that all Americans could vote.

We have all come a long way. The Declaration of Independence and the United States Constitution first stated that all people are created equal, and that they are endowed with certain inalienable rights. The Thirteenth, Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments to our Constitution, the Voting Rights Act and the Civil Rights Act have ensured that all Americans can exercise their right to vote. Motor Voter guarantees that they will.

Too many people, especially the young and the poor, are sitting on the sidelines. They have not registered to vote. They are not going to the ballot box. We must encourage all Americans to vote. We all must be involved. For people not to register—for people to refuse to participate in the political process—is dangerous to the health of our country.

Despite our proud democratic history—despite the obvious success of Motor Voter, certain Members of this body want to repeal Motor Voter. They want us to take a step back in history—a step away from having a truly democratic society. We must not let this happen.

Why do so many of my colleagues want to repeal Motor Voter? Why do they want to make it harder for people to vote? What do they fear? That people will vote? That people will get involved? That we will expand democracy?

This is what Motor Voter does. It makes it easier for all Americans to participate in our democratic process. Motor Voter opens up the process—it makes it easier for people to come in, to participate. Registering to vote is as simple as renewing your driver's license.

The more people vote—the more people become involved—the more government becomes responsive to the people. Each and every citizen has the power to hold their elected officials accountable.

When people do not vote, they forfeit their power—they silence their own voices. They say ''I do not care.''

How can so many Members of Congress continue to oppose Motor Voter? They say it is an unfunded mandate—an unfunded mandate. My Colleagues, if telling states to register voters is an unfunded mandate, it's a mandate as old as the Constitution.

Read article I, section 4 of the Constitution. ''The times, places and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives shall be prescribed in each state by the legislature thereof; but Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations.''

My Colleagues, our Constitution is not just another unfunded mandate. We cannot put a price tag on political participation. We cannot put a price on democracy.

Despite the opposition, despite the attempts to make it harder for Americans to vote, I am heartened by all that Motor Voter has accomplished in three short months. We must encourage people to become involved—to stand up and speak out—to vote. We must continue to support Motor Voter.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to yield to the gentlewoman from the State of Georgia, the gentlewoman from the great State of Georgia [Ms. MCKINNEY].

Ms. MCKINNEY. Congressman LEWIS, I just want to commend you for remembering the importance of motor voter to our democracy, and I cannot help but think about I have a 9-year-old son, and I buy books. The most recent book that I purchased for him was a pictorial of the civil rights movement. It has got all of these wonderful, glorious, and infamous pictures about the dogs, and the water hoses, and Bull Connor, and this is a legacy of this country.

This is also a legacy of our quest for real and true democracy. You were there. You saw it. I can only rewalk your footsteps. I can only go back and see where you were 30 years ago at Edmund Pettis Bridge and recall in my own new way the contributions of Goodwin, Chaney and Schwerner, and Viola Liuzzo, and, when I go to Montgomery, I never go there without passing by the civil rights memorial at Morris Deze's Southern Poverty Law Center.

We have some of our colleagues here who participated in that struggle for American democracy. BOB FILNER is one who serves in Congress with us now who was there with the Freedom Riders fighting for a more perfect democracy.

I have a question for you. You have a story that you tell about the man with a cattle prod in his hand, and for our viewers tonight I just would like for you to retell that story because this is a part of our history, and this is a history that we cannot forget; lest we forget, we will surely allow those enemies of democracy who want to restrict the American people's right to vote to wane. So please tell the story.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Well, let me just say to my friend and colleague from Georgia, I will never forget some 30 years ago in the little town of Selma, AL, in the heart of the black belt in Dallas County in 1965. Only 2.1 percent of blacks of voting age were registered to vote. They had to take a so-called literacy test. People were afraid. There were black men and women teaching in the local college, black doctors and lawyers, but they flunked the so-called literacy test. They could only go down to attempt to register on the first and third Mondays of each month.

On the third Monday in January 1965, it was my day to lead a group of people down to the Dallas County Courthouse. To be exact, it was January 18, and we walked up to the steps of the courthouse, and there was a sheriff named Jim Clark. He wore a gun on one side, a night stick on the other, and he carried an electric cattle prod in his hand, and he did not use it on cows, he used it on people, and he said to me, ''John Lewis, you're not some agitator. You're the lowest form of humanity.''

At that time I was almost 25, and I had all of my hair. I was a few pounds lighter, but I looked him straight in the eye, and I said, ''Sheriff, I may be an agitator, but I'm not an outsider. I grew up 90 miles from here, and we're going to stay here until these people are allowed to register and vote.''

And he said, ''John, you're under arrest,'' and he arrested me along with many other people.

A few days later in a little town near Selma a young black man by the name of Jimmy Lee Jackson was leading the march for the right to vote. He was shot in the stomach by a state trooper, and a few days later he died. In the course of what happened to him we said that we were marching from Selma to Montgomery to dramatize to the Nation and to the world that people wanted the right to participate in the democratic process. And on March 7 we decided to march in twos, leaving downtown Selma, walking through the streets of Selma, about 525 of us, elderly men and women and a few young children.

We came to the apex of the bridge. We saw a sea of blue. It was the Alabama State troopers. We continued to walk until we came within hearing distance of the State troopers, and a man identified himself and said, ''I'm Major John Cloud of the Alabama State troopers. I give you 3 minutes to disperse and go back to your church.''

In less than 1½ minutes he said, ''Troopers, advance,'' and they came toward us, beating us with night sticks and bull whips, trampling us with horses and using tear gas.

This became known as bloody Sunday, and because of what happened in Selma, President Johnson came to this hall, and spoke to a joint session of Congress, and introduced the Voting Rights Act, and it was passed, and since then I must say, my colleague, we have seen hundreds and thousands and millions of new registered voters because this Congress had the courage to pass the Voting Rights Act in 1965, and Motor Voter is another step down that long road toward opening up the political process and letting all of the people come in.

Ms. MCKINNEY. You know you said something about accountability, and the fact that we enlarge the voting pool also indicates that we would enlarge the attentive public; that is, the public that is paying attention to what we do with the laws that we pass and the impact that what we do here has on those peoples' lives. I cannot help but believe that there is a group of people, and I am sure they are a small group of people, who want to escape accountability for the things that they do, and therefore they introduced legislation to repeal Motor Voter, or they try to call it an unfunded mandate in an effort to escape the accountability that the American people would bring on them for the kinds of policies that we are seeing put into play now.

☐ 2015

Also, I have to say that it has never been so easy, particularly in the South, in Georgia, to register people, as it is today, and that is because of motor voter. We have a simple little form.

I remember in 1992, we had Jesse Jackson come down to the 11th district to do some voter registration for us because we knew we needed that. We found all kinds of voting registration barriers. And in one little small town, Milledgeville, I know you know Milledgeville, GA, we had to stage a protest march, because for some reason it was inconvenient for the folks down at the courthouse to register a lot of people in the town, who happened to be African-American and who happened to be students in the town.

So we have got these impediments that have been removed. And now it is so easy, all people have to do is want to be registered and they can register. And it sure makes it a whole lot easier for those of us who want them to be registered.

I think this new move on the part of this small group of people is perhaps, well, we know it is wrong-headed and ill-founded, but it takes us in the wrong direction. It takes us backwards, and we do not need to be going back. We need to be going forward. Our democracy is stronger when the American people feel that they have an investment in their Government. Right now the American people do not feel that they have an investment, and a lot of people sit on the sidelines at election time because it is so darn hard to go out there and register to vote. We, of course, as you know, have the purges that go on.

Motor voter cures all of that. You can register to vote at midnight in your home if you want to, and that is the beautiful thing about motor voter.

So I just think this move that is afoot is wrong-headed and ill-founded,

but there are 170 cosponsors on the repeal bill, so it is a threat that is imminent. And that is why I am so happy that the gentleman is alerting the rest of us here to the importance of motor voter, and at the same time the American viewing public that is interested and is looking at C–SPAN right now, to let them know that motor voter is good and motor voter is not safe.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Let me agree with you that motor voter is good, and it is necessary to open up the political process. As you well know, in our own State hundreds and thousands of people have been registered during the past 3 months. I think in Georgia more than 3,000 people every single day are being registered because of motor voter.

Ms. MCKINNEY. And we do not even have all of the counties on line yet. Just imagine what it would be like if we had all of the counties, 159 counties in Georgia, on line for motor voter. When that happens, Georgia will not be last anymore. I am so sick and tired of Georgia being last in most things. Georgia can become first, and it will also be first in democracy.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Let me just thank my colleague, the gentlewoman from the State of Georgia, CYNTHIA MCKINNEY, for participating in this special order tonight. I appreciate your help and all of your support. I think we have a moral obligation, a mandate, and a mission as Members of this body to do what we can to increase the political participation of all of our citizens. Open the process up, let everybody come in.

Ms. MCKINNEY. The gentleman knows that I have long admired his work and his advocacy on behalf of the American people and the American democracy.

Just a word about the nature of this discourse tonight: This is not about Democrat or Republican. This is about the American people and enhancing and fine-tuning our democracy. We do have, we are blessed in this country to have the most perfect democracy on the face of the Earth. Yet it can still be a whole lot better. Motor voter is but one tool to get us there, and I appreciate the gentleman and his strong leadership and advocacy. You know you have my support every step of the way.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Thank you very much for those kind words and for participating in this special order tonight.

Miss COLLINS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the absolute need for the motor-voter law is clear. Without it, millions of American voters will continue to be denied equal access to the franchise by a bureaucratic opposition that simply does not make sense. Without it, millions of Americans will remain voteless, and voteless people are powerless people.

Like the Voting Rights Act, a thirty-year old success story itself, this new law has clearly begun to eclipse the barriers and the lingering legacy of voting booth exclusion that have had a ''chilling'' effect on the political participation of African-Americans and other ethnic minorities in this country.

The motor-voter law is already a striking success in some states where discriminatory and unfair registration laws and procedures once prevailed. In states like Texas, Florida, and Georgia—where the history of voting discrimination has been most egregious—more than 200,000 previously unregistered voters have gained new opportunities to register to vote, at motor vehicle departments, public assistance offices, mental health and disability agencies, and by mail.

Instead of mouthing platitudes about democracy, we in this body ought to feel more compelled to make democracy a reality. But the truth is, until every American citizen has one-hundred percent, undeniable access to the ballot box, Democracy will be little more than an illusion. Democracy, it is said, is a ''collectivity'' of individuals. But there can be no democracy when millions of Americans remain shut out of the Democratic process.

Mr. Speaker, making voting more accessible to the public is not a partisan issue. In fact, Mr. GINGRICH himself has said that ''it is simply good public policy.''

Voting is the linchpin of American Democracy. Registering to vote should be as convenient as applying for a library card, or filling out a tax return. The costs of the motor-voter law are minimal, especially when considering the payoff in increased citizen participation.

Even my own home state of Michigan is now resisting this great effort to eliminate the final barriers to full enfranchisement, and of this I am ashamed. Mr. Speaker, it is a national disgrace if America is permitted to return to its darkest period, when millions of citizens were systematically denied equal access to the franchise, and ultimately their power to govern. It is a disgrace that this country simply cannot afford.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LEWIS], for reserving this Special Order. I am pleased to join him for a discussion of the motor-voter law. The National Voter Registration Act was signed into law by President Clinton on May 20, 1993. The law requires motor vehicle bureaus, welfare offices and other public agencies to offer voter registration services. Today, we gather to mark the two year anniversary of this successful legislative initiative.

The motor-voter law took effect on January 1, 1995. It is noted that during the months of January and February alone, more than 630,000 citizens across the country registered to vote. Analysts predict that next year, as many as 20 million Americans will be added to the ranks of the voting population. Not since the Voting Rights Act of 1965, which removed obstacles that had kept many African-Americans from the voting booth, have so many new voters registered to vote.

Mr. Speaker, the road to passage of national voter registration laws has not been an easy one. Many in this Chamber will recall that efforts to establish a national voter registration system followed closely on the heels of the passage of the Voting Rights Act of 1965. During the 1970's, a substantial effort was made to implement a national voter ''postcard'' or mail registration system. Efforts also focused on the passage of a national voter registration standard that would have allowed citizens to register to vote on election day. Both measures failed to be enacted by both the House and Senate.

During the 1980's, we celebrated the enactment of several voter registration measures. In 1984, Congress passed the Voting Accessibility for the Elderly and Handicapped Act. The Act established national requirements for making polling places more accessible to the elderly and the handicapped, and provided greater access to absentee ballots for these individuals. The Uniform and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act required States to permit absentee uniformed service personnel and overseas voters to use absentee registration procedures, and to vote by absentee ballot in federal elections.

Mr. Speaker, the goal of the National Voter Registration Act is to simplify voter registration, thereby encouraging citizens to participate in the election process. In addition to making it easier for individuals to register to vote, the Act also provides more than adequate measures to prevent voter fraud by making violations of the Act a federal offense. Further, the cost that states bear to implement the motor-voter law has proven to be minimal.

As we celebrate the success of the motor-voter law, we must ensure that this important Act is not repealed. We must also ensure that all states are in compliance with the motor-voter law. In the United States, 80 percent of our nation's youth, those 18 or 19 years of age, apply for driver's licenses. Yet, fewer than 40 percent of this age population is registered to vote. We have a responsibility to make certain that all Americans are participants in the electoral process. The motor-voter law represents an important step in achieving this objective.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join Congressman LEWIS for this special order. He has played a major role in securing and protecting the voting rights of minority citizens and others. I applaud his leadership, and I offer my full support of his efforts.

IN REMEMBRANCE OF APHIS EMPLOYEES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, we stand here today in memory of the seven employees of the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, those that were tragically murdered in the bomb blast at the A.P. Murrah Federal Building in Oklahoma City on April 19, 1995. The explosion murdered scores of innocent children and adults, injured hundreds, shattered innumerable lives, and shook the soul of the Nation. We remember them all.

But today we mention the 15 employees stationed in the building at the time of the explosion. By stroke of providence, five of the employees were not in the building at the time. Three of the employees left the building

alive. The remaining seven were killed in the explosion.

Mr. Speaker, I personally feel some kinship with these APHIS employees. My father in his late years worked for APHIS. He was a proud, dedicated, loyal employee, as were these who worked in that building and the seven that we lost.

Today the Department of Agriculture held a day of remembrance to honor the victims and survivors, continuing the tradition of planting trees to honor those we have lost. These employees were dedicated workers who have left a legacy of service to all citizens. They have one thing in common: They died serving their country.

As APHIS employees, these men and women were on the front lines working in the heartland of America to improve agriculture productivity and to protect our public health. These employees were beloved by families and friends and cannot be replaced. I know all of us here today and people throughout the country and the world embrace their families and friends in their sorrow and join me in paying tribute to them.

I hope that somehow the American people might learn and grow closer from this tragic incident. What we must learn is that the agenda of a small minority of anti-government terrorists is based on extremism and hatred and has no place in America. We must also learn respect for our Federal workers who are trying hard every day to make this government work.

On April 22, the Washington Post printed an editorial entitled ''Federal Employees.'' I will include that for the RECORD, Mr. Speaker.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Some of them are still buried in the rubble. Some are hospitalized, perhaps broken in body, if not in spirit, for the rest of their lives. Others will be memorialized by the nation tomorrow. They are part of the group of an estimated 550 women and men who earned their living in that federal building in Oklahoma City. They are federal workers.

The next time you are tempted to go off on the federal work force, as if those employed inside federal office buildings constitute nothing more than a financial threat to the Republic, think of that gutted facility in Oklahoma City. But don't stop there.

Suspects in this country's worst bombing in 70 years are now in custody. Credit a swiftly launched, massive round-the-clock investigation conducted by thousands of law-enforcement agents and officers around the country—yet more federal government workers of that nameless, faceless, much-denounced variety. When you are tempted to indulge in easy, all-purpose, indiscriminate rhetoric about slow, cumbersome and complacent federal bureaucrats caught up in an entitlement mentality, think of the men and women in law-enforcement agencies such as the FBI, Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms and Secret Service who dropped everything to be part of the manhunt. They, too, like their colleagues who were at work in the devastated Oklahoma City building, are federal workers.

The Oklahoma City bombing, as tragic as it is, is not the first time federal employees have found themselves putting so much on the line by mere reason of their association with the U.S. government. Far away from the national spotlight, in places as remote as Khartoum and Karachi, federal workers on the front lines have paid the ultimate sacrifice in service of their country. Women and men on the federal payroll in those locations bear the title of Foreign Service officer, or AID worker, or U.S. Embassy staff. But they pursue the same basic mission that employees of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, Social Security, the Food and Drug and the General Services administrations and other federal agencies in Oklahoma City are also about: They are trying to make their government work. And most work long and hard to make that happen.

So the next time you feel yourself about to deliver categorical thoughts about federal workers not having to work for a bottom line and getting caught up in process rather than results and all the other easy words of generalized contempt that serve to undermine respect for the work these famously ''faceless'' workers actually perform, consider the possibility that they are good people who not only work hard but also are committed to the work they perform in our behalf. That is why so many of them were where they were when evil visited them Wednesday morning in Oklahoma City. It's worth remembering.

Mr. Speaker, what brought us closer was that these are good people, who not only work hard, but also are committed to the work they perform in our behalf. That is why so many of them worked where they work when evil visited them that Wednesday morning in Oklahoma City.

It is worth remembering. I hope in tribute to them, all of us, the Nation, have respect, the proper admiration for those. I know it is very easy to say bureaucrat or say Federal employee sometimes in a negative, derogatory way. But, Mr. Speaker, these seven died serving their country and serving us.

I yield to my distinguished colleague from Oklahoma who represents that district.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday morning, April 19, at 2 minutes after 9 o'clock, America's heartland lost its innocence. The bombing of the Alfred P. Murrah Building in downtown Oklahoma City was a cowardly act of tragic proportions, with no justification. I, like you and the Nation as a whole, will never forget the scene or the devastation, the death, the suffering, and, most of all, the innocence of the victims.

I cannot begin to express the heartbreak and sense of helplessness one feels when faced with such a gruesome scene. As each day has passed since this crime, the spirit, courage, resourcefulness that exemplifies our great Nation has been displayed. Our outrage, while still in mind, has been superseded by charity, kindness, prayer and healing.

This evening, I join with heavy heart the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, Mr. ROBERTS, and the equally distinguished ranking member of the committee, Mr. DE LA GARZA, to memorialize the employees of the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service who lost their lives in this bombing. While the building resided in my district, a number of these good folks were my constituents.

With that, I would like to thank my colleagues for organizing this special order this evening.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my distinguished colleague, the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, Mr. ROBERTS.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to, as has been said, honor the memory of the men and women and children who lost their lives in the Oklahoma City bombing. Among killed, as has been said, were the seven employees of the Department of Agriculture agency called the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service. It is commonly known by its acronym as APHIS. As chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, along with the committee's distinguished ranking member, Mr. DE LA GARZA and the gentleman from Oklahoma, Mr. LUCAS, and other members of the committee and Members of the Oklahoma delegation, we gather here this evening to pay a special tribute to these seven employees and the families and friends that they leave behind.

Mr. Speaker, the decision to take this special order came from many members of the House Committee on Agriculture who wanted to pay their respects. As chairman of the committee, I wish to pay, however, a special tribute to a long-time employee of the Department of Agriculture, Mr. Carl Barnes, who was the Personnel Director for the department under Secretary of Agriculture Mr. Orville Freeman. Mr. Barnes served under several Presidents and continues to be an example and champion of public service. He also just happens to be a good neighbor and brought to my attention the article by Steve Twomey in the Washington Post entitled ''They walk, they talk, and they bleed.'' Mr. Twomey wrote his column following the tragedy in Oklahoma City, and I think it is fitting and appropriate that this article be brought to the attention of our colleagues and to everyone concerned, as it has been all too easy when people are unhappy with the way that our government works, or does not work, that we point a finger of blame at the hard working men and women who makeup our Federal work force.

Excerpts from his article include, ''To get there, you march down a long, gloomy, marble corridor, devoid of human touches. Doors slip by at an exact spacing and interval. Nothing distinguishes one office from the next, except small signs identifying the occupants and their titles. Yes, this fits. Cold is how the bureaucracy is supposed to look. It is tempting to imagine Federal gnomes in here dreaming up costly regulations, wasting forms in triplicate, and funding cost-plus contracts with your money, because that is what you imagine the Federal workers do. Your escort, and yes, while security is tight, walks you to room 312–

E, which is to say the third floor east of the administration building, the United States Department of Agriculture. It is an older but attractive building along the Mall that exudes government formality right down to the flower beds on Jefferson Drive.

What a sign hanging outside 312E: Administrator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service. You think it even sounds make-work. ''60 Minutes'' would love this office, which, naturally, has a government acronym, APHIS, pronounced A-fus.

You enter, and from an inner room emerges not a bureaucrat, not a GS-level, not an anonymous cog in the federal machine, but a human, who has a name and, at the moment, feelings so overwhelming you hesitate to ask about them.

Lonnie King, in dark suit and white shirt, a man of average build with graying hair but a youthful and pleasant face, has served APHIS for 17 of his 51 years, rising to acting administrator.

''Here's a ribbon,'' he says, ''from Oklahoma City.''

He tosses a purple one on the table in front of you. He carried it home Sunday, after the memorial service. Does the public know what APHIS does? What the seven did?

''No,'' King says. ''No.''

The 6,500 people who work for him can be found in every state and even overseas. The federal budget says they ''protect the animal and plant resources of the nation from destructive pests and diseases.'' They help farmers, monitor imports, do research. What that means for you is better, more abundant and cheaper food on the table, be it at home or in a restaurant. Before that Wednesday, King certainly knew that the reputation of The Federal Employee wasn't what it used to be.

''We're not immune to the press and the TV,'' he says. Comedians, journalists and talk-show hosts have made mincemeat of the type, calling them wasteful, incompetent, dangerous. King took the contempt personally, because it clashed with his view, which was that he was surrounded by people who cared, who showed up every day, not for the paycheck, not to waste, but to serve.

''Who thinks of us in those terms?'' he says, ''Is it that bad, that we're so hated? Could it happen here? Am I safe?''

In a way, the bombing also was an attack on this region, the capital region, on the 360,004 civilians here who do Uncle Sam's tasks. We often forget that they got those tasks from us, through Congress. It is we who have told them to provide clean air and water, stop the flow of drugs, help farmers, process Social Security checks, promote trade, protect workers and much more.

Do they perform flawlessly? Of course not. Who does?

The irony of the bombing, King says, is that the perpetrator benefited every day from what APHIS does, every time he ate. ''He was probably degrading the government with his mouth full,'' King says, ''and dumb enough not to understand.''

Yes, Linnie King is angry.

''I'm not blaming anybody,'' King says, ''but I hope people will stop and think and ask themselves about what's being said.''

He leaves you with this.

Monday morning, with seven of their colleagues still buried in the rubble, two of three APHIS workers who survived went back to work in temporary offices.

Mr. Speaker, today special ceremonies were held by the Department in behalf of the service deceased employees. In keeping with these ceremonies, it is our privilege to honor each individual with a brief tribute.

Olen Bloomer is survived by his adult daughters, Maureen Bloomer and Lucretia Bjorklund; his son, Lee Switzer; four grandchildren, Amelia, Heather, Jeff, and Sara; and one great granddaughter, Dillon Ann. His memory will be cherished by seven siblings—Ester Willis, Elwanda McComas, Merle Easter, Erdene Jones, Doyle Blommer, Dean Bloomer, and Dennis Blommer. He was preceded in death by his wife of 26 years, Norma Jean, who passed away in 1990.

Olen was born in Elk City, Oklahoma, in 1933, and spent his youth working on his father's cotton farm near the Beckham-Washita county line. A few years after graduating from Highway High School, Olen joined the U.S. Air Force, where he served in a number of locations, including Thailand. His work in the Air Force focused on purchasing and inventory management. He retired in 1974 after 20 years of service.

Olen went back to work for the Federal government in 1977, this time for APHIS. Olen began this second career at the screwworm rearing lab in Mission, Texas. He was subsequently reassigned to Salt Lake City, Utah, where he worked for 5 years as an administrative assistant. He was serving as the budget assistant for Oklahoma at the time of his death.

Olen labored to keep the agency's budget trim and in order and was admired by the staff he supported for his ability to stay cool under pressure and cut through the bureaucratic red tape when emergencies struck. He was always willing to help and volunteered ably at troubleshooting computer problems. His grandchildren called him ''Big Dad,'' not only out of deference to his 6-foot, 6-inch stature, but to distinguish him from their fathers. He was a true gentle giant and will be sorely missed by many.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. LUCAS. Jim Boles is survived by his loving wife of 12 years, Jennifer, his 8-year-old son, James Michael, and adult son, Stephen, and his family in Mississippi.

Jim was born in Quitman, Mississippi. He attended Lake High School in Lake, MS and graduated in 1964. He entered the U.S. Army in 1964 and served as the noncommissioned officer-in-charge of the 793rd military police battalion, a small M.P. detachment, in Bayreuth, West Germany. Upon leaving the U.S. Army in 1968, Jim managed an oil station and served as accounting clerk for State Beverage Company, both in Jackson, MS.

In 1970, Jim joined APHIS where he worked for the next 25 years. During his tenure with APHIS, he made many friends throughout the Department and lived in Mississippi, Florida, Maryland, and finally, Oklahoma. Jim met his wife Jennifer through APHIS.

As administrative officer for APHIS' Veterinary Services office in Oklahoma City, Jim helped develop new and better ways of conducting the various administrative functions Government agencies must carry out. His progressive ideas paved the way for innovative resource—and responsibility—sharing with sister branches that saved the Government both time and money.

Above and beyond his on-the-job duties, he will be remembered for encouraging, guiding and helping develop his coworkers' career goals. But his foremost concern was the well-being of his colleagues as people. He was careful to recognize fellow employees for their accomplishments and service to the community and agency. We all will miss his smile, sense of humor, and dedication.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, Margaret Louis Clark was known by her many friends and colleagues as Peggy. She is survived by her loving husband, David Spencer, three daughters, Rosslyn 16, Margaret Blayne 13, and Chelsea 6, her mother Mary Spurlin, and sister, Susan Winchester. Peggy was 42.

A native of Chichasha, OK, Peggy attended Star Spencer High School in Oklahoma City. Her academic achievements were all made at Oklahoma State University, where she earned a bachelor of science degree in agriculture in 1976, and a doctorate of veterinary medicine degree in 1978. After completing her studies, Peggy began veterinary private practice placing special emphasis on the equine industry.

In 1981, Peggy worked for the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture as a staff veterinarian and coordinated Federal/State disease control programs. In 1985, she moved over to the State of Oklahoma's Horse Racing Commission. As the official veterinarian, she performed pre- and post-race examinations. Peggy joined APHIS in 1994 as part of a Federal training program called the Public Veterinary Practice Career Program. Her assignment to the Oklahoma City office as a Veterinary medical officer was part of that developmental training.

Outside of the office, Peggy was very involved in the lives of her children

and was active in horse shows, livestock shows, and soccer. She was an active and popular member of the Oklahoma Veterinary Medical Association, and helped run her family's horse breeding operation. Peggy was appointed by the Governor to serve a 6-year term on the Oklahoma State Board of Veterinary Medical Examiners, where she served as secretary. Although she was the newest member of the Veterinary Service staff in Oklahoma City, Peggy's outgoing personality, willingness to help, and professional competence made her a most welcome addition.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished chairman of the committee.

Mr. ROBERTS. Richard Leroy Cummins' memory will be cherished by a large and loving family, including his wife of 30 years, Frances; his daughters, Courtney and Nikki; his son, Kraig; grandsons Chayse and Austin; his mother, Christine; his two brothers, Wall, of Tucson, AZ, and Frank of Ruidosa, NM; and many friends and coworkers.

Dick was born in Douglas, AZ, in 1940. He spent his youth in and around Douglas and graduated from Douglas High School in 1957. He then attended Arizona State University in Tempe, AZ, where he pursued studies in business administration.

Dick's notable career as a public servant began with the U.S. Air Force in 1959, where he worked in aircraft maintenance in Colorado and Oklahoma for 4 years. Upon leaving the Air Force, he worked for the Southern Pacific Railroad for 2 years.

In 1965, Dick joined the U.S. Department of Agriculture, where his professional contributions were welcomed for 30 years. He first worked with the Agricultural Research Service on the screwworm eradication program in Douglas, AZ. In 1980, he moved to Henryetta, OK, and become Animal Health Technician. A short time later he moved to Durant, OK, where he served in the same capacity. Dick was promoted to investigator in 1987 and reassigned to Oklahoma City to work with the Regulatory Enforcement and Animal Care staff. In this position, Dick was responsible for ensuring that animal breeders, dealers, and exhibitors comply with the standards of humane care and treatment prescribed in the Animal Welfare Act. Dick moved again to Mustang, OK, where he continued to work as an investigator working out of his home. He was a senior investigator at the time of his death.

Dick received well-deserved recognition in 1990 for his work on the Midwest Stolen Dog Task Force. His diligence helped curb the theft of pets for sale to research institutions. Dick was a devoted family man, animal lover and advocated human treatment of all living things.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. LUCAS].

Mr. LUCAS. Known by her many admiring friends and relatives as Adele, Doris Adele Higgenbottom is survived by her loving husband, David; his children, Kelly and Van; her mother, Melanie; and the Maddox family. She was 44.

Adele was born in Pecos, TX, and graduated from Pecos High School in 1968. Several years later, Adele resumed her studies at the University of Oklahoma in Norman, OK, where she earned a bachelor of arts degree in English in 1982.

Adele began her Federal career with APHIS as a clerk/typist in Oklahoma City in 1978. A few years later, she transferred to the Federal Aviation Administration where she served as a purchasing agent. In 1980, she resigned from the FAA and went to San Antonio, TX, to spend a few months with her family. While there, she worked as an advertising salesperson for the San Antonio Express and News. She rejoined APHIS in Oklahoma City in late 1980 as she mastered the often complicating purchasing regulations.

Adele was popular in the Oklahoma City office, as much for her positive outlook as her animated personality. Adele served as manager of the Federal Women's Program and was an ardent supporter of equality and women's rights. Adele and her husband, David, met in 1989 through David's work with the State Department of Agriculture.

Adele was heard to say she was happy to be married to someone with whom she could share so much of her professional life and who cared about the same people and issues she did. David and Adele considered themselves a happy and compatible team whose personalities and interests complemented each other well.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Carole Sue Khalil is survived by her daughter, Heather, and many loving relatives and friends. She was 50.

Carole was born in Shattuck, OK, and attended Laverne High School in Laverne, OK. She graduated in 1962. Following graduation, she attended the Draughons School of Business in Oklahoma City for 1 year where she completed an executive secretarial course. Already she had big plans to serve her country and the civic good as a public servant.

Carole began a lifelong commitment to the U.S. Government in 1964 when she took the first of several temporary positions in the clerical field with the Internal Revenue Service in Oklahoma City. Her career with the U.S. Department of Agriculture began with the Agriculture Research Service's Animal Health Division in 1967. In this position, which was based in Oklahoma City, Carole provided clerical support to a variety of animal disease eradication programs.

Carole was promoted to export document examiner in 1992. In this position, she provided critical review of documents used to clarify the health of all animals exported from Oklahoma to other countries. Her eye for detail and ability to catch even minute errors were among the reasons she was a valuable contributor to the staff.

Carole also took care of many routine personnel functions, such as time and attendance reports, training nominations, personnel reports and benefit actions. She was an able and dedicated employee whose contributions were appreciated by everyone with whom she worked.

□ 2045

I yield to my chairman, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS].

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, Rheta Long is survived by a large and loving family, including her daughter, Valerie Tramel; son, John; sisters, Wilda York and Leona Thompson; and grandsons, Kenneth and Christopher Tramel, and Nicholas Long. Rheta was preceded in death by her husband of 11 years, Thomas; her brothers Earl and Andrew Dean Bender; father, Andrew Bender; and grandson, John Thomas. Rheta was 60.

Rheta was born in Guymon, OK. She attended Guymon High School and graduated in 1952. Afterwards, she attended Panhandle State College and Phillips University to study education. She earned a bachelor of science degree in education in 1955.

Rheta was married in the summer of 1955 and dedicated herself to her family and church. She was an active volunteer with the Boy Scouts and Girl Scouts of America. In 1968, Rheta began teaching mathematics in Guymon and found the experience rewarding. She said it was a pleasure to show children that school and learning could be fun.

Rheta began her 20-year Federal career in 1974 as a military personnel clerk with the U.S. Army. In 1978, Rheta transferred to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service in Guymon, OK, to take a clerical position. Rheta came to APHIS in Oklahoma City in October 1982, where she served as a program clerk. She handled workers' compensation claims, and was the final authority on payment eligibility for indemnity claims. She was very active in the Federal Employees Women's Group and Equal Employment Opportunities Committees. Rheta had a vision disability and she served as the Persons with Disabilities Special Emphasis Program Manager as a means of helping educate people about the challenges of working with a physical handicap.

Rheta was active with the Christian Women's Foundation and looked forward to the Jewel Box Theater's seasonal plays. A devoted grandmother, Rheta was very proud of her grandchildren and kept snapshots of them at her desk. Her dedication, cheerful attitude, and many contributions to the effectiveness of the office helped many of her coworkers in their time of need. She will be greatly missed by all.

Mr. Speaker, the members of the Committee on Agriculture, the chair of

the Committee on Agriculture, the distinguished chairman emeritus of the Committee on Agriculture, and the gentleman from Oklahoma, [Mr. LUCAS], share in the sense of personal loss and share in the sense of personal pride regarding the contribution of these employees. Perhaps an appropriate closing is this from Helen Steiner Rice.

When I must leave you for a little while,
Please go on bravely with a gallant smile
And for my sake and in my name,
Live on and do all things the same—
Spend not your life in empty days,
But fill each waking hour in useful ways—
Reach out your hand in comfort and cheer,
And I in turn will comfort you and hold you near.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Texas for taking this special time.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. I thank my distinguished colleague.

Mr. Speaker, if I might add a personal note, we notice that Mr. Bloomer served at the screwworm eradication plant in Mission, TX, the years when my father worked there, so I feel certain that they knew each other in those days and they have already found each other up there and they are talking about the good old days at the plant in Mission.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my two colleagues. The seven that we lost not only belonged to APHIS, to USDA, they belonged to our Nation and they belong now to all of us. May they rest in peace.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of my special order this evening.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NETHERCUTT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. HANSEN (at the request of Mr. ARMEY), for today and the balance of the week, on account of official business relating to base closings.

Mr. MCNULTY (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today after 2 p.m., on account of personal business.

Mr. KLECZKA (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for the week of May 22, on account of medical reasons.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. LOFGREN) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. OWENS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DOGGETT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. EHRLICH) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, today and on May 25.

Mr. EHLERS, for 5 minutes, today and on May 25.

Mr. BRYANT of Tennessee, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BILBRAY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KINGSTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. LOFGREN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FOGLIETTA.

Mr. STARK.

Mr. STOKES.

Mr. VISCLOSKY.

Mr. SCHUMER.

Mr. MENENDEZ.

Mr. MORAN.

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin.

Mr. MINETA.

Mr. HOYER in two instances.

Mr. RICHARDSON in four instances.

Mr. FORD.

Mr. ENGEL.

Mrs. KENNELLY.

Mr. CLAY.

Mr. RUSH.

Mr. TUCKER.

Mr. BONIOR in two instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. EHRLICH) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. DAVIS.

Mr. RIGGS.

Mr. PACKARD.

Mr. FORBES in two instances.

Mr. SMITH of Washington.

Mrs. ROUKEMA.

Mr. LEWIS of California.

Mr. LIGHTFOOT.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina.

Mr. SOLOMON.

Mr. CHAMBLISS.

Mr. TALENT.

Mr. SHADEGG.

Mr. MCCOLLUM.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DE LA GARZA) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. GILMAN.

Mr. SHAW.

Mr. WELLER.

Mr. BARCIA.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1421. An Act to provide that references in the statutes of the United States to any committee or officer of the House of Representatives the name or jurisdiction of which was changed as part of the reorganization of the House of Representatives at the beginning of the One Hundred Fourth Congress shall be treated as referring to the currently applicable committee or officer of the House of Representatives.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 1421. An act to provide that references in the statutes of the United States to any committee or officer of the House of Representatives the name or jurisdiction of which was changed as part of the reorganization of the House of Representatives at the beginning of the One Hundred Fourth Congress shall be treated as referring to the currently applicable committee or officer of the House of Representatives.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 51 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until Thursday, May 25, 1995, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

909. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the defense environmental quality program annual report to Congress for fiscal year 1994, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2706(b)(1); to the Committee on National Security.

910. A communication the President of the United States, transmitting his follow-up report on the deployment of United States combat-equipped aircraft to support NATO's enforcement of the no-fly zone in Bosnia and Herzegovina (H. Doc. No. 104–79); to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LEVIN (for himself and Mr. HOUGHTON):

H.R. 1690. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to simplify certain rules relating to the taxation of U.S. business operating abroad, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LAZIO of New York:

H.R. 1691. A bill to provide for innovative approaches for homeownership opportunity and provide for the temporary extension of

the rural rental housing program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

By Mr. CLINGER:

H.R. 1692. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to increase the limitation amount applicable to contributions to candidates in Federal elections by individuals and to decrease the limitation amount applicable to contributions to such candidates by nonparty multicandidate political committees; to the Committee on House Oversight.

H.R. 1693. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to prohibit congressional leadership committees; to the Committee on House Oversight.

H.R. 1694. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to provide for a voluntary limitation on contributions from other than individual district residents in House of Representatives elections; to the Committee on House Oversight.

H.R. 1695. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for an income tax credit for in-State contributions to congressional candidates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H.R. 1696. A bill to authorize the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to exempt certain small landfills from the ground water monitoring requirements contained in landfill regulations promulgated by the Agency; to the Committee on Commerce.

H.R. 1697. A bill to provide for the continuation of certain commercial activities at the Red's Horse Ranch area of the Eagle Cap Wilderness, Wallowa and Whitman National Forests, OR; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. LIGHTFOOT (for himself, Mr. HOYER, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. VISCLOSKY, and Mr. HORN):

H.R. 1698. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to require electronic funds transfer for all Federal payments by 2001 to promote efficiency and economy in the disbursement of Federal funds and to eliminate crime incident to the issuance of Treasury checks; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

By Mr. MCCOLLUM:

H.R. 1699. A bill to amend the Community Reinvestment Act of 1977, the Equal Credit Opportunity Act, and the Fair Housing Act to improve the administration of such acts, to prohibit redlining in connection with the provision of credit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. NADLER (for himself, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mrs. MALONEY, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. TORRES, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. COYNE, and Mr. SABO):

H.R. 1700. A bill to make an exception to the United States embargo on trade with Cuba for the export of medicines or medical supplies, instruments, or equipment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. ROEMER (for himself, Mr. ZIMMER, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. KLECZKA, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. YATES, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. UPTON, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. DANNER, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. DEFAZIO):

H.R. 1701. A bill to cancel the space station project; to the Committee on Science.

By Mr. SERRANO:

H.R. 1702. A bill to protect the constitutional right to travel to foreign countries; to the Committee on International Relations.

H.R. 1703. A bill to allow for news bureau exchanges between the United States and Cuba; to the Committee on International Relations.

H.R. 1704. A bill to reinstate the authorization of cash remittances to family members in Cuba under the Cuban Assets Control Regulations; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mrs. SMITH of Washington (for herself and Mr. TATE):

H.R. 1705. A bill to amend the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act to require public notice and local hearings before property is made available under that act for use to assist the homeless, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

By Mr. SOLOMON:

H.R. 1706. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish Federal standards to ensure quality assurance of drug testing programs for private employers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. STARK (for himself, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. COYNE, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. OLVER, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. RANGEL, and Ms. WOOLSEY):

H.R. 1707. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure access to services and prevent fraud and abuse for enrollees of health maintenance organizations under the Medicare Program, to amend standards for Medicare supplemental policies, to modify the Medicare Select Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WELLER (for himself, Mr. METCALF, Mr. BARR, Mr. FOX, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. EHRLICH, Mr. CHRYSLER, Mr. NEY, Mr. HEINEMAN, Mr. BONO, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. TATE, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. FORBES, Mr. SALMON, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. FRISA, Mr. BURR, Mr. WAMP, and Mr. BRYANT of Tennessee):

H.R. 1708. A bill to establish the Federal Mortgage Insurance Corporation as a wholly owned Government corporation to provide full mortgage insurance and provide for the development of credit enhancement products for mortgages for single family homes of low- and moderate-income homebuyers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

By Ms. DANNER:

H.J. Res. 92. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to limit the terms of office for Representatives and Senators in Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 65: Mr. HINCHEY.

H.R. 103: Mr. ENGEL and Mrs. MORELLA.

H.R. 104: Mr. SOUDER.

H.R. 109: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota and Mr. POMBO.

H.R. 127: Mr. KILDEE, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. GONZALES, Mr. BARCIA of Michigan, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. SABO.

H.R. 303: Mr. CALLAHAN.

H.R. 390: Mr. LAUGHLIN.

H.R. 467: Mr. EVANS and Mr. SOLOMON.

H.R. 468: Mr. PETERSON of Florida, Mr. HEFNER, and Mr. RIGGS.

H.R. 488: Mr. LUTHER.

H.R. 500: Mr. MCCRERY.

H.R. 540: Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. NADLER, Mr. TORRES, and Mr. BONIOR.

H.R. 625: Mr. YOUNG of Florida and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 733: Mr. BARR and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 734: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 747: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania and Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.

H.R. 755: Mr. BROWN of Ohio.

H.R. 784: Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas and Mr. BONO.

H.R. 789: Mr. HASTERT.

H.R. 801: Mr. DOYLE, Mr. RUSH, Mr. FOX, and Mr. SOLOMON.

H.R. 863: Mr. ROSE.

H.R. 868: Mr. CANADY.

H.R. 873: Mr. BATEMAN and Mr. RIGGS.

H.R. 1023: Mr. SABO, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. GEKAS.

H.R. 1037: Mr. PAYNE of Virginia.

H.R. 1044: Mr. SOLOMON.

H.R. 1090: Ms. RIVERS and Mr. PASTOR.

H.R. 1143: Mr. RIGGS.

H.R. 1144: Mr. RIGGS.

H.R. 1145: Mr. RIGGS.

H.R. 1210: Mr. COSTELLO.

H.R. 1222: Mr. GOSS, Mr. OLVER, Mr. CANADY, Mr. SKAGGS, and Mr. LOBIONDO.

H.R. 1233: Mr. SCOTT, Mr. BORSKI, Mrs. LOWEY, and Mr. FILNER.

H.R. 1235: Mr. LUTHER.

H.R. 1242: Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, and Mr. BUYER.

H.R. 1264: Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. HINCHEY, and Mr. GUTIERREZ.

H.R. 1297: Mr. THOMPSON.

H.R. 1298: Mr. BROWN of California.

H.R. 1302: Mr. BORSKI.

H.R. 1352: Mr. BLILEY, Mr. PETERSON of Florida, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. FAZIO of California, and Mr. SPRATT.

H.R. 1402: Mr. HINCHEY and Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 1431: Mr. BAKER of Louisiana.

H.R. 1442: Mr. CONDIT and Mr. PAYNE of Virginia.

H.R. 1450: Mr. LUTHER and Mr. SABO.

H.R. 1487: Mr. BACHUS and Mr. HAYWORTH.

H.R. 1490: Mr. EVANS, Mr. UNDERWOOD, and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 1491: Mr. ORTON.

H.R. 1493: Mr. PACKARD, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. THOMPSON, and Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey.

H.R. 1500: Mrs. KELLY, Mr. STOKES, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, and Mr. YATES.

H.R. 1510: Mr. LUTHER.

H.R. 1532: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas and Mr. FROST.

H.R. 1533: Mrs. KELLY and Mr. BAKER of Louisiana.

H.R. 1552: Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. CRANE, Ms. MCCARTHY, Mr. JONES, Mr. WELLER, Mr. WOLF, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. TALENT, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. WISE, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. KLUG, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. LEACH, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 1583: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H.R. 1588: Mr. HOSTETTLER.

H.R. 1594: Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina and Mr. HEFLEY.

H.R. 1595: Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. BUNN of Oregon, Ms. PRYCE, Mr. FOX, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. ANDREWS, and Mr. COBLE.

H.R. 1611: Mr. NEY.

H.R. 1662: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, and Mr. MOLLOHAN.

H. Con. Res. 42: Mr. MORAN and Mr. DOOLITTLE.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 6 of rule XXIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 1561

OFFERED BY: MR. ANDREWS

AMENDMENT NO. 79: Add the following at the end of Division A:

TITLE VI—OVERSEAS PRIVATE INVESTMENT CORPORATION

SEC. 601. ABOLITION OF OVERSEAS PRIVATE INVESTMENT CORPORATION.

(a) ABOLITION.—The Overseas Private Investment Corporation is abolished, effective October 1, 1995.

(b) ADMINISTRATION OF EXISTING OBLIGATIONS.—The Secretary of State shall carry out the functions performed on September 30, 1995, by the Overseas Private Investment Corporation only for purposes of administering insurance, reinsurance, financing, and other contracts or agreements issued or entered into by the Corporation that are effective on October 1, 1995. Such functions shall terminate when all such insurance, reinsurance, financing, and other contracts or agreements expire.

(c) TERMINATION OF PROVISIONS.—Title IV of chapter 2 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2191 and following) shall cease to be effective on October 1, 1995, except that such title shall continue in effect with respect to the functions performed by the Secretary of State under subsection (b).

(d) TERMINATION OF AFFAIRS.—The Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall take the necessary steps to terminate the affairs of the Overseas Private Investment Corporation.

H.R. 1561

OFFERED BY: MR. BILBRAY

AMENDMENT NO. 80: Page 100, line 10, strike ''$12,472,000'' and insert ''$21,958,000''.

At the end of the bill, add the following:

DIVISION D—ADDITIONAL PROVISIONS

TITLE XLI—FOREIGN BUILDINGS

SEC. 4001. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Notwithstanding section 2101(a)(4), there are authorized to be appropriated for ''Acquisition and Maintenance of Buildings Abroad'', $367,274,000 for the fiscal year 1997.

H.R. 1561

OFFERED BY: MR. BURTON OF INDIANA

AMENDMENT NO. 81: In paragraph (1) of section 3309(b) (relating to the future of the United States military presence in Panama)—

(1) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), strike ''a new base rights'' and insert ''an''; and

(2) strike subparagraph (B) and insert the following new subparagraph:

(B) to ensure that the United States will be able to act after December 31, 1999, to maintain the security of the Panama Canal and guarantee its regular operation; and

H.R. 1561

OFFERED BY: MR. BURTON

AMENDMENT NO. 82: In paragraph (1) of section 3309(b) (relating to the future of the United States military presence in Panama)—

(1) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), strike ''a new base rights'' and insert ''an''; and

(2) strike subparagraph (B) and insert the following new subparagraph:

(B) to ensure that the United States will be able to act after December 31, 1999, to maintain the security of the Panama Canal and guarantee its regular operation, consistent with the Panama Canal Treaty, the Treaty Concerning the Permanent Neutrality and Operation of the Panama Canal, and the resolutions of ratification thereto; and

H.R. 1561

OFFERED BY: MR. CHABOT

AMENDMENT NO. 83: At the end of the bill, add the following:

DIVISION D—ADDITIONAL PROVISIONS

TITLE XLI—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 4101. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) FOREIGN MILITARY FINANCING PROGRAM.—Notwithstanding section 3101 of this Act, there are authorized to be appropriated for grant assistance under section 23 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2763) and for the subsidy cost, as defined in section 502(5) of the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990, of direct loans under such section—

(1) $3,274,440,000 for fiscal year 1996; and

(2) $3,216,020,000 for fiscal year 1997.

(b) ECONOMIC SUPPORT ASSISTANCE.—Notwithstanding section 3201 of this Act, section 532(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2346a(a)) is amended to read as follows:

''(a) There are authorized to be appropriated to the President to carry out the purposes of this chapter $2,346,378,000 for fiscal year 1996 and $2,238,478,000 for fiscal year 1997.''.

(c) DEVELOPMENT FUND FOR AFRICA.—Notwithstanding paragraph (2) of section 3221(a) of this Act, there are authorized to be appropriated $649,214,000 for fiscal year 1996 and $634,214,000 for fiscal year 1997 to carry out chapter 10 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2293 et seq.).

H.R. 1561

OFFERED BY: MR. FILNER

AMENDMENT NO. 84: In section 2103(1)(A), strike ''$12,472,000'' and insert ''$19,372,000''.

In section 2103(4), strike ''$13,202,000'' and insert ''$6,302,000''.

H.R. 1561

OFFERED BY: MR. GILMAN

AMENDMENT NO. 85: Strike subsection 505(e) and insert the following:

''Section 505(e) AUTHORITY SUBJECT TO EXPRESS APPROPRIATION. The authority to make voluntary separation incentive payments which is provided under this section shall be effective for any fiscal year only to the extent or in such amounts as provided in advance for that express purpose in appropriation Act.''

H.R. 1561

OFFERED BY: MR. GILMAN

AMENDMENT NO. 86: After section 510, insert the following new section:

SEC. 511. TRANSFER OF FUNCTION.

Any determination as to whether a transfer of function, carried out under this Act, constitutes a transfer of function for purposes of subchapter I of chapter 35 of title 5, United States Code, shall be made without regard to whether or not the function involved is identical to functions already being performed by the receiving agency.

H.R. 1561

OFFERED BY: MR. HAMILTON

AMENDMENT NO. 87: On page 286 after line 19, amend the subsection ''(e)'' which would be added to Section 222 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, by adding at the end a new sentence as follows:

''The provisions of this subsection shall not apply to guaranties which have been issued for the benefit of the Republic of South Africa.''

H.R. 1561

OFFERED BY: MR. HAMILTON

AMENDMENT NO. 88: At the end of the bill add the following new chapter:

CHAPTER XXXVI—ADDITIONAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 3601. ADDITIONAL AUTHORIZATIONS.

(a) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, except for sections 2101(a)(3), 2101(a)(5), 2101(a)(6), 2102(e)(1), 2104(a), 2106(2), 2106(3)(B), 2106(3)(C), 2106(3)(D), 2106(3)(E), 2106(6), 2106(7), 3141, 3151, 3161, the following amounts are authorized to be appropriated for the specified programs and activities:

(1) $1,748,438,000 for each of the fiscal years 1996 and 1997 for ''Diplomatic and Consular Programs'' of the Department of State.

(2) $372,480,000 for each of the fiscal years 1996 and 1997 for ''Salaries and Expenses'' of the Department of State.

(3) $421,760,000 for each of the fiscal years 1996 and 1997 ''Acquisition and Maintenance of Buildings Abroad''.

(4) $24,250,000 for each of the fiscal years 1996 and 1997 for ''Office of the Inspector General'' of the Department of State.

(5) $15,465,000 for each of the fiscal years 1996 and 1997 for ''Payment to the American Institute in Taiwan''.

(6) $8,579,000 for each of the fiscal years 1996 and 1997 for ''protection of Foreign Missions and Officials''.

(7) $934,057,000 for each of the fiscal years 1996 and 1997 for ''Contributions to International Organizations''.

(8) $425,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1996 and 1997 for ''Voluntary Contributions to International Organizations''.

(9) $533,304,000 for each of the fiscal years 1996 and 1997 for ''Contributions for International Peacekeeping Activities''.

(10) $100,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1996 and 1997 for the Department of State to carry out section 551 of Public Law 87–195.

(11) $13,858,000 for each of the fiscal years 1996 and 1997 for ''International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico; Salaries and Expenses''.

(12) $10,393,000 for each of the fiscal years 1996 and 1997 for ''International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico; Construction''.

(13) $740,000 for each of the fiscal years 1996 and 1997 for ''International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Canada''.

(14) $3,550,000 for each of the fiscal years 1996 and 1997 for ''International Joint Commission''.

(15) $14,669,000 for each of the fiscal years 1996 and 1997 for ''International Fisheries Commissions''.

(16) $15,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1996 and 1997 for ''Asia Foundation''.

(17) $496,002,000 for each of the fiscal years 1996 and 1997 for the purposes of section 2106(1) of this Act.

(18) $130,799,000 for each of the fiscal years 1996 and 1997 for the purposes of section 2106(3)(A) of this Act.

(19) $119,536,000 for each of the fiscal years 1996 and 1997 for the purposes of section 2106(3)(F) of this Act.

(20) $395,340,000 for each of the fiscal years 1996 and 1997 for the purposes of section 2106(5) of this Act.

(21) $85,919,000 for each of the fiscal years 1996 and 1997 for the purposes of section 2106(5) of this Act.

(22) $4,300,000 for each of the fiscal years 1996 and 1997 for the purposes of section 2106(8) of this Act.

(23) $20,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1996 and 1997 for the purposes of section 2106(9) of this Act.

(24) $76,300,000 for each of the fiscal years 1996 and 1997 to carry out the purposes of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act.

(25) $3,351,910,000 for grant assistance under section 23 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2763) and for the subsidy costs, as defined in section 502(5) of the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990, of direct loans under such section.

(26) $2,504,300,000 for each of the fiscal years 1996 and 1997 to carry out chapter 5 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.

(27) $1,300,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1996 and 1997 to carry out sections 103 through 106 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2151a through 2151d).

(28) $802,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1996 and 1997 to carry out programs under chapter 11 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2295 et seq.).

(29) $788,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1996 and 1997 to carry out programs under chapter 11 of Part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2295 et seq.).

(30) $480,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1996 and 1997 for economic assistance for Eastern Europe and the Baltic states under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2151 et seq.) and the Support for East European Democracy (SEED) Act of 1989.

(31) $31,760,000 for each of the fiscal years 1996 and 1997 to carry out section 401 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1969 (22 U.S.C. 290f).

(32) $17,405,000 for each of the fiscal years 1996 and 1997 to carry out the African Development Foundation Act (22 U.S.C. 290h et seq.).

(33) $529,027,000 for each of the fiscal years 1996 and 1997 for necessary operating expenses of the agency primarily responsible for administering part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (other than the office of the inspector general of such agency).

(34) $39,118,000 for each of the fiscal years 1996 and 1997 for necessary operating expenses of the office of the inspector general of the agency primarily responsible for administering part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.

(35) $50,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1996 and 1997 for the provision of agricultural commodities under title III of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (7 U.S.C. 1727 et seq.).''

(b) Nothing in this section shall be construed to affect sections 3103, 3104, 3202, and 3203 of this Act.

SEC. 3602. AGGREGATE AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the aggregate authorization of appropriations provided for in this Act shall not exceed $16,505,843,000 for fiscal years 1996 and $15,395,362,000 for fiscal year 1997.

H.R. 1561

OFFERED BY: MR. HOKE

AMENDMENT NO. 89: Page 289, add the following after line 26 and redesignate the succeeding chapter accordingly:

CHAPTER 8—OVERSEAS PRIVATE INVESTMENT CORPORATION

SEC. 3275. SUBSIDY COST OF OPIC PROGRAMS.

Section 235(a)(2) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2195(a)(2)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(C) The subsidy cost of the investment guaranties and direct loan programs under subsections (b) and (c) of section 234 may not exceed $79,000,000 for fiscal year 1996. The subsidy cost of such programs shall not be separately designated for the independent states of the former Soviet Union, or for any other particular country or group of countries, but shall be combined for all countries. The standards in effect on May 15, 1995, for determining for which projects the Corporation should provide guaranties and loans in countries other than the independent states of the former Soviet Union shall apply to projects in all countries. No net subsidy cost of the investment guaranties and direct loan programs may be incurred after September 30, 1998.''.

SEC. 3276. STUDY ON PRIVATIZATION.

(a) STUDY AND REPORT.—The Overseas Private Investment Corporation shall conduct a study on privatizing the activities of the Corporation and, not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, submit to the Congress a report on the study.

(b) CONTENTS OF REPORT.—In the report submitted under subsection (a), the Overseas Private Investment Corporation shall set forth the necessary steps to transfer to the private sector all the evidences of ownership of the Corporation with respect to the activities of the Corporation, whether through the sale of the Corporation's stock, contracts, leases, or other agreements or rights, or otherwise. The process of privatization described in the preceding sentence shall be prudent and orderly, shall maximize the value to United States taxpayers, shall proceed as quickly as market conditions permit, through a limited transition period, and shall be completed by a date certain. The report shall outline a privatization plan which, at a minimum—

(1) specifies the date certain for completion of the privatization process that begins not later than 1 year after the report is submitted;

(2) ensures that any transitional United States Government support before the completion of the privatization process involves no net cost to the United States Government;

(3) provides for the sale or other transfer of the existing portfolio and reserves of the Overseas Private Investment Corporation; and

(4) retains, during the transition period, the agreements entered into with foreign countries under section 237(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.

SEC. 3277. REPEAL.

Effective on the date certain that is specified under section 3276(b)(1), title IV of chapter 2 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is repealed, and any reference in any other law to the Overseas Private Investment Corporation shall cease to be effective.

H.R. 1561

OFFERED BY: MS. JACKSON-LEE

AMENDMENT NO. 90: on page 260, line 24, strike ''$2,000,000'' and insert in lieu thereof ''$2,500,000''.

H.R. 1561

OFFERED BY: MS. JACKSON-LEE

AMENDMENT NO. 91: on page 265, line 10, strike ''$5,000,000'' and insert in lieu thereof ''$6,500,000''.

H.R. 1561

OFFERED BY: MR. MICA

AMENDMENT NO. 92: page 75, lines 6 through 22, and insert the following:

separates from service with the agency during the period beginning on the date on which the offer is made for a voluntary separation incentive payment under this section and the last day of the second quarter of the fiscal year in which the offer is made.

(d) PERIOD OF AUTHORITY.—The head of an agency shall have authority to authorize payment of voluntary separation incentive payments under this section for a 60-day period beginning on the 61st day after the date on which the President transmits to the appropriate congressional committees the applicable reorganization plan for the agency under section 221, 321, or 421.

H.R. 1561

OFFERED BY: MR. MICA

AMENDMENT NO. 93:

SEC. 2106. UNITED STATES INFORMATIONAL, EDUCATIONAL, AND CULTURAL PROGRAMS.

Page 105, strike lines 20 through 23.

SEC. 3212. MICRO- AND SMALL ENTERPRISE DEVELOPMENT CREDITS.

Page 260, line 24, strike ''$2,000,000'' and insert ''$2,800,000''.

H.R. 1561

OFFERED BY: MRS. MORELLA

AMENDMENT NO. 94: Page 196, after line 2, insert the followng new section:

SEC. 2712. REGARDING THE GUATEMALAN PEACE PROCESS AND THE NEED FOR GREATER PROTECTION OF HUMAN RIGHTS IN GUATEMALA.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Formal negotiations to bring an end to the 34-year armed conflict in Guatemala and to establish conditions for democracy in Guatemala were resumed in January 1994 under United Nations mediation between the Government of Guatemala and the armed opposition, the Guatemalan National Revolutionary Union (URNG).

(2) These negotiations have resulted in the signing of a series of landmark accords on human rights, the establishment of a Commission for the Historical Clarification of Human Rights Violations, the resettlement of displaced populations, indigenous rights and identity, and other issues, and are expected to lead to the signing of further accords and a final comprehensive accord in the near future.

(3) The government and the Guatemalan National Revolutionary Union (URNG) agreed in the human rights accord signed on March 29, 1994, that ''[t]he Government shall not sponsor the adoption of legislative or any other type of measures designed to prevent the prosecution and punishment of persons responsible for human rights violations''.

(4) The United Nations Mission for the Verification of Human Rights and of Compliance with the Commitments of the Comprehensive Agreement on Human Rights in Guatemala (MINUGUA) established under the Global Human Rights Accord to monitor compliance with that agreement began operations across Guatemala in November 1994 and released its first report in March 1995.

(5) MINUGUA reports that in Guatemala there have been numerous violations of the right to life, and that the vast majority of cases involving death have not been adequately investigated or resolved by the competent Guatemalan authorities.

(6) MINUGUA reports that the Guatemalan Government has not adequately guaranteed the right to be free from torture or other cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment, and that no information exists to demonstrate that such cases in which the involvement of military and police officers has been verified have been investigated in depth or that the guilty parties have been prosecuted.

(7) MINUGUA reports that Guatemala has made no progress in the investigation of

criminal acts alleged to constitute human rights violations, and that specific actions and inquiries which could and should have been undertaken promptly were not carried out.

(8) MINUGUA has observed numerous, persistent serious human rights violations to which, in nearly every case, there has been no response from competent Guatemalan authorities.

(9) Systematic human rights violations are committed with impunity against Guatemalan civilians, especially members of the indigenous population, by members of government security forces and by the Civil Self-Defense Patrols acting under their authority.

(10) Human rights abuses that endanger and intimidate judicial authorities, human rights activists, and public figures continue to occur, such as the killing of Guatemala's Constitutional Court President Epaminondas Gonzalez Dubon on April 1, 1994, civil patrollers firing on a group of peaceful human rights demonstrators in Colotenango on August 3, 1993, the killing of former presidential candidate Jorge Carpio Nicolle on July 3, 1993, the killing of Chimaltenango district court judge Edgar Ramiro Elias Ogaldez on August 20, 1994, the kidnapping on August 29, 1994, of police agent Miguel Manolo Pacheco, who was assigned to protect appeals court judge Maria Eugenia Villasenor, and the October 14, 1994, murder of police agent Cesar Augusto Medina.

(11) The Organization of American States has found that the Civil Self-Defense Patrols are a ''source of human rights violations'' and should be ''disbanded or reorganized''.

(12) The Organization of American States has found that in Guatemala there have been serious ''cases of arbitrary arrest, illegitimate deprivation of liberty, isolation, and torture and execution without trial'' of individuals, including Efrain Bamaca, the husband of United States citizen Jennifer Harbury, and other members of the Guatemalan National Revolutionary Union who are held by various government security forces.

(13) The Organization of American States has determined that the Communities of Populations in Resistance, which have been harassed and attacked by government armed forces and the Civil Self-Defense Patrols, are civilian communities.

(14) The Organization of American States has called on the Government of Guatemala to ''take a clear stand on the grave problems that obstruct the full observance of human rights, set well defined goals, and schedule policies for attaining them''.

(15) The security of repatriated refugees in Guatemala and of internally displaced civilians, including the Communities of Populations in Resistance, remains at risk due to continued military intimidation and harassment, and their reintegration into Guatemalan society has been hampered by inadequate access to land and other productive resources.

(16) There has been insufficient progress in bringing to justice all of those responsible for the murders of United States citizens Michael DeVine, Griffin Davis, and Nicholas Blake, the abduction and torture of United States citizen Dianna Ortiz, the attempted murder of United States citizen Meredith Larson, the murder of guerrilla comandante Efrain Bamaca Velazquez (the husband of United States citizen Jennifer Harbury), and the murders of the following Guatemalan citizens: anthropologist Myrna Mack Chang, politician Jorge Carpio Nicolle, Constitutional Court President Epaminondas Gonzalez Dubon, and victims of the Colotenango massacre perpetrated by Civil Self-Defense Patrols.

(17) Recent reports and congressional hearings have established that United States agencies hold information concerning the role of individual Guatemalan military officers in several human rights cases in which the United States and the Congress have expressed longstanding concern, including the cases of Michael DeVine and Efrain Bamaca.

(18) Eyewitness testimony presented to the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights has implicated nine Guatemalan military officers in the clandestine detention and torture of Efrain Bamaca.

(19) The United States Embassy and Honduras threatened to revoke the visas of all possible witnesses to the December 1994 shooting of an American citizen in Tegucigalpa when they refused to provide information on the crime.

(20) Congressional hearings have established that covert actions taken by the Central Intelligence Agency were in direct contradiction of officially articulated United States policy toward Guatemala.

(21) Guatemala has failed to extradite Colonel Carlos Rene Ochoa Ruiz, under indictment in Tampa for drug-trafficking, in spite of the official request from the United States Government.

(22) The Guatemalan National Revolutionary Union has engaged in violations of the laws of war, including the assassination of military commissioner Teofilo Lopez Castillo, firing on a bus filled with civilians which ran a roadblock in Chupol, and the recruitment of child soldiers.

(23) MINUGUA has called on the URNG to stop the destruction, and threatened destruction, of installations on rural estates, to refrain from sabotaging electric power pylons, and to prevent retaliatory attacks against civilian persons or property.

(b) DECLARATION OF CONGRESS.—The Congress—

(1) commends the President of Guatemala, Ramiro de Leon Carpio, and the leaders of the Guatemalan National Revolutionary Union for establishing a framework for formal negotiations, and for reaching agreement on several important accords in these negotiations, which, under the mediation of the United Nations, are designed to bring an end to more than 30 years of internal armed conflict and set Guatemala on the road to democracy;

(2) commends the leaders of the various segments of civilian society for their role in articulating the concerns of all sectors of Guatemalan society and for bringing critical issues onto the agenda of the peace negotiations;

(3) calls on President de Leon Carpio and all parties in the negotiation process to proceed in the spirit of the Oslo Accords to achieve peace by political means, to the end that a final, binding, and verifiable agreement will be attained at the earliest possible date;

(4) calls on the Group of Friends of the peace negotiations (Colombia, Mexico, Spain, Venezuela, Norway, and the United States) to continue and intensify their support of the peace negotiations through diplomatic initiatives and dialogue with all parties;

(5) calls on President de Leon Carpio to immediately develop a measurable and substantive plan to end grave human rights abuses, in compliance with internationally recognized human rights standards, Guatemala's national Constitution, and the recommendations of MINUGUA, the United Nations Independent Human Rights Expert for Guatemala, and the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights, a part of the Organization of the American States;

(6) calls on President de Leon Carpio, as a sign of good faith and a contribution to peace, to immediately disband the Civil Self-Defense Patrols, which are one of the major sources of human rights violations in Guatemala, and to cancel plans to convert these patrols to ''Peace and Development Committees'';

(7) calls on the Guatemalan Government to ensure that any amnesty promulgated to allow the URNG to be reintegrated as a political party cover only crimes against the state and not human rights violations;

(8) calls on President de Leon Carpio to ensure the safety and complete return and reintegration of Guatemalan refugees in Mexico, in full compliance with the Accord of the Permanent Commissions of the Guatemalan Refugees in Mexico and the Government of the Republic of Guatemala, signed in Guatemala on October 8, 1992, that determines the conditions and understandings under which certain Guatemalan refugees may be repatriated;

(9) calls on President de Leon Carpio to recognize the civilian character of the Communities of Populations in Resistance, ensuring their security and their right to peaceful integration into Guatemalan society with the full exercise of rights and liberties guaranteed under Guatemala's national Constitution;

(10) calls on the United States executive branch to allocate sufficient funding for a transition to peace fund for Guatemala, which should include all of the military aid frozen in the pipeline since 1990 and should be supplemented with additional resources, to be used to finance the United Nations Verification Mission and to implement other peace accord implementation programs as they are determined;

(11) calls on the executive branch of the United States Government to undertake every effort to assure that no foreign assistance provided to the Government of Guatemala is made available to ''Peace and Development Committees'' which have been created from transformed civil patrols;

(12) calls on the executive branch of the United States Government to condition all assistance to Guatemala, with the exception of humanitarian assistance, development assistance, and Administration of Justice assistance, on—

(A) full compliance with MINUGUA recommendations and the recommended precautionary measures of the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights, including resolution of concerns involving clandestine prisons;

(B) progress in the continuation of the peace process;

(C) substantive improvement in the protection of human rights;

(D) the dissolution of the Civil Self-Defense Patrols;

(E) the guaranteed safety of refugees, returnees, and the internally displaced;

(F) verifiable resolution of the DeVine, Ortiz, Davis, Blake, Larson, Bamaca, Mack, Carpio, Gonzalez Dubon, Elias Ogaldez, Pacheco, Medina, and Colotenango cases;

(G) the strengthening of the various segments of civilian society, which are essential to the establishment of genuine democracy in Guatemala; and

(H) extradition of Guatemalan Colonel Carlos Rene Ochoa Ruiz;

(13) urges the executive branch, in its efforts to achieve the goals listed in paragraph 12, to also consider termination of Caminos Fuertes civic action program, and the licensing of private arms sales and the sale of excess defense articles;

(14) calls on the executive branch to immediately suspend the visas of any Guatemalan military officer implicated in human rights abuses, drug-trafficking, and other crimes until these cases have been adjudicated to the satisfaction of the Secretary of State;

(15) calls on the executive branch to permanently cancel the visas of Guatemalan military officers implicated in human rights violations or other criminal activity if the judicial process related to such activity is disrupted by threats or acts of intimidation against police investigators, prosecutors, judges, witnesses, or their families;

(16) calls on the executive branch to permanently cancel the visas of Guatemalan military officers and those of their immediate family if the threats or acts in section 15 are carried out;

(17) calls on the executive branch to comply as fully and as expeditiously as possible with freedom of information act requests dealing with human rights cases in Guatemala, beginning with those that have already been filed by Jennifer Harbury and Dianna Ortiz;

(18) calls on the Administration to support the work of the Commission on the Clarification of the Past by moving to review for declassification in an expedited manner all United States Government records pertaining to human rights violations in Guatemala; and

(19) calls on the administration to assure that no covert action undertaken in Guatemala contradicts publicly stated policy unless the President signs a finding authorizing such activity and fully informs the appropriate congressional committees of the action authorized and the reasons for the authorization.

H.R. 1561

OFFERED BY: MR. ROEMER

AMENDMENT NO. 95: In paragraph (3) of section 3221(a) (relating to authorization of appropriations for development assistance for the independent states of the former Soviet Union), strike ''$643,000,000'' and insert ''$578,000,000''.

H.R. 1561

OFFERED BY: MRS. SCHROEDER

AMENDMENT NO. 96: At the appropriate place, insert the following:

Whereas, female genital mutilation is a violation of women's basic human rights; and

Whereas, female genital mutilation constitutes a major health risk to women, with lifelong physical and psychological consequences; and

Whereas, female genital mutilation should not be condoned by any government;

It is the sense of Congress that:

The President seek to end the practice of female genital mutilation worldwide through the active cooperation and participation of governments in whose nations female genital mutilation takes place. Steps to end the practice of female genital mutilation shall include:

(1) encouraging nations to establish clear policies against female genital mutilation, and enforcing existing laws which prohibit it; and

(2) assisting nations in creating culturally appropriate outreach programs that include education and counseling about the dangers of female genital mutilation for women and men of all ages; and

(3) ensuring that all appropriate programs in which the U.S. participates includes a component pertaining to female genital mutilation, so as to ensure consistency across the spectrum of health and child related programs conducted in any country in which female genital mutilation is known to be a problem.

H.R. 1561

OFFERED BY: MR. SMITH OF TEXAS

AMENDMENT NO. 97: In section 2252 (relating to persecution for resistance to coercive population control methods)—

(1) insert ''(a) DEFINTION OF REFUGEE.—'' before ''Section''; and

(2) add at the end the following new subsection:

(b) NUMERICAL LIMITATION ON ASYLUM.—Section 208 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1158) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(f) Notwithstanding any other provision of law or of this Act, for any fiscal year not more than 2,000 aliens may be granted asylum on the basis of a determination pursuant to the third sentence of section 101(a)(42) (relating to persecution for resistance to coercive population control methods).''.

H.R. 1561

OFFERED BY: MR. TRAFICANT

AMENDMENT NO. 98: At the end of title XXVII (relating to congressional statements), add the following new section:

SEC. 2712. SENSE OF THE CONGRESS REGARDING SYRIAN OCCUPATION OF LEBANON.

It is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) the Government of Syria should honor the Taif Agreement and withdraw all of its troops from Lebanon;

(2) the United States should take every action feasible through the United Nations to encourage the Government of Syria to withdraw all of its troops from Lebanon not later than 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(3) the Secretary of State should report to the Congress, not later than 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, as to the actions the United States has taken to effect a withdrawal of all Syrian troops from Lebanon.

H.R. 1561

OFFERED BY: MR. TRAFICANT

AMENDMENT NO. 99: At the end of chapter 2 of title XXXIV of division C (relating to special authorities and other provisions of foreign assistance authorizations), add the following new section:

SEC. 3420. LIMITATION ON PROCUREMENT OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES.

Funds made available for assistance for fiscal years 1996 and 1997 under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, for which amounts are authorized to be appropriated for such fiscal years, may be used for procurement outside the United States or less developed countries only if—

(1) such funds are used for the procurement of commodities or services, or defense articles or defense services, produced in the country in which the assistance is to be provided, except that this paragraph only applies if procurement in that country would cost less than procurement in the United States or less developed countries;

(2) the provision of such assistance requires commodities or services, or defense articles or defense services, of a type that are not produced in, and available for purchase from, the United States, less developed countries, or the country in which the assistance is to be provided;

(3) the Congress has specifically authorized procurement outside the United States or less developed countries; or

(4) the President determines on a case-by-case basis that procurement outside the United States or less developed countries would result in the more efficient use of United States foreign assistance resources.

H.R. 1561

OFFERED BY: MR. WAMP

AMENDMENT NO. 100: Strike subsection (a) of section 3204 (relating to funding for the International Fund for Ireland).

Strike section 3221 (relating to authorization of appropriations for development assistance authorities).

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 104th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 141 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MAY 24, 1995 No. 87

Senate

(Legislative day of Monday, May 15, 1995)

The Senate met at 8 a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the President pro tempore [Mr. THURMOND].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The prayer this morning will be led by the guest Chaplain, the Reverend Ralph E. McCormack, of Danville, VA, guest of Senator BYRD.

PRAYER

The Reverend Ralph E. McCormack, pastor of Burton Memorial Presbyterian Church, Danville, VA, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray:

Gracious God, we invoke Thy presence with us here in this place.

We pray for these U.S. Senators. We pray that they may have wisdom in their deliberations. We pray that their decisions will continue to keep our Nation strong and safe for all people.

We pray for all of us here and for our families. If there is sickness, we pray for better health. If there is unhappiness, we pray for reasons for joy. If in our families, there is ill feeling, we pray for peace and harmony. If in our families there is any problem or any cause for worry, we pray for a good resolution of the difficulty.

Help us to honor Thee with our lips and with our lives. Amen.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate will resume consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 13.

The clerk will report the pending business.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 13) setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for the fiscal years 1996, 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002.

The Senate resumed consideration of the concurrent resolution.

Pending:

(1) Harkin-Bumpers amendment No. 1126, to reduce unnecessary military spending, holding military spending to a freeze in overall spending over 7 years protecting readiness and modernization activities and shifting the savings to education and job training, restoring a portion of the reductions proposed for those programs in the resolution.

(2) Feingold-Hollings amendment No. 1127, to strike the budget surplus allowance provision (Section 204) from the resolution to eliminate the use of the fiscal dividend for further tax cuts.

(3) Snowe amendment No. 1128, to increase funding for mandatory spending in function 500 (Education).

(4) Bumpers amendment No. 1130, to strike the proposed change in the budget process rules which would permit the scoring of revenue derived from the sale of federal assets.

AMENDMENT NO. 1128

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I would ask my chairman of the committee if it would be in order for me at this time to yield 10 minutes off the bill in opposition to the Snowe amendment to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, parliamentary inquiry.

How much time remains on the Snowe amendment?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Senator SNOWE has 67 minutes; the opposition has 35 minutes.

Mr. DOMENICI. I would prefer to yield 10 minutes off the opposition to the amendment. Is that what the Senator wanted?

Mr. EXON. The Senator from Ohio wants 10 minutes.

I would start out today by saying to all the Senators that we are extremely strapped for time. Five minutes here, ten minutes there, under ordinary circumstances would be in order. I think we have about what—4 hours maximum left? How much time is remaining?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Three hours and 45 minutes.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, 3 hours and 45 minutes, with about 70 amendments. We will have to extremely limit our time. I think that the requests—may I suggest that we yield 8 minutes to the Senator from Massachusetts and 8 minutes to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. DOMENICI. And 8 minutes to the senior Senator from Ohio.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I might ask if I could have 4 minutes.

Mr. DOMENICI. Let me see how the opposition goes. I have none for myself at this point. Then I will see.

I yield 8 minutes to Senator KENNEDY, 8 minutes to the junior Senator from Ohio, and 8 minutes to the senior Senator from Ohio.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The distinguished Senator from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. KENNEDY. Thank you, Mr. President. I yield myself 8 minutes.

Mr. President, one of the most important aspects of the whole budget resolution is what it does in the areas of higher education, as well as education generally.

I took a few moments of the Senate's time just 3 days ago to outline where I thought we were on the whole issue of education in this country. We take pride in our higher education system. Of the top 149 universities worldwide, 127 of them are here in the United States. Our system works well. We provide superb higher education in this country. If there is a basic problem, it is the cost of higher education. We have tried to address this problem at the Federal level.

Our Federal education policies have been worked out in a bipartisan way over the period of years since the early 1960's when a judgment was made that it was in the national interest to support higher education.

Individual contributions, private sector contributions, and Federal assistance have created the world's best education system. Together, we support educational opportunities for our Nation's citizens, and at the same time,

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

we support the outstanding research that is going on in places like the NIH, the National Science Foundation, and other research agencies. Our system is working, and it is working well.

The charts we reviewed a few days ago in this Chamber show that providing higher education to our citizens contributes to this country immeasurably. The clearest example of this was the cold war GI bill which returned $8 for every $1 that was invested in education. Investments in education continue to be an investment in our country.

Now, the Budget Act that is before the Senate today effectively cuts $65 billion from education, $30 billion of it out of higher education, and the remainder out of other education support programs over the period of the next 7 years.

That is a one-third cut in higher education. The suggestion by members of the Budget Committee that these cuts are not going to touch the Pell grants, that we are going to hold them harmless, is basically hogwash. Even when we hold the Pell grants harmless, we see a 40-percent reduction in what has been a lifeline for young people to go on to higher education.

Mr. President, 70 percent of all the young people in my State need some kind of assistance to go to the fine schools and colleges, the 4-year colleges and the 2-year colleges in my State. And 75 percent of that assistance comes from Federal support to higher education.

What is amazing to me is that after we have had this dramatic cut, and the Senate has rejected the efforts by Senator HARKIN, Senator HOLLINGS, and others, to restore education funding, we now have this amendment that restores a meager 10 percent of the proposed reduction in Federal support to higher education.

The explanation about how we are going to avoid instructions to the Labor and Human Resources Committee that will be charged with going ahead with these cuts is enormously interesting to me.

We had a debate here on the floor of the U.S. Senate about how we ought to eliminate home equity—farm home equity and home equity of young people—in our calculations of student assistance eligibility. Why? Because the value of the farms have gone up over the period of recent years. That has been true in the heartland of this Nation, just as it has been true in the increased value of homes as a result of inflation that students have nothing to do with. Including home equity in calculations for student aid eliminated the sons and daughters of working families whose principal problem is the value of their farm went up or their home went up.

A second debate we had here on the floor of the U.S. Senate, supported by Republicans as well, was to give young people a few months after they get out of college to find a job.

We wanted to make sure that they were not going to have to repay their loans for a short period of months—and we are talking a few months—after they graduate, when they are trying to find a job. That decision had the support of Republicans and Democrats alike. Now we are finding out that this grace period will be gone as well. Students are going to be penalized again.

I do not know how it is in other parts of the country, but I can tell you the job market in my State is not flourishing for young people who are graduating from college. They are able to get jobs, but it takes them a little while and their salaries to begin are low. Now the Republicans want to penalize them for that.

If you want to talk about a figleaf over a problem, the Snowe amendment is just that. This is a 10-percent restoration from the budget cut. Some will say, given the fact we have been voted down and voted down and voted down, we ought to grab this, because it is the only thing we are going to get. The fact of the matter is, this amendment proposes to find offsets from travel, bonuses, and other agencies, but these are not binding instructions. The appropriators decide on those instructions. There is nothing to guarantee that education will be off limits.

So on the one hand, the Snowe amendment may restore some benefit to those who need Stafford loans, but you are taking money away from the sons and daughters of working families who need the help and assistance provided in a title I program or a school-to-work program. There are no guarantees here that you are not going to just put it back in one part of education and sacrifice another part.

So we should be thankful for any kind of restoration of funds to education. But I must say to the parents who are watching this debate that what they ought to understand is that we are going to see a one-third cut in the area of education, a $65 billion loss over the period of the next 7 years. The effect of this amendment, if it is successful, will be a restoration of $6 billion of those funds.

The Senator from Connecticut, myself, the Senator from Minnesota, and others will be offering, at an appropriate time, a very modest amendment to restore $28 billion, not the full amount, but just $28 billion, with offsets from corporate welfare and tax provisions.

It is extraordinary to me that once again we talk about educating children in this country, but the Budget Committee could only find $20 billion out of $4 trillion reductions in tax expenditures to turn to this important venture. We could have gotten the $60 billion. You would have thought they could find the billionaires' tax cuts where you find billionaires turning into Benedict Arnolds, where they make fortunes, hundreds of millions and billions of dollars, and then give up their citizenship and go overseas and avoid any kind of taxes. You would have thought they could find——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield myself another minute.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator has no more time.

Mr. KENNEDY. I yielded myself 8 minutes and I was given 10, I believe.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is incorrect. The time of the Senator has expired.

Senator DEWINE.

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, I rise today in very strong opposition to the amendment of my friend, the Senator from Maine. This amendment, frankly, will hurt the very people it purports to help, our young children.

The Snowe amendment would support programs that are, in fact, meritorious. But it would do so with an offset that would cause serious harm to the future of U.S. competitiveness in a very important high-technology industry. It would do so with an offset that would cause serious harm to U.S. competitiveness in an increasingly tough and competitive world. The offset assumes a reduction of $1.124 billion in aeronautic research and development.

Let me explain the real world consequences this cut would have, and especially what it would do to some very important programs at NASA.

One of the programs has to do with the advanced subsonic technology. This program addresses future technology needs covering the whole spectrum of subsonic aviation, from commercial jets to small aircraft.

First of all, this program has already perfected techniques for detecting and evaluating corrosion and cracks in aircraft. These techniques have now become a part of the industry. If we make this cut, the cut proposed in the Snowe amendment, our future ability to increase air safety will be seriously impaired.

Second, our ability to decrease the harmful environmental effects of aircraft will also be seriously impaired. To remain globally competitive, U.S. aviation has to stay ahead of international environmental standards. Thanks in part to the advanced subsonic technology program, we are doing that today. It would be wrong to lose our competitive edge in this area.

Third, our ability to improve satellite air traffic control would also be seriously hurt by a cut in this program.

All of these areas—aircraft safety, the environment, air traffic control—are legitimate concerns of the Federal Government and have been an area where the Federal Government has been involved for decades. In these areas, NASA is engaging in high-risk research that individual companies simply cannot and will not undertake.

Furthermore, Federal investment in this technology has important roots in the history of our country, as I will explain in a few moments. NASA's role, really, is to develop high-risk, high-

payoff, precompetitive technologies so they can then be passed along to private industry. This is something that only NASA can do. And this investment is essential to the future of the U.S. aircraft industry. The continuing growth of U.S. market share depends on our ability to ensure that aircraft are safe, cost effective, and able to comply with ever more stringent environmental regulations.

There is a long history of Government involvement in basic, precompetitive research. Back in 1917, the United States established the National Advisory Committee on Aeronautics to engage in basic precompetitive research. The NACA was a precursor of NASA and did the same kind of forward-looking work that would be cut under this amendment.

Earlier this month we, of course, celebrated the 50th anniversary of the end of World War II. Every single airplane that helped win that war was made possible by NACA's testing facilities. No single corporation had enough money to be able to invest in the kind of wind tunnels that were used to test these planes. NACA's Ames facility did have those resources. No single corporation had the resources to do the basic research on how wings should be shaped. NACA did have the resources.

For almost eight decades, NACA, and its successor agency, today's NASA, have been making the kind of investment in America's aviation knowledge base that no corporation could possibly match. Every single plane in America today has NASA's technology somewhere in it. The little piece of wing that juts out perpendicular from the wing tip—known as a winglet—was designed by NASA. The winglet increases the fuel efficiency of an airplane by 5 percent, and that 5 percent can make a big difference in making U.S. planes competitive.

Just this week the Boeing 777 was unveiled. Major components in that plane were designed some 15 years ago in NASA's laboratories, not with a view toward the product line of any particular corporation, but because, over the long run, the long term, America needs that technology know-how.

Another research project threatened by this amendment is NASA's high-speed research program. Before investing the roughly $20 billion that might be necessary to develop a high-speed civil transport aircraft, private companies need to know whether such a plane could be built in compliance with environmental and safety standards.

If we allow the United States to fall behind in the quest for this technological breakthrough, the U.S. share of the long-range global aircraft market could drop below 50 percent. It would be a horrible blow to the trade deficit, to high-technology jobs, and to something in many respects even more important, our national sense that America is leading the world in the future of high technology.

America's ascent to the role of global superpower was made possible in large part by the ability of America's aviation pioneers to invest in the future.

Education—so ably advocated by my good friend from Maine—has to do with preparing our children for the challenges of the future. This program—the program that would be cut by this amendment—is building that future. I think cutting this program would be a very shortsighted measure—and the losers would be our children.

Tens of thousands of American children can grow up to work in high-technology aviation jobs—if we do not foreclose that option by making shortsighted decisions today.

In aviation, there is a truly global market. Over the next 15 to 20 years, the global demand is expected to be between $800 billion and $1 trillion.

A recent study by DRI/McGraw-Hill estimates that a 1-percent gain in U.S. market share creates 9,000 new jobs—and $120 million in Federal revenues—each year.

Aviation already contributes over $25 billion a year to the U.S. balance of trade. That's more than any other U.S. manufacturing industry.

And aviation already generates almost a million high-quality jobs in this country.

If we allow this cut to go forward, we will fall behind in our effort to develop technologies that will keep America on top of this global market.

I think we should continue to invest in a high-technology future for this country.

I think NASDA's research on aviation plays a fundamental and irreplaceable role in that process.

That is why I will be voting ''no'' on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Maine. To vote ''no'' on this amendment is to say ''yes'' to a high-technology future for Amercia's children.

I will conclude by summarizing as follows: We hear a lot of talk on this floor about making sure our children have good jobs, high-paying jobs, high-technology jobs, and they should not be confined, as some people on both sides of the aisle have said, to flipping hamburgers. This type of research gives these good high-paying jobs to our children.

I urge, therefore, a ''no'' vote on the Snowe amendment. I urge a vote for our future.

I see my time is almost expired. I see my friend and colleague from Ohio, who has a tremendous amount of experience in this area, has risen to speak and will be speaking in just a moment. I look forward to listening to his comments.

Mr. GLENN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, I regret we have such a short time here this morning to deal with this.

Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the amendment proposed by Senators SNOWE, ABRAHAM, GRASSLEY, BROWN, KASSEBAUM, COHEN, LOTT, AND CHAFEE.

I support the goal of the amendment—to provide increased funds for higher education. My record is clear and unequivocal on education funding. These funds must be increased, but not in the way proposed by the proponents of this amendment.

I do not know that there has been an education bill which I voted against since I have been in the Senate for over 20 years. My record is very clear in that regard.

I want to speak about the offsets that are required here that would provide the money for this particular amendment. I would like to speak about two of the offsets that the amendment identifies and discuss the impact which these cuts would have on our economy and our Federal workers.

First, the amendment would zero out two important NASA programs. This Nation has gotten to be what it is because we put more into research, and the inquiry into the unknown, into pushing back the frontiers of science, and then we develop the industry and the business once that has occurred. That has been the hallmark of America. We have been the envy of the world in doing that; the envy of the world.

So these programs in our R&D are seed-corn type programs that whole industries benefit from. We have seen in the past money spent at NASA in aeronautical research which in particular had led to the development of an aircraft industry in this country that has been leading in exports second only to farming, to agricultural products, in years past.

Dan Goldin, the Administrator of NASA, was given aid by the administration, and was tasked to downsize some, and he went ahead and did it. He did it, and he has a program in NASA, a 5-year budget, which was about $122 billion in fiscal 1993. The 1996 request is now $82 billion for the next 5 years. So they have been cut by one-third in just 2 years.

NASA has stepped up to the plate to reduce bureaucracy and improve the way it does business. These programs are the R&D or seed-corn type programs which many of my colleagues have heard me speak about in the past. This amendment would zero out NASA's High-Speed Research Program, and NASA's Advanced Subsonic Technology Program.

Before I talk about these specific programs, I would like to observe that NASA has already absorbed more than its share of budget cuts. A couple of figures will illustrate what I am talking about. In fiscal year 1993, NASA's 5-year budget request was about $122 billion. The fiscal year 1996 request is now $82 billion for the next 5 years. NASA has been cut by one-third in just over 2 years.

Dan Goldin's leadership of the agency is currently going through a painful process of reducing its budget by $5 billion over the next 5 years. Mr. Goldin

believes that this can be achieved without eliminating programs. He has a tough row to hoe to achieve this and he just cannot do it if we impose another cut like this on his budget over there.

These programs are valuable. They are not something that we just pick up and lay down as a whim. Further cuts in NASA's budget will simply result in the elimination of current programs.

And Mr. President, I suggest that, if this amendment is approved, the future of NASA's three aeronautic research centers—Lewis Research Center, Ames Research Center, and Langley Research Center will be in jeopardy.

Now, let me talk about the High-Speed Research Program first. The goal of this program is to help develop the technologies industry needs to design and build an environmentally compatible and economically competitive high-speed civil jet transport for the 21st century. The technology developments are to reach an appropriate stage of maturity to enable an industry decision on aircraft production by 2001.

Mr. President, the technologies currently needed to develop such a transport are beyond the state of the art. NASA estimates that industry will need to invest more than $20 billion to bring such a transport to market. A $20 billion industry just with this one development alone; $20 billion we are talking about, and we are talking about cutting back the research that will make that possible.

Studies have identified a substantial market for a future supersonic airliner to meet rapidly growing demand for long-haul travel, particularly across the Pacific.

Those that have been to the Southeast Asian area recently know how that area is really expanding economically. Over the period from 2005 to 2015, this market could support 500 to 1,000 aircraft, creating a multibillion sales opportunity for its producers. Such an aircraft will be essential for capturing the valuable long-haul Pacific rim market.

As currently envisioned an HSCT aircraft should be designed to carry 300 passengers at Mach 2.4 on transoceanic routes over distances up to 6,000 nautical miles at fares comparable to subsonic transports.

Now let me talk about the Advanced Subsonic Technology Program.

The goal of NASA's Advanced Subsonic Technology program is to develop, in cooperation with the FAA and the U.S. aeronautics industry, high-payoff technologies to enable a safe, highly productive global air transportation system that includes a new generation of environmentally compatible, economical U.S. subsonic aircraft. Some of the technologies and issues being studied and developed in this program include:

First, fly-by-light/power-by-wire: a fully digital aircraft control system which would be substantially lighter, more reliable and efficient than current control systems.

Here is one that ought to get the attention of every single person who is hearing my voice, and every single person in this Chamber: Aging aircraft. My colleague from Ohio mentioned that a moment ago.

Second, aging aircraft: To develop new ways of inspecting aircraft to determine their airworthiness.

When you see a black storm cloud on the horizon the next time you are taking off out of Washington National or Dulles in a 727 aircraft over 20 years old, I think you would be interested in this kind of research NASA wants to do.

New approaches are being developed to determine the residual strength in airframes using advanced nondestructive technologies. It might be worth thinking about this program the next time you are sitting in a 727 that's 20 years old waiting to take off on a cross-country flight.

Third, noise reduction: This program is developing technologies to reduce aircraft noise by 10 decibels or more by the year 2000.

Fourth, terminal area productivity: Technologies, chiefly involving air traffic control, that can improve the efficiency of operations on the ground at busy airports.

Fifth, integrated wing design: New concepts, design methodologies, model fabrication and test techniques are being developed to provide industry an integrated capability to achieve increased aircraft performance at lower cost.

Sixth, propulsion: Technologies to improve fuel efficiency of future commercial engines by at least 8 percent and reduce nitrogen oxides by 70 percent over current technology.

These are only some of the technologies being developed under the program which the amendment's propents would completely gut.

It is a truly shortsighted amendment that would eliminate these important applied technology programs.

Mr. President, it is no secret that aerospace business is a government-private sector partnership. Historically our government has funded aeronautics R&D, and industry has taken this basic technology and developed aircraft that have dominated the world market. Over the last decade or so, other governments have gotten into the act. Currently, the U.S. market share is about 65 percent, down from about 91 percent in the 1960's.

We had 91 percent of the world's commercial aircraft market in the 1960's. We are now being competed with more vigorously than we have ever been in the past.

Cutting these two important programs will not help us regain this market share—quite the opposite. We will be sending a signal that the U.S. aircraft industry will be less competitive. I do not want to see that happen.

In summary, the advanced subsonic technology: meets future technology needs for next generation aircraft; enables NASA to develo high-risk, high-payoff, precompetitive technology to prove feasibility so that industry may complete development and apply technology to specific products; will result in accomplishments in noise prediction codes for quieter engines, non-destructive evaluation techniques for detecting corrosion, cracks and disbonds; analytical tools to understand aircraft wake vortices for safe landings; and assists in preserving 1 million U.S. high quality jobs and $25 to $30 billion in annual positive balance of trade for U.S. aviation.

How can we possibly take a chance on knocking something like that down?

The High-Speed Research Program will: enable NASA to develop early, high-risk technology for future environmentally compatible, economically competitive high-speed civil transport aircraft (technologies needed are beyond state of the art); industry will take NASA technology and invest $20 billion to actually develop aircraft; and if the United States is first to market, the U.S. market share could grow to 80 percent, achieve $200 billion in sales, and create 140,000 new U.S. jobs.

Thank you Mr. President. I urge my colleagues to vote against the Snowe-Abraham amendment.

I think, while I support the goal of getting more money for education, I certainly do not support taking it out of these forward-looking research programs that have served us so well in the past, and will in the future.

IMPACT ON NASA LEWIS

NASA's zero-based review announced last week will have a significant impact on Lewis Research Center outside of Cleveland, OH. Lewis will be given primary responsibility for aeronautics research, especially aeropropulsion research. Other programs would be shifted away from Lewis, including work on expendable launch vehicles.

Mr. President, if the proposal by the Senator from Maine is accepted, I think it could be the death knell for Lewis Research Center. I use these words carefully. But when an agency like NASA is downsizing, and the chief mission of a given facility is eliminated—and this amendment would eliminate high-speed research and advanced subsonic technology research, which will be Lewis' bread and butter—then I think my words are accurate.

If Lewis closes, the impact on my State will be significant. According to NASA, Ohio has the second largest number of aeronautics jobs in the country, behind California. This is due primarily to NASA Lewis, Wright Patterson, the Ohio Aerospace Institute, and Ohio's university system. Anchoring these jobs is Lewis. It attracts world class scientists and engineers to world class facilities.

Did the Senator from Maine and her cosponsors consider this impact when they put together their amendment? I do not think so.

Mr. President, Lewis employs directly about 4,500 people. About one-third of these are in some way connected to aeronautics research. But the multiplier effect is significant. The people employed at Lewis attract other businesses, or help form new ventures and stimulating the economy. Gutting these two programs would have a serious impact on this dynamic system.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that several relevant documents be printed in the RECORD.

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

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION, OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR,

Washington, DC, May 8, 1995.

Hon. PETE V. DOMENICI,

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

DEAR SENATOR DOMENICI: I am writing to express NASA's strong objection to the recommendation by the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) in its February 1995 Report to the House and Senate Committees on the Budget, ''Reducing the Deficit: Spending and Revenue Options,'' to eliminate NASA's Advanced Subsonic Technology and High Speed Research programs. I request that this recommendation not be included in assumptions supporting the Committee's forthcoming FY 1996 Budget Resolution.

In making its recommendation, CBO contends that these programs develop technologies which should be developed by the private sector, namely large aircraft companies. The aeronautics program conducted by NASA and its predecessor, the National Advisory Committee on Aeronautics, has, since 1917, developed a wide range of precompetitive technologies to address safety, environmental, and aviation system capacity issues, as well as aircraft performance. The research and technology results, used by other U.S. Government or commercial entities, directly benefit air travellers and the general public while contributing to U.S. economic strength and national security. NASA's role is to develop high-risk, high-payoff technologies to a point where feasibility is proven and transfer those to FAA, DOD and U.S. industry. It is up to U.S. companies to make the substantial investments to validate the technologies and incorporate them into specific products and systems. Individual companies simply cannot undertake the high-risk research and technology development NASA does; investments are unrecoverable and often beyond the capability of a single company.

Estimates for global aircraft market demand over the next 15 to 20 years range from $800 billion to $1 trillion. However, this market could be much smaller if it is constrained by safety and system capacity and/or an inability to meet more stringent environmental standards. Part of NASA's aeronautics research addresses these issues, i.e., to ensure the largest possible market for which U.S. companies will compete. U.S. companies currently hold about two-thirds of the global market; their primary competitor, Airbus Industries, is aiming to capture a full half of the market in the next 10 years. A recent study by DRI/McGraw-Hill estimates that a 1 percent gain in U.S. market share generates 9,000 jobs (40 percent in aerospace and 60 percent in supporting industries), $360 million in sales, and $120 million in Federal tax revenue each year. Aviation contributes between $25 and $30 billion annually to the U.S. balance of trade, the largest of any U.S. manufacturing industry.

I believe CBO is inaccurate in stating ''the benefits from the R&D supported by the NASA programs in question fall almost exclusively to aircraft manufacturers, their suppliers, and airlines.'' These enabling advances provide the basic tools for U.S. industrial innovation. While NASA R&D contributes to a stronger U.S. aviation industry, the benefits are broader. Terminating these important technology programs would have repercussions far beyond the short-term profitability of U.S. aircraft manufacturers and airline operators. Joint NASA-FAA efforts to safely increase the capacity of the airspace system, eliminating costly and unproductive delays, would end. Technologies to ensure that the aging aircraft fleet remains safe and cost-effective would not be developed. U.S. efforts to develop rational positions on proposed international environmental regulations governing airline operations would be severely hampered, and new technologies to meet increasingly stringent environmental requirements would not be developed. The Nation's only precompetitive technology development for general aviation, commuter, and civil tiltrotor aircraft would end.

NASA understands the continued budget pressures facing the Nation. In fact, NASA has led the Federal Government by reducing its outyear budget by 30 percent since 1993 and is engaged in a major effort to identify an additional $5 billion in reductions between FY 1997 and FY 2000. We shall continue to seek efficiencies and streamline our processes to ensure that the Nation has the best possible civil aeronautics and space program, conducting cutting-edge research and technology which will lead the United States into the 21st century.

Sincerely,

DANIEL S. GOLDIN,
Administrator.

RESPONSE TO CBO RECOMMENDATION TO ELIMINATE NASA'S SUPPORT FOR PRODUCERS OF COMMERCIAL AIRLINERS

CBO criticizes NASA's Advanced Subsonic Technology (AST) Program's goal of maintaining current U.S. market share in subsonic aircraft.

Aviation generates almost one million high quality jobs in the U.S. and contributes between $25 and $30 billion annually to the U.S. balance of trade—the largest of any U.S. manufacturing industry.

U.S. aircraft and engine manufacturers must compete effectively on both cost and technical capability with government-subsidized foreign competition. Airbus already claims more than one-third of the commercial aircraft market; their goal is 50% by 2005.

The AST program addresses future technology needs not only in next-generation subsonic aircraft, including small general aviation aircraft and civil tiltrotor as well as large transports, but also for safety and capacity of the evolving airspace system and environmental concerns.

NASA's role is to develop high-risk, high-payoff precompetitive technologies to a point where feasibility is proven and transfer those to FAA, DOD and U.S. industry. Industry picks up the technologies, and with its own resources continues development, performs systems-oriented research and applies them to specific products.

CBO criticizes NASA's role in High Speed Research (HSR).

The technologies required for an environmentally compatible, economically viable High Speed Civil Transport (HSCT) aircraft are beyond today's state-of-the-art. Before industry can decide whether to invest the roughly $20 billion required to develop an HSCT, some level of confidence must be established that it could meet noise and emissions standards and that airlines could operate it profitably. The HSR program was designed to develop precompetitive technologies to eliminate the highest technology risks for a future HSCT, ensuring U.S. leadership.

The first to market a successful HSCT stands to gain $200 billion in sales and 140,000 new jobs.

CBO criticizes NASA's work in technologies that will allow the continued operation of aging jet aircraft.

25% of planes flying today are more than 20 years old, beginning to exceed their design life. The trend is to fly aircraft 30 years or more; as airlines continue to operate on the edge of profitability they cannot afford new aircraft. It is essential that these aging aircraft remain safe.

CBO contends that ''the benefits from the R&D supported by the NASA programs in question fall almost exclusively to aircraft manufacturers, their suppliers, and airlines.''

A recent study by DRI/McGraw-Hill estimates that a 1% gain in U.S. market share will generate 9,000 jobs (40% in aerospace and 60% in supporting industries), $360 million in sales and $120 million in Federal tax revenue each year.

NASA's programs address critical issues of safety, airspace system capacity, and environmental aspects of flight which benefit air travellers and the general public.

CBO contends that noise and atmospheric pollutants generated by air travel are unpaid ''costs'' that travellers impose on the public at large and therefore air travellers should pay the full cost, including R&D for aircraft.

Air travel is global, not national, just as the aircraft market is global. Airline operators will buy the best aircraft at the best price. If U.S. manufacturers were to incorporate the price of meeting international, government-established environmental regulations into their products they would quickly go out of business competing against government-subsidized competition.

ADVANCED SUBSONIC TECHNOLOGY

National investment in high-risk, high-payoff technologies will help ensure continued U.S. leadership in aviation, which brings significant economic and national security benefits to the Nation. Aviation generates almost one million high quality jobs in the U.S. and contributes between $25 and $30 billion annually to the U.S. balance of trade—the largest of any U.S. manufacturing industry.

NASA addresses a broad range of advanced technology needs for both civil and military aviation. The Advanced Subsonic Technology (AST) program specifically addresses future technology needs in next-generation subsonic aircraft (from large commercial jets to small general aviation aircraft) and the evolving airspace system. NASA's role is to develop high-risk, high-payoff precompetitive technologies to a point where feasibility is proven and transfer those to FAA, DOD and U.S. industry. Industry picks up the technologies, and with its own resources continues development, performs systems-oriented research and applies them to specific products.

Recent accomplishments in the AST program include:

The first integrated engine noise prediction code was delivered to industry for use in designing quieter engines to meet future noise standards.

Nondestructive evaluation techniques for detecting corrosion, cracks and disbonds in aircraft have been licensed to industry to help keep the aging aircraft fleet safe.

Tropospheric climatology data has been collected, to assist in understanding long-term changes in nitrogen oxides in the lower atmosphere caused by aircraft.

Analytical tools to understand aircraft wake vortices are being developed, which will contribute to revised safe aircraft landing separation standards.

An experimental database is improving understanding the relative acoustic and aerodynamic benefits of different rotor configurations for future civil tiltrotors.

FY 1995 Budget: $125.8 million.

FY 1996 Budget: $188.4 million.

Possible impact of significant reduction/termination:

Efforts to develop technologies to increase the capacity of the airspace system, increasing safety and expanding the aircraft market, would be severely curtailed. Weather and capacity delays cost airline operators $3.5 billion a year, and cause untold hours of unproductive time for the travelling public.

Technologies to ensure that the aging aircraft fleet (25% of planes flying today are more than 20 years old) remains safe and cost-effective would not be developed.

U.S. efforts to develop rational positions on proposed international environmental regulations would be hampered by not developing better understanding of aircraft noise and pollution effects and technologies to minimize those effects.

The only technology development efforts in the U.S. for general aviation, commuter and civil tiltrotor aircraft would be terminated.

The ability of U.S. aircraft and engine manufacturers to compete effectively on both cost and technical capability with government-subsidized foreign competition would be seriously hampered. Airbus already claims more than one-third of the commercial aircraft market, and their goal is one-half by 2005.

HIGH SPEED RESEARCH

NASA's High Speed Research (HSR) Program is performing the early, high-risk technology development for an environmentally compatible, economically competitive high speed civil transport (HSCT) aircraft. Such a plane would fly at more than twice the speed of sound and carry 300 passengers over 5000 nautical miles at fares close to today's subsonic aircraft (747, DC–10, etc.). Before industry can decide whether to make the roughly $20 billion investment to develop an HSCT, some level of confidence must be established that it could meet international noise and emissions standards, and that airline operators would be able to operate it profitably. The technologies to achieve this are beyond today's state-of-the-art. The HSR program was designed to eliminate the highest risks and ensure U.S. leadership in this important arena.

Recent accomplishments:

Completed research campaign in the South Pacific to characterize the stratosphere for incorporation in atmospheric simulation models which will be used to determine the potential impact of future HSCT aircraft.

Achieved test goal for low-emission engine combustors (NO_x level of 5g/kg fuel burned—the Concorde emissions index is 20g/kg)

Demonstrated a process to fabricate up to 10 feet per minute of fiber/resin composite material suitable for high temperature use, making the essential use of these materials for an HSCT affordable.

FY 1995 Budget: $221.3 million.

FY 1996 Budget: $245.5 million.

Possible impact of significant reduction/termination:

Interim assessment of atmospheric effects of a supersonic aircraft fleet would not be completed. This assessment is to support work by the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) on setting an HSCT emissions standard.

Engine noise reduction tests and analysis to determine whether an HSCT could comply with strict international noise standards (Annex 16, Chapter 3 set by ICAO) would be stopped.

The U.S. share of the global long-range aircraft market could drop to under 50%, if technology development is stopped and Europe is first to market with a successful HSCT. This would result in larger trade deficits and the loss of hundreds of thousands of high-skill, high-wage jobs. If the U.S. is first to market, the U.S. market share could grow to nearly 80%, and crate $200 billion sales and 140,000 new jobs.

FISCAL YEAR 1996 ESTIMATED TOTAL AERONAUTICS EMPLOYMENT BY STATE

OA rank	State	Total employment	Funding (millions)
1	California	4,783	$382.6
2	Ohio	2,564	205.5
3	Virginia	1,466	117.3
4	Washington	519	41.5
5	Maryland	356	28.5
6	Texas	263	21.0
7	Connecticut	193	15.4
8	Wisconsin	171	13.7
9	District of Columbia	165	13.2
10	Georgia	113	9.0
11	Massachusetts	106	8.5
12	New York	84	6.7
13	Pennsylvania	73	5.8
14	Florida	70	5.6
15	Indiana	60	4.8
16	Missouri	56	4.5
17	Colorado	39	3.1
18	Illinois	38	3.0
19	Tennessee	28	2.2
20	North Carolina	26	2.1
	Other	226	18.2
	Total	11,399	911.9

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, how much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DEWINE). The Senator from New Mexico has 13 minutes, and the Senator from Maine has 17 minutes.

Mr. DOMENICI. Might I ask the distinguished Senator from Maine, does she need all 17 minutes? We are trying to expedite things.

Ms. SNOWE. Yes.

Mr. DOMENICI. I wonder if we might reach this agreement. I understand there is one second-degree amendment contemplated. I assume that we could enter into a unanimous-consent agreement about that.

Let me ask Senator SNOWE, could she get by with 10 minutes?

Ms. SNOWE. Yes.

Mr. DOMENICI. I could use 10 minutes. Then we could move to a second-degree amendment by Senator DODD for 5 minutes on a side.

Mr. EXON. First, the second-degree amendment by Mr. DODD, as I understand it, is the same second-degree amendment being considered by the Senator from Minnesota, and also the Senator from Massachusetts. Is that correct? We are talking about one second-degree amendment?

Mr. DODD. Yes.

Mr. EXON. Certainly, we would agree. We will need about 2 minutes for the negotiations that are going on. I think we are pretty close to making an arrangement along the lines that you outlined.

Mr. DOMENICI. I am going to get somebody to come to the floor, but I leave this suggestion. I must attend a meeting on the final wrap-up on this bill now, but we would be willing to have 5 minutes on a side on the Dodd amendment, which I have seen, which essentially is a change on the tax side of the equation, and spend the tax money in two ways, part of it on entitlement programs for education and part on discretionary, and we would take 5 minutes on our side on that, 10 minutes each here. Then I would authorize somebody to enter into that agreement in my behalf in my absence.

Mr. DODD. If my colleague will yield, I wonder if I might get a couple of minutes on the Snowe amendment itself. Is that a possibility? Of the time you have?

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I cannot hold the Senator to this, but if the Senator will talk about the Snowe amendment and not about education in general, that would be fine. The Senator wants to speak against that amendment?

Mr. DODD. I do.

Mr. DOMENICI. If I am going to give the Senator time against it, I want him to be against it.

Mr. DODD. I intend to be against the Snowe amendment.

Mr. DOMENICI. And the Senator will speak against it?

Mr. DODD. Absolutely.

Mr. DOMENICI. All right, I yield Senator DODD 2 minutes of my time.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I wonder if my colleague from New Mexico, upon condition that I speak against the Snowe amendment, would grant me time?

Mr. DOMENICI. I will give the Senator 2 minutes of my time.

How much did I give the Senator?

Mr. DODD. The Senator did not.

Mr. DOMENICI. I give the Senator 2 minutes of my time. Each Senator gets 2 minutes in opposition and that will keep 6 for me, and then Senator SNOWE has the full 10 minutes to speak to the Senator's amendment.

Mr. EXON. Is that in the form of a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. DOMENICI. The Senator said he needed some time. Is he willing to do that?

Mr. EXON. That is agreeable to those on this side.

Mr. DOMENICI. Let us give it a try.

Mr. KENNEDY. Reserving the right to object, and I do not intend to object, will the result of that proposal ensure that we will have an opportunity to vote on the Dodd amendment in a timely way?

Mr. DOMENICI. Sure. We will not amend it. We do not guarantee that somebody will not table it, but we will have a vote on it and we will agree to stack it in the normal way that we are doing the others.

Mr. KENNEDY. So it would be treated as a second-degree amendment?

Mr. DOMENICI. Exactly.

Mr. KENNEDY. In that particular order.

Mr. DOMENICI. Correct.

Let us try this, Mr. President. First of all, I am going to yield 2 minutes in opposition to the Snowe amendment to Senator DODD, 2 minutes to Senator WELLSTONE, and I reserve the remainder for myself.

The total amount of time that is going to be used on the Snowe amendment—and we yield back whatever other time we have—is 10 minutes by Senator SNOWE and a total of 10 minutes in opposition, of which 4 have just been allocated.

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

Mr. DOMENICI. Let me move on then to a unanimous-consent request. There will only be one second-degree amendment. It shall be an amendment offered by Senator DODD which has been described here and presented to the Senator from New Mexico. There will be 5 minutes on a side, 5 minutes by Senator DODD, 5 minutes in opposition, either by myself or Senator SNOWE. We will then proceed to an amendment by Senator HATFIELD immediately after that. And when the time has expired on the second-degree amendment—there shall be no other second-degree amendments—we will then stack the second-degree amendment pursuant to the previous understanding, that the leader will arrange the order and there will be a vote on or about the Dodd amendment in the stacked order.

Mr. EXON. I certainly do not object. I would just simply wish to expand this in order to move things along. We are prepared to consider time agreements now on both the Hatfield amendment and the amendment following that to be offered by Senator BOXER.

Is the Senator from New Mexico in a position to talk about time agreements on the Hatfield amendment?

Mr. DOMENICI. I am going to a meeting right now at which I think the Senator will be in attendance, and I will seek some relief on time.

Mr. EXON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. DOMENICI. I yield the floor at this time.

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

The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I rise this morning to express my objection to the Snowe-Abraham amendment. This amendment proposes to restore some $6.3 billion in education, specifically to reduce the Labor Committee's instruction by this amount in an effort to stave off severe cuts in student loans.

Let me at the outset say I appreciate the fact that there is at least some recognition of the fact we ought to be trying to restore some of these critical funds in education.

Education has always been an issue that has transcended politics in many ways. There has been a deep commitment historically to it on both sides of the aisle, and yet the Budget Committee proposal that is before us, even with the Snowe-Abraham amendment, offers education too little too late, I would say, Mr. President.

It is too little in that it offers students an umbrella in the midst of the hurricane they face with this budget proposal, even if this amendment were to be adopted. It will provide some protection but it is the thinnest of fig leaves in that the committee will still have to eliminate $7.5 billion from student loan programs.

I have been through a number of reconciliations on the Labor Committee and make no mistake about it—there is only one place you can find $7.5 billion, and that is in student loans. There is no other place within our committee's jurisdiction. And so we will be faced with looking ways to cut loans for working-class families, middle-class families many who do not qualify for Pell grants, do not have the personal affluence, and yet long for the better life that higher education can offer their children. And these will be the Americans who bear the brunt of these cuts.

Now, these cuts may take many forms. It could come from the elimination of the in-school interest subsidy which can amount to additional costs of as much as $4,000 for a working family in this country; it could come through increased fees, through the elimination of the 6-month grace period, or an increase in the interest on student loans or any combination of those, again all money out of students' pockets. The bottom line is students and families are going to pay dearly as a result of what is in this budget, even if we adopt the Snowe-Abraham amendment.

This amendment is also too late, Mr. President, because the amendment only addresses the end of the education pipeline, higher education. Our world class higher education sector is in no way secure if our efforts in college preparation, elementary and secondary schools, Head Start and other areas are going to be severely undercut.

This amendment is sort of the double whammy for these critical discretionary programs. Not only does it not address the cuts proposed in these programs, it also further cuts into discretionary programs to offset the reduction it makes on the mandatory side.

Mr. President, we will offer a second degree amendment as an alternative which offsets $28 billion in cuts in education with very specific plugging of corporate loopholes which we can identify specifically, which Mr. KASICH on the House side identified as areas that should be looked at in the effort to balance our Federal budget.

So I would urge rejection of this amendment, with all due respect. We will have a substitute that will allow for this body to vote on truly whether or not they want to see these working-class families in this country get a break when it comes to education.

Mr. WELLSTONE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, last year in Minnesota over 14,000 students received assistance from the Federal Stafford Loan Program—14,000 students.

I just rise to speak in opposition to the Snowe amendment and say that I am proud to be an original cosponsor of the Dodd amendment.

Mr. President, this is, indeed, too little too late. What we are faced with right now are some really draconian cuts that will do irreparable harm to higher education in America. In the second-degree amendment we are going to introduce, we focus on corporate welfare or tax expenditures.

Mr. President, I would far prefer for some of the oil companies, some of the large pharmaceutical or insurance companies or large financial institutions to be tightening their belts and to be a part of the sacrifice than I would go forward with deep cuts in financial assistance for higher education.

I cannot think of a more important middle-class issue as a former college professor than this issue.

I do not have time, but if I had time I could recite story after story after story after story of students who have written letters to me and made phone calls saying for God sake, please do not deny us the opportunity to have an affordable higher education. No matter how you cut it, that is what these cuts are all about. I do not even have a chance in the 2 minutes to talk about earlier education which is, of course, equally important.

These cuts in higher education are myopic. These cuts are profoundly mistaken for our country. These cuts will have an accrual effect on students all across the across the nation from Ohio to Minnesota, and the Snowe amendment in that respect is really just a little bit more than symbolic—too little, too late. We can do much, much better in how we sort out our priorities.

I yield the floor.

Mr. MURKOWSKI addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. How much time is remaining on our side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine has 10 minutes. The opposition now has 6.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I thank the Chair. I would yield such time as the Senator from Maine may need on the available time.

Ms. SNOWE. I thank the Senator from Alaska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Ms. SNOWE. I found quite interesting the debate that has been offered here today on my amendment.

First of all, just to recap my amendment, it is to restore $6.3 billion in the education account. And, yes, we do provide specific offsets. That should be no

surprise if you are attempting to provide a credible alternative.

And that is why I am somewhat confused by the debate here this morning, because I heard from the Senator from Ohio that my offsets are binding but then we heard from the Senator from Massachusetts that they are not binding.

Well, I think we all understand the true nature of the budget process in the Congress. No, the instructions in the budget resolution are not binding. But if you are attempting to provide real numbers to demonstrate that they are credible, then it is responsible to recommend some specific offsets.

It is also true the committees do not have to follow those instructions. I understand that and the cosponsors of this amendment understand that. But we want to make sure that everybody understands that there is a way to reach those numbers. That is what is important.

The second issue is whether or not you live in a fiscal fantasy land. The difference between the amendment that I am offering here today with the cosponsors of this amendment and those who oppose it is we support a balanced budget. If you support a balanced budget, you have to make some choices. If you do not support a balanced budget, you do not have to make any choices. You can spend in an unlimited fashion.

The amendment that they will be offering will recommend reducing corporate welfare and tax loopholes. You cannot object to that. But exactly how are we going to reach that goal? They do not specify. No, they do not want to specify, because they do not want to receive any opposition to those specific offsets, just as they do not support a balanced budget because they do not want to make any real choices as to how we get there. So that is the difference.

My amendment is a credible amendment. It restores specific funding for specific issues with respect to student loan assistance. Yes, I would like to do more. But there are those on my side saying, ''You are doing too much,'' and then I hear from the other side of the aisle who say, ''No, you are not doing enough.'' Well, I think my amendment is somewhere in the middle. Hopefully, we will do more in the final analysis.

The amendments that have been offered to restore funding for education have used the illusory dividend. Well, that is just gimmickry at this point. That dividend may come down at the end of this process when reconciliation is in place. That does not give adequate instructions to the committee. It is not money that they can use right now and everybody knows it.

So if we really want to restore funding to education, if we really want to address the home and farm equity issue so that it is not used to determine one's income eligibility for student loans, if we want to keep the origination fee at 3 percent, if we want to have an adequate grace period, then you support the Snowe amendment.

And, I should add who the cosponsors are of my amendment: Senator KASSEBAUM, Senator LOTT, Senator COHEN, Senator ABRAHAM, Senator BROWN, Senator GRASSLEY, Senator CHAFEE, and Senator KEMPTHORNE.

In fact, I ask unanimous consent to add Senator KEMPTHORNE from Idaho as a cosponsor of this amendment.

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

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. MURKOWSKI addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. How much time is remaining on this side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I yield 6 minutes to my friend from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. I thank the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. President, last night, when we were watching the discussion take place, a comment was made by the Senator from Wyoming that the debate is getting redundant on this budget; that we have heard about every argument there is to hear and now we are working on repetition to try to drive it in.

It occurred to me that it sounded very much like the debate that we had on the balanced budget amendment to the Constitution. At that time, people were standing up and saying, ''Well, give us the details. Give us the details. Where do you want to make cuts? What do you want to do with Medicare and Social Security,'' and all the contentious items that we can so easily demagog?

I can suggest right now we have the details. But I wanted to take a couple of minutes this morning to share one thing with you, and that is we know pretty much how it is going to come out. We know who is going to vote for it and who is going to vote against it. And we know why.

First of all, the argument has been used that there are cuts. We have talked about this over and over again. They are not cuts in the Medicare system. We are talking about a growth factor that is built in. And the same thing is true with all the other areas that people are very much concerned with.

What we are trying to do is take this one last golden opportunity that we have—this is it, our chance to fulfill that obligation that the American people gave to us back on November 8 with a mandate. The No. 1 mandate was to balance the budget. This is an opportunity to do it. The House has already done theirs. All we have to do is do it here. I think the votes are here to do it.

But I have heard people stand up, such as one Senator the other day, and say every Senator wants to balance the budget. I suggest, Mr. President, that is not true. I suggest that they want people to think they want to balance the budget, but what it gets down to is they are basically traditional big spenders and big taxers and they want the status quo. They want to keep Government going as it has been going.

To demonstrate this, I am going to tell you, Mr. President, who is going to be voting against this. The same people who will be voting against it today are the ones that voted for and are the right-to-know supporters. These are the ones that did not want a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution.

So during that debate, I characterized who these people are who do not want a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution and today do not want a balanced budget. I suggest to you they are the ones that can be identified with a voting behavior of taxing and spending.

And I use as my examples the tax bill of 1993, the tax bill that was a Clinton bill that some people are touting as the great deficit reduction bill. In fact, it did not reduce any programs. All it did was increase taxes, the largest tax increase in history—$267 billion. That is not what the American people wanted. It was an increase in taxes on all segments of society, a Social Security tax increase for thousands of Social Security recipients. It was a 70-percent increase. Yet, these individuals who will vote today against this balanced budget are the ones who voted for that tax increase.

Then along came the Clinton stimulus program. It was characterized by a Democrat in this body as the largest single spending increase in the history of public finance in America or anywhere in the world. Such things as the $2.5 billion for swimming pools, parking lots, ice rink warming huts, alpine ski lifts, and other pork barrel projects; $1 billion for summer jobs, $1.1 billion for AIDS treatment and food distribution, on and on and on, all these spending increases that supposedly were going to stimulate the economy.

So I characterized those individuals who voted for those two bills and also who are rated as big spenders. There are a number of corporations that rate big spenders. The main one is the National Taxpayers Union. So I looked at those individuals who cosponsored the Right To Know Act which was the one to demolish, to do away with, the balanced budget amendment and stop our effort for a balanced budget.

I found, of all the 41 cosponsors, all 41 voted yes on the biggest spending bill in the history of this body. And all 41 of those individuals had a National Taxpayer Union rating of D or F.

So, Mr. President, I think that we have had a lot of debate on this. But when it gets right down to it, the bottom line is this: Those individuals who are trying to hold on to the past, those

who are trying with white knuckles to hold on to the status quo, those who did not hear the mandate that was so loud and clear on November 8, 1994, are going to be voting for big spending, big government, tax increases, spending increases and vote against the balanced budget that we have up before us today.

I believe it will pass, because those individuals who are for the status quo are now in a minority.

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

Mrs. HUTCHISON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. How much time is remaining on our side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Twenty-two seconds in opposition; and 6½ minutes for the Senator from Maine.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Six-and-a-half minutes remaining for the Senator from Maine?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Six-and-a-half minutes remaining.

Ms. SNOWE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURNS). The Senator from Maine.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, since I have a few remaining moments on my amendment, I think it is important to restate the case of how essential it is to restore funding to education, and the difference in the amendments that are being offered this morning is a difference between being able to realistically restore funding to education or not, because you will hear from the other side in presenting an amendment that there will not really be any specific offsets. While it is true that my offsets are not binding on the committee, at least we are being responsible in the approach that we are taking.

I think this amendment is critical because it does provide $6.3 billion. It will be protecting some very serious student loan assistance programs, and I want to make sure that the low- and middle-income families are not affected by any changes in the student loan programs.

I also want to ensure that the Labor and Human Resources Committee has the ability to protect the student loan assistance programs in the way that we have recommended in this amendment, so that they will not feel compelled to include home and farm equity in determining one's income eligibility, they will not feel compelled to raise the origination fee from 3 to 5 percent, and they will not feel compelled to eliminate an adequate grace period.

I know there are some who are opposed to the offsets, but the committees are the ones who are ultimately responsible for the way in which we provide the restoration of funds. They have the options to pursue other courses.

The fact of the matter is, we have to take a responsible course by recommending ways in which we can reach our goals as identified in this amendment.

I think that it is very, very important that we restore some of the funding in the education accounts. It is something that I argued within the Budget Committee during the time in which we were assembling this resolution. I wish it were more, but I also understand the delicate balance in crafting this budget resolution to reach the historic goal of balancing the budget by the year 2002.

I wish that we could identify other areas and perhaps that will ultimately develop in the process. Maybe the dividend down the road, but that dividend is not here today, and I think everybody should understand that. The dividend is not available to be used because it is not there yet. We have to pass a balanced budget plan and reconciliation has to become law for the Congressional Budget Office to score a potential dividend. That will materialize over 7 years, so that is not money that can be used by the Appropriations Committee or considered by the authorization committees as they develop their programmatic changes.

So it does not make sense and it is gimmickry to suggest that we are going to use an illusory estimate. So if you hear about amendments, as we will hear from others this morning, about restoring funding by using this dividend, it means nothing because it is not available and it is not there yet.

So if you support restoring $6.3 billion in education and doing it in a responsible way, then I hope you will support the Snowe amendment that is cosponsored by 10 Members of the Senate.

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, the Dodd second-degree amendment is, in effect, an increase in taxes and I am opposed to any increase in tax.

However, I am also opposed to the Snowe amendment.

Let me begin by stating that I am a strong supporter of educational funding. I am firmly opposed to the drastic cuts in educational programs and funding which is outlined in the House resolution. I believe that these cuts, while well-intentioned, are shortsighted. Such cuts ignore the long-term benefits of preparing America's children to assume their position in the world market, and for that reason I oppose those cuts.

By the same token, however, I believe that Senator SNOWE'S amendment is shortsighted. I believe that we, as guardians of our children's future, are charged with the moral obligation to not only educate our children but also to insure that there will be jobs available for them to assume once they have been educated. To ignore either is irresponsible.

Now let us take a look at what is on the table. The High-Speed Research Program was designed to develop precompetitive technologies for high-speed civil transport aircraft. Once developed, the technology is transferred to the Federal Aviation Administration, the Department of Defense, and U.S. industry. It is estimated that the first organization to market such an aircraft stands to gain $200 billion in sales and 140,000 new jobs. In short, this program accomplishes three goals that are vital to the United States' financial solvency: First, it increases new jobs, which increases the country's tax base; second, it generates sales for U.S. industry, which increases the country's GNP, and, in so doing, increases the country's tax base; and third, it insures the United States' continued leadership in this field, thus forecasting future revenues.

Likewise, the Advanced Subsonic Technology Program generates substantial long-term revenue benefits. This program is designed to protect the United States' market share in subsonic aircraft, an area which generates almost a million high quality jobs in the United States and contributes between $25 and $30 billion annually to the U.S. trade balance—which, incidentally is the largest of any U.S. manufacturing industry. These programs are moneymakers, and to eliminate them for any reason is fiscally irresponsible.

This is particularly true under the present circumstances, where the chairman's budget adequately addresses the concerns raised by Senator SNOWE. Senator SNOWE'S amendment seeks to restore $6.3 billion over 7 years for undergraduate loans—$1.124 billion of this from the termination of the NASA programs.

However, the chairman's resolution protects undergraduate student loans. Under Chairman DOMENICI'S resolution, interest on loans for undergraduate education does not accrue until graduation. So, for all students who enter the work force immediately after college, nothing has changed. With regard to individuals who choose to pursue graduate or professional coursework, interest would not accrue on their college debt until they complete this coursework. Chairman DOMENICI's resolution does change the present student loan program with respect to deferring interest payments accruing upon graduate and professional coursework. However, this burden is lessened by the chairman's budget by preserving the benefits of capped interest rates on student loans, federal guarantees, opportunities to defer payments in case of economic hardship, and Federal fellowship programs targeted specifically toward graduate students.

The Snowe amendment ignores the long-term impact that terminating these programs would have upon the U.S. balance of trade, the GNP and its consequent U.S. Treasury implication, and the generation of jobs in America. Consequently, I oppose this amendment, and urge my fellow colleagues to do the same.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

AMENDMENT NO. 1128

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by Senator SNOWE and others that

would reduce funding for NASA's Aeronautics Program by $1.1 billion over the next 5 years. The $1.1 billion reduction proposed in the Snowe amendment for Aeronautics is in addition to the $800 million reduction proposed for NASA's Aeronautics Program that is included in the chairman's mark.

The effect of the Snowe amendment would be to eliminate NASA's Advanced Subsonic Technology Development and High-Speed Research programs which make up the core of NASA's Aeronautics program.

Mr. President, the aeronautics industry contributes over 1 million high quality jobs to the U.S. economy and generates $20 to $30 billion in exports each year. But U.S. aircraft and engine manufacturers must compete on both cost and technical capability against government-subsidized foreign competition.

The European Airbus Consortium already claims more than one-third of the commercial aircraft market, a market once dominated by U.S. manufacturers. The goal of Airbus is to control 50 percent of the global market by the year 2005.

I do not intend to let the Europeans accomplish their goal, Mr. President. That is why, when I was chair of the VA–HUD Appropriations Subcommittee, I pushed NASA to expand their research and technology efforts in aeronautics.

NASA's Advanced Subsonic Technology program specifically addresses future technology needs in next-generation subsonic aircraft—from large commercial jets to small general aviation aircraft—and the evolving airspace system. NASA's role is to develop high-risk, high-payoff pre-competitive technologies to prove technical feasibility and then transfer these new technologies to the FAA, DOD, and U.S. industry.

Elimination of the Advanced Subsonic Technology program would terminate NASA's efforts to develop technologies to increase the capacity of the airspace system, to ensure that the existing aging aircraft fleet remains safe and cost-effective, and that the technologies needed for U.S. industry to meet international environmental, noise, and pollution regulations are available.

Mr. President, the Snowe amendment would also wipe out NASA's High Speed Research program which is conducting the early, high-risk technology development needed for an environmentally compatible and economically competitive high speed civil transport (HSCT). The goal of this program is develop a plane that would fly at more than twice the speed of sound and carry 300 passengers over 5,000 nautical miles at fares competitive with existing subsonic aircraft.

Mr. President, the stakes associated with the development of the HSCT are enormous. If the Europeans are the first to market an HSCT, it will cost the U.S. larger trade deficits and the loss of hundreds of thousands of high-skilled, high-wage jobs. If the U.S. wins this race, the U.S. market share for commercial aircraft could grow to nearly 80 percent, and create $200 billion in sales and 140,000 new jobs.

Mr. President, I happen to believe that the best social program is a job, and that job creation in America must be linked to our manufacturing base. Manufacturing in the new economy of a post-cold war era will require high technology and competitiveness in the global marketplace.

America's future in manufacturing begins and ends with aeronautics. Commercial aviation is one of the few areas of manufacturing where the U.S. continues to export more than we import, and where we are able to provide high-skilled, high quality jobs for American workers.

Mr. President, I do not intend to let our commercial aviation industry go the way of the VCR, the automobile, or the textile industry. I intend to fight to keep the U.S. aeronautics industry competitive so that we preserve the jobs we have and the job opportunities needed for the 21st century.

The Snowe amendment would reduce funding for NASA's Aeronautics Program by two-thirds over the next 5 years. The amendment is shortsighted and threatens our ability to develop a manufacturing strategy for this Nation.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment. I yield the floor.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I oppose the amendment offered by my distinguished colleague from Maine, Senator SNOWE. I, too, am concerned about the deep cuts—$14.6 billion over 7 years—in the William D. Ford Federal Direct Loan and Federal Family Education Loan Programs which make it possible for many of our young people to pursue a higher education.

However, I cannot support an amendment to restore funding for mandatory programs, such as the $6.3 billion for these student loan programs, by cutting nonmilitary discretionary programs by an equal amount. In other words, it would not cut military spending at all, even though it is the only area of the discretionary budget that will not be cut under this budget resolution. Not only is this robbing Peter to pay Paul, it violates the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990 which prohibits offsetting tax cuts or mandatory program expansions with cuts in discretionary programs.

In addition, it is not growth in nonmilitary discretionary programs which is driving up the Federal deficit. This spending has been at a hard freeze or below since 1993. The budget resolution before us would cut nonmilitary discretionary programs nearly $200 billion below a freeze over the next 7 years. Meanwhile, mandatory programs and tax expenditures will continue to grow—the latter with no restraint at all under this budget resolution.

No one understands the value of a higher education better than I, but I cannot support this amendment which would set an unacceptable precedent for funding mandatory programs with nonmilitary discretionary program cuts.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, has all time been yielded back?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, we yield back the remainder of our time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Maine yield back her time?

Ms. SNOWE. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been yielded back.

Mr. DODD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

AMENDMENT NO. 1131 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1128

(Purpose: To restore $28 billion in outlays over seven years to reduce by $16 billion the discretionary cuts proposed in education and reduce the reconciliation instructions to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources (primarily affecting student loans) by $12 billion by closing corporate tax loopholes)

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I send a substitute to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], for himself, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. PELL, Mr. WELLSTONE, and Mr. SIMON, proposes an amendment numbered 1131 to amendment No. 1128.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

Strike all after line 1 and insert:

On page 3, line 10, increase the amount by $5,100,000,000.

On page 3, line 11, increase the amount by $3,400,000,000.

On page 3, line 12, increase the amount by $3,600,000,000.

On page 3, line 13, increase the amount by $3,800,000,000.

On page 3, line 14, increase the amount by $4,00,000,000.

On page 3, line 15, increase the amount by $4,000,000,000.

On page 3, line 16, increase the amount by $4,100,000,000.

On page 3, line 20, increase the amount by $5,100,000,000.

On page 3, line 21, increase the amount by $3,400,000,000.

On page 3, line 22, increase the amount by $3,600,000,000.

On page 3, line 23, increase the amount by $3,800,000,000.

On page 3, line 24, increase the amount by $4,000,000,000.

On page 3, line 25, increase the amount by $4,000,000,000.

On page 4, line 1, increase the amount by $4,100,000,000.

On page 4, line 18, increase the amount by $5,100,000,000.

On page 4, line 19, increase the amount by $3,400,000,000.

On page 4, line 20, increase the amount by $3,600,000,000.
On page 4, line 21, increase the amount by $3,800,000,000.
On page 4, line 22, increase the amount by $4,000,000,000.
On page 4, line 23, increase the amount by $4,000,000,000.
On page 4, line 24, increase the amount by $4,100,000,000.
On page 5, line 4, increase the amount by $5,100,000,000.
On page 5, line 5, increase the amount by $3,400,000,000.
On page 5, line 6, increase the amount by $3,600,000,000.
On page 5, line 7, increase the amount by $3,800,000,000.
On page 5, line 8, increase the amount by $4,000,000,000.
On page 5, line 9, increase the amount by $4,000,000,000.
On page 5, line 10, increase the amount by $4,100,000,000.
On page 5, line 17, increase the amount by $28,300,000,000.
On page 5, line 18, increase the amount by $3,800,000,000.
On page 5, line 19, increase the amount by $3,600,000,000.
On page 5, line 20, increase the amount by $3,800,000,000.
On page 5, line 21, increase the amount by $4,000,000,000.
On page 5, line 22, increase the amount by $4,000,000,000.
On page 5, line 23, increase the amount by $4,100,000,000.
On page 6, line 16, increase the amount by $5,100,000,000.
On page 6, line 17, increase the amount by $3,400,000,000.
On page 6, line 18, increase the amount by $3,600,000,000.
On page 6, line 19, increase the amount by $3,800,000,000.
On page 6, line 20, increase the amount by $4,000,000,000.
On page 6, line 21, increase the amount by $4,000,000,000.
On page 6, line 22, increase the amount by $4,100,000,000.
On page 31, line 12, increase the amount by $28,300,000,000.
On page 31, line 20, increase the amount by $3,800,000,000.
On page 32, line 3, increase the amount by $3,600,000,000.
On page 32, line 11, increase the amount by $3,800,000,000.
On page 32, line 19, increase the amount by $4,000,000,000.
On page 33, line 2, increase the amount by $4,000,000,000.
On page 33, line 10, increase the amount by $4,100,000,000.
On page 31, line 13, increase the amount by $5,100,000,000.
On page 31, line 21, increase the amount by $3,400,000,000.
On page 32, line 4, increase the amount by $3,600,000,000.
On page 32, line 12, increase the amount by $3,800,000,000.
On page 32, line 20, increase the amount by $4,000,000,000.
On page 33, line 3, increase the amount by $4,000,000,000.
On page 33, line 11, increase the amount by $4,100,000,000.
On page 64, line 9, decrease the amount by $1,100,000,000.
On page 64, line 10, decrease the amount by $7,900,000,000.
On page 64, line 11, decrease the amount by $12,000,000,000.
On page 65, line 17, increase the amount by $26,700,000,000.
On page 65, line 18, increase the amount by $4,000,000,000.
On page 65, line 24, increase the amount by $2,400,000,000.
On page 65, line 25, increase the amount by $2,000,000,000.
On page 66, line 6, increase the amount by $2,000,000,000.
On page 66, line 7, increase the amount by $2,000,000,000.
On page 66, line 13, increase the amount by $2,000,000,000.
On page 66, line 14, increase the amount by $2,000,000,000.
On page 66, line 20, increase the amount by $2,000,000,000.
On page 66, line 21, increase the amount by $2,000,000,000.
On page 67, line 2, increase the amount by $2,000,000,000.
On page 67, line 3, increase the amount by $2,000,000,000.
On page 67, line 9, increase the amount by $2,000,000,000.
On page 67, line 10, increase the amount by $2,000,000,000.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I offer this substitute amendment to the Snowe-Abraham amendment on behalf of myself and Senators HARKIN, HOLLINGS, KENNEDY, JEFFORDS, PELL, WELLSTONE, and SIMON.

As I understand it, there are now 5 minutes to be allocated on either side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I offer this amendment which will restore $28 billion to our education programs. This is substantially less than the amendment that was offered yesterday by several of my colleagues, but this amendment would reduce the committee's instruction and, thereby, the cuts in student loans by $12 billion and restore $16 billion in discretionary cuts in education.

This amendment is also deficit neutral. While certainly in these resolutions it is ultimately up to the committees of jurisdiction as to where specifically they will make their cuts, I offset this $28 billion and suggest specifically four areas within the Tax Code that would provide up to $65.7 billion in revenues currently lost through corporate tax loopholes.

These areas were identified in a list of corporate tax loopholes compiled by the chairman of the Budget Committee on the House side, Mr. KASICH from Ohio. Let me identify them specifically.

You can pick $28 billion out of the $65.7 billion they would garner. The issue is choosing between these tax loopholes or investing in the education of children in this country who need higher education and count on the Federal investment in critical elementary and secondary programs.

One is the expatriate billionaire tax loophole. Closing this loophole generates $2.1 billion. Those are people who leave the country, fly out of America to avoid their taxes. That is $2.1 billion. So that is part of the choice: Helping out those people or children and students in this country who need an education.

The second is $26 billion. This currently shields foreign source income of U.S. firms from U.S. taxes, which should apply to that income. This change alone generates $26 billion. If you do not want to take all $26 billion, you can reduce that somewhat, since I offer a total of $65 billion in offsets. I understand it may be important to some firms, but we are making tough choices around here. So you have to ask yourself on this one: Should we modify that tax loophole to some degree to help pay for the education needs of America? That is my second tax loophole.

My third permits U.S. exporters to exempt a portion of their export income from U.S. taxation—the House Budget Committee's figures suggest that this would generate an additional $10.9 billion. Again, you do not have to take all of it here, since there is the other part of the total $65 billion. But can't we take some of that money and try and restore these funds for the educational needs of America?

And last, Mr. President, the one that provides $26.3 billion is one that interacts with the foreign tax credit provisions in a way that can effectively exempt a portion of a firm's export income from U.S. taxation. It is called the inventory property sales source rule exemption. The title is vague to me, but there is what Mr. KASICH said it does.

So $26.3 billion, $10.9 billion, $26.4 billion and $2.1 billion—that is $65.7 billion. I would like to get just $28 billion out of that $65 billion to try and shield students and families from the crushing blow of these education cuts—and preserve their access to higher education and continue our partnerships with schools and communities across this country in elementary and secondary education.

That is the choice: Whether you want to keep these tax loopholes or restore the $28 billion. We all make tough decisions.

Again, this is Mr. KASICH's list, this is not my list. These are the provisions he suggested that we ought to be looking at as a way to try to deal with deficit reduction. My amendment allows us to take these steps while simultaneously making the kinds of investments families across America need—$12 billion to protect the student loan program and $16 billion to support critical discretionary programs like Pell grants, title I, and Head Start. Families and students need that kind of help.

Mr. President, this is an investment we must make in our future. Last Congress was hailed as the education Congress. We passed legislation lowering student loan costs, Head Start legislation that was to move us to fully funding all eligible children, the Goals 2000 legislation offering vital federal support to local efforts to improve our schools.

With this budget, we back away from our commitment. At this rate we will need to rename that last act if we are being honest with the American people.

Why do we not call it Goals 3000 because, obviously, if we continue with the cuts proposed here we are never going to reach our goals, Goals 2000 becomes an absolute mirage. It does not exist. As this resolution is, we move the goal posts further down the road and make our education deficit that much larger.

So here is the choice: Billionaire tax loophole and some modification of the treatment of export income or critical investments in education.

Mr. President, I strongly urge that my colleagues support us in this substitute amendment. This gives this body the opportunity to demonstrate that the educational needs of America are just as important—just as important—as the export income or the billionaire tax loophole. The issue is, do you want to defend these interest, or do you want to defend families who are out there making investments in their children's educations. Investments which fundamentally contribute to the economic security of this Nation in the 21st century. To turn our backs on the educational needs of these children and their families I think would be a great tragedy.

The health of a nation depends upon many things. Fiscal responsibility is clearly one of them, but also an educated society, a well-prepared society. There are families that are out there telling their children to stay in school and study hard and do their homework, and go to college. We break a contract with them when those loans are not there or at such a high cost that they cannot avoid them. Fifty percent of all students in higher education today receive some form of assistance—one out of every two. Yet, here we are slashing $14 billion out of these programs while we shield expatriot billionaires from their taxes and protect export income. We urge you to support our substitute.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Maine.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, here we go again. I hope that Members of the Senate will oppose this amendment. It is another generic amendment. You did not hear any specifics, other than the $6.3 billion and the $28 billion that would be necessary under this amendment through corporate welfare reductions and tax loopholes. While we all might agree with that goal, there is no specificity. It conveniently lacks specificity because they do not want to offend anybody. But that is not the responsible budgetary approach. That is why the Snowe-Abraham amendment is a credible approach in restoring $6.3 billion in education.

If you want to make sure that those funds are restored, then you must support the Snowe-Abraham amendment.

The amendment that is before us now, offered by the Senator from Connecticut, is illusory. It does not offer any instructions. It leaves potential instructions to the appropriate committees to determine how they reach the $28 billion. Unfortunately, that has been the process, not only here on the floor of the Senate but also in the Budget Committee. There were a number of Members who offered amendments to increase spending—the accumulation of spending of more than $500 billion and $77 billion in tax increases—but no corresponding amendments to reduce Federal spending, which is the goal of this budget resolution, and it is also a goal to reach a balanced budget.

Yes, we remember offsets. But at least we are in a position to say to the committee that this is the way in which you can arrive at these numbers. Do you want to make a decision about eliminating aircraft in the executive branch or raising funds for education? I think the choice is an easy one, and that is what this amendment is all about.

So I hope that Members of the Senate will oppose the Dodd amendment because it is not credible, because it does not offer responsible recommendations as to how to arrive at $28 billion worth of changes and at the same time do what we think is important by raising funds for education. The Snowe-Abraham amendment reaches that goal to provide the much-needed, very valuable school loan assistance programs to low- and middle-income families all across America.

So I urge the support of the Snowe-Abraham amendment in opposition to the Dodd amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

AMENDMENT NO. 1131

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I see a compromise. I see a way for the bipartisanship to return on education. It is a painful compromise on both sides, but we must pursue the art of the possible.

Mr. President, I tried 2 days ago, with my colleague from Iowa, Senator HARKIN, to make substantial progress toward restoring the cuts to education in this budget resolution with an amendment to restore $40 billion. That amendment was narrowly defeated. Yesterday, my colleague from Nebraska, Senator EXON attempted to restore $30 billion to education, as part of a package. That amendment narrowly failed.

Today, the Republican Senators from Maine and Ohio, Senator SNOWE and Senator DEWINE have offered a $6.3 billion restoration to student loan cuts.

We are making progress. Republicans have admitted that there is a real problem in this budget in that it severely cuts education.

But Mr. President, $6.3 billion for student loans still leaves students paying billions more, essentially to provide tax cuts elsewhere. More importantly, we should not merely restore part of the college student aid cuts while accepting the 33 percent cuts in this budget resolution to the programs that serve children. This budget resolution cuts the 6 million children served under title I for the disadvantaged to 4 million. It cuts services for over 5 million disabled children served under the Individuals With Disabilities Education Act by $5 billion. If it is wrong, economically, to cut student aid to provide tax cuts, as my Republican colleagues seem to concede, then it is certainly wrong to pass these huge cuts to education for younger children.

The means of bipartisan compromise is the Dodd amendment. It is a compromise that both sides can strain to reach. It restores a total of $28 billion. It does not fully restore the cuts to children's programs. It still reduces the number of children served, while we know that the number of children will rise. And, it fully—not partially—relieves college students of their part of cuts in student loans.

Mr. President, this amendment can help us rebuild the bipartisan consensus that education is a priority. We should not cut disadvantaged and disabled children, and it is economically foolish to do so. I know colleagues on both sides of the aisle believe this, and I urge all Senators to support this amendment.

Mr. DOMENICI. Do I have 3 minutes remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I was searching in my mind for what Yogi Berra might say about this, but I cannot quite come up with it. ''Déjà vu all over again,'' yes; that sounds right. See, we just got behind us, we thought, the idea that the way to balance the budget was to raise taxes. We thought we had finished that off and that maybe so long as we were attempting to balance the budget by restraining Government, since the first effort 2 years ago to balance the budget relied heavily on tax increases and did not work and the deficit is still going up, we thought we ought to restrain Government in a very serious way. And the first real serious opportunity on the other side to change this budget resolution significantly is to raise taxes $25 billion for a good cause.

Now, frankly, Mr. President, I believe the American people understand that the time has come to balance the budget by reining in Government, having less Government, redefining it, doing it better, doing it more efficiently. All of the arguments about what is happening to programs that we have in existence assumes that those programs are the only way to help Americans; that the only way to help education is the exact array of Federal programs that we have right now. And anybody that suggests you might do it for less, or do it a different way, of course, they are against education, or they are against highways, or they are against whatever it is.

So essentially, nobody should misunderstand this amendment, regardless of the rhetoric about loopholes and the like. The budget resolution does three things with reference to taxes, it either lowers or increases them or it leaves

them the same. Essentially, this will increase taxes. I do not believe we should adopt it. At the appropriate time, I will move to table it. I will not do it now because obviously it will be stacked. I hope we will defeat it. It clearly would be one of the amendments that this budget resolution should not carry with it as we go to conference with the House.

I yield back any remaining time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Oregon is now recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 1132

(Purpose: To restore funds cut from the National Institutes of Health)

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD], for himself and Mr. JEFFORDS, proposes an amendment numbered 1132.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 11, line 7, decrease the amount by $430,000,000.
On page 11, line 8, decrease the amount by $258,000,000.
On page 11, line 14, decrease the amount by $920,000,000.
On page 11, line 15, decrease the amount by $552,000,000.
On page 11, line 21, decrease the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 11, line 22, decrease the amount by $600,000,000.
On page 12, line 3, decrease the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 12, line 4, decrease the amount by $600,000,000.
On page 12, line 10, decrease the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 12, line 11, decrease the amount by $600,000,000.
On page 12, line 17, decrease the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 12, line 18, decrease the amount by $600,000,000.
On page 12, line 24, decrease the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 12, line 25, decrease the amount by $600,000,000.
On page 33, line 19, increase the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 33, line 20, increase the amount by $430,000,000.
On page 34, line 2, increase the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 34, line 3, increase the amount by $920,000,000.
On page 34, line 9, increase the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 34, line 10, increase the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 34, line 16, increase the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 34, line 17, increase the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 34, line 23, increase the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 34, line 24, increase the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 35, line 5, increase the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 35, line 6, increase the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 35, line 12, increase the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 35, line 13, increase the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 54, line 20, increase the amount by $570,000,000.
On page 54, line 21, increase the amount by $172,000,000.
On page 55, line 2, increase the amount by $80,000,000.
On page 55, line 3, increase the amount by $368,000,000.
On page 55, line 10, increase the amount by $400,000,000.
On page 55, line 17, increase the amount by $400,000,000.
On page 55, line 24, increase the amount by $400,000,000.
On page 56, line 6, increase the amount by $400,000,000.
On page 56, line 13, increase the amount by $400,000,000.
On page 65, line 14, decrease the amount by $430,000,000.
On page 65, line 15, decrease the amount by $258,000,000.
On page 65, line 17, increase the amount by $430,000,000.
On page 65, line 18, increase the amount by $258,000,000.
On page 65, line 21, decrease the amount by $920,000,000.
On page 65, line 22, decrease the amount by $552,000,000.
On page 65, line 24, increase the amount by $920,000,000.
On page 65, line 25, increase the amount by $552,000,000.
On page 66, line 3, decrease the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 66, line 4, decrease the amount by $600,000,000.
On page 66, line 6, increase the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 66, line 7, increase the amount by $600,000,000.
On page 66, line 10, decrease the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 66, line 11, decrease the amount by $600,000,000.
On page 66, line 13, increase the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 66, line 14, increase the amount by $600,000,000.
On page 66, line 17, decrease the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 66, line 18, decrease the amount by $600,000,000.
On page 66, line 20, increase the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 66, line 21, increase the amount by $600,000,000.
On page 66, line 24, decrease the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 66, line 25, decrease the amount by $600,000,000.
On page 67, line 2, increase the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 67, line 3, increase the amount by $600,000,000.
On page 67, line 6, decrease the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 67, line 7, decrease the amount by $600,000,000.
On page 67, line 9, increase the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 67, line 10, increase the amount by $600,000,000.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. DOMENICI. If the chairman will yield, I have conferred with the other side, and I understand there are no second-degree amendments. Perhaps Senator HATFIELD would like to handle it differently if there are not going to be any second-degree amendments.

Mr. HATFIELD. I have no preference. Parliamentary inquiry. I am trying to get to the real part of the amendment, which is to restore the money to the NIH by offsets in all the other accounts, with the exception of defense. The one I have sent to the desk includes defense. That is my personal preference, but the votes are not there. So I am trying to protect the essence of the real amendment, which I want to debate, which is my second-degree amendment that excludes defense.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. I am told that a second-degree amendment is not in order until all time has been expired on the first degree.

Mr. DOMENICI. Could the Senator not withdraw the first amendment and offer the second amendment at this point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

Mr. HATFIELD. I yield to the request of the chairman, and I withdraw my first amendment on the assumption that I will be able to debate with my time allocation on the amendment that I want to bring to a vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has that right.

The amendment (No. 1132) was withdrawn.

AMENDMENT NO. 1133

(Purpose: To restore funds cut from the National Institutes of Health)

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD], for himself and Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. SPECTER, Mrs. KASSEBAUM, and Mr. D'AMATO proposes an amendment numbered 1133.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 33, line 19, increase the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 33, line 20, increase the amount by $430,000,000.
On page 34, line 2, increase the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 34, line 3, increase the amount by $920,000,000.
On page 34, line 9, increase the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 34, line 10, increase the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 34, line 16, increase the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 34, line 17, increase the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 34, line 23, increase the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 34, line 24, increase the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 35, line 5, increase the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 35, line 6, increase the amount by $1,000,000,000.

On page 35, line 12, increase the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 35, line 13, increase the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 54, line 20, increase the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 54, line 21, increase the amount by $430,000,000.
On page 55, line 2, increase the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 55, line 3, increase the amount by $920,000,000.
On page 55, line 9, increase the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 55, line 10, increase the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 55, line 16, increase the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 55, line 17, increase the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 55, line 23, increase the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 55, line 24, increase the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 56, line 5, increase the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 56, line 6, increase the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 56, line 12, increase the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 56, line 13, increase the amount by $1,000,000,000.

Mr. DOMENICI. Will the Senator yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. HATFIELD. Yes.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that no second-degree amendments be in order to the HATFIELD amendment that is pending.

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

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to add Senator D'AMATO as a cosponsor on this amendment.

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

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I now understand I have a 2-hour, equally divided time allocation to consider this amendment.

Mr. President, I would like to yield 1 minute to the Senator from New York to make a statement on this amendment.

Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, I rise to support and am pleased to join as a cosponsor of Senator HATFIELD's amendment.

We are talking about making cuts in order to balance our budget and provide a better future for coming generations. Yet I believe we have to be very careful about how we make those cuts and where.

In the amendment that has been put forth, Senator HATFIELD would restore $7 billion of the $7.7 billion that would otherwise come out of the National Institutes of Health.

I have to say, representing as I do New York, and Long Island in particular, we are being ravaged by an epidemic of cancer, breast cancer in particular. Breast cancer rates in the Long Island counties of Nassau and Suffolk rank first and fourth highest respectively among the 116 largest U.S. counties.

We cannot afford to reduce the funding for this vital research that provides at least a glimmer of hope for achieving the necessary breakthroughs to deal with the ravages of cancer, and breast cancer in particular.

The amendment of Senator HATFIELD will go a long way toward holding citizens harmless in this area. There would be a slight reduction of about 1 percent. Far better that 1 percent reduction than one that might reach as much as 15 to 16 percent. That, I believe, would not be the kind of investment in the future that we are attempting to bring about as we work to make a better future for all Americans, those whom we are protecting now and future generations.

I believe that is why this amendment is important and why it makes sense. I strongly urge its support. I thank the Senator for raising this very important issue.

Mr. HATFIELD. I thank the Senator from New York.

Mr. President, I offer this amendment on behalf of Senator SPECTER of Pennsylvania and Senator KASSEBAUM of Kansas. There will be other cosponsors that we will add as we go along.

Mr. President, fundamentally, what we are facing here is a prelude to disaster as it relates to medical research and medical science in this country.

We are really, in this session of the Congress, being offered three possibilities, three options. Each one of the three options has the same ending result.

We have the President's budget. The President's budget, if we vote this line—my visual aid supporting chart for 1996—the President raises the NIH appropriation budget proposal by 4.1 percent. Like so many things in politics, it is a shell game. You see it and then you do not see it. You think you have it, and then you do not have it.

After the first year of 1996 of raising this up by 4.1 percent, then the President's budget says—look at that drop. By the year 2000, we will take $1 billion away from medical research in this country. This amendment is bipartisan. The President is offering to demolish our medical research infrastructure on a slow-water-drip system.

Then we have the House resolution. The House resolution says, ''Well, by 1996, next year, we want to drop it 5 percent,'' and then we steady income out here whereby we again find the end result of a dramatic reduction in the budget for the NIH.

Not to be outdone by the White House, not to be outdone by the House of Representatives, the Senate budget resolution that is pending before the Senate today said, ''Oh, we will make a quicker death. We are going to say take $1 billion out between 1995 and 1996.'' In fact, in excess of $1 billion. By the time we get to 2000 we will have taken $7.7 billion out of the medical research of this country that leads to cures and leads to better treatment of disease.

That is it, simply straightforward. I cannot believe that the body of the U.S. Senate can ignore the fact that the only thing the American people have said is raise our taxes if necessary, and we will tell Members by a 30 percent margin that dollars expended for medical research should be the top priority of our country. This is not one politician speaking to another politician. This is the voice of the people saying, ''We want to increase medical research.'' We have had polls show they would pay another $1 per week on their medical premiums in order for it to be earmarked for medical research. We have had polls show they would take another $1 per week in their income tax if it could be earmarked for medical research.

Somehow the political establishment of the executive branch, led by the President, and the congressional branches, led by the two House and Senate budget resolution committees, do not hear that.

Now, I am not going to get into a lot of detail except to say we are making tremendous progress in warring against many diseases. It was only half a dozen years ago we had a handful of dollars dedicated to Alzheimer's research.

I have a personal interest in Alzheimer's. I watched my father die from Alzheimer's. I can say it is as difficult for the family as it is difficult for the victim. It is difficult for all those around him or her. I will not go into the gory details because most people around here have seen that kind of deadly disease attack and destroy people.

Mr. President, we could not even diagnose Alzheimer's short of an autopsy a few years ago. Now we have built it over the years to about $210 million of research money dedicated to Alzheimer's. We have made breakthrough after breakthrough, both in gene analysis and identification, as well as treatment and diagnosis.

When we say to the medical structure of this country, take $1 billion out of the $11.3 billion—10 percent—in 1 year, it is like in this country when we shut down the sawmill for a lack of logs and lose our chief sawyer, that company does not reassemble that team that makes that mill work a month later when a supply is received, or 2 months later.

When the company begins to build the infrastructure of medical research, and once it is there, the company does not rebuild it because maybe 2 years down the road they decided they made a mistake.

We have had the decade of the brain. Mr. President, 5 years have passed and a major part of that 5 years is building 130 scientists into an infrastructure in this country. Now it at a point where the payoff comes, we are about ready to start dismantling.

Now, let me get a point of contrast. We have literally thousands of diseases in this country on which no research—no research—is being conducted, thousands of diseases in which there is no

national registry to even know how many people have the disease or where they are located. No registry. They are called orphan diseases. Thousands of them.

The most important factor that is missing is no hope. No hope. We have been trying to attack that gradually by serendipity, meeting a young man in a wheelchair 15 years of age with EB, epidermolysis bullosa. At that point, no registry. At that point, no research money. It is like leprosy. They lose their fingers. It is a pigmentation problem. Sores break out all over their bodies. They cannot handle even this kind of artificial light, let alone sunlight. And they die at a very early age. This young man was so impressive with his eloquence, we wheeled him right into the Committee on Appropriations and we made a line item. If I ever had a reason to fight a line item veto, the whole concept of vetoing a line item—this was to get a line item in the appropriations that year to start a registry, starting a research project for EB, and giving hope for those people. That is not the way to run it, just because I met someone like that. There are thousands of them out there all over this country.

I want to also say there is a point of reference and comparison. This same budget resolution calls for a $800 million increase in research in nuclear weaponry. Yes, $800 million increase and they are calling for a $1 billion cut in medical research. Oh, we have to protect our bombs but we cannot really protect our people. I am saying this is a value of people over bombs. I would like to have included the military research dollars. The 18 months of military research in this country leading us to be more efficient—we say at defending our country, but at the same time, cluster bombs in order to increase the capacity to destroy life—is the equivalent of 95 years of medical research in the NIH; 18 months. That is a real value.

But I do not have the votes. So we still have this power of the military that says, ''Do not include us in any reductions. We only can handle increases. Reduce the medical research programs.''

All this does is to face reality that we exclude the military, that sacrosanct military. We are going to exclude it. But at the same time we are going to reshuffle all of the other accounts and say, by putting the priority on medical research, the others are going to be reduced 5 percent.

I enjoyed a little personal therapy by those last few statements. Now we get back to the reality of saying we have to reach this kind of agreement. I am happy to say I think, even though I would like to have a broader base, I am willing to settle for the narrower base in order to save the medical structure, research structure of this country.

I hope some of my colleagues realize we have had a colleague recently diagnosed with Parkinson's, Senator CLAIBORNE PELL. Do you realize we are spending this year $26 million for Parkinson's research—$26 million. You say that is a lot of money—yes, it is a lot of money. We are spending over $1 billion for heart; $2 billion for AIDS; another $1 billion-plus for cancer, as we should, and I helped to fight for every one of those dollars, and I would defend every one of those dollars. All I am saying is, for Parkinson's, $26 million.

Take a 16- to 20-percent decrease on $26 million for Parkinson's and you have a bigger impact than taking a 16- to 20-percent reduction, say, on cancer or heart, which is in excess—almost $2 billion each. So it is disproportionate in its impact. And I think this would then give us an opportunity to keep our commitment to the sick and those who have no hope for cure.

If my friends are not interested in the humanitarian aspect of reducing suffering and putting the value on human life—and quality life, not just quantitative life—I hope we would support this because I am convinced it is the answer. If you are not impressed with that factor, then look at the cost. We have saved billions of dollars per year in what we have been able to accomplish in medical research with TB. Now we are having a revival of TB. We have Zaire and the Ebola problem over there, that is a threat to this country. Every time we used to want to get an increase in military spending we could say, ''The Russians are coming,'' and, boy, everybody would jack up another $1 million. I want to tell you, ''The viruses are coming.'' They are here. And we better get ready for that warfare because we need this kind of weaponry to fight it.

Mr. EXON. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HATFIELD. Yes. I will be very happy to. But first of all may I yield to my cosponsor, who has not had an opportunity to make an opening statement and then I will be happy to yield for questions.

Mr. EXON. Certainly.

Mr. HATFIELD. I yield at this time to Senator SPECTER, whatever time he needs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I thank my distinguished colleague, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, for yielding time to me. I compliment him for his leadership generally, and especially on this amendment for his very spirited and eloquent articulation of the reasons for this amendment.

I am pleased to join Senator HATFIELD as a cosponsor, along with Senator KASSEBAUM, Senator MACK, and there may be others who will join in cosponsoring this very, very important amendment.

Senator HATFIELD has added the name of Senator KENNEDY to the list as original cosponsor here, along with Senator JEFFORDS.

The consideration of this budget resolution is very important to America. It is the toughest series of votes which I have seen in my 14½ years in the U.S. Senate. It has been very carefully crafted by the Budget Committee, under the leadership of Senator DOMENICI, who has great respect in this body on all counts. We have seen a series of amendments defeated so far on the budget resolution, many of which I would have liked to have voted for. But we have to make some really extremely tough choices which I think we are making. I believe this is a historic time for the U.S. Government to balance the budget.

Substantial efforts were made following the election of President Reagan in 1981, when we considered a budget resolution some 14 years ago, but there was not the political will at that time to balance the budget. We did not have Republican control of the House of Representatives, with, candidly, the political determination to balance the budget.

That time is now. In order to balance the budget we have had to turn down some requests on amendments which I think were very, very attractive. It was very, very difficult to vote against the amendment which offered additional funding for education because I am very much concerned about the cuts in this budget resolution on education. I am very much concerned about the cuts in this budget on Medicare and Medicaid. And I have heard from constituents about the devastating impact of what the Medicare cuts will do in closing hospitals, and not marginal hospitals but hospitals which are very important across this country, providing very vital services for the people of America.

But it seems to me if we are going to move to a balanced budget we are going to have to have belt tightening all across the board. I personally would very much have liked to have voted for the amendment yesterday on a tax cut. Who would not like to have a tax cut in America? But the difficulty with the amendment was present in the additional cuts which would have been present for other very important items, and also in the direction of the tax cuts not being directed with sufficient depth and specificity at the lower income groups and raising the concern about too much of a tax cut for wealthier Americans at a time when we are going to be cutting very many important programs which impact across the board, and many on the poor.

The amount offered yesterday on increasing national defense was a very attractive amendment. But there again the difficulty is that it would have resulted in cuts in other programs and added to the deficit.

I think that in the amendment which we are now considering, to have a restoration of part of the budget cut on the National Institutes of Health, that we are going to have the strong bipartisan support which was not present to increase funding or restore funding for education, or the bipartisan support

which was necessary to restore funding for Medicare and Medicaid. I believe that we have this bipartisan support because of the unique importance of what the National Institutes of Health does for America.

In the 14½ years that I have been on the Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, which I now chair, we have maintained an increasing amount of funding year by year, notwithstanding proposed budget cuts virtually every year from the administration, and it has been a bipartisan effort, once under the chairmanship of Senator Weicker, then under the chairmanship of Senator Lawton Chiles, then under the chairmanship of Senator TOM HARKIN, and now with my chairmanship.

We had a hearing last Thursday attended by the distinguished chairman of the full committee, where we heard of the devastating impact of what these budget cuts would do to medical research in the United States.

There is not time enough to go through the entire array of very powerful arguments and very powerful considerations. But let me start with a few.

At the present time, the National Institutes of Health funds less than 1 in 4 grant applications. If funding were cut by 10 percent, that grant rate might decrease to as much as 1 in 10. There would be a drastic reduction in clinical trials to initiate promising new treatments leaving the application of research findings for the patients on an untested basis.

There would be a cataclysmic consequence with over 80 percent of the NIH budget being cut with support from colleges, universities, medical schools, and research institutes throughout the country.

We are on the brink of having extraordinary advances in medical research on gene therapy on a whole range of very, very devastating illnesses in America.

Let me name just a few. Last year the National Institutes of Health discovered a breast cancer susceptibility gene, and the NIH is now closing in on the gene which causes breast cancer, which would be really a remarkable achievement on a terrifying disease which strikes 1 of 9 women in America.

The problems on heart disease, cardiovascular disease, which is still the number one killer of both men and women, causing 43 percent of all deaths each year; delaying the onset of heart disease by 5 years, which is right around the corner, would save almost $70 billion annually.

When we take a look at the kind of economic savings which come from this research from NIH, it is really remarkable.

Alzheimer's disease, such an overwhelming emotional problem in America today for those who suffer from Alzheimer's and their families; the medical research is on the brink of decreasing the incidence by half, which would mean an annual cost saving of some $50 billion.

Alcoholism, the No. 1 drug problem in the United States, is on the verge of significant advances, if not a cure, with the savings of some $100 billion a year.

Osteoporosis leads to 1.5 million fractures each year, affecting 140,000 people, and with the potential for saving of some $5 billion.

I know the time is short, Mr. President.

So I shall not go on with the list of really remarkable achievements which have been made and are right around the corner.

But I will say, chairing the Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and having been on the Appropriations Committee for 14½ years, that there is no more important funding item in the budget to restore, and we are not restoring it all, but to restore the amount proposed in the pending amendment.

I thank the Chair. I thank my colleague.

Mr. EXON. Will the chairman yield for a question?

The question I have for my great friend and colleague I want to preface by saying the chairman knows of my fondness for him and the many years that we have worked. I have never seen a finer presentation, I say to my friend from Oregon. I do not disagree with a single thing he has said. I think he said it all very, very well.

I cannot think of a more important amendment that will pass. I think this amendment will pass. I know of no objection to it on this side. I just checked with Senator DOMENICI. He knows of no objection on his side of the aisle. I think the case has been adequately made.

I have a list of 23 Democratic Senators, and heaven knows how many on that side of the aisle, that have other important matters, and we run out of time at noon today on the amendment. I am just wondering, since I think there seems to be near unanimous support for the amendment, if there is any way that we can cut down some of the time to allow some of these other Senators a chance to offer their amendments. Because of the time constraints, because I would not want to see any of our colleagues have a heart attack or apoplexy for fear that they are not able to talk on their amendment, I am just wondering, my question is can we get some time agreement if we would agree to yield back our whole hour of the time? I know of no opposition on this side. Could we get an agreement to cut down the remaining 50 minutes or so that the chairman has? I think he has made his case very well.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I would be very happy to work out an arrangement. I have a list here of about a dozen Senators who have asked for a few minutes to express themselves on this amendment. Once I fulfill that obligation to my colleagues, I will be very happy to consider that.

Mr. EXON. I will simply add there have been Senators coming to me wanting 10 to 20 minutes. I have cut them most down to 1 or 2 minutes.

If I might courteously suggest that if we had some time constraints, I believe everything good can be said about this amendment in a minute if people choose their words very carefully.

Mr. HATFIELD. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I have a list. My other chief cosponsors are Senator KASSEBAUM, Senator BOXER, Senator KENNEDY, Senator MACK, and others. As soon as we complete those, I would be very happy to consider yielding back the time.

I would like at this time to yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Mr. President, I would ask for a couple of minutes. I certainly appreciate the time constraints.

I think every Senator in the Chamber is a supporter of the National Institutes of Health and recognizes the importance of the work done there.

I myself am a strong supporter of the importance of continuing basic research.

I think Senator HATFIELD, who has initiated this amendment, has spoken eloquently of the importance of those needs. Senator SPECTER has spoken as well.

Mr. President, I am pleased to join with Senators HATFIELD and SPECTER and eight other cosponsors in offering an amendment to the fiscal year 1996 budget resolution which is designed to protect funding for the National Institutes of Health. Our amendment, which adds $1 billion annually to budget function 550, is intended to restore the 10-percent reduction in NIH funding assumed by the Budget Committee. In order to assure the health of our citizens—through continued support of our nation's biomedical research—I urge my colleagues to join with us in supporting this amendment.

To offset the additional NIH funding, our amendment would reduce spending in various discretionary accounts by 0.58 percent. The budget functions which would be excluded from these reductions are: defense; international affairs; education, training, and employment; income security; Medicare; Social Security; and net interest.

NIH-supported biomedical research has a proud history of scientific breakthroughs. Many of my colleagues will remember the iron lungs which once ventilated individuals after their bodies had been ravaged by the polio virus. Because of biomedical research, we no longer face the threat of this disease. In fact, experts at the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention now predict that the polio virus could soon be eradicated from this planet.

The vitality of these efforts is maintained today. For example, through the human genome project, scientists have

identified a gene linked to breast cancer. Using this information, health care providers may one day decrease the burden of this disease, which now attacks one in nine women.

I am concerned about the detrimental impact of the NIH reductions assumed by the Budget Committee. I believe, that biomedical research advancement—and breakthroughs—could slow dramatically.

The committee, in its report on this resolution, lays out a thoughtful argument in support of this budget reduction. As noted in the report, it is true that the NIH has seen a real budget growth over the last decade. In real terms, after adjusting for biomedical research inflation, the budget for 1993 was 47 percent greater than it was a decade earlier. It is also true that private sector contributions to biomedical research have increased.

At the same time, I do not believe it is wise to propose reductions based on this recent growth in NIH funding. These reductions will leave many biomedical researchers and their advancements stranded. In many areas, scientists are on the verge of amazing discoveries. Because the average length of an NIH award is nearly 4 years, cuts of this magnitude will require an adjustment period. We need to consider ways to ensure that promising research receives new funding, while we honor existing research commitments.

Mr. President, the $1 billion which this amendment would add back to the NIH allows for a smooth transition. Even with this add-back, real funding for NIH will decrease over the next 7 years. In fact, if we assume a 5 percent annual biomedical research inflation, maintaining NIH funding at its 1995 level would still result in a real funding reduction of nearly 5 percent in the first year and 35 percent 7 years from now.

As chairman of the Committee on Labor and Human Resources, I am committed to working with the National Institutes of Health and our Nation's biomedical researchers to find ways to adjust to our current budget limitations. However, accomplishing this goal will require thoughtful consideration and careful deliberation.

As the Labor Committee begins to consider the reauthorization of the National Institutes of Health, I welcome the suggestions of my colleagues. I intend to examine organizational and structural changes at the NIH which could lead to some budget savings.

This effort may include reexamining the need for the current 23 institutes, centers, and divisions. Another approach will be to review the amount of research funding which the NIH currently devotes to indirect research costs. Finally, I also believe that we will need to reexamine how the NIH makes its grants to ensure that the most promising areas for research advancement receive funding, while funding for basic biomedical research is maintained.

Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to consider this amendment carefully. Its effect would be to improve the health of our Nation's citizens by supporting funding for biomedical research through the NIH. The effort of NIH has and will continue to create a national environment in which biomedical research and health flourish.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I would like to yield 3 minutes to the Senator from California.

Mr. President, in yielding to the Senator from California, she was facing the same issue, I understand, in her committee work, and I wish to thank the Senator for laying the foundation at that time.

Mrs. BOXER. I thank my friend very much. I will be brief because I think so much has already been said on this.

I simply want to add my voice in support of the Senator from Oregon. I did, in fact, offer a similar amendment in the Budget Committee. However, I took the funds out of the little tax cut—honey pot—that was squirreled away by our chairman and there was no support from the Republican side for using that as an offset.

I truly understand the frustration expressed by the Senator from Oregon. He wanted to cut across the board and include in the cut to pay for this NIH increase the military budget. I think the Senator is wise not to offer that up because there are not the votes here to do that, but I wish to spend just a minute talking about that and adding my voice to that of the Senator from Oregon.

I think the people of this country understand that the cold war is over, and I think the people of this country understand we are the only superpower, and I think the people of this country understand that we are spending 2½ times more than all of the potential enemies combined in the world, and that includes on the list the potential enemies Russia and China. The fact is if you add the spending of the NATO countries, America and the NATO countries are spending 5½ times more than all the potential enemies in the world.

What are the real enemies that we face on a daily basis in America? I would say the daily enemies we face are the prospect of disease striking a loved one. Alzheimer's has been discussed, osteoporosis, breast cancer, AIDS, prostate cancer, lung cancer, diabetes, scleroderma, something many people do not know about, which is a soft tissue disease which is disfiguring and frightening and strikes young women; strokes, Parkinson's disease. There are so many others.

The fact is, I say to my colleagues, these are the enemies that we face, and to retreat from this war would be ludicrous.

Now, it hurts my heart to vote to cut other domestic programs. It breaks my heart. I think it is outrageous that we do not have the votes here to include defense in a small cut, but like the Senator from Oregon I am a realist. I am a realist, and I wish to see this funding be restored to the NIH. We are one plane ride away from a major epidemic. We read with horror about this Ebola virus. Anyone who has read the book ''The Hot Zone'' understands the tenuous position we are in in this very world in which we now live. As we lose the rain forests of the world, what scientists are discovering is that viruses that live in the rain forests are looking for other hosts, and they are finding us. So to cut back on the National Institutes of Health, which is our first line of defense against these diseases, would be worse than outrageous.

I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD at this point a letter from the University of California, Irvine, and I would close with a quote from the dean of the college of medicine there, Thomas C. Cesario. He says:

> With Federal support, the University has achieved remarkable breakthroughs in medical research which prevent, control, or reverse disease, saving lives and millions of dollars in medical care.

And he just says that the UC doctors there with Federal funds were first to identify the lack of a gene as a cause of disease. They developed a blood test for the genetic defect that causes Tay-Sachs, and it goes on and on.

I see my time has run out. So again let me add my voice to the Senator from Oregon. I thank the Senator so much for picking up this fight in this Chamber. I am with the Senator all the way.

I yield the floor.

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

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, IRVINE,
COLLEGE OF MEDICINE,
Irvine, CA, May 22, 1995.

Hon. BARBARA BOXER,
Hart Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR BOXER: I am writing to express my deepest concern over the funding cuts to the National Institutes of Health that have been assumed in the Committee's Budget Resolution and to thank you for your tremendous effort to restore funding during the Committee's consideration of the NIH bill.

According to the committee report, the Senate Budget Committee recommends a 10 percent cut for the NIH budget in FY 1996, and then a freeze of the NIH budget at this lower level through 2002. This means that the NIH budget would be cut from $11.3 billion in FY 1995 to $10.2 billion in FY 1996, and then frozen at $10.2 billion through 2002. Cuts of this magnitude would be devastating to our nation's biomedical research enterprise. The NIH is one of the country's most respected and revered research institutions, setting international standards for excellence for basic and clinical biomedical and behavorial research and ensuring that medical care in the United States is the best in the world. Many people literally owe their lives to NIH-funded research.

These cuts represent a serious retreat from the national support given to medical innovation. They would be devastating to the NIH mission. NIH projects that with a 10 percent reduction in its budget the success rate for competing research project grants would fall from its current overall level of 24 percent in FY 1995 to between 6 percent and 12

percent in FY 1996. The potential loss in new life saving discoveries is incalculable. We know that few, if any, new clinical trials could be instigated and other NIH mechanisms of support would be decimated.

Cuts to NIH would certainly wreak havoc throughout the University of California's research institutions. About 85 percent of the NIH's appropriation is expended on extramural research conducted in all 50 states. The University of California operates the largest health science program in the nation—with five schools of medicine. Last year UC received about $650 million for extramural grants university-wide. Three of our five medical schools were ranked among the top 15 institutions for receipt of extramural research awards for FY 1993 and all fell within the top 100 institutions.

With federal support, the University has achieved remarkable breakthroughs in medical research which prevent control of reverse disease, saving lives and millions of dollars in medical care; UC doctors:

were first to identify the lack of a gene as a cause of disease;

developed a blood test for the genetic defect that causes Tay-Sachs disease;

created the first human vaccine by genetic engineering;

were among the first three groups in the world to isolate the AIDS virus;

found a quick method to determine if infants were infected with the AIDS virus;

developed an artificial ankle to replace joints damaged by arthritis;

adapted a heart pump implant to pump insulin in diabetics thus eliminating the need for daily insulin injections;

developed a procedure that restores hearing by replacing damaged middle ear bones with sculpted cartilage.

In addition, the University has been an incubator for the rapidly growing biotechnology industry in California. California has the largest concentration of the nation's biotechnology companies and 28 percent of high tech medical device firms in the nation. The University of California at San Francisco and San Diego alone account for more than 50 new companies pursuing life saving medical drugs and devices from AIDS, cancer and heart disease to genetic disorders like cystic fibrosis and multiple sclerosis.

Cuts to NIH cut the lifeline of biomedical research. The devastation would be felt for years to come. The pace of scientific discovery would slow and cures for diseases like AIDS and cancer would be delayed. Even worse, biomedical research would be essentially eliminated as a career track for a whole generation of young people.

I urge you to do all you can to restore funding to the NIH during the Senate's consideration of the Budget Resolution.

Sincerely,

THOMAS C. CESARIO, M.D.,
Dean, College of Medicine.

Mr. HATFIELD. I thank the Senator from Oregon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, again I am going back to the list of those who have made their request to be heard. I would yield 2 minutes to Senator KENNEDY, 3 minutes.

Mr. KENNEDY. Two minutes will be fine.

Mr. HATFIELD. Two minutes to Senator KENNEDY from Massachusetts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, the Senator from Oregon and the other cosponsors are speaking for the best American values and are really speaking for mankind all over the world in the restoration of this funding for the National Institutes of Health. This budget is permeated with penny-wise and pound-foolish mentality that values short-term savings today over investments that will improve the life of the Nation tomorrow.

There is no better example of these misplaced priorities than the meat-ax cuts in the National Institutes of Health. It is truly a great success in terms of research, and it maintains respect throughout the world. The NIH is not just a source of excellence to those of us on the floor of the Senate. It is recognized throughout the world.

The NIH is the symbol of excellence in medical research. Its achievements are world renowned. Dollar for dollar, it is among the wisest and most productive investments the Nation has ever made. It is the source of America's international preeminence in industries such as pharmaceuticals, biotechnology, and medical devices. Talk to any leaders of these industries, and they will tell you that without the basic research of the NIH, progress in their industry would slow to a crawl, and America's international competitiveness would fail.

Above all, we need NIH research because of its indispensable role in improving the health of the American people. In recent years, biomedical research supported by the NIH has led to new and more cost-effective treatments for cancer, heart disease, diabetes, and a wide range of infectious diseases. More than a million premature deaths from heart disease alone were prevented by improved cardiovascular programs and innovative treatments developed by NIH research in the past quarter century.

With mushrooming new discoveries in biotechnology, we stand on the threshold of even greater progress in the years ahead in the conquest of dread diseases. There is no American family that has not lost a loved one or a close friend to the ravages of heart disease, cancer, diabetes, or Alzheimer's disease. Why would anyone curtail the extraordinary progress that is possible?

If the cuts in this budget resolution are approved, only 10 percent of meritorious research will be funded, according to the NIH's own estimates. Currently, ninety scientists have received Nobel prizes for research funded in whole or in part by the NIH. With these cuts, young researchers will leave the field because they cannot find support for their investigations. Careers in biomedical research will be less attractive to the brightest minds of this generation of college students. Worst of all, it is no exaggeration to say that because of these cuts, Americans will die who would have been saved.

These funds make such a difference to the families that all of us represent. I urge the Senate to adopt this amendment and maintain NIH's vital investments in medical research.

I thank the Chair.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from New Mexico.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. BINGAMAN. I thank the Chair. I thank the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. President, I support the amendment of the Senator from Oregon. I also want to point out that the problem he identifies with medical research funding is part of a larger problem that we are trying to address in another amendment that will come up for a vote later today. That is the amendment related to civilian research more generally.

The Senator from Oregon made the point that the proposed budget as it now stands in the area of medical research is a prelude to disaster. I would say that the same point could be made about civilian research generally in this country.

I would address people's attention to this chart which shows Federal civilian R&D as a percentage of the gross domestic product of this country from the period 1961 through the end of the century, the last portion, of course, being the projected level of funding for civilian research and development.

This chart includes the figures for the National Institutes of Health, about which the Senator from Oregon is speaking. It shows that we will be dropping to an unprecedented low in our level of support for civilian research if we go ahead with the budget as it presently stands.

The amendment the Senator from Oregon proposes will cure the problem as it relates to the National Institutes of Health. The larger amendment that I have proposed with Senators LIEBERMAN and ROCKEFELLER and HOLLINGS and BIDEN deals with the larger issue of civilian research, and it is necessary also if we are going to avoid the same kind of precipitous drop in Federal support for civilian research that is contemplated in the present budget.

I thank the Senator and I support his amendment strongly.

Mr. HATFIELD. I thank the Senator from New Mexico.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. HATFIELD. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Minnesota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I asked the Senator from Oregon only for a minute because I am one of those Senators who later on wants to speak to other amendments, and I know we are in a time crunch.

I say to the Senator from Oregon I certainly want to be included as an original cosponsor, but I do it with some sadness because I believe that the military-defense part of the budget

ought to have been included in the offset. I understand why the Senator was not able to do so.

Second of all, I am very worried about cuts in some of the other nondefense discretionary programs. Therefore, later on I am going to have a sense-of-the-Senate amendment making clear it does not have to be in each of those areas because each deserve a high priority, and I am going to try to point out the direction in which we should be directing our priorities. But it is with a sense of equity and fairness I proudly support this amendment.

Mr. HATFIELD. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Florida.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MACK. Thank you, Mr. President.

First, let me express my deep appreciation to Senator HATFIELD for his leadership on this issue in bringing this amendment to the floor of the Senate.

In trying to figure out what I would confine my comments to in 5 minutes, because there is so much that I feel and so much that I have learned with respect to what the National Institutes of Health is involved in, again, it is very difficult to kind of bring it down to a couple of points.

A book that I read several years ago called ''The Transformed Cell,'' written by Dr. Steven Rosenberg out at the NIH National Cancer Institute, really talks about the fundamental changes that have taken place in the way we treat diseases in this country and, for that matter, around the world. I am referring specifically to the treatment of cancer now.

For many years, if one was diagnosed with cancer, basically, surgery, radiation, or chemotherapy were the three choices, if you will. The physicians would look at the particular disease and status to make a determination about which of those three alternatives to pursue.

Dr. Steven Rosenberg began his practice over 20 years ago when something occurred that kind of indicated to him that maybe there was something else going on that could, in fact, be used to fight the disease. An individual that he was treating was cured of, I believe, melanoma. And 20 years ago, if a person was discovered with melanoma, it was just a matter of time. There was no cure.

But, somehow or other, this patient survived. Dr. Steven Rosenberg came to the conclusion and a very strong feeling that the answer was in the immune system; that what saved that individual was his own immune system. And then that raised the question: Well, if the immune system can defeat the disease in one individual but yet it does not in another, why does that occur? And that began a long process of over 20 years of trying to come to the discovery and understanding of what we can do to enhance the immune system in order to fight the disease.

Now, if Dr. Steven Rosenberg were here today, I do not think he would say to us that he has the total answer. But if you read his book, you will find, for example, that in 40 percent of the cases there was a response to immunotherapy in melanoma.

The reason I get a little bit focused on melanoma is because, as many of you know, I am a survivor of melanoma. In 1989, after coming to the U.S Senate, I was diagnosed with melanoma. Fortunately, we found it early and I should not have to be concerned with it at all. But in 1979, my younger brother Michael died of melanoma. And I can tell you personally what that experience is like.

And I could be talking about AIDS, I could be talking about, as the Senator from California talked about, the viruses, I could be talking about any one of those. But the reality is that we are making great strides today because of the work that is being done at NIH by people like Dr. Steven Rosenberg.

So he added a fourth modality to the treatment of cancer. And there is a fifth today, and it is called gene therapy. And we are just beginning to scratch the surface on gene therapy.

One of the earlier speakers referred to the discovery of the breast cancer gene, and there probably are several breast cancer genes. But there has also been discovered a melanoma gene. It is called P–16. And we know, through the research that has been done out at NIH, that it is relatively simple to define cancer but very complicated to come up with a solution. Cancer is nothing more than the uncontrolled growth of cells. But the issue is: Why are they uncontrolled and how can we control them? And gene therapy and DNA are going to play a significant role in making that determination.

My last point would be this: We have discovered what is called P–53, which I believe is a protein—it may be a gene as well—a protein that is involved in sending the message to the individual cells as to when they should grow and when they should stop growing. There have been great strides made with respect to the P–53 gene.

It would be a tragedy for us to step back now when we are on the verge of breakthroughs on all kinds of diseases through gene therapy.

So what I am saying to the Senate is there are great benefits that come from this investment.

I will close with this quote. Pasteur wrote: ''I am on the verge of mysteries and the veil is getting thinner and thinner.''

We want to provide the funds to make sure that that veil disappears.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Will the Senator yield?

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

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. I recognize the floor manager, the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I want to propose a unanimous-consent request that will protect the Senator from Oregon but will advise Senators of when we will vote.

ON NIH

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I rise to express my passionate support for the National Institutes of Health.

The National Institutes of Health is the foundation of this Nation and the world's medical research. It is an investment in the future health and well-being of every American.

Over 85 percent of the NIH funding goes to academic medical centers of excellence all over the United States of America. From Stanford University, Johns Hopkins University, and Harvard to the University of Maryland and the University of Wisconsin—these are the leaders in medical science research.

What does our investment dollars get? Our investment in the NIH provides the means to find the cures and preventions for disease. It keeps the United States of America in the forefront of biomedical science and biomedical technology. It encourages our global competitiveness and assures economic growth through the creation of jobs in Maryland and throughout the United States. It helps communities help themselves.

The NIH has icon status in America and around the world. The shortsightedness of narrow-minded people in green eyeshades who would cut the NIH funding is deeply disturbing. I simply cannot understand it.

The American people deserve a future of improved health. They understand the importance of investing in research and prevention. They want their Federal dollars to go to programs that will help them meet their day-to-day needs. That is what the NIH does. Its research finds cures, prevents the onset of disease, and helps people live not only longer but better lives.

For some time, I have worked on a bipartisan basis to advocate for a women's health agenda. I was one of those who led the fight to establish an Office of Women's Health Research at the NIH—the first of its kind. I worked with my colleagues to expand research and address gender-specific health concerns like breast cancer, cervical cancer and prostate cancer.

The National Institutes of Health is the anchor for health research investment in this country.

And now, this picky little budget wants to freeze NIH funding into the year 2000, or worse yet, may even cut NIH funding by 10 percent. Let us face the fact. You cannot freeze disease. You cannot freeze neurological deterioration and Parkinson's disease. And you cannot freeze life saving research. You just cannot.

The impact of cutting NIH will take an incredible human toll. The major killers of men and women today are lung cancer and heart disease. What will happen to this research when there is not enough dollars to invest in finding a cure? How will we ever find a cure

for Alzheimers disease and for AIDS without investing the necessary dollars?

My own dear father died of Alzheimers disease. He died one brain cell at a time, and it did not matter that I was a U.S. Senator. All I could do was look out for him, care for him, and make sure that he was comfortable and safe. In loving memory of my father, I vowed to do all that I can to lead the fight for research to find a cure for Alzheimers.

This is what this Budget would knock out. It is a tragedy for the dedicated men and women of NIH who have committed their lives to finding cures to deadly diseases. And it is a tragedy for the American people who look to NIH to meet our day-to-day health needs and to get us ready for the future.

I am passionate about my commitment to preserve this investment. We must not turn our back on NIH. There are those who seem set on trying to dismantle the National Institutes of Health. I want to put those people on notice—they will have to put up with me first. I will do everything I can to keep the National Institutes of Health an investment that saves lives, saves jobs, and helps communities.

Mr. HATFIELD. I thank the Senator.

Mr. EXON. I applaud the Senator.

Mr. DOMENICI. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, although I share the concern of my distinguished colleague from Oregon, Senator HATFIELD, about funding for the National Institutes of Health (NIH), I must oppose his amendment. I oppose his amendment because it fails to address the underlying defect in the Budget Resolution we are debating—a one-third reduction overall in nonmilitary discretionary spending.

The amendment, in effect, simply rearranges the deck chairs on the *Titanic*. It cuts across-the-board from all discretionary functions—except for military, international affairs and the functions that fall largely under the jurisdiction of the Labor, HHS Appropriations Subcommittee—to restore the 10-percent cut in NIH assumed in the budget resolution.

I emphasize the word ''assumed'' because it should be clear that the funding levels for individual programs are not determined by the budget resolution. The budget resolution only determines the amount of discretionary spending overall. The appropriations process determines the amount of funding for individual programs, such as NIH. In fact, the budget resolution does not even determine the amount of total funds available to the Labor, HHS Appropriations Subcommittee which has jurisdiction over NIH funding. Section 602(b) of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 reserves that power to the Appropriations Committee as well.

In addition, I take strong objection to the exclusion of the military and international affairs functions from the across-the-board cut required by this amendment. The cold war is over and the military should bear a share of the cuts that this budget resolution will force the Appropriations Committee to make in most, if not all, nonmilitary programs, including the very worthy NIH.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I support the amendment offered by my distinguished colleague from Oregon, Senator HATFIELD. We have worked together in the past to increase our commitment to the National Institutes of Health [NIH]. Last year, during the health care reform debate, Senator HATFIELD and I introduced legislation to ensure that any reform plan also included increased investment in the fight against disease and disability.

But, Mr. President, I am disappointed that this amendment once again protects and preserves a bloated Pentagon budget. The budget resolution cuts over $1 trillion in Federal spending. It cuts health, education, training, veterans, and virtually everything else but it does not touch defense. The Pentagon is increased by $34.5 billion over what a hard freeze would be over the 7 years. So, while I support this amendment I believe strongly that instead of taking money away from discretionary programs that are below a hard freeze in this budget to protect NIH we should have looked to the bloated Pentagon budget.

NIH, as we all know, stands for the National Institutes of Health but it could just as easily stand for National Investment in Health. That's what we're talking about, investing in the health of our people and our economy.

Unfortunately, today we are not here to talk about taking a small step forward in medical research, we're here to prevent taking a giant leap back and cutting our commitment to research that saves lives and money.

The budget resolution before us cuts NIH by 10 percent and freezes spending through 2002. This translates into a cut of over $1 billion for fiscal year 1996 alone.

Backing away from that commitment is shortsighted and fails to recognize the important role that NIH plays in improving health care and holding down health care costs in the long run.

As former chairman of the Appropriations Committee, Senator Warren Magnuson, said ''medical research is the first link in the chain of prevention.'' Without sufficient investment, we can't build that chain.

People from all over the world come to the United States for medical care. Why? Because, we lead the world in quality of care. And research is key to this quality.

The United States has built an impressive biomedical research enterprise. Today, dramatic developments in genetics and gene therapy offer hope to many suffering from disorders such as cystic fibrosis, breast and prostate cancer, diabetes, and Alzheimer's disease.

Increased investment in health research is key to reducing health costs in the long run. And if we can unlock the cure for a disease like Alzheimer's the savings would be enormous—in dollars and human lives. Today, federally supported funding for research on Alzheimer's disease totals $300 million yet it is estimated that nearly $100 billion is expended annually on caring for people with Alzheimer's.

Gene therapy and treatments of cystic fibrosis and Parkinson's could eliminate years of chronic care costs, while saving lives and improving patient's quality of life.

Past investment in research has paid off.

Less than $1 million spent to develop a potassium citrate treatment to prevent the formation of kidney stones yields over $436.2 million in annual savings in treatment costs.

$20.1 million in NIH support over a 17-year period led to the development of an improved influenza intervention for children, saving at least $346.6 million annually from a reduction in premature mortality and long-term earnings losses.

Clinical trials to develop a laser treatment for a diabetes related eye condition cost $180.6 million and has resulted in a potential annual savings of over $1.2 billion.

New cell therapy techniques can reduce the costs of a bone marrow transplant by as much as $50,000.

This country invests far too little in medical research, less than 2 percent of the total health budget is devoted to medical research. Compare that to the Pentagon where 15 percent of military dollars are spent on research. Where are our priorities?

It is expected that this budget proposal would reduce the success rate of qualified research proposals from the current 25 percent to as little as 15 percent. Just a decade ago, it was twice that. Science and cutting edge medical research are being put on hold. And every day we wait is another day we go without finding the cure for diabetes, Alzheimer's, Parkinson's and countless other diseases.

Mr. President, this resolution also further discourages our young people from pursuing careers in medical research. The number of people under the age of 36 even applying for NIH grants dropped by 54 percent between 1985 and 1993. This is due to a host of factors but I'm afraid that the lower success rates among all applicants is making biomedical research less and less attractive to young people. If the perception is that funding for research is impossible to obtain, young people that may have chosen medical research 10 years ago will choose other career paths.

Mr. President, investing in NIH doesn't just promote the health of our people, it promotes the health of our economy. The biotechnology and pharmaceutical industries contribute some $100 billion annually to the economy and support 200,000 highly skilled jobs.

In 1994, sales of biotechnology products totaled close to $8 billion and the Department of Commerce estimates that biotechnology will be a $50 billion industry by the year 2000.

Investing in medical research promotes healthier lives, creates jobs, and strengthens our economy and our competitive position in the global marketplace. It's the right thing to do and the smart thing to do.

Mr. President, I support this amendment. But, even if this amendment passes as expected, it does not address the underlying defect in the budget resolution we are debating, a one-third reduction overall in nonmilitary, discretionary spending.

This amendment cuts across-the-board from all discretionary functions, except for national defense, international affairs and the functions that fall largely under the jurisdiction of the Labor, HHS Appropriations Subcommittee, to restore the 10-percent cut in NIH assumed in the budget resolution.

But, Mr. President, funding levels for individual programs are not determined by the budget resolution. The budget resolution only determines the amount of discretionary spending overall. It is the appropriations process that determines the amount of funding for individual programs, such as NIH. So, Mr. President, despite this amendment, the Appropriations Committee will be faced with a one-third reduction in nonmilitary discretionary spending and, therefore, all discretionary spending programs such as the NIH are going to be subject to cuts because of this budget resolution.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I support what the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, Senator HATFIELD, is attempting to do, ensure that sufficient funding is made available for the work of the National Institutes of Health [NIH]. I strongly support the important work that body is undertaking, particularly with respect to research on breast and prostrate cancer, heart disease and diabetes.

However, what troubles me about this amendment is the proposition that it isn't possible to reorder priorities within function 550—the health account—to make the necessary funding available to the NIH. To make the amount of funding contemplated by the amendment available to the NIH, we simply have to shift $1 billion within function 550, an account that will total $120 billion in fiscal year 1996, rising to $150 billion by 2002. Instead, the amendment takes money out of other accounts, including funding for veterans, and that seriously concerns me.

The budget resolution already contemplates a phase-out of construction of VA facilities. Higher prescription copayments for certain veterans are assumed. Outlays for veterans programs would actually amount to $500 million less next year compared to this year. And the Hatfield amendment would take another $224 million a year out of veterans programs on top of that.

If I thought that it wasn't possible for Congress, for the appropriators, the Health and Human Services Department or the NIH itself to prioritize spending for the good and necessary work that the NIH does, I might be willing to support this amendment.

However, we all know that the budget resolution doesn't require that NIH funding be cut, only that funding within function 550 not exceed a specified level. There are ways to do that without adversely affecting the work that the NIH does. For example, the growth of Medicaid could be slowed, as Senator GRAMM proposed yesterday.

I am confident that, as the author of the amendment and as chairman of the Appropriations Committee, Senator HATFIELD won't allow the NIH budget to be cut too deeply when it comes time to appropriate money for the NIH. The Department of Health and Human Services and the NIH won't sacrifice critical research when it comes time to prioritize the use of funds that are ultimately appropriated.

Mr. President, I want to work with the chairman of the Appropriations Committee to find a solution, but one which doesn't adversely affect our Nation's veterans.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I rise in support of the amendment offered by my colleague from Oregon, long recognized as a leader in our efforts to promote biomedical research. I can think of no more worthy a purpose than to restore funding for the National Institutes of Health. NIH is the world's premier biomedical research institution. It is our investment in the Nation's future health. I have watched with pride as NIH has grown during my years in the Congress. I have watched with pride as exciting discovery after discovery spawned by the NIH has become a reality. I have watched with pride as efforts at the premier research institutions in Utah, such as the excellent work at the University of Utah, have led to incredible discoveries helping to improve literally millions of lives.

As with many of my colleagues, I was very disappointed when the measure approved by committee set NIH on a such a steep downward funding path. While I do not believe any program or agency should be immune from reductions in our efforts to get Federal spending under control, the NIH may have been hit too hard.

Some may say that a 10-percent cut in NIH does not sound like a lot, but it is. The President's proposed NIH budget of $11.8 billion was intended to support 23,874 research project grants, which includes 6,046 new and competing research project grants. Maybe that sounds like a high level, but it is not. The President's proposal represented a decrease of 522 new and competing grants from this fiscal year, and the budget resolution funding level will lead to even further reductions.

In 1987, by comparison, we funded almost 7,200 new and competing grants. It is not commonly recognized, in addition, that the majority of projects submitted to the NIH, extremely worthy projects which could yield scientific advances as promising as any, are not funded. Just look at the numbers: This year, project grants at NIH are expected to have a 24-percent success rate; this means that only one-quarter of the projects which are approved are funded.

Under the President's budget, it is expected to decline to 23 percent. And under the budget resolution, to an even smaller percentage. Contrast this to 1992, when the success rate was 29.6 percent, or 1986, when it was 32.1 percent. Although I do strongly support this amendment, I also want to express my concern about the ''offsets'' used to ''pay for'' the amendment, or, in other words, about the source of funding which will make up the difference if NIH funding were increased and the entire budget resolution is to stay within the same overall cap.

As I understand the amendment offered by my colleague, it would restore $7 billion of the proposed $7.9 billion reduction in NIH funding over the coming 7 fiscal years. The difference would be made up by an across-the-board reduction in all budget functions except for the social programs, broadly speaking, and defense and international affairs. The effect of this amendment is to place the burden of making up the difference on the other accounts within the budget, many of which are already sustaining large reductions.

For example, under this amendment, in order to increase NIH, decreases would be effected in programs for veterans, agriculture, space and science research, energy, natural resources, and community development.

I am particularly concerned about a proposed reduction of about $1 billion over 7 years in law enforcement and crime prevention efforts, at a time when increased acts of violence and terrorism throughout the United States are threatening the ability of peaceful, law-abiding citizens to lead their lives.

In addition, I would point out to my colleagues that under the budget resolution, funding for function 550, the health function, comes down 12.2 percent overall. However, several accounts are held harmless within that function, including the Food and Drug Administration, which would receive $884 million—AIDS programs at the Health Resources and Services Administration—$656 million—the Indian Health Service—$1.963 billion—the Centers for Disease Control—$2.88 billion—the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration—$2.197 billion—and AIDS research at NIH—$1.336 billion. These programs were all held level.

I urge the House and Senate budget conferees to take a look at the entire health function to see if we are allocating funds most appropriately in relation to the other budget functions.

Obviously, I have no interest in seeing very vital programs such as Indian health or AIDS sustain unwise reductions. At the same time, I do not wish to see the Administration of Justice account, or veterans programs, for example, sustain inappropriate reductions.

It is my desire that conferees take all these competing needs into account and create the best possible balance.

That being said, Mr. President, I urge adoption of the Hatfield amendment on NIH.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Oregon, Senator HATFIELD, for his leadership in providing biomedical research funding, and I strongly support his amendment to restore $1 billion per year that otherwise would be cut under this Senate budget resolution.

Most basic biomedical research in this Nation is supported by the National Institutes of Health. Nearly every week we hear of advances against disease supported by NIH grants. As such, NIH not only reduces suffering in our country, it lays the groundwork for economic growth and leads the world in the fight against disease.

Despite our profound responsibility to maintain NIH funding, we currently provide funds adequate to support only one in four research proposals. The Senate budget resolution could cut that current support level to 1 in 10.

At that level, young researchers will be strongly encouraged to seek other careers. The steady stream of Nobel Prize winners at NIH—89 so far—will dry up. In short, we will be cutting into the muscle and bone of an institution that demonstrates the best of American Government and the best of human endeavor.

Furthermore, the Senate budget resolution funding levels would effectively forestall life-saving, cost-effective research. NIH is currently in the middle of many long-term projects that revolutionary implications for medicine. NIH is supporting a $3 billion, 15-year effort to map the human genome. This project underlies the revolution in genetic medicine that has implications for cancer, developmental disabilities, Alzheimer's disease, juvenile diabetes, and numerous other diseases. NIH began a 12-year, $68 million prostrate cancer prevention trial in 1991. It began a $50 million, 11-year childhood asthma management program in the same year. In 1990, it began a 12-year test of tamozifen treatments for breast cancer among a randomized group of 16,000 women. It continues to support the Framingham longitudinal investigation of factors influencing the development of cardiovascular disease, which began in 1948. Next year NIH plans to support six centers specializing in hypertension research over 5 years.

These are just a few examples of the critical research underway at NIH that should not be eliminated or delayed in the name of short-term budgetary gains. The truth is, we save money through biomedical research. Recent NIH advances in the therapy of sickle cell disease save an estimated $350 million annually. Recent advances against alcoholism save $125 million annually. Research underway to delay the onset of blindness in diabetics and to delay the onset of Alzheimer's could save billions. Simply delaying the onset of cardiovascular disease by 5 years is estimated to potentially save $70 billion yearly. And clearly, without progress against AIDS, will continue to spend billions in our hospitals and in lost human productivity.

So, Mr. President, we cannot responsibly turn away from these research needs. We must provide for them in the budget, and Senator HATFIELD has provided the vehicle to do so. Again, I thank him for his leadership and urge all of my colleagues to support the Hatfield amendment.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I rise in strong support of the Hatfield amendment which adds $1 billion to the budget for the National Institutes of Health [NIH]. The budget proposal before us recommends a 10 percent cut for the NIH in fiscal year 1996, and then a freeze at this lower level through the year 2002. This means that the NIH budget would be cut from $11.3 billion in fiscal year 1995 to $10.2 billion in fiscal year 1996, and then frozen at $10.2 billion through 2002.

If the proposed cuts are permitted to take place, it would damage NIH research at a time of unprecedented productivity, drive talented scientists, both young and established, into other careers, and cause the United States to lose its hard-won leadership in such fields as biotechnology and pharmaceuticals.

Mr. President, NIH has been a tremendous investment for the American people. The research supported by NIH has saved lives, reduced suffering, and led to lower medical costs. The NIH has an impressive collection of new successes, such as the following list of some fundamental discoveries and clinical advances for the past year:

A revolution in cancer risk assessment, the long-sought gene for some heredity breast cancers, BRCA-1, has been isolated, as have genes that predispose some patients to colon cancer, melanoma, and kidney cancer.

A simple drug, hydroxyurea, alters the composition of hemoglobin and thereby reduces by half the painful crisis that commonly hospitalize patients with sickle cell disease.

Hormone replacement successfully controls blood lipids in postmenopausal women and likely reduces cardiovascular disease.

A new acellular vaccine for whooping cough is safe as well as effective.

The biomedical research supported by NIH makes vital contributions to the Nation's health, improving the quality of life, advancing science, and creating economic growth. Advances derived from NIH research save an estimated $69 billion in medical care costs each year. Because of the discoveries made by biomedical researchers over the years, we live longer, healthier, and more active lives. Today, an American's life expectancy is 75.5 years, an increase of almost 5 years since 1970.

If this progress is to continue, it is imperative that the NIH budget be preserved. Stable NIH funding is required to maintain laboratories performing cutting edge research. Even a short hiatus in funding results in loss of established research programs that can not be readily recovered.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the conclusion of the debate on the Hatfield amendment, the Senate begin voting in the following sequence: on the Harkin amendment, on the Feingold amendment, on or in relation to the Bumpers amendment, on or in relation to the Dodd substitute, on or in relation to the Snowe amendment, and on the Hatfield amendment. I further ask unanimous consent that the first vote in this sequence be 20 minutes and thereafter the remaining ones, back to back, be 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Do I hear objection?

Mr. LEAHY. Reserving the right to object, and I shall not, I missed, Mr. President, what the distinguished manager said. Did he say when these votes would begin?

Mr. DOMENICI. Well, they will begin when Senator HATFIELD's time has run out.

Mr. LEAHY. I thank the Senator. I have no objection.

Mr. EXON. Reserving the right to object, and I do not intend to object, I would just say, for purposes of clarification, two things. With regard to the Snowe amendment, could we insert in the language ''the Snowe amendment, as amended, if amended''?

Mr. DOMENICI. I have no objection.

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

Mr. EXON. One further question. Could we get agreement at this time to move things along. As the Senator from Nebraska has continually warned, we are running out of time. Could we get an agreement, as a part of this unanimous-consent agreement, to have the votes on the series of amendments that have been outlined by the chairman of the committee to start, I am suggesting, maybe at 10 minutes after 10 or something of that nature?

Mr. DOMENICI. I think Senator HATFIELD has 17 minutes.

Mr. HATFIELD. I have 17 minutes and other Senators are asking to be heard. I would agree, say, to a quarter after 10, provided this time is not charged against my allotment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time remaining to the Senator from Oregon is 14 minutes 56 seconds.

Mr. HATFIELD. Does that include this period of colloquy?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That time has come out of the time of the Senator from New Mexico, who requested the time.

Mr. DOMENICI. So, Mr. President, for the understanding of everyone, Senator HATFIELD has 15 minutes, and I will yield back the remainder of the time on the amendment so we will have more time for other amendments, and we will proceed in this order.

Mr. EXON. So the vote will be in the area of 10:15?

Mr. DOMENICI. That is about right.

Mr. LEAHY. Reserving the right to object, will the distinguished manager be willing to amend that to the following: that after the series of votes, the Senator from Vermont be recognized for not to exceed 4 minutes to speak on two resolutions which will be voted on.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, it seems to me that the Senator from Vermont, with all due respect, is trying to step ahead of several other Senators whom we have made commitments to. I would ask the Senator to withdraw that request.

Mr. LEAHY. I was not aware of the commitments.

I withdraw the request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Hearing none, so ordered.

Mr. HATFIELD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized.

Mr. HATFIELD. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Vermont.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I rise in strong support as a cosponsor of the Hatfield amendment. I also want to commend the Senator from Florida for his very eloquent statement on why the NIH is so important to this Nation, and I do not have too much to add to that.

But I will point out that this is a perfect example of what can happen if we are not careful as we go forward with the debate on the budget and agree to cut things without recognizing that, in many cases, those things that we seek to cut to try to reduce the deficit, in effect, will add to the deficit. That is certainly true when it comes to medical research.

Time and time again, we have been able to make breakthroughs through the research by the NIH. Those breakthroughs have resulted in considerable, if not substantial, and gigantic savings in the cost of health care.

We all know that as we move forward, the most essential area that we have to control costs in is the health care area. So I would say that the NIH is clearly an entity that must be maintained because this is one area where they have a role and a role that must be maintained to not only do the research that they do at the NIH but, in addition to that, to take care of the research that is done in the hospitals, the training schools and the training universities, so that our whole area of health care can improve as we move along.

This creates many jobs through the biomedical research and technology transfers and all this adds, again, revenues to our deficit.

The resulting knowledge is essential from these entities for established industries such as DNA and other areas of research.

In other areas, we have saved already billions of dollars with respect to psychoactive drugs that save over $70 billion a year in hospitalization of mental patients. Vaccines and fluoridation save countless health care dollars and, again, help reduce the deficit.

The recent discovery of bacterial causes of peptic ulcers will save millions in chronic care costs. As I said over and over again, the same is true in education generally, not just medical education; that if we cut those things which are resulting in savings, then our job to solve the deficit problem will get worse and worse instead of better.

So I commend the Senator from Oregon for this amendment and support it with enthusiasm. If I have any time remaining, I yield it back.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for his comments. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from New Hampshire.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I wish to join with many of my colleagues today who support the amendment of the Senator from Oregon. In the process of developing a budget, we have to set priorities and, in this instance, I think the Senator from Oregon has rightly pointed out the initial budget resolution had some priorities that should be adjusted, and he has certainly pointed out the strengths and importance of NIH and what it contributes to the fabric of America's society and it should be supported. I strongly commend him for that. Therefore, I will vote for this amendment.

NIH is a unique institution. It is a collection of some of the most talented and brilliant individuals from around the world, but especially from the United States, who are working together to push the envelope of improving the health of not only the American people but the world in general.

It is an institution which is also fairly delicate. That type of talent and ability needs to be nurtured and needs to be supported, and it can be affected rather considerably by changes in its funding structure or in its general structure.

Therefore, I want to commend and support what the Senator from Oregon has decided to do with this amendment, which is to assure that NIH remains a strong and vibrant institution as we move into the future, and that their commitment to improving the lives of all Americans will not in any way be undermined by this budget resolution.

So I support and look forward to voting for the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon.

I yield back the remainder of my time to the Senator from Oregon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JEFFORDS). Who yields time?

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I have a number of comments I wish to close with, but if there are questions pending, I would like to respond.

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

Mr. HATFIELD. I will be very happy to yield.

Mr. BYRD. There is some confusion as to where the offsets are coming from. Will the Senator please state where he is getting these offsets for his increase in the NIH funding?

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, the offsets are coming from nondefense discretionary funds and accounts. I have pages of tables here on each precise account that would indicate where they are coming from. We have excluded within that Medicare, and the health services, but they are then from all other remaining of the nondefense discretionary accounts.

Mr. BYRD. Well, I am a strong supporter of adequate funding of NIH research programs, but we are already suffering terrible blows to nonmilitary discretionary programs. I would like to have seen the Senator's amendment take the funds out of military discretionary programs and foreign aid.

I would like to know just what other programs are being cut. The distinguished Senator has stated that certain programs are not being cut. But what does this leave by way of nonmilitary discretionary programs that are going to suffer additional cuts over and above those that are already involved in the resolution?

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I will respond by saying I wholeheartedly agree. In fact, at the beginning of my time allocation today, I sent to the desk a proposal that would take these funds, offset these funds from everything in the discretionary area, including military.

Having shopped that proposal around the Senate, I calculated we would have had about 20 votes. So we would have ended up with the dismantling, what I call this proposal, which is a prelude to disaster, of the medical research infrastructure we have developed in this country, the greatest in the world.

By taking a second-degree or withdrawing the first and offering the second proposal, which was to exclude the military, by that action, we have salvaged, at the expense of a fewer other agencies than my first proposal, but we at least have salvaged the future of NIH.

It is a matter of robbing Peter to pay Paul, I suppose would be the most succinct way to do it. Not my preference, but with the political reality I face on this floor, it was the only way I could find to salvage and save NIH.

Mr. BYRD. In other words, if I may pursue the subject a bit further, it would mean additional cuts in VA programs?

Mr. HATFIELD. Yes.

Mr. BYRD. It would mean additional cuts in education programs?

Mr. HATFIELD. Yes.

Mr. BYRD. It would mean additional cuts in various other health programs?

Mr. HATFIELD. Yes, various others. Nondefense discretionary funds, with the exclusion of the health programs and Medicare.

Mr. BYRD. It would mean additional cuts in law enforcement?

Mr. HATFIELD. Yes.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator. I applaud his objective. I want to support the amendment, but at the same time, I find it hard to continue to cut more and more and more from these other nonmilitary discretionary programs.

I suppose we are faced with the choice now of either voting for or against the amendment. I am sorry that other nonmilitary programs are to be cut.

We apparently do not have the votes in here to cut military funding. As an example, the B–2 bomber costs somewhere between $740 million and $1.2 billion per copy—and I believe that we have already committed ourselves to a contract for 20 additional B–2 bombers to be completed by the year 2000. There are many other military programs of like manner that I could cite, but I will not do it at this time. I thank the distinguished Senator for allotting me this opportunity to ask a question.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I share the agony. Believe me, one might think that we have cause to celebrate a victory if this amendment passes—which I expect it to do, and to survive conference, which I hope it could do—but I do not believe that it does call for a joint celebration because we have achieved one goal at a pretty heavy cost to an awful lot of other programs that I have deep interest in, as well. It is like choosing between your children. It is very difficult.

Mr. President, if I could have the attention of the chairman of the Senate Budget Committee, I would like to ask a question for the RECORD. In the report of the Budget Committee accompanying this resolution, where there were exemptions listed within the report language, if this amendment is adopted, do I understand clearly that that will then, in effect, eradicate, eliminate, excise those conditions within the report language of exemptions?

Mr. DOMENICI. The Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. HATFIELD. Thank you.

Mr. President, in closing, I thank my colleagues who joined in this effort. I say that it is, I believe, a step in the right direction. But, at the same time, I want to take a moment, once again, to commend the chairman of the Budget Committee, Senator DOMENICI from New Mexico. I would not trade with him for all the tea in China. I think Senator DOMENICI has probably one of the toughest jobs in the Senate. No matter what he does and his colleagues on that committee, it is a no-win situation. It is a very, very difficult task. I think they have carried their duties with not only great skill, great dignity and, above all, with remarkable patience. I have been in the strategy meetings, and everybody is gigging, and I am happy that everybody is taking it out on good old PETE. I want to come to his defense—not that he needs my defense—but I admire him as chairman of the committee. I admire what he does and his dedication and spirit. And I deeply admire him as one of my closest personal friends.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I think the Senator has 1 minute. If he does not mind, I will use it. I personally thank Senator HATFIELD for his comments. I think it is obvious to everyone that you do not have a budget resolution like the one pending on the floor without a lot of cooperation. On our side, let me say that the chairman of the Appropriations Committee clearly could have made this more difficult, and he chose to go with us on a balanced budget. He has been a strong advocate on it. We are not going in a direction he might choose, but I think he indicated to me that he is so concerned about our deficit spending that he compliments us on what we are doing.

Let me also say there is no doubt in my mind that the funding for the NIH that the distinguished Senator from Oregon seeks could be accommodated in the budget resolution by the appropriators, by allocating differently and leaving more for the NIH. I think the Senator has decided he wants the Senate to speak on the issue. I gather that is the purpose of the vote.

I yield the floor.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield the remainder of his time?

Mr. HATFIELD. Yes.

Mr. DOMENICI. I yield any time I may have had remaining, Mr. President.

AMENDMENT NO. 1130

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. President, I rise in support of the Bumpers-Bradley amendment to strike language that would allow us to count the sale of public assets—parks, powerplants, buildings, even oil in national storage facilities—as deficit reduction.

This bill language will open the floodgates for proposals to unload valuable Federal assets in return for the fast buck. Many of these proposals, in fact, will lead to reduced revenues in the future, and higher deficits. Only by a reliance on today's political myopia—a simpleminded scoring of sales revenue within the limited budget window—will many of these proposals withstand the straight face test. Only by railroading these proposals through the Senate, under the very restrictive and controlled conditions of budget reconciliation, would many of these proposals ever have a chance of becoming law.

I have not seen the Budget Committee's latest scoring of these asset sales receipts. But I note for colleagues' benefit that the analysis that I have shows an interesting point. In the short term, the committee's proposals produce deficit reduction. In the longer term, however, and certainly by the year 2002, these savings disappear. In fact, selling these assets appears to reduce future revenues sufficiently that the actual effect by the year 2002 is that the deficit increases. Asset sales are short-term and short-sighted.

It would be helpful to review why we produce these budget resolutions in the first place. The reason is not to balance the budget. If it was, I'm sure we could create some appropriate fiction which showed budgetary balance by definition.

But that's not what we were supposed to be doing here. We're supposed to be systematic. We're supposed to be honest. We're supposed to be consistent. We're supposed to address the substantive, structural issues which keep the Federal Government spending—year in, year out—more money than it takes in.

So what do we have here, buried deep in this bill? We have a trick, a gimmick. We cut spending, by redefining what a cut is. Now, for the first time since we gave this budget process teeth—with the passage of Gramm-Rudman—we can sell off national property—national assets—and include the proceeds as deficit reduction.

Mr. President, because of these cynically clever changes, we can now propose—for example—to sell nearly a billion dollars' worth of oil from the strategic petroleum, and chalk that up to deficit reduction.

Notwithstanding the fact that both Democratic and Republican administrations have endorsed expanding the SPR, notwithstanding the fact that hardly a week goes by without some oil State Senator coming to the floor to talk about rising oil imports and the threats to national security, notwithstanding the fact that at any time we could liquidate this oil inventory for cash, how can we seriously allege that this particular sale has anything to do with positive public policy, with putting our fiscal house in order, with creating a better future for our children?

Why stop at a billion dollars of SPR oil? Sell it all. And credit the $10 billion raised to balancing the budget or protecting our children's future.

This asset sale language will lead to all sorts of questionable proposals. It may make sense to sell the assets of the Tennessee Valley Authority, or Bonneville Power, or the hydrodams in

the West, or some small park in Louisiana or Texas or Virginia. But these arguments need to have a broader basis than the most simpleminded budget concerns.

In fact, I doubt that any business accountant or economist would agree with the underlying budgetary premise—that liquidating public assets adds to public wealth. If I sell my stock portfolio and put the returns in my checking account, do I become wealthier? Have I protected my children? It may make sense to make sell my stocks, but the transaction itself produces no wealth—except for my broker.

Consider the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. We can lease the refuge to oil developers and sell any oil that might be underground to them. We will get some money. The companies will get the rights to oil. If they find oil, probably it will be shipped to the Pacific rim and burned completely. Have we done a lot for our kids? You must be joking.

At best, we can claim for our children a neutral financial transaction. But what about the larger issues? If we go ahead with the development of ANWR, we damage probably irrevocably a unique, world-class ecosystem. We consume utterly a non-renewable resource. We get some cash.

If we forgo the drilling of ANWR, we preserve intact this ecosystem. We preserve intact any oil underground and the possibility of future development. We do not get the cash.

I, frankly, reject any claim that our children will thank us for using up this oil and running oil rigs and oil pipelines across the Arctic Plain.

Mr. President, what the American public expects, and what our children expect, is for us to get our fiscal house in order. Our children are not asking us to sell off their collective inheritance. Our children are not asking us to look narrowly at some budget window and forget that many of these assets produce public value—and I do not just mean financial value—beyond the window.

When one Member from the other side of the aisle, Senator CRAIG, considered this issue as a House Member, he said ''asset sales are in fact blue smoke and mirrors at best. If they are to happen, they should be set off budget.'' Exactly right.

Mr. BAUCUS. I rise today in support of the amendment offered by my colleague, Senator BUMPERS, to strike a provision of the budget resolution that would allow scoring of revenues from the sale of Federal assets. Make no mistake, I believe in reducing the Federal deficit. But this is simply the wrong way to do it.

The current rule prohibiting the scoring of Federal asset sales, first adopted as part of the 1987 Gramm-Rudman-Hollings Act, has been incorporated into recent budget resolutions. When it was first adopted, Senator Chiles, then chairman of the Senate Budget Committee, made it clear that the rule was intended to prevent the use of asset sales from being used to jimmy the figures, in other words to give the appearance of deficit reduction without really reducing spending.

The same principle applies here today. By changing the current rule prohibiting the scoring of Federal asset sales, the budget resolution would allow individual Committees to reach their deficit reduction targets by selling off Federal properties. This is a short-sighted strategy that sacrifices our children's heritage for an immediate infusion of cash; we should not use their inheritance to pay our debts.

There are two examples where I think this strategy is particularly misguided. The first is the sale of power marketing agencies that year after year provide affordable electricity to people in rural communities across this country. The second is the leasing for oil and gas development of one of this Nation's most magnificent wildlife refuges, the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge in Alaska.

POWER MARKETING AGENCIES

I've spoken many times before opposing the sale of power marketing agencies as a silly and shortsighted idea. It's nonsense. We should be selling off our infrastructure. We would be opening the door to monopolies. And that spells higher utility bills for ratepayers in Montana and other States across the Nation. In other words, it's nothing but a heavy-handed, punitive tax on the middle class.

ARCTIC NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE

The budget resolution also proposes to lease the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, which is in the northeast corner of Alaska. The refuge supports a spectacular diversity of wildlife, including polar bears, grizzly bears, wolves, and snow geese. In addition, more than 150,000 caribou migrate through the refuge, bearing their young on the coastal plain. The caribou are an important source of food for the native people who live near the refuge and continue, as their ancestors have for generations, to depend on the land to sustain their way of life. In 1987, the United States and Canada signed an International Agreement for the Conservation of the Porcupine Caribou Herd.

Under the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act, which Congress passed in 1980, oil and gas development is prohibited in the 19 million acre refuge unless authorized by Congress. Because the 1.5 million acre coastal plain is such an important and unique are for wildlife, I believe it should be permanently protected. I have cosponsored a bill (S. 428) to designate that area as wilderness.

However, regardless of whether you agree with me that this area should be permanently protected or, as the Budget Committee proposes, it should be opened for drilling, I believe this issue is too significant and too complex to be resolved during the budget process. The budget process focuses on the short-term economic gains to be obtained by drilling. It is not suited to considering what benefits and values will be lost for future generations of Americans by developing this pristine wildlife refuge. The budget resolution and the subsequent reconciliation bill are two of the very few bills where Senate rules limit debate and amendments. In my opinion, this path does not provide an adequate opportunity to evaluate alternatives, to question the assumptions on which those projected economic gains are based, or to fully consider the potential impacts of drilling on the fragile arctic environment.

These decisions could result in higher utility bills for middle-class Americans across the country and significantly impact one of our most precious national wildlife refuges. To ensure that these issues receive the full consideration and debate they deserve, I urge my colleagues to reject the proposed rule change that would allow the scoring of federal asset sales and to vote for the Bumpers amendment.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 1126

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been yielded back.

According to the previous order, the vote will now occur on amendment No. 1126 offered by the Senators from Iowa and Arkansas.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I request the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 1126.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LOTT. I announce that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. BOND] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 28, nays 71, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 181 Leg.]

YEAS—28

Akaka	Jeffords	Murray
Boxer	Kennedy	Pell
Bradley	Kerrey	Pryor
Bumpers	Kerry	Reid
Byrd	Kohl	Rockefeller
Daschle	Lautenberg	Sarbanes
Dorgan	Leahy	Simon
Feingold	Levin	Wellstone
Harkin	Moseley-Braun	
Hatfield	Moynihan	

NAYS—71

Abraham	Cohen	Glenn
Ashcroft	Conrad	Gorton
Baucus	Coverdell	Graham
Bennett	Craig	Gramm
Biden	D'Amato	Grams
Bingaman	DeWine	Grassley
Breaux	Dodd	Gregg
Brown	Dole	Hatch
Bryan	Domenici	Heflin
Burns	Exon	Helms
Campbell	Faircloth	Hollings
Chafee	Feinstein	Hutchison
Coats	Ford	Inhofe
Cochran	Frist	Inouye

Johnston
Kassebaum
Kempthorne
Kyl
Lieberman
Lott
Lugar
Mack
McCain
McConnell
Mikulski
Murkowski
Nickles
Nunn
Packwood
Pressler
Robb
Roth
Santorum
Shelby
Simpson
Smith
Snowe
Specter
Stevens
Thomas
Thompson
Thurmond
Warner

NOT VOTING—1

Bond

So the amendment (No. 1126) was rejected.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, the Senate is not in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on two amendments that have been previously ordered to be voted on. I ask for the yeas and nays on the Feingold amendment and the yeas and nays on the Dodd substitute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

Is there objection to ordering the yeas and nays en bloc?

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, there is no motion en bloc, is there?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is a sufficient second. Hearing no objection, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 1127

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 1127.

The yeas and nays have been ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LOTT. I announce that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. BOND] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber who desire to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 44, nays 55, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 182 Leg.]

YEAS—44

Akaka
Biden
Bingaman
Boxer
Breaux
Bryan
Bumpers
Byrd
Chafee
Conrad
Daschle
Dodd
Dorgan
Exon
Feingold
Feinstein
Ford
Glenn
Graham
Harkin
Heflin
Hollings
Inouye
Johnston
Kennedy
Kerrey
Kerry
Kohl
Lautenberg
Leahy
Levin
Mikulski
Moseley-Braun
Moynihan
Murray
Nunn
Pell
Pryor
Reid
Robb
Rockefeller
Sarbanes
Simon
Wellstone

NAYS—55

Abraham
Ashcroft
Baucus
Bennett
Bradley
Brown
Burns
Campbell
Coats
Cochran
Cohen
Coverdell
Craig
D'Amato
DeWine
Dole
Domenici
Faircloth
Frist
Gorton
Gramm
Grams
Grassley
Gregg
Hatch
Hatfield
Helms
Hutchison
Inhofe
Jeffords
Kassebaum
Kempthorne
Kyl
Lieberman
Lott
Lugar
Mack
McCain
McConnell
Murkowski
Nickles
Packwood
Pressler
Roth
Santorum
Shelby
Simpson
Smith
Snowe
Specter
Stevens
Thomas
Thompson
Thurmond
Warner

NOT VOTING—1

Bond

So the amendment (No. 1127) was rejected.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 1130

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to amendment No. 1130 of Senator BUMPERS.

Mr. DOMENICI addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority manager of the bill.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I move to table the Bumpers amendment and ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to table the Bumpers amendment, No. 1130. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. LOTT. I announce that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. BOND] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CAMPBELL). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber who desire to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 52, nays 47, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 183 Leg.]

YEAS—52

Abraham
Ashcroft
Bennett
Brown
Burns
Campbell
Chafee
Coats
Cochran
Coverdell
Craig
D'Amato
DeWine
Dole
Domenici
Faircloth
Frist
Gorton
Gramm
Grams
Grassley
Gregg
Hatch
Hatfield
Helms
Hutchison
Inhofe
Jeffords
Kassebaum
Kempthorne
Kyl
Lott
Lugar
Mack
McCain
McConnell
Murkowski
Nickles
Packwood
Pressler
Roth
Santorum
Shelby
Simpson
Smith
Snowe
Specter
Stevens
Thomas
Thompson
Thurmond
Warner

NAYS—47

Akaka
Baucus
Biden
Bingaman
Boxer
Bradley
Breaux
Bryan
Bumpers
Byrd
Cohen
Conrad
Daschle
Dodd
Dorgan
Exon
Feingold
Feinstein
Ford
Glenn
Graham
Harkin
Heflin
Hollings
Inouye
Johnston
Kennedy
Kerrey
Kerry
Kohl
Lautenberg
Leahy
Levin
Lieberman
Mikulski
Moseley-Braun
Moynihan
Murray
Nunn
Pell
Pryor
Reid
Robb
Rockefeller
Sarbanes
Simon
Wellstone

NOT VOTING—1

Bond

So the motion to table the amendment (No. 1130) was agreed to.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the motion was agreed to.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 1131

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question occurs with respect to amendment No. 1131 offered by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] to amendment No. 1128, offered by the Senator from Maine [Ms. SNOWE].

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I move to lay that amendment on the table, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table amendment No. 1131. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LOTT. I announce that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. BOND] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 51, nays 48, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 184 Leg.]

YEAS—51

Abraham
Ashcroft
Bennett
Brown
Burns
Chafee
Coats
Cochran
Cohen
Coverdell
Craig
D'Amato
DeWine
Dole
Domenici
Faircloth
Frist
Gorton
Gramm
Grams
Grassley
Gregg
Hatch
Hatfield
Helms
Hutchison
Inhofe
Kassebaum
Kempthorne
Kyl
Lott
Lugar
Mack
McCain
McConnell
Murkowski
Nickles
Packwood
Pressler
Roth
Santorum
Shelby
Simpson
Smith
Snowe
Specter
Stevens
Thomas
Thompson
Thurmond
Warner

NAYS—48

Akaka
Baucus
Biden
Bingaman
Boxer
Bradley
Breaux
Bryan
Bumpers
Byrd
Campbell
Conrad
Daschle
Dodd
Dorgan
Exon
Feingold
Feinstein
Ford
Glenn
Graham
Harkin
Heflin
Hollings
Inouye
Jeffords
Johnston
Kennedy
Kerrey
Kerry
Kohl
Lautenberg
Leahy
Levin
Lieberman
Mikulski
Moseley-Braun
Moynihan
Murray
Nunn
Pell
Pryor
Reid
Robb
Rockefeller
Sarbanes
Simon
Wellstone

NOT VOTING—1

Bond

So the motion to lay on the table the amendment (No. 1131) was agreed to.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 1128

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now occurs on Amendment No. 1128 offered by the Senator from Maine [Ms. SNOWE].

The yeas and nays have been ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. LOTT. I announce that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. BOND] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 39, nays 60, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 185 Leg.]

YEAS—39

Abraham	Harkin	Murkowski
Akaka	Hatch	Pressler
Biden	Helms	Rockefeller
Bingaman	Hollings	Roth
Bradley	Kassebaum	Santorum
Brown	Kempthorne	Simon
Campbell	Kennedy	Simpson
Chafee	Kyl	Snowe
Cohen	Levin	Specter
Feingold	Lott	Stevens
Frist	Lugar	Thomas
Grams	McCain	Thurmond
Grassley	Moseley-Braun	Wellstone

NAYS—60

Ashcroft	Dorgan	Lautenberg
Baucus	Exon	Leahy
Bennett	Faircloth	Lieberman
Boxer	Feinstein	Mack
Breaux	Ford	McConnell
Bryan	Glenn	Mikulski
Bumpers	Gorton	Moynihan
Burns	Graham	Murray
Byrd	Gramm	Nickles
Coats	Gregg	Nunn
Cochran	Hatfield	Packwood
Conrad	Heflin	Pell
Coverdell	Hutchison	Pryor
Craig	Inhofe	Reid
D'Amato	Inouye	Robb
Daschle	Jeffords	Sarbanes
DeWine	Johnston	Shelby
Dodd	Kerrey	Smith
Dole	Kerry	Thompson
Domenici	Kohl	Warner

NOT VOTING—1

Bond

So the amendment (No. 1128) was rejected.

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

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

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 1133

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now occurs on amendment numbered 1133, offered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD].

The yeas and nays have been ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LOTT. I announce that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. BOND] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 85, nays 14, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 186 Leg.]

YEAS—85

Abraham	Baucus	Biden
Akaka	Bennett	Bingaman
Boxer	Gramm	Moseley-Braun
Bradley	Grams	Moynihan
Breaux	Grassley	Murkowski
Brown	Gregg	Murray
Bryan	Harkin	Nickles
Bumpers	Hatch	Nunn
Burns	Hatfield	Packwood
Campbell	Heflin	Pell
Chafee	Helms	Pressler
Cohen	Hollings	Pryor
Conrad	Hutchison	Reid
Coverdell	Inhofe	Robb
D'Amato	Inouye	Roth
Daschle	Jeffords	Santorum
DeWine	Kassebaum	Sarbanes
Dodd	Kennedy	Shelby
Dole	Kerrey	Simon
Domenici	Kerry	Simpson
Dorgan	Kohl	Snowe
Exon	Lautenberg	Specter
Faircloth	Leahy	Stevens
Feingold	Levin	Thomas
Feinstein	Lieberman	Thurmond
Ford	Lugar	Warner
Frist	Mack	Wellstone
Glenn	McConnell	
Graham	Mikulski	

NAYS—14

Ashcroft	Gorton	McCain
Byrd	Johnston	Rockefeller
Coats	Kempthorne	Smith
Cochran	Kyl	Thompson
Craig	Lott	

NOT VOTING—1

Bond

So the amendment (No. 1133) was agreed to.

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

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I believe now we would proceed under the previously agreed to order. I yield such time as she may need to the Senator from the State of California.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California [Mrs. BOXER].

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on my time?

Mrs. BOXER. Of course. I am happy to yield.

Mr. DOMENICI. How much time remains on the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. One hour forty-nine minutes.

Mr. DOMENICI. It is divided about equally?

Mr. EXON. I believe the time rests with the minority.

Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time controlled by the Senator from Nebraska is 1 hour and 49 minutes.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I want to remind Senators that when that 1 hour and 49 minutes is up—and, obviously, if the Senator uses the full hour—we will use a full hour on our side on the amendment. Then there will not be any time left.

It would seem to me that we ought to try to expedite things and find out how many amendments are real. I will try to do that in the next 10 minutes; find out exactly how many amendments we must have on our side. I hope we will try because I think Senators must know. Last year, on the budget resolution, there were 20 or 35 amendments, and the way the majority leader then did it was the clerk read one sentence explaining it and we voted.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I think I can enlighten my friend. It is this Senator's intention to use only about 5 or 6 minutes, then to yield back my time on this amendment to my ranking member, Senator EXON, and then he will yield to other Senators to explain their amendments. That is the plan.

Mr. DOMENICI. That is fine. I just want Senators to know that even if the Senator yields her time I do not have to yield my time. I would like to get some understanding of how we are going to use the time because I will use an hour in opposition. On the other hand, we might be able to work out something, if the Senator would like.

Mr. EXON. I appreciate the attitude expressed by the chairman of the Budget Committee. I appreciate the remarks and the agreement made by the Senator from California.

What we are trying to do is give Senators on this side 2 or 3 minutes to explain amendments that will later be offered, and trying to use the time in that fashion. Hopefully we can cooperate.

Mr. DOMENICI. I wonder if the Senator might permit me. I will depend on the Senator from Nebraska totally. When she yields, if the Senator from Nebraska would use 10 minutes or so while I am off the floor, then I will come back.

Mr. EXON. I will be able to use that, or as much time that the Senator from New Mexico cares to be gone.

Mr. DOMENICI. I thank the Senator very much. I would like to use mine in opposition.

AMENDMENT NO. 1134

(Purpose: To strengthen the sense of the Congress that 90 percent of the benefits of any tax cuts must go to the middle class)

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from California [Mrs. BOXER] proposes an amendment numbered 1134.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 89, strike line 1 through 17 and insert the following:

SEC. 306. PROHIBITION OF LEGISLATION THAT WOULD INCLUDE A TAX CUT UNLESS 90 PERCENT OF THE BENEFITS GO TO THE MIDDLE CLASS.

(a) FINDING.—The Congress finds that—

(1) the incomes of middle-class families have stagnated since the early 1980's, with family incomes growing more slowly between 1979 and 1989 than in any other business cycle since World War II; and

(2) according to the Department of the Treasury, in 1996, approximately 90 percent of American families will have incomes less than $100,000.

(b) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, resolution, amendment, motion, or conference

report that contains a reduction in revenues unless at least 90 percent of the benefits of that reduction goes to working families with annual incomes less than $100,000.

(c) APPEALS.—Appeals in the Senate from decisions of the Chair relating to this section shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided between and controlled by, the appellant and the manager of the bill or resolution, as the case may be. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required in the Senate to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this section.

(d) CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE REPORTS.—Whenever the Director of the Congressional Budget Office shall prepare a report pursuant to section 308 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 in connection with a bill, resolution, or conference report that contains a reduction in revenues, the Director shall so state in that report, and, to the extent practicable, shall include an estimate of the amount of the reduction in revenues and the percent of the benefits of that reduction in revenue that will go to working families with annual incomes less than $100,000.

(e) ESTIMATES.—Solely for the purposes of enforcement of this section on the Senate floor, the percentage of benefits of a reduction in revenues going to working families with annual incomes less than $100,000 shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the Congressional Budget Office.

(f) SUNSET.—This section shall expire at the close of the 104th Congress.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be able to speak for 6 minutes.

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

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, we are asking the question again with this Boxer amendment: ''Whose side are you on?'' And with many amendments that have come before this body which have all been revenue neutral which have not added 1 cent to the deficit, we have asked this question: ''Whose side are you on?''

I think that this Boxer amendment gives all of us a chance to answer that question one more time.

The amendment says that the only tax cuts that will be in order in this Congress will be tax cuts where 90 percent of the benefits go to those earning under $100,000 per year. Any other tax cut plan will be subjected to a 60-vote point of order.

So this is our opportunity to really take a stand with the middle class, not just in words but in actual votes.

Why is this amendment necessary? Simply because the Republican contract calls for tax cuts for the very wealthy, the very top 1, 2 percent of the people, and I would like to point this out, courtesy of Senator LAUTENBERG. We have some facts here.

The winners in the Republican budget clearly are wealthy. Nothing that has happened on this floor has changed it. Indeed, the amendments that we had, which would have helped this balance tilt back toward the middle class, have gone down in flames because of party-line votes.

So clearly the winners are the rich, $350,000 a year, and this Republican budget will give them a $20,000 tax break. That is what is hidden in the so-called reserve for tax cuts. That is what the House has already voted on.

We know that corporate subsidies are protected and tax loopholes are saved. As a matter of fact, when we tried even to end the one that goes to the billionaire Benedict Arnolds who leave the country to avoid taxes, we could not even get that one through.

I think another chart by the Democratic leader shown to us in this debate tells the story. Working families pay for GOP tax cuts for wealthy. Here is the family. Seniors pay $6,400 more due to the changes in Medicare. Working families pay $1,400 more because of the changes in the earned-income tax credit. Students pay $3,000 more over the lifetime of the loans because of the change in the cuts in student loans.

So that is who is paying for the tax cuts for the wealthy. Who? Those over $350,000 will get a $20,000 tax cut. That is in the contract, and that has been voted by the Republican House.

Now, will there be tax cuts? We hear the chairman of the Budget Committee saying there are not going to be tax cuts. ''I do not have them in there. It is going to be awhile.''

I say to my friends that there are going to be tax cuts. Look at what the majority leader says, Senator DOLE. ''We are going to have tax cuts.'' It does not say ''maybe.'' It says, ''We are going to have tax cuts.'' He said it on May 9. He said it on March 11. ''I am certain that Senate tax cuts will be as big in magnitude as the House,'' Senator DOLE.

Senator GRAMM:

> I don't think a budget without a tax cut can pass.

And we know that is true because Senator FEINGOLD just had an amendment that would have taken that little honeypot and put it toward deficit reduction, and it went down because Republicans voted against it.

So to UPI, Senator GRAMM said in March:

> Let me assure you that tax cuts are in order in the Republican Senate. I am for them. They are part of our Contract With America.

So that really shows you the facts. There is going to be a tax cut, and what this Senator from California is saying is, if there are going to be tax cuts, let us make sure they go to those earning under $100,000. I think it is very important.

Now, I want to say to my friends who are debating in their mind how they are going to vote that in the committee, every single Republican except one, Senator GRAMM, voted for the Boxer amendment that was a sense-of-the-Senate that said 90 percent of the tax cuts should go to those earning $100,000 or less.

I ask for 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator has 1 additional minute.

Mrs. BOXER. Is that the remainder of my time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has used 5 minutes now. There were 6. She has two additional minutes.

Mrs. BOXER. I thank the Chair.

So every single Republican save one voted for the sense of the Senate. Now we are putting some teeth into that sense-of-the-Senate resolution. Now we are saying if the Republicans come up with a tax cut that benefits the rich, it will take 60 votes to allow that tax cut to move forward. This is a chance for my Republican friends to stand up and be counted for the middle class.

Now, in the course of this debate, Senator GREGG, Senator BROWN, and Senator DOMENICI referenced my sense-of-the-Senate resolution that passed and is part of the budget resolution. They said this Senate is on record; we believe that tax cuts should go to the middle class and the middle class only.

Well, now is where the rubber meets the road. They have a chance to cast their vote on the side of those earning $100,000 or less. They have a chance to say that those will be the only tax cuts that come before us.

I say to my colleagues, this is an opportunity to stand with the middle class, to stand with those hard-working Americans and to say to those who earn over $350,000, over $250,000: Listen, you are great Americans, but it is time for you to pay your fair share and it is time for others to get some of the breaks that you have received.

I think it is important to close with a quote from Kevin Phillips, a Republican, who said about this budget the following:

> Spending on Government programs for Medicare and education to home heating oil assistance is to be reduced in ways that hurt the poor and middle class, while simultaneously taxes are to be cut in ways that benefit the top 1 or 2 percent of Americans.

Kevin Phillips closes his remarks, and he says about this budget, with these tax cuts in it:

> It deserves to be rejected with outrage.

Those are his words, a Republican who has looked at this budget. I think that the Boxer amendment that clearly points out that a point of order will lie against any tax cut that does not benefit the middle class is one which we should all agree to and vote for in a bipartisan way. I thank the Chair.

I yield my time back to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mrs. BOXER. I have yielded my time back to the Senator from Nebraska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. INHOFE). The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. EXON. We are now going to go forward in an orderly fashion. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Louisiana. Following the Senator from Louisiana, I had committed to yield 1 minute to the Senator from Maryland, 2 minutes to the other Senator from Maryland, 2 minutes to the Senator from New Mexico, 4 minutes to the Senator from Massachusetts, 2 minutes

to the Senator from Nevada, and then we will go to a main amendment of the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. JOHNSTON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, the Johnston amendment takes the $170 billion fund which is reserved exclusively for tax cuts and permits such part of that as the Senate wishes to allocate to reduce the cuts in Medicare.

Under the Domenici proposal now before the Senate, there is $257 billion cut from Medicare in the amounts shown in each of these years. What I would do is authorize that the $170 billion be restored in the manner shown here so that net cuts in Medicare would amount to only one-third of those proposed by Senator DOMENICI. There would be no cuts at all in the first 2 years and a minimal cut in the third year, and overall there would be less than a third the cuts which are presently proposed.

Mr. President, this amendment places in stark contrast the fact that Medicare cuts are not required in order to balance the budget. At least two-thirds of those cuts are not required to balance the budget. Two-thirds of the Medicare cuts proposed by Senator DOMENICI and now backed by the Senate are required to lower taxes, and to lower taxes on the wealthy, not required to balance the budget.

Mr. President, this does not require that we spend the money to reduce Medicare cuts, but it authorizes that. And I will tell my colleagues that we have not the foggiest notion how we are going to achieve those Medicare cuts. We have not been told. We are told there might be a commission appointed. What I am saying is the Senate ought to have the freedom to decide whether or not, after this budget resolution passes, and after we make that $170 billion in savings, we ought to have the freedom to spend that $170 billion to reduce the impact of Medicare cuts on our senior citizens.

All the public opinion polls say 80 percent of the people of this country are opposed to these deep Medicare cuts. Now, why does the Senate want to lock itself into reducing Medicare by that much when all we have to do is give ourselves the freedom to take the tax cut for the wealthy and spend it to reduce the Medicare cuts?

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

The Senator from Maryland is recognized for 2 minutes.

RETIREMENT BENEFITS OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, the amendment which I will be sending to the desk at the proper time on behalf of myself, Senator MIKULSKI, Senator WARNER, Senator ROBB, and Senator BINGAMAN goes directly at a provision that is in the budget resolution which is going to change the calculation of retirement benefits for Federal employees from the employee's highest 3-year average to the highest 5-year average.

This I think is a breach of the contract with the Federal employees. I think it is clearly unfair to them. The amendment honoring our contract with Federal employees is paid for by closing the billionaires' tax loophole that allows very wealthy people to escape paying taxes by renouncing their American citizenship.

Mr. President, I regret that Federal employees are constantly being used as whipping boys in the course of these budget deliberations. Behind the phrase Federal worker are individual men and women who every day go in and try to do a dedicated job and render a service to the American people. They perform critical and important functions each and every day with a great deal of dedication and a great deal of devotion, and in my judgment they are entitled to be treated with dignity and respect.

Federal employees have already in the various deficit reduction programs made very significant sacrifices. We are talking about men and women who have worked hard in service to their country. They have earned their benefits, and the rules ought not to be changed on them as they are approaching retirement.

The existing provision, the 3-year provision, has been in effect for more than a quarter of a century. People have calculated their retirement and their ability to meet their financial obligations based on the current system, and we ought not to come along at the very end and change the rules on them, by shifting the basis on which their retirement is being calculated.

The truth is that Federal workers give dedicated service to their country and have earned their benefits. They made a choice to serve their country with an understanding of what that service entailed and what they could expect in return. To change the rules breaches the contract with these employees. This is an issue of fairness and I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this important amendment.

Ms. MIKULSKI addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland [Ms. MIKULSKI], is recognized for 1 minute.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I rise in strong support of the Sarbanes-Mikulski amendment which strikes the provision which cuts Federal employee retirement benefits. The proposed change in the budget resolution would reduce lifetime retirement benefits for Federal employees between 2 and 4 percent.

Now, that might not sound like that much, but for an average Federal worker, that could mean as much as a loss of $27,000 or more over a lifetime.

Mr. President, this is outrageous. We are changing the rules of the game on Federal employees in the middle of their career or near the end of their career. I have Federal employees in my State, 130,000 of them. They are the civilian work force that makes your Air Force One keep flying. They are the people at the National Institutes of Health that we just extolled the virtues of when we supported NIH.

We talked a great deal about a wonderful physician by the name of Dr. Rosenberg who has devoted his life to saving lives and curing cancer, and now this amendment will cut his Federal pension. It is both a reality and a metaphor for people who gave up careers that would have paid more in the private sector but wanted to serve their country and they thought they would have an adequate health insurance plan and a reasonable retirement plan.

So, Mr. President, I really ask the U.S. Senate to support the Sarbanes-Mikulski amendment to ensure that promises made are promises kept and that we can continue to attract the kind of quality work force for the Federal Government that we have had.

Mr. DOMENICI addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I yield myself 15 minutes in opposition to the Boxer amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, let me suggest to my good friend if we would like to build a little bit of back and forth on this, I am more than willing. Otherwise, we will use the hour in opposition to the Boxer amendment. I would very much like to know where we are.

Mr. REID addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, if I could direct a question through you to the manager of the bill, to the chairman. The Senator was off the floor. There are a few of us here that have only a couple of minutes to explain what our amendments would be, and it would probably be that we will only have a couple minutes to maybe get these out of the way. Would that be possible?

Mr. DOMENICI. The way it is now, you have an hour, the rest of an hour, and I have an hour. I would like to be accommodating.

Mr. EXON. I simply say to my friend, we want to be accommodating, too. We know the situation we are in. I have three additional Senators which I had assigned time, of which Senator REID is one of them. There is 1 minute, 2 minutes, and 2 minutes. If we could accommodate those Senators who have been waiting—and I do not want to be unfair—for the next 5 minutes, at least we would take care of the first round of the attempts that this Senator is trying to make to accommodate a whole group of Senators on this side who want to speak.

Could we complete the first round, in line with the question from the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I yield the floor and reserve my 15 minutes until the Senator's wishes as expressed are completed. Then I will speak in opposition to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who seeks recognition?

Mr. BINGAMAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico is recognized for 2 minutes.

CIVILIAN RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I wanted to speak just briefly on an amendment that I will be offering, along with Senators LIEBERMAN, ROCKEFELLER, BIDEN, HOLLINGS, BYRD, and KERRY from Massachusetts for a vote later on today.

The amendment attempts to restore some of the funds that are proposed to be eliminated in the civilian research and development accounts. This amendment is attempting to retain as much as we can of the U.S. science and technology enterprise which has brought such great results to our country and to the world.

This chart, I believe, sums it up very well. This shows what has happened to Federal civilian research and development as a percentage of gross domestic product from 1960 until the end of this century if we were to take the budget proposal that is now pending on the Senate floor. As you can see, under the proposed GOP budget, there will be an additional dramatic drop off in Federal support for civilian research and development. This includes the National Institutes of Health funding which we earlier had a vote on, but it also includes many other areas of funding that the Federal Government supports in the research and development area.

You can see the last year we had a balanced budget in this country, about 1968–1969, we were spending something in the range of 0.7 of our gross domestic product on civilian research and development. If this budget is adopted, we will be spending less than 0.3 percent, less than half of that. We will be spending substantially less as a country than our competitors in other parts of the world.

I believe our amendment is important. I know Senators LIEBERMAN and ROCKEFELLER intend to speak on it later, as well.

I have used my time and I yield the floor.

Mr. REID addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

RESTORING FUNDING TO NATIONAL PARKS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, our national parks are in a state of embarrassing disrepair. As an example, water systems in one of our busiest national park areas has been closed because of water not meeting minimal standards. In short, it is not safe to drink.

We will be closing visitor centers, closing roads and trails, closing public buildings, closing campgrounds; and law enforcement reductions will occur, to name but a few.

My amendment, which I will offer, will seek $1 billion from the proposed tax cuts and instead give the money to partially restore, renovate, and maintain our beautiful national heritage—that is our National Park System. And that will only partially do it, because there is a $2 billion backlog. I will apply the $1 billion toward this.

Mr. President, I rise today to propose an amendment to the 1996 Budget Reconciliation Act that over the next 7 years would restore $1 billion in funding to the National Park Service to alleviate its devastating maintenance backlog. These fund would be drawn from the $170 billion reserve fund. With my amendment the money can only be used for restoration, renovation, or maintenance of our national parks.

As Teddy Roosevelt, the man most responsible for the conservation movement involving our public lands once said and I quote, ''Surely our people do not understand even yet the rich heritage that is theirs. There can be nothing in the world more beautiful than the Yosemite, the groves of giant sequoias and redwoods, the canyon of Colorado, the canyon of Yellowstone, the tetons; and our people should see to it that they are preserved for their children and their children's children forever, with their majestic beauty all unmarred.'' These words spoken by Theodore Roosevelt in 1905 ring true today. But, the very government, this Congress, that has been given the responsibility to protect the crown jewels, better known as our national parks and recreation areas, is abdicating that trust.

That is why I have come to the floor today to highlight a matter of national concern. I am speaking of the outrageous and deplorable conditions of our national parks and recreation areas. The spending cuts proposed by this budget would reverse a longstanding trend of committed support by the citizens of this nation to the continued preservation and protection of its National Park System.

In today's environment of fiscal responsibility it is interesting that some in this body and the leadership in the House are calling for a tax cut for the wealthiest Americans. The tax breaks in the House-passed Contract With America tax bill will mostly benefit those families with incomes over $100,000, the top twelve percent of income distribution in this country. In essence these cuts are going to those who can afford to travel anywhere for vacation.

However, millions of less affluent Americans in 1994 traveled to one or more of our national parks for their vacations and in many instances found these facilities in some form of disrepair.

It defies common sense to think that Congress will approve a tax cut and then proceed to pass a budget that will decimate our national parks. In essence, funding for the National Park Service continues to be inadequate to meet public use needs. With this budget, the current maintenance backlog of over two billion dollars is simply going to grow and grow causing portions of the parks to become unavailable to the public.

Rehabilitation of park structures, roads, trails, and utility systems is critical to the health and safety of visitors as well as employees. With increased visitation to our national park system the proposed decrease in funding is going to limit the Park Service's ability to serve the public.

There are many examples of the terrible conditions that have befallen our national treasures. In my own State of Nevada, the Lake Mead National Recreation Area has an antiquated water treatment system. After State officials inspected the park's various water treatment facilities they notified the park service that because of surface water facility deficiencies, water supplied in areas of the park poses an acute risk to human health. The park then posted signs requesting visitors to boil their water before drinking. For a park that received 10 million visitors last year this is an outrage. As a result of the current budget proposals it may take as long as 10 years before this problem is corrected.

Here are some other examples that illustrate my concerns of what can be expected if this budget becomes an reality. At Independence National Historical Park there would be extensive building closures—total or partial closure of 11 of the 14 buildings open to the public resulting in elimination of 700,000 to 800,000 park visits.

At Yosemite National Park, operational oversight of concessions would be reduced. Campfire programs and visitor centers hours would be reduced and some visitor centers would simply close. Preventative maintenance on facilities would cease and cutbacks in snow removal would delay road openings over mountain passes. Additionally, campground seasons would be shortened and horse and backcountry patrols would be reduced. Also, visitor protection responses would be reactive only and limited to life threatening emergencies or criminal incidents involving threats to persons.

In Rocky Mountain National Park, the drastic reduction in seasonal park ranger staff would cut essential personnel available for search, rescue, law enforcement, and other emergency services. Three of five visitor information centers would be closed. Not to mention that the two remaining centers and all campgrounds would be open only from Memorial Day through Labor Day.

At Redwood National Park, all nondiscretionary funds would be eliminated forcing severe reduction of the temporary workforce, and operating supplies which would minimize maintenance on buildings, grounds, trails and roads due to lack of supplies and materials and shortage of personnel to complete the work.

Mount Rainer National Park would also suffer in this current and future budget cycle. The park would see its interpretive programs eliminated and

the inventory of endangered spotted owls and marbled murrilette would not be accomplished. This in turn would lead to the degradation of other natural resources such as fragile alpine meadows. Not to mention the scaling back of ranger patrols and reduced campground operating hours with reductions in maintenance and cleaning.

Mr. President, we must not stand by and allow our national parks to simply rot. While in the short-term this budget proposal would save money, it would, over the long run lead to irreversible consequences, and irrevocable damage to the nation's heritage and legacy. I want to reemphasize the point that all National Park Service sites, will be affected, including the representative symbols of our democracy. For example, the Statue of Liberty/Ellis Island, Washington Monument, Independence Hall, Jefferson Memorial, Mount Rushmore, Fort McHenry, and Martin Luther King, Jr. National Historical Site.

The impact of the current budget proposals in years one and two force the park service to curtail visiting hours at Independence National Historical Park and many buildings would be entirely closed. The Statue of Liberty would be closed at least 1 day a week. In years three through five the impacts are expected to be more extreme. For example, with staffing levels further reduced, extensive and prolonged park closures could occur. Many of the park services resources would be subjected to unacceptable levels of risk pertaining to loss through deterioration, theft, fire, and other factors.

Mr. President, let us reflect for a moment on the responsibility that has been delegated to the National Park Service. The Park Service is comprised of 368 park units covering more than 80 million acres in 49 States. The physical inventory alone consists of 15,000 buildings, 5,200 housing units, 1,400 bridges, 8,000 miles of roads, 125 sewage treatment plants, and 1,300 water systems.

Simply put, the insufficient funding levels proposed by this bill, in addition to new facilities and requirements associated with the addition of 12 new parks since 1991, will cause the Park Service to continue to fall behind in maintaining these structures, thereby contributing to a mounting backlog of deficiencies. The net result will be increased costs in the future and the subsequent loss of some irreplaceable and irretrievable resources.

Let me reemphasize the point that the effect of this action would result in outcomes immediately visible to the public, such as, deferred maintenance, closures of campgrounds, and closures of visitor facilities. We must and can find other savings offsets in our quest to reduce the Federal deficit. These parks are one of the great legacy's which we will leave our children. Lets not leave them underdeveloped and rundown.

In closing, Mr. President, I would like to leave you more sound advice from Theodore Roosevelt:

> To waste, to destroy, our natural resources, to skin and exhaust the land instead of using it so as to increase its usefulness, will result in undermining in the days of our children the very prosperity which we ought by right to hand down to them amplified and developed.

Mr. KERRY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized for 4 minutes.

PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGN FINANCE SYSTEM

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I call up an amendment at the desk on behalf of myself, Senators SIMON, FORD, FEINGOLD, BRADLEY, BIDEN, and WELLSTONE.

I ask unanimous consent that several letters and editorials supporting the existing campaign finance law be printed in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENTS IN SUPPORT OF PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGN FINANCE SYSTEM

The bipartisan Commission on National Elections, headed by Melvin Laird, Secretary of Defense in the Nixon Administration, and Robert Strauss, former chair of the Democratic National Committee, recognized the value and success of the presidential campaign finance system. The Commission concluded: "Public financing of presidential elections has clearly proven its worth in opening up the process, reducing undue influence of individuals and groups, and virtually ending corruption in presidential election finance. This major reform of the 1970s should be continued."

Former Senator Paul Laxalt (R-NV), who chaired the 1976, 1980 and 1984 presidential campaigns for President Reagan, also praised the presidential campaign finance system. In discussing the campaign finance problems in Congress, Senator Laxalt said, "The problem is so bad we ought to start thinking about federal financing" of House and Senate campaigns. "It was anathema to me * * * but in my experience with the [Reagan] presidential campaigns, it worked, and it was like a breath of fresh air."

The New York Times calls the presidential campaign finance system "the best existing counterweight to the dominance of check-writing special interests in national politics. * * * This public financing has worked remarkably well to minimize the financial advantage of the party in power and reduce candidates' dependence on wealthy favor-seekers."

The Washington Post says the presidential campaign finance system is "hugely important to efforts aimed at limiting the impact of campaign fund-raising on the presidency." It notes that the system "has actually worked."

According to The Wall Street Journal's columnist Gerald F. Seib, "Whatever else may be said about presidential campaigns of the last two decades, they have been largely free of charges of serious financial corruption. And the elections themselves have been fair and competitive. * * * [T]his is one part of the system that doesn't seem broke."

Seib wrote of the effort to repeal the presidential campaign finance system, "And ultimately, this change would undercut what is supposed to be the GOP's very purpose, which is to balance the budget. The budget is hardly going to be balanced with the minuscule savings achieved by eliminating the presidential campaign fund. * * * It is going to be balanced by getting the snouts of special interests out of the public trough. But special interest snouts won't be kept out after they are invited deeper into American political campaigns."

[From the Atlanta Constitution, May 22, 1995]

PRESIDENCY TO HIGHEST BIDDER?

Tucked away in the 90-page deficit-reduction blueprint of Senate budget Chairman Peter Domenici (R-N.M.) are two lines that would make only a slight dent in federal expenses—less than $50 million a year—but could drastically and perniciously alter the way America picks its presidents.

The two lines call for the termination, starting in the year 2000, of the presidential campaign fund, which is financed by taxpayers' check-offs on their income tax returns and then made available every four years to qualifying candidates for president during both primary and general election campaigns.

So what's So wrong with this particular program elimination? Plenty.

Public financing of bids for the White House was a reform born in the aftermath of the Watergate scandal. Its whole purpose was to avoid a repeat of the corrupting excesses of the 1972 Nixon campaign, which amassed millions of dollars more than it knew what to do with, legally.

Considering the climate of cynicism about politics these days, the justification for public campaign financing may sound hopelessly idealistic, but it is fundamentally sound: The presidency ought not be up for auction. No contestant for the office ought to have a wildly disproportionate funding advantage. Serious candidates ought to have enough money to get their messages across throughout the country without becoming beholden to powerful individual donors or interest groups.

The budget resolution may have Domenici's name on it, but the fingerprints of Sen. Mitch McConnell (R-Ky.) are all over the two lines in question. He is an unabashed opponent of public financing and delights in misrepresenting it as "food stamps for politicians." He believes that since the Republicans, who currently are taking a king's ransom in special-interest contributions, are in a position to kill public financing, they should go for it. So there.

Senate Majority Leader Bob Dole is hardly less enthusiastic about sinking the program—for the campaign in 2000, that is. Whatever principles he may have on the matter don't apply to his immediate situation. He'll happily accept whatever millions be qualified for to pay for his 1996 candidacy.

Democrats, who blew their change to reform campaign financing rules for Congress in the last session, promise to do what they can to save the presidential campaign system, but they don't appear to have the numbers. A veto may be the only recourse, and since the regression the McConnell champions is so profound, President Clinton should be readying one.

Public financing, it must be conceded, is not a widely popular notion. Only about 15 percent of taxpayers dedicate $3 each of their taxes for the presidential campaign fund. What that shows is that too few Americans have considered the alternative—that absent public financing, our country may get the best president that money with strings attached ban buy.

America should strive to do better.

[From the Kennebec Journal, May 18, 1995]

MONEY, MONEY, AND MORE MONEY

As congressional Republicans work to dismantle the one significant campaign finance reform measure of our time—public funding of presidential races—the influence of private money upon the making of public policy continues to be a national disgrace.

According to former Senate Majority Leader George Mitchell, who fought hard if unsuccessfully to reform the system, big money contributions may not actually buy votes but they do buy access to members of Congress.

''I think it obviously creates the appearance of conflict and casts doubt on the independence of judgment,'' says Mitchell in a new book on the subject produced by the Center for Responsive Politics. ''I think it reduces respect for the institution and the product of its work.''

However, it is far more than simply a public relations problem. Big money is a corrupting influence in fact as well as in appearance, even if it only gives the contributor readier access to a member of Congress than competitors or ordinary citizens may enjoy.

It is no doubt true, as Mitchell asserts, that most special interest groups contribute to politicians who share their views rather than attempt to sway those who do not. Even so, the big contribution in that case is used to bind goodwill and ensure a sense of mutual loyalty.

Clearly the giving of money in large amounts to political candidates is viewed by donors as more than simply a friendly, civic-minded gesture. And it can be used as a stick as much as a carrot.

Think back a year or so when a Maine labor leader threatened to cut off campaign contributions to then-1st District Rep. Thomas Andrews if he failed to vote against the North American Free Trade Agreement. Call it a form of reverse bribery. Andrews ultimately voted against NAFTA, but swore off labor PAC contributions. It proved costly; he unexpectedly ended up running for Mitchell's Senate seat and raised far less money than his opponent, Sen. Olympia Snowe.

Most candidates prudently avoid such grand gestures, and, as the cost of election campaigns continues to escalate, so does the candidate's dependence upon special interest money. Last year, 35 to 40 percent of the campaign funding for winners in U.S. Senate and House races came from political action committees. Overall spending in Senate races was up a whopping 20 percent.

The system cries out for reform, not retrenchment. For years, the Republican minority in Congress has insisted it favors effective reform while rejecting virtually every Democratic proposal to cut the flow of cash from special interests to policy makers. Now that the GOP is in control, we know what it meant by reform: lowering the flood gates.

[From the Boston Globe, May 17, 1995]

WHAT ABOUT THE FAIRNESS DEFICIT?

The changes being pushed by Republican budget makers are so grave they understandably dominate public attention, but they are crowding out some senseless proposals that also deserve the spotlight.

A prime example is the Senate Budget Committee proposal to eliminate the Presidential Campaign Fund after the 1996 election.

Created post-Watergate, the fund is the single greatest political reform of modern US history. It took the ''For Sale'' sign off the White House, moving moneyed special interests out of the driver's seat and into the spectator stands with the rest of us. Candidates have been funded in the primaries by small individual givers and by federal matching funds, and in the general election by the presidential fund alone. Bill Clinton and George Bush each received $55 million in 1992.

It has worked. The benefits of the fund have been watered down in recent years by rulings allowing the parties to collect huge sums of ''soft money'' contributions that support campaigns indirectly. The Federal Elections Commission needs to close this gaping loophole. But far from eliminating the fund, it should be expanded to include candidates for Congress so the nation's legislators would not have to continue selling themselves to special interests to raise the requisite thousands of dollars a day. The only other problem with the system—uncertain cash flow—was addressed this year when the voluntary tax checkoff to finance it was raised from $1 to $3.

Politicians can debate the exact message from voters last November, but the people surely wanted cleaner government, not corruption.

The Budget Committee chairman, Sen. Pete Domenici, characterized his proposal as ''doing something right for the future of our country and for our children.'' He was speaking of deficit reduction, though eliminating the campaign fund would save only $45 million. In attempting to restore balance to the budget, Domenici's proposal could return venality to the Oval Office.

[From The Buffalo News, May 15, 1995]

KEEP PRESIDENTIAL CHECKOFF—ENDING IT WOULD STRENGTHEN SPECIAL INTERESTS

Hidden among proposals that have aroused loud immediate objections is an ominous Senate Budget Committee plan. It would shift the presidential selection process away from average Americans and place it even more in the hands of big-money special interests.

That's what will happen if Congress wipes out the two-decade-old system that allows for partial public funding of presidential elections by having taxpayers check a box on their income tax returns.

Approving the checkoff—currently $3—has absolutely no impact on the size of a taxpayer's refund or the amount of taxes owed. When taxpayers check the box, as all should, it simply means that the contributions will be used to help finance the presidential selection process.

That is one of the best investments taxpayers can make in good government. It means candidates will be more beholden to average Americans and less beholden to special-interest groups for their money. In fact, this Watergate-era reform, first employed in the 1976 campaign when Jimmy Carter challenged President Gerald Ford, is the antidote to the poison of special-interest funding that has left candidates with a taint and the public with a bad taste in its mouth.

Before allowing Congress to end this reform, the public should ask a simple question: Without this public funding, where else will candidates turn for money?

The $45 million per year raised through the checkooff is a minuscule amount in a $1.5 trillion budget. Yet, while limiting the impact of lobbyists, it also puts sensible limits on campaign spending and levels the playing field among candidates. That helps elevate ideas over fund-raising ability as the determining factor in campaigns.

Senate Republicans are hypocritical and less than forthright in trying to end all of that by slipping this provision through amid the turmoil surrounding the rest of their budget proposals.

The hypocrisy can be seen in the fact that the proposal would end the checkoff system after the 1996 election cycle. That would mean current GOP senators eyeing the White House—among them, Majority Leader Bob Dole and Texan Phil Gramm—would still benefit next year.

But the real benefit of the checkoff goes to the public. That's why, if a revision this significant is to be examined, it should be done separately so that the proposal can be judged on its own merits.

Once that happens, and Americans really understand what's at stake, it is unlikely that they will choose to forsake a system of such demonstrated worth. Over two decades, the checkoff system has shrunk the influence of big-money interests, helped clean up the process of choosing American presidents and returned that process closer to the American people.

[From the New York Times, May 16, 1995]

A SNEAKY BLOW AT CAMPAIGN FINANCE

Senate Republicans are proposing to eliminate the best existing counterweight to the dominance of check-writing special interests in national politics. The budget blueprint unveiled last week by Pete Domenici, chairman of the Senate Budget Committee, includes a call to abolish the public campaign financing system for Presidential candidates.

This 20-year-old system provides matching funds for candidates during the primaries and, for the general election, identical grants to both major party candidates. The system is financed by allowing taxpayers to indicate on their income tax returns whether they want $3 of the tax they owe to be used for the campaign fund. This public financing has worked remarkably well to minimize the financial advantage of the party in power and reduce candidates' dependence on wealthy favor-seekers.

The proposal to end public financing is the brainchild of Senator Mitch McConnell of Kentucky, who also played a big role last year in killing a Democratic reform measure that would have repaired damaging loopholes in the Presidential system while reducing the influence of big money in Congressional races as well.

Under the G.O.P. budget proposal, the Presidential public financing system would not end until after the 1996 election. That would allow the Republicans to continue using public financing in their quest to drive out the incumbent Democratic President, but then block public financing after they hope to have recaptured the White House.

Abolishing public financing for Presidential campaigns would save only about $45 million a year, while destroying a worthwhile effort to curb the amount of special-interest money in national politics. House and Senate Republicans also want to impose a crippling funding cut on the Federal Election Commission, the agency charged with enforcing campaign finance laws. It begins to look like a G.O.P. war on cleaner politics.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, May 17, 1995]

WRONG-WAY PETE—DOMENICI BUGLES RETREAT ON CAMPAIGN FINANCING.

''Declare victory and retreat.'' That was the tart suggestion of a senator years ago on how to salvage the fiasco that was Vietnam.

Now, another senator, Senate Budget Committee Chairman Pete Domenici of New Mexico, has got it into his head to declare defeat and propose retreat in an area where there's actually been a major victory: public financing of presidential campaigns.

This post-Watergate reform has insulted presidential campaigns from the corrupting influence of special-interest money. For some strange reason, the budget proposal

made by Mr. Domenici last week would end it.

Of all the Republican ideas for balancing the budget, this may be the worst. By giving special interests carte blanche to start subsidizing presidential candidates again, Mr. Domenici would drop White House wannabes back into the pigsty of special-interest financing where Congress still wallows.

Not only is the system that pays for presidential races not broken, it works quite well. If you want to put $3 of your tax bill toward presidential campaigns, you check that option. If you feel that public financing is sinister or socialistic, you don't.

In the primary season, the system's matching money helps underdogs get their ideas across to the voters. In the general election, it helps ensure a fair battle.

The elimination of public financing may be just a sop to Sen. Mitch McConnell (R., Ky.), the Senate's leading obstructionist on campaign-financing reform; maybe Senate leaders will quietly drop the idea later on.

Instead of scrapping the checkoff, Republicans ought to be acting to get special-interest money out of congressional campaigns. Of course, their reforming zeal might be muted because the majority of that money is now flowing to them.

It's sad to see the Senate even toying with this ill-advised retreat on campaign financing. And it is a discredit to Mr. Domenici's otherwise bold budget-balancing plan.

[From the Rutland Herald & the Times Argus, May 21, 1995]

GOP AND CAMPAIGN FINANCE

Over the next few weeks almost every budget cut that the Republicans in Congress have proposed will be opposed by some special interest group or other. But there is one intended cut that would harm the very fabric of our democratic process—by changing the way we elect our presidents.

The GOP Senate budget resolution would abolish the presidential campaign financing system, beginning in 1996. Eliminating public financing of presidential campaigns would save from $100 million and $300 million by 2002, the date the Republicans have targeted for balancing the federal budget.

The GOP wants to abolish the public campaign finance law to help provide about $350 billion in tax cuts that would benefit many of their favorite corporate benefactors. It's not hard to imagine the generosity of such companies when it comes time to replenish the campaign coffers of worthy Republicans.

Why do we use tax dollars to fund presidential campaigns? The practice began in 1974, after Watergate, which showed the nation how dramatically money can change the political equation. Since the cost of national campaigns has risen so drastically, politicians find they must budget a larger and larger share of their time to fund-raising—and currying favor with potential contributors.

Shouldn't private financing of elections benefit Democrats as well as Republicans? In the past, many wealthy contributors realized that since Democrats controlled Congress, any Democratic candidate might become a powerful committee chairman. So the moneyed interests have traditionally covered their bases by contributing to both candidates in many elections.

But now that the Republicans control both houses of Congress, a fundraising gap favorable to the GOP is likely to grow even wider, as the party of big business calls in its chips for the constituent service it's currently performing. The Republicans already have claimed an edge in fund-raising for 1996 campaigns.

The Republicans may be able to brush aside the few limits that now exist on campaign spending. And the Democrats have only themselves to blame for not passing more comprehensive campaign finance reform while they had control of Congress. If the GOP gets its way, the Democrats will be sorely punished for their own complacency.

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, May 17, 1995]

UNREFORMING CAMPAIGN FINANCE

When the Republicans took over Congress, they vowed to clean up Washington and give government back to the people. So what are they doing with this hypocritical proposal in the Senate budget plan to eliminate the presidential campaign-finance tax checkoff?

The Watergate-inspired public-campaign-financing law has somewhat limited the corrupting influence of special interests on presidential elections by providing each candidate in the general election with around $60 million in voluntarily contributed tax dollars, about the same amount Richard Nixon spent in 1970. The use of public funds, under a landmark Supreme Court ruling, allows an overall spending cap to be imposed. Without it, a run for the presidency would cost an estimated $200 million.

When campaigns cost $200 million we all lose, because special interests will be free to flood the presidential election process with money. The fragile integrity of the democratic process will be the first victim.

Instead of reversing public financing, the Republicans should join with Democrats in finding ways to bring equally effective reform to congressional elections.

[From The Washington Post, May 11, 1995]

A BAD IDEA, WELL-HIDDEN

Tucked away in the middle of Senate Budget Chairman Pete Domenici's 97-page budget blueprint are two lines describing a proposal with a minuscule impact on federal spending but enormous meaning for the nation's political process. Mr. Domenici, following a suggestion by Sen. Mitch McConnell (R–Ky.), proposes the elimination of public financing for presidential campaigns after the 1996 election.

This is not only a terrible idea; it also has no place in the budget debate. A change this large in the electoral system should be debated on its own, independent of the great confrontation that is about to occur on the deficit. The amount of money involved is trivial in a budgetary sense—roughly $45 million a year in a $1.5 trillion budget—but hugely important to efforts aimed at limiting the impact of campaign fund-raising on the presidency.

Public financing of presidential campaigns has actually worked. It was instituted after the Watergate scandal revealed all sorts of unsavory fund-raising shenanigans in the 1972 campaign. The idea is simple: The presidency ought not be put up for bid, the major party candidates ought to compete on a level playing field, and the party in power should not enjoy a prohibitive financial advantage. Existing law provides for a Presidential Election Campaign Fund that is financed through a voluntary $1 checkoff on income tax returns. For the general election, each major-party candidate draws the same amount from the fund—George Bush and Bill Clinton got $55.2 million each in 1992. The law also includes provisions for future public financing for any third party that makes a substantial electoral showing (as did the independent movements of John Anderson in 1980 and Ross Perot in 1992). And it provides for a system of matching funds in the primaries, whereby candidates who raise a certain amount in private contributions qualify for a share of the federal funds. The formula puts a premium on smaller contributions, so candidates who are serious but without huge interest group backing have a chance to make their case.

There are problems with the system that need to be addressed. The campaign fund has been running low, and the checkoff amount needs to be increased. But at a time when Congress's emphasis should be on finding ways to reduce the impact of money on politics, this proposal moves in entirely the wrong direction. It is also interesting that the budget proposal would leave the current system in place long enough to allow Republican presidential candidates (such as Sens. Dole, Gramm, Specter and Lugar) to take advantage of it while the GOP is out of the White House, and only abolish it after the next election.

If Mr. McConnell wants an open debate on the merits of the public financing system, he can encourage one. But a change this large should not happen covertly as part of the budget process.

[From the Valley News, May 17, 1995]

CASH FOR CAMPAIGNS

Hold your tears for those Republicans who complain that special-interest groups are preparing to lay waste to the balanced-budget proposals they're now championing. If special-interest groups exercise undue influence over the federal government, why are Republicans proposing that their influence be expanded?

That is exactly what would happen if the budget plan proposed last week by Sen. Pete Domenici, R–N.M., is passed intact. It contains a provision that calls for elimination of public financing of presidential campaigns. That item would save the federal government $45 million a year but would exact a much greater cost in the damage it would do to the national political system.

Few would argue that presidential politics are squeaky clean. But they are far better than they were before the Watergate scandal prompted Congress to reform the system.

Presidential candidates still must raise bucketfuls of money to be considered serious contenders. But the prospect of matching federal contributions encourages primary candidates to concentrate their fund-raising on contributions that qualify them for federal funds—relatively small donations from individuals. During the primary season, candidates who accept public financing agree to abide by spending limits established for each state. In the general election, each major party nominee draws an equal amount from the campaign fund (the 1992 candidates each received $55.2 million)—placing them on equal footing and reducing the need for candidates to go hat in hand to potential contributors.

Problems remain. Both parties continue to abuse so-called soft-money contributions, donations that are made to parties and spent for generic campaign purposes rather than directly for candidates. But the system is far better than the one that existed before 1973, when candidates accepted lots of cash from deep-pocketed donors, many with a direct interest in federal policy.

If public financing is abolished, the corrupting cancer that has severely undermined the integrity of Congress will spread to the White House and similarly compromise its integrity. All those things we have come to know and detest about the influence of money on federal legislators will afflict the White House—political action committees, nonstop fund-raising, the amassing of campaign war chests.

Few Americans are enthusiastic about proposals to pay for campaigns with taxpayers' money. The notion of bankrolling some of the behavior that passes for campaigning

these days is enough to make the most earnest goo-goo blanch. But it is strictly a defensive strategy: The public picks up the tab to ensure that no one else does—and that no one lays a greater claim on the loyalty of the people elected to conduct the public's business. Public campaign financing needs to be expanded, not rolled back.

MAY 23, 1995.

DEAR SENATOR ——— ———:

We strongly oppose the Senate Budget Committee's 1996 budget recommendation to abolish the presidential campaign finance system. We urge you to reject the Budget Committee's proposal and vote to retain this fundamental Watergate reform.

The presidential public financing system is an essential mechanism for controlling campaign spending, restricting special-interest influence and allowing challengers to compete successfully with incumbents.

To repeal presidential public financing would be to dismantle a vital reform that goes to the heart of the integrity of the electoral system for our country's highest office. Such an action would further undermine already low public confidence in government and the political process.

We strongly urge you to vote against any effort to abolish the presidential public financing system.

Sincerely,

Ann McBride, President, Common Cause; Becky Cain, President, League of Women Voters of the United States; Joan Claybrook, President, Public Citizen; Richard Foltin, Legislative Director and Counsel, American Jewish Committee; Larry Hobart, Executive Director, American Public Power Association; Paul Mauer, Executive Director, Blue Grass Community Action Agency; Michael F. Jacobson, Executive Director, Center for Science in the Public Interest; Stephen Brobeck, Executive Director, Consumer Federation of America; Dixie Horning, Executive Director, Gray Panthers; Leland Swenson, President, National Farmers Union; John Adams, Executive Director, Natural Resources Defense Council; Karen L. Hicks, Executive Director, New Hampshire Citizen Action; Caswell A. Evans, Jr., President, American Public Health Association; Amy Isaacs, National Director, Americans for Democratic Action; Robert C. Porter, Executive Director, Cenla Community Action Committee, Inc.; Rodney E. Leonard, Executive Director, Community Nutrition Institute; Joe Volk, Executive Secretary, Friends Committee on National Legislation; Susan Katz, President, National Council of Jewish Women; Harriet Woods, President, National Women's Political Caucus; Kathy Thornton, RSM, National Coordinator, NETWORK: A National Catholic Social Justice Lobby; Jay Lintner, Director, Washington Office, Office for Church in Society, United Church of Christ; Gerald Meral, Executive Director, Planning and Conservation League; Rabbi David Saperstein, Director, Religious Action Center of Reform, Judaism, Union of American Hebrew Congregations; Gene Karpinski, Executive Director, U.S. Public Interest Research Group; Rev. Elenora Giddings Ivory, Director, Washington Office, Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.), Washington Office; Robert Z. Alpern, Director, Washington Office, Unitarian Universalist Association of Congregations.

[Common Cause, May 23, 1995]

STATEMENT OF FORMER WATERGATE SPECIAL PROSECUTOR ARCHIBALD COX

I call upon Congress to reject the tricky attempt to repeal the post-Watergate reform of our presidential election campaigns under the pretense of budget balancing. Maintaining the reform costs .003 percent of the budget.

Watergate dramatized the three-step relationship between large political contributions, the outcome of elections, and the governmental decisions of those who win. We should never forget the acceptance of a $2-million pledge from the Milk Producers Association to the Nixon Administration, which concurrently granted an increase in the support price of milk; the approval of American Airlines' route applications shortly after a large corporate contribution to the party in power; or the settlement of antitrust litigation against ITT Corporation, shortly after an ITT subsidiary agreed to underwrite a large proportion of the cost of the Republican National Convention.

Spurred by this corruption, Congress in 1974 enacted the presidential campaign finance system as a vital means to restore public confidence in government. Through this system, small individual contributions are matched by public funds in the primary elections. The major party candidates receive a grant of public funds with which to conduct their general election campaigns. Importantly, spending limits are imposed in both the primary and general elections.

The system has worked. Presidential elections were largely cleansed of the corrupting influence of special-interest money. Spending in presidential campaigns was brought under control. Candidates in the general election were freed from the burdens of fundraising. And presidential elections, unlike congressional campaigns, became more competitive. Exploitation of a soft money loophole has reduced the gains. But the system is fundamentally sound. The remedy is to close the soft money loophole.

We are told that political candidates should not campaign with taxpayers' money. The money goes to protect ourselves by keeping the system honest. The alternative is for candidates to campaign with special-interest money to be repaid with much larger government favors after the election—in short, to go back to the days of Watergate.

I urge the Congress not to repeal the centerpiece of the Watergate reforms. The presidential campaign finance system must be preserved.

[Common Cause, May 23, 1995]

STATEMENT OF COMMON CAUSE PRESIDENT ANN MCBRIDE

We are very pleased to join today with Senators John Kerry (D–MA) and Bill Bradley (D–NJ), and with the League of Women Voters and Public Citizen, to launch an all-out effort to preserve the presidential campaign finance system.

Today we face a deadly serious attempt in the Senate to destroy the most important political reform in nearly a century.

By burying a simple two-line provision to kill the presidential campaign finance system deep in their proposed budget, the Senate Republican leadership has conducted a stealth attack on our democracy—an attack that would turn back the clock two decades to the dark days of Watergate and its influence money scandals, a time when the integrity of the Presidency hit rock bottom.

The stakes in the outcome are enormous. If this attack were to prevail, the winners would be Washington lobbyists and monied special interests. The losers would be the average taxpayers.

That's why Common Cause urges Congress to eliminate this provision from the Senate budget proposal and to act to save the presidential campaign finance system.

A vote to kill the presidential campaign finance system is a vote for corruption and a return to the campaign finance scandals of Watergate.

The responsibility to save the presidential campaign finance system lies not only with Congress, but with President Clinton as well.

If President Clinton is serious about preserving the presidential campaign finance system, he must make clear that he will veto any legislation that includes a provision to repeal the system.

Killing the presidential campaign finance system would do more than eliminate the public funds available to presidential candidates. Killing the presidential campaign finance system completely repeals campaign spending limits in presidential races. The result would be a campaign fundraising—and campaign spending—free-for-all, and a ''For Sale'' sign back on the White House.

The public financing system has worked. Spending has been limited. Richard Nixon's 1972 reelection campaign raised and spent $60 million—the equivalent of more than $200 million today. That's less than both major party candidates combined spent in the 1992 campaigns.

Elections have been competitive. Under this system, four incumbents have sought reelection—three challengers have won. And special-interest contributions have been replaced by dollars designated by millions of taxpayers.

As The Washington Post has noted, ''Public financing of presidential campaigns has actually worked. . . . The idea is simple: The presidency ought not be put up for bid, the major party candidates ought to compete on a level playing field, and the party in power should not enjoy a prohibitive financial advantage.''

Instead of destroying a system that has worked, and worked well, for two decades, the Senate should instead be shutting down the soft money system that has emerged in recent years.

This issue is not a budget issue. The presidential public financing system is not a simple piece of a budget puzzle that can be turned off and on at will. In fact, from a federal budgetary perspective, the $45-million program is a small amount. Fiscal responsibility comes from a Congress that will stop the financial drain that special interests impose on the federal budget through access-seeking campaign contributions. Ending the presidential campaign finance system simply will open the budget to even more big-money investments from special interests.

This issue should not be a partisan issue. The presidential public financing system was passed with bipartisan support and signed into law by President Gerald Ford. All but one major party candidate have voluntarily chosen to use public funds to wage their campaigns. In the five presidential races conducted under this new system, the Republican candidate has won three times, the Democrat twice.

This issue is a matter of integrity.

More than 20 years ago, Common Cause members pressed their Members of Congress to create a campaign finance system that would restore the integrity of a presidency that had been devastated by the scandals of Watergate. Congress did.

Today, Common Cause, along with a broad coalition of other organizations, is launching a nationwide campaign to protect the presidential campaign finance system.

Common Cause members and other concerned citizens will work just as tirelessly now to ensure that the presidential campaign finance system is not destroyed.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, there is in this budget an unfortunate effort to try to take away the current system of a——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will suspend, while I ask the clerk to report the amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KERRY] proposes an amendment numbered 1135.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to consideration of the amendment at this time?

Mr. EXON. The Senator was not recognized to offer an amendment. I want to make that clear to the Senator. You can reserve the right to offer an amendment.

Mr. KERRY. I ask unanimous consent——

Mr. EXON. Have you done that?

Mr. KERRY. I did ask unanimous consent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DOMENICI. Reserving the right to object.

Mr. EXON. I object.

The Senator from Nebraska yielded to the Senator from Massachusetts with certain instructions and understandings that the Senator from Nebraska is going to insist upon. Therefore, I yielded to the Senator from Massachusetts not to offer an amendment, but to make such remarks as he sees fit.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I certainly apologize. I had no idea. I thought the procedure was to call the amendment up. There was no intention to try to go outside of the Senator's desires.

I ask unanimous consent that the past exchange not come out of this Senator's time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. KERRY. I thank the Chair, and I thank the distinguished managers.

Mr. President, there is in this budget resolution an effort to do away with the Presidential checkoff finance system. I would like to share with my colleagues what Archibald Cox, the Watergate prosecutor, said with respect to this particular effort.

Watergate dramatized the three-step relationship between large political contributions, the outcome of elections, and the governmental decisions of those who win. We should never forget the acceptance of a $2 million pledge from the Milk Producers Association to the Nixon administration which concurrently granted an increase in the support price of milk; the approval of American Airlines' route application shortly after a large corporate contribution to the party in power; or the settlement of antitrust litigation against ITT Corp. shortly after an ITT subsidiary agreed to underwrite a large portion of the cost of the Republican National Convention.

Mr. President, this campaign system has worked. Some 63 primary candidates since 1976 have used the checkoff fund. The checkoff fund democratizes the Presidential races of this country. It distances Presidential candidates from the fundraising process. It liberates our entire system from the influence of big money, as Watergate prosecutor Archibald Cox said.

In 1972, when Richard Nixon ran for President, he spent $60 million in that race, the equivalent of $200 million today. That is more than President Bush and Bill Clinton spent together in 1992. If this amendment were to fail, if we proceed on the assumption that that campaign system will be taken away, all voluntary limits on campaign spending in Presidential races are gone. No voluntary limit will remain, and it is only that volunteerism in the system that keeps accord with the Constitution on Buckley versus Valeo that allows us to have a limit in Presidential races.

So we will have gone back to the system of 1972 when there was unlimited funding from sources in Presidential races. I cannot imagine anything that runs more contrary to the vote of 1994 and to the grassroots statement of Americans in the 1994 election. They do not want this country going back to big money, large corporate interests. They want people liberated to participate. In fact, Mr. President, more people participate through the checkoff than contribute voluntarily to campaigns in this country. One out of seven Americans participate in the checkoff, whereas only one in 22 Americans contributed to campaigns in 1994. The checkoff could, in fact, be stronger than it is today. But, everybody should understand, no American is coerced to do this. It is a voluntary system where $3 from an individual has as much impact as tens of thousands of dollars from the rich or from corporate interests.

Mr. President, it would be an enormous setback in our efforts to gain control of our political process if, now, we choose to go backward.

Some people say, ''Well, we're not controlling all the money in the system; you still have soft money and we should be closing that loophole.'' The solution is not to take the hard money restriction in the voluntary system and make it like soft money. The solution is to make the soft money like the hard money or outlaw it altogether, Mr. President.

So it is my hope that colleagues who have supported this in the past will not now go counter to the very grassroots effort that is supposedly being represented on the floor. This system has worked. It costs $45 million on the year, Mr. President, but to lose it would be tens of millions of dollars in campaign contributions. I hope we will support the system.

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, the budget resolution includes a provision that will have a far reaching consequence for this Nation. It assumes elimination of the program that provides for spending limits and public funding in Presidential election campaigns. This provision was enacted with bipartisan support to address the campaign finance abuses of Watergate.

This is voluntary program. The American taxpayer voluntarily funds it and candidates voluntarily accept funds from it. It is the only Federal program that the American public directly votes to fund each year. And as long as the American taxpayer votes for campaign spending limits, then we should not eliminate it.

What is interesting to this Senator, is that the Republican budget resolution does not affect the 1996 Presidential election cycle. It would allow candidates to continue to take taxpayer money to fund their primary campaigns next year. That means up to approximately $15 million in taxpayer dollars to each Republican and Democratic primary candidate, with a potential $62 million more to the nominee in the general election.

Perhaps a different amendment would have been to eliminate this program immediately. That would give our distinguished Republican colleagues here in the Senate who have announced their candidacy for President an opportunity to vote to give back their potential $77 million in taxpayer funds to the Treasury and the American taxpayer in order to help eliminate the deficit. Let me respectfully suggest that it seems a little self-serving to take the money next year but deny it to future candidates.

American taxpayers support this program and vote on how much to fund it each year. It is the only Federal program which serves to limit the money chase to the White House. Until we come up with a better system, I urge my colleagues to leave this program in place and support the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COVERDELL). The Senator's time. has expired.

Mr. DOMENICI addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I really want to use a little bit of my time. I am on my 15 minutes in opposition, but I just want to talk to the Senate a minute.

Frankly, to my knowledge, there is only one law that controls the U.S. Senate in terms of debates and amendments and the like, and it is the Budget Act, which includes impoundments.

Essentially, it says in law, it sets down the detailed rules of how you proceed on a budget resolution and how you proceed on a reconciliation bill. It is not my rule. It is not Senator EXON's rule. It says 50 hours equally divided.

Frankly, maybe we will ask so the RECORD will be clear, how much time remains now on the entire budget resolution, under 50 hours that we are allocated by law?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Approximately 1 hour 20 minutes.

Mr. DOMENICI. Approximately 1 hour 20 minutes. Essentially, I will say to the Senate, if 1 hour is used on Senator BOXER's amendment and 1 hour

used in opposition to it, there will be no time left. No time left.

What I would like everybody to understand—and this is not my rule; I wish it were different—but I do not know if there is going to be very much time to debate very many amendments in that remaining time.

I have been expressing to the Senator from Nebraska, based on this reality—this is just real—when the 50 hours comes, any Senator can say ''regular order'' and, obviously, there is no more time for debate.

I want to make sure everybody knows, under a unanimous-consent agreement, the majority leader and the minority leader, after all the votes are finished, including those that may be handed to the desk, there will be one-half hour allotted to the Democrat leadership and one-half hour to our leadership, to recap the budget situation. So that is there and that is all it can be used for.

We will soon be out of time. Maybe Senators on my side and Senators on that side of the aisle do not understand that we cannot help very much, but we would like to be helpful. So what I would like to do, and I am urging that we find a way to decide, is for you all to decide on your side through your ranking member what are all the amendments that you intend to offer. Some will be debated for a couple of minutes; some are just going to be offered at the end.

Why would I like to know? Because I would like to help. I would like to say maybe everybody ought to have a minute before they have to vote on their amendment, even beyond the 50 hours. I have no such authority from the majority leader. But I cannot do that if there are 50, 60 amendments because we will be here until midnight, and the whole purpose was to have 50 hours.

We are getting close to that 50 right now. So if there is any way that Senators on that side could accommodate so that we might sit down here soon in a room and say what process could we agree to to give everybody a little bit of time.

Again, I want to say the majority leader has told me on our side, if there are 20 or 30 such amendments, or 40, we are not going to agree to any time because you add all that up and the time to vote and we will be here 6 hours to 7 hours.

So I am asking for some reason, some reasonableness. When the 50 hours is up—and I am not using anybody's time so nobody has to worry about that. I am entitled to this time under the law, and when that time is up, there is no opportunity to talk about an amendment, unless we, as a Senate, agree to that. So if you have an amendment at the end left over and you want to insist on it, and the statute says you can do that, the statute also says no debate. We are not going to agree to give everybody time when we have already used up all the time unless we do it in an understandable manner where the Senate then understands what the amendments are, how many there are, and then maybe we may be in business to try to make some overall agreement.

I hope everybody understands, I am not trying to be harsh. I am not trying to take time away from anybody. That is just the reality.

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

Mr. DOMENICI. I yield on my time.

Mr. FORD. I thank the Senator for what he is trying to do and for his comity. It is kind of unusual, and I am glad to see it.

If we have 20 amendments that will be offered at the end of the 50 hours, we have two options, as I hear you: One is to offer the amendment, or call it up and we can vote up or down or to table; we can do that. Or on the other side, if we have a minute, you offer a minute or 2 minutes on each side, pro and con, on how many amendments? Do you have any figure if they are less than that or more than that?

Mr. DOMENICI. I very much would like you all to come up with some proposal.

Mr. FORD. When you say you all, who do you mean?

Mr. DOMENICI. The Democratic side.

Mr. FORD. How many will be on your side?

Mr. DOMENICI. We probably, in short order, can establish the fact that there would only be four or five.

Mr. FORD. You will have four or five amendments to come after the 50 hours?

Mr. DOMENICI. I will give that to Senator EXON shortly.

Mr. FORD. I thank the Senator for his courtesy.

Mr. DOMENICI. Let me correct the record. You said there are only two things that can happen. I do not want anybody to misunderstand. An amendment pending at the desk can be second-degreed even if there is no time. There is a series where we understand somebody wants to exercise that. They understand it is pending. They would not have any time either.

Mr. FORD. They would still offer it and then you move to table.

Mr. DOMENICI. Yes. Mr. President, how much time do I have left?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Approximately 10 minutes.

Mr. DOMENICI. I will yield 10 minutes to Senator BURNS.

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I will respond to the amendment offered by the Senator from California and just point out some things about that amendment that I think are flawed. The Senator's amendment would create another point of order against how a tax cut should be constructed, and I think that is very important with this body because we already have enough points of order on the rest of this bill. Rather than a point of order against tax cuts, I think we should have a point of order against raising taxes, if you want to do it on both sides.

Let us be very careful. Whenever we start talking about this budget and what it does, all at once we start offering the amendments and it starts to come unraveled. When it was first put together in the Budget Committee, everybody just about knew where we had to go and what we had to do. Some would increase taxes, as has been proposed by some, really, on both sides of the aisle. I am firmly opposed to that.

Right now, most folks in America have a marginal tax rate over 45 percent—almost one-half of their yearly salary. So what is there left to tax? It makes no sense to bankrupt American citizens in the name of keeping the American Federal Government solvent.

So I think when you look at the overall budget, we have to come up with the word responsible. And that is what I would like to emphasize through this recap of not how I look at the amendment but the entire package of the bill. We have slowed the rate of spending. Back in 1990, I offered a bill that was a 4 percent solution—I called it—to allow in the budget process the Federal Government expenditures to only grow 4 percent based on the previous year's expenditures and do away with baseline budgeting. Unfortunately, that did not pass. But with the assumptions that we made then, by 1995 and 1996, we would have balanced the Federal budget. But I have to say there are hints of my ideas that I had back in 1990 in this bill.

Everyone would agree, maybe, that the Government has gotten too big to operate efficiently. This bill freezes pay for Senators, Representatives, Federal judges, and political appointees for a period of 7 years. As far as I am concerned, I can accept that. I am not real sure if my wife can. But nonetheless I think she will. It cuts Senate staff by 15 percent and Senate support staff by 12.5 percent. And we have cut a little already. It reduces the spending of the Executive Office of the President by around 25 percent. Those cuts save us almost $7 billion.

I take the budget another step further. I would consolidate the Surgeon General's office with the Assistant Secretary of Health. The office of the Surgeon General was originally created to function as a spokesperson for public health and has been used as a political football. I advocate putting an end to that political grandstanding by eliminating this unnecessary position and consolidating its duties with those of the office of the Assistant Secretary of Health. That is the way it used to be. During the Carter administration, Dr. Julius Richmond served as both the Surgeon General and the Assistant Secretary of Health. I see no reason why the American taxpayer should have to pay for staffing both offices.

When we look at what it does—a while ago we talked about the NIH, National Institutes of Health. I voted to restore some of those funds because I believe that this Government should be

actively involved in research and development, especially in the line of health. But the chairman's budget also calls for the transformation of NASA's management structure, contracting procedures, and the reduction of Government involvement in scientific research, infrastructure and equipment. I have to say that I voted against the Snowe amendment a while ago for the simple reason that it called for another billion-dollar reduction in NASA, when they have already shown their good faith, without any cajoling from this Congress to come to the bar, and cut $5 billion over 5 years. And there are some within the NASA organization that say now we have to start looking at safety when we start thinking about our space programs.

So we are glad to see that baseline budgeting is out. The chairman's budget proposed the elimination of spending on the National Biological Service. I have long said that is not needed. We have enough biologists in the Forest Service, in the U.S. Fish and Wildlife, and BLM to do what they want to do and what Interior wants to do. They have to do it within the confines of that. Why another layer of bureaucracy? I generally support that.

As I explained last week, I have concerns with the provision that cuts the Agricultural Research Service. I find it ironic that we are cutting back on R&D in the very area that is very important to us in the production of food and fiber for this country. To reduce the ARS at this time is appealing in the short run, but it would have a devastating long-term negative impact on farming and ranching in the United States and, consequently, on the Federal Treasury. I believe our first priority should be a commitment to the production of food and fiber. I find that many folks are surprised when you tell them that for the first time in the history of this country, wheat yields have actually leveled off in some areas and were declining because of our research work in developing new strains of wheat that are disease resistant.

So I am opposed to a reduction in ARS funding. Furthermore, agriculture has taken its fair share of cuts; if you look at the last 8 years, about a 45 percent cut.

So with that, it is a good package. When we start picking away at it, it starts to come unraveled. I want to congratulate my friends from New Mexico and Nebraska. They have worked very hard together on this. And it should be presented and they should be given the guidelines for the rest of us to complete our work.

I yield the floor.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, are my 15 minutes used?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 4½ minutes remaining.

Mr. DOMENICI. I reserve that.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I have four more relatively short speakers that I would like to yield to at this time. I would like to yield at this time in whatever order they are entitled to the floor from the time allotted to me most generously by my colleague from California. First is Senator LEAHY for 2 minutes, and then Senator BAUCUS for 2 minutes, Senator CONRAD for 6 minutes, and fourth, Senator GRAHAM for 2 minutes.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, Senator EXON, could we take a couple names at a time instead of the whole list? Who are the first two?

Mr. EXON. The first two I have are Senator LEAHY for 2 minutes and then Senator BAUCUS for 2 minutes.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I have a Senator on the floor who would like to speak in opposition for up to 10 minutes on my time. Maybe we could move back and forth after the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. EXON. Since we are limiting—may I suggest we take care of the two Senators that I have mentioned—this is 4 minutes—and then go to 10 minutes. Is that reasonable?

Mr. DOMENICI. Can we have the two Senators for 4 minutes and then the Senator from Kentucky for 10?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. INHOFE). The Senator from Vermont.

VIOLENT CRIME REDUCTION TRUST FUND

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I will have two resolutions that we will be voting on at the appropriate time. One is expressing the sense of the Senate that the violent crime reduction trust fund not be cut. Notwithstanding the tremendous violence we have seen in New York, Oklahoma, and elsewhere, the House of Representatives voted on April 5 to cut $5 billion from the violent crime reduction trust fund and to give it for a tax cut.

They congratulated themselves on this, but have not explained to the American people that they are cutting out money in a trust fund set aside to fight violent crime.

Frankly, I think that is more important than to give a tax break to the wealthiest. We will be voting on that.

Earlier this year, on April 7, 1995, the Senate passed a resolution reaffirming our support for State and local law enforcement when their integrity was challenged.

When we passed Senate Joint Resolution 32 we were responding to remarks, by a well-known attorney in connection with a high-profile criminal case, that unfairly and inaccurately maligned the integrity of the Nation's law enforcement officers.

On April 19, 1995, a bomb exploded outside a Federal building in Oklahoma City killing scores of Americans, including a number of Federal law enforcement employees. There is reason to believe the bomb was directed at the Federal Government and its law enforcement officers.

This bombing has served to focus our attention on the real threats of violent extremism here at home and foreign terrorism. We will soon have an opportunity to consider legislative efforts to provide additional resources and better coordination of Federal, State, and local law enforcement efforts to deal with these threats.

Today, my purpose is a related one: I ask my colleagues to join with me to pass this resolution reaffirming our commitment and appreciation for Federal, State, and local law enforcement and the outstanding job that they do under the most difficult and dangerous circumstances and to reject House attempts drastically to cut our financial support for their efforts.

Since the bombing there has been a lot of public debate and comment about the activities of law enforcement and the rhetoric that has been used over the past few years to disparage and malign these dedicated public servants and the law enforcement agencies in which they serve.

I submit that law enforcement deserves better. We owe these men and women our respect, appreciation, and public, moral, and financial support.

Even had we not recently noted the increasing threats against the safety and lives of law enforcement officers, the Oklahoma bombing and the reports of attacks against park rangers, Forest Service employees, Treasury employees, and others all make the gruesome point too well.

Moreover, there has been a lot of recent discussion about the way responsible citizens converse about law enforcement and other public officials. I certainly understand President Bush's reaction when those with whom he served and who have made the ultimate sacrifice in the service of public safety are being criticized unfairly.

I commend our colleagues, from both sides of the aisle, who have tried to tone down the rhetoric and to turn the focus of debate to responsible efforts to assist law enforcement to do its job.

Likewise, I appreciate the apology recently issued by the National Rifle Association of the intemperate tone of certain remarks.

I have spoken about my revulsion with celebrities talking about how to shoot Federal agents and their using representations of our President for target practice. This is vile and reprehensible.

If we are to preserve freedom of speech in this increasingly violent and confrontational society, we need to use our freedoms to reject violent extremism and hatemongering. We need to remind ourselves that we live in the freest nation on Earth because the rule of law is respected, as are people's rights to speak, associate and petition the government.

We need to speak out ourselves against those who would portray the President, the Congress, the Government or law enforcement as conspirators intent on taking away people's rights. To the contrary, the dedicated men and women in Federal, State, and local government and law enforcement work long hours for limited financial reward in order to serve the public, protect us, and preserve our freedom.

It is in this context that I was concerned when the House of Representatives voted on April 5 to offset certain tax reduction proposals by cutting $5 billion from the violent crime reduction trust fund.

As it congratulated itself on its first 100 days and adjourned for its April recess, the House majority did not explain to the American people that it was invading the violent crime reduction trust fund and making it impossible to pay for the law enforcement and crime prevention programs of the Violent Crime Control Act of 1994, which the President signed into law only last summer.

Although this major crime bill was 6 years in the making, the House is apparently prepared to gut it. I hope and trust that our Senate colleagues will reject this $5 billion cut in funding to Federal law enforcement and Federal assistance to State and local efforts.

When we passed the crime bill last year we paid for its program. A trust fund was established from the saving of the downsizing of the Federal Government by some 250,000 jobs. The violent crime reduction trust fund contains funds dedicated to law enforcement and crime prevention programs, and is intended in large part to provide Federal financial assistance to critical Federal, State, and local needs.

On April 5, the House invaded that trust fund without debate and slashed our anticrime funding by $5 billion to help offset the budget deficit the House tax bill would create. This is wrong.

Since passage of the Violent Crime Control Act, the U.S. Department of Justice has been doing a tremendous job getting these resources to the field. I commend the Associate Attorney General John Schmidt and Chief Joe Brann, who directs the community policing programs for their quick work.

I know that funding to assist local law enforcement hire additional officers went out almost immediately based on simple, one-page applications. Vermont received commitments of over $2 million toward 35 new officers in 34 jurisdictions, for example. The House action would cost Vermont, for example, the equivalent of 50 State and local law enforcement officers over the next 5 years.

The House would have us turn our backs on law enforcement and prevention programs and the commitments we made in the Violent Crime Control Act. Law enforcement and community-based programs cannot be kept on a string like a yo-yo if they are to plan and implement crime control and prevention programs.

What we need to do is to follow through on our commitments, not to breach them and violate our pledge to law enforcement, State, and local government, and the American people. Invading trust funds dedicated to crime control purposes is simply no way to justify the elimination of the corporate alternative minimum tax or capital gains taxes.

From our Attorney General to the Fraternal Order of Police, International Brotherhood of Police Officers, National Association of Police Organizations, National Sheriffs Association, and the Police Foundation, dedicated law enforcement officers are justifiably outraged by this arbitrary action.

Funding for important programs implementing the Violence Against Women Act and our rural crime initiatives should not have been cut by one-sixth or at all, let alone without debate and justification.

I will work with the Attorney General and my Senate colleagues to reject the ill-advised House action and preserve the violent crime reduction trust fund so that we can fulfill the promise of the Violent Crime Control Act and our commitment to all that we can to reduce violent crime in our local communities.

I have noted that this is not the time to undercut our support for Federal law enforcement or the assistance provided State and local law enforcement. After the tragedy in Oklahoma City, I was certain that the House would abandon this ill-conceived plan.

Yet, in spite of all that has happened, the House chose to reaffirm its intention to proceed with this $5 billion cut in law enforcement funding, which it included in the House-passed budget resolution last week.

Accordingly, I offer this amendment as an embodiment of the Senate's resolve against the House-passed cuts to the violent crime reduction trust fund and reductions in funding of Federal, State, and local law enforcement.

Now is not the time to cut law enforcement funding and this is not the way to show our support for those whom we ask to protect public safety and preserve our precious freedoms.

PROTECTING FEDERAL NUTRITION PROGRAMS

My other resolution is very simple. It says that the infant formula that is purchased by the WIC Program be done under competitive bidding.

The House of Representatives gave in to some very powerful lobbyists and very powerful drug companies, and removed the amendment which requires competitive bidding for WIC. That meant the taxpayers will give a $1 billion windfall to four drug companies, and they will take 1.5 million pregnant women and newborn infants off the WIC Program.

This sense of the Senate says we ought to take care of the women and the infants before we do the drug companies, especially at taxpayers' expense.

It also says we ought to have real nutritional standards in school lunch. Not what the fast food industry would like, but perhaps what mothers, fathers, and children should like and should have.

Mr. President, this amendment is very simple.

It says that it is the sense of the Senate that infant formula be purchased by the WIC Program under competitive bidding. It says that school lunches should meet minimal nutrition requirements and that the content of WIC food packages be based on scientific evidence.

That has been the case for years and should continue. I am offering this amendment because the House-passed welfare reform bill does not follow that longstanding approach to child nutrition programs.

I am very pleased that the Senate Budget Committee majority report does not assume that the Senate wants to eliminate those protections for children.

The Contract With America, as passed by the House, would allow States to serve junk foods with lunch. The Senate should stand up to that challenge and say ''no.''

It would allow States to waste Federal taxpayer dollars on needlessly expensive foods for the WIC Program.

I have spent 8 years protecting the WIC Program from drug companies. Now the House Contract With America changes that. A few years ago, I called on the Federal Trade Commission to investigate price-fixing and bid-rigging regarding infant formula companies and the WIC Program.

I introduced bills, which all my Senate colleagues supported, to require that WIC buy infant formula under competitive bidding rules similar to rules used by the Federal Government, and most State governments, to purchase goods.

These WIC procedures save $1 billion a year. That money keeps 1.6 million pregnant women, infants, and children on WIC at no additional cost to taxpayers.

The House bill does not require competitive bidding. Instead it includes paltry cost containment requirements that are a sham.

It is hard to imagine a provision that better symbolizes what is wrong with the Contract With America.

The contract could give up to $1 billion to four corporate giants and take 1.6 million low-income women, infants, and children off the WIC Program.

For 8 years as chair of the Agriculture Committee, I tried to make our work on nutrition programs bipartisan. And I am pleased that the Senate Budget Committee report is supportive of the WIC Program.

Last year both the Senate and the House passed the child nutrition reauthorization by unanimous agreement.

That reauthorization act maintained the principle that school lunches provide one-third of the nutritional requirements for each day. It maintained strong competitive bidding procedures for the WIC Program.

And it ensured that foods of minimum nutritional value may not be sold with school lunches. It passed the Senate without objection last year.

The House bill eliminates minimum nutritional requirements for school lunches. I fought Coca-Cola and the

fast food companies last year to make school lunches healthier.

Congress reduced the saturated fat content of school meals, and clarified that schools have the right to say ''no'' to Coca-Cola and Pepsi-Cola.

Under the House Contract With America, soft drinks can be sold to school children during lunch instead of milk. Candy companies, fast food giants, and junk food purveyors are the big winners. Children and dairy farmers are the big losers.

The House-passed Contract With America could hurt child nutrition programs by eliminating what we put into law last year.

I hope the Senate tells the lobbyists for the soft drink bottlers that Coke or Pepsi should not be part of a school lunch or breakfast.

I hope the Senate tells the lobbyists for drug companies that make infant formula that the Senate wants to continue to save taxpayers $1 billion a year in the WIC Program by mandating strong competitive bidding procedures.

Remember, before the Congress required competitive bidding, many States did not use those procedures that now put 1.6 million more pregnant women, infants, and children on the WIC Program at no additional cost to taxpayers.

I hope the Senate rejects the House approach that repeals scientific standards for the WIC food package. These standards make WIC a success.

I want to make one additional point not directly related to the amendment I am offering. I believe it is a mistake to block grant food stamps.

On December 2, 1969, President Nixon said in a speech that relying on local governments meant that ''our Nation's food programs have been shot through with inequities.''

Chairman GOODLING put it another way when he opposed block grants a few years ago—he said that a ''child's basic nutrition needs do not vary from State to State.''

I joined with Senator DOLE in opposing block granting some years ago. He said, and I agreed with him, that the ''Federal Government should retain primary responsibility for nutrition programs in order to guarantee some standardization of benefits.''

We have to recognize that food stamps are America's best and largest child nutrition program.

Over 80 percent of food stamp benefits go to families with children; and over 90 percent of food stamp benefits go to families with children, or the elderly or disabled.

I am pleased to report that as the economy has grown over the last year, participation in food stamps has dropped by 1 million persons.

It is crucial to me that food stamps not be block-granted—I agree with the House of Representatives and Chairman ROBERTS, Chairman EMERSON and Chairman GUNDERSON on this issue.

Their view is that food stamps is the final safety net and that it should neither be block-granted nor cashed out. In rejecting block grants, the House used some of the same points made years ago by President Nixon.

In closing, I urge my colleagues to support my amendment.

Mr. President, I thank the managers for their courtesy.

PRIVATIZING PMA'S IS BACKDOOR TAX

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I have an amendment, joined with Senator PRESSLER, Senator DORGAN, Senator ROBB, Senator WARNER, and others, No. 1120, to oppose the sale of the public power marketing administrations.

Very simply, Mr. President, this is the situation: The budget resolution proposes the sale of public power marketing administration, the PMA's.

What is the effect of that sale? Twofold. No. 1, to dramatically increase the rates of consumers, utility consumers, in most States of our country, because public power is sold at a lower rate than power from other sources that is sold to consumers.

The estimate is between a 20- and a 60-percent increase in utility rates for farmers, for ranchers, for homeowners, for small business, for anybody who is in a rural co-op, or anyone who buys public power. No. 1, the effect is very much to increase the rate. It is a hidden tax, Mr. President. It is a hidden tax because in effect people will have to pay more.

The second major consequence of the sale of the PMA's: Increase the budget deficit. That is a consequence. Why? Very simply, because the PMA's currently make money. They make about $240 million a year. When the PMA's loan is retired, in about, I think, 14 or 16 years, Uncle Sam will make $5 billion on the investment.

So the sale of PMA's has two effects. No. 1, big increase in utility rates; No. 2, increase in the budget deficit.

My amendment says, ''No, let's not sell the PMA's; therefore, let's not raise utility rates; and let's also reduce the budget deficit by keeping the PMA's alive.''

Please add Senators FORD, HARKIN, HEFLIN, and HOLLINGS as cosponsors. Webster defines a ''tax'' as follows: ''to require to pay a percentage of income, property or value for support of the government.''

So a tax can come in many forms—a direct levy, or a hidden fee that sneaks up on taxpayers under a cover name. And that is precisely what this budget resolution contemplates for ratepayers across rural America.

Privatizing the power marketing administrations is a bad idea. It is shortsighted and it hurts rural America. Privatization cannot work when its result is simply to create four huge monopolies, which will gouge their captive market like any other monopoly.

So at its core, the proposal to sell off PMA's is no more than a backdoor tax increase on the rural middle class. A tax hidden in a utility bill is every bit as much a tax as a gas tax, income tax or anything else. I won't stand for it. And many of my colleagues on both sides of the isle won't stand for it.

Let me tell you what this would mean to Montana. Montana, like much of the west, was built on hydroelectric power. By harnessing the Missouri River at Fort Peck Reservoir, Montanans bring water to arid lands for farming and ranching. Small industries use the affordable power to create jobs and build communities. And folks in rural areas get affordable power to heat and light their homes.

This is an essential service. It is something that works. And it has worked ever since Franklin Roosevelt came out to break ground at the Fort Peck Dam and bring public power to rural Montana. Public power meant electricity that an ordinary farm family could afford. It helped create Montana communities like Glasgow, Sidney, and Shelby. It keeps towns like these strong and healthy today.

As my friends George and Barbara DenBoer of Dupuyer, MT, recently told me:

> Our electric bills are high enough. We are barely making a living on the ranch now and with all the new taxes and increases in expenses it is all but impossible to continue. Please stop and consider how many rural people will be affected with higher rates. . . . We need the Power Marketing Administration. Please do not make it impossible for those who make their living in the country.

One hundred thousand Montana families—nearly one in three Montana men, women, and children—share George and Barbara's feelings.

All of them use WAPA power in Montana today. And they stand to see their electric bills increase by at least 30 percent if this proposal goes forward. You are talking about a real, tangible cut in the living standards for people in rural America. And that is why I so strongly oppose the sale of WAPA and the PMA's.

A second point is that WAPA and the other power marketing programs take not one tax dollar. In fact, the Federal Government makes money off of these programs.

WAPA is a good example. The Federal Government has invested a total of $5.6 billion in WAPA. And each year, WAPA pays the Federal Government approximately $380 million for this loan with interest. So far, the Federal Treasury has gotten back $4.1 billion on its initial loan. And by the time this debt is retired in 24 years, the Federal Treasury will have made $14 billion on its initial investment of $5.6 billion.

Second, even now the PMA's run a profit for the Government. A recently released CRS report on the PMA's found that the Federal Treasury actually earns a profit of $244 million a year on the PMA's. You have to look long and hard to find a Federal program that provides a good service to the public and makes a profit.

I find it incredibly shortsighted that the Congress would want to sell America's infrastructure for a quick, one time shot of cash. What is next? Our highways? Our bridges? Our national

parks? The principle is just the same. America's infrastructure up for sale. It doesn't make any sense to me, and I will not stand by and let it proceed without a fight.

And I urge my colleagues—particularly those Republicans and Democrats from the 32 rural States served by the PMA's—to join me. Senators will find a comprehensive list of all electric utilities in their States who are served by the PMAs on their desks.

Let me read for the RECORD, States who are served by the PMA's:

Alabama, Arkansas, Arizona, California, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Iowa, Idaho, Illinois, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Minnesota, Missouri, Mississippi, Montana, North Carolina, North Dakota, Nebraska, New Mexico, Nevada, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Virginia, Washington, Wisconsin, and Wyoming.

I urge Senators to take a moment before they vote on my amendment to consider the consequences elimination of the PMA's will have on the people in their States—the small businesses, farmers, ranchers, homeowners, and school districts. Say no to this backdoor tax and support my amendment.

I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I want to yield 7 minutes to the Senator from Kentucky.

NO TAXPAYER FUNDING OF ELECTIONS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I listened with great interest to my friend and colleague, Senator KERRY from Massachusetts, decry the effort of the Budget Committee to get rid of the Presidential checkoff. Let me say, my good friend could not be more wrong.

In looking back at the Watergate scandal, it is interesting to note that the Select Committee on Watergate in the mid-1970's in recommendation No. 7, said the committee recommends against the adoption of any form of taxpayer funding of elections—against any form of it. The Congress proceeded to establish the Presidential fund in spite of that.

During the last 20 years, Mr. President, such eminent persons as Lyndon LaRouche has gotten a $12 million in taxpayers funds to run for President of the United States. He even got, interestingly enough, $200,000 from the taxpayers to run for President while he was in jail. My assumption is he would not even be able to vote for himself as a resident of the jail.

In addition, that outstanding American, Lenora Fulani, has gotten $3.5 million from the taxpayers of America to run for President.

Now, Mr. President, the taxpayers of America have an opportunity every April 15 to vote on how they feel about using taxpayers' money for the Presidential election. As a matter of fact, it could be argued it is the most complete survey ever taken in America on any subject.

Every April 15, voters get to decide whether they want to check off—it used to be $1, and now $3—of taxes they already owe—it does not add to their tax bill—to divert that away from whatever else may be funded by the Federal Government into this fund.

Now the checkoff participation has dropped down last year to 14.5 percent, and is still falling. Two years ago, the majority, for fear that the taxpayers would totally revolt and there would be no money in the fund at all, raised the checkoff from $1 to $3. Now the net effect of that is that fewer and fewer people could divert more and more money. Eighty-five percent of the American people choose not to check off, even though it does not add to their tax bills, $3 to go into this fund.

Everyone, in effect, ends up paying for the checkoff because the money is diverted away from other topics.

If there is any system that has been thoroughly discredited, Mr. President, it is this one. It has not stopped spending. It has not stopped soft money, and it has eaten up about $1 billion of the tax money of the people of the United States over the last 20 years.

If we cannot kill this program, Mr. President, then what program can we kill? Now, at the appropriate time I will be offering a second-degree amendment to the Kerry amendment. I would like to briefly describe what that is about.

Among the things, Mr. President, that taxpayers funding has been used for during these years was to settle a sexual harassment case. My amendment would prevent, assuming the Presidential fund survives—which I hope it will not, but assuming it survives—my second-degree amendment to the Kerry amendment would be a sense of the Senate that the Presidential election campaign fund, if it survives, could not pay for or augment damage awards or settlements arising from a civil or criminal action, or the threat thereof, related to sexual harassment.

Now, I will be offering that second-degree amendment to make a point, Mr. President, as to how taxpayers' money has been used: $37,500 was used to settle a sexual harassment case against a top aide of the current President in his campaign back in 1992. The taxpayers paid for the settlement.

At the appropriate time, I will be offering a second-degree amendment which I hope will be approved. I hope that the underlying amendment will be disapproved. This is a program that ought to end up on the ash heap of history.

In addition to that, Mr. President, I will offer an amendment with regard to the Appalachian Regional Commission, a Commission that is extremely important to my own State of Kentucky, and will be cosponsored by Senator WARNER, Senator COCHRAN, Senator ROCKEFELLER, and Senator HEFLIN.

Essentially, Mr. President, even though the Appalachian Regional Commission would be taken down in its funding over a period of 7 years, very, very significantly, this amendment would prevent the ARC from being totally phased out, and it would pay for it largely by diverting funds from the Office of Surface Mining and from other regulatory activities.

So, essentially what this amendment is about is to take money away from regulators and give it to those involved in economic development. It is simply a question of priorities. Do we want to give the money to the Office of Surface Mining and others engaged in regulating in this and other fields? Or do we want the money to go directly into economic development activities in parts of our country that are economically deprived? This ARC covers such States as West Virginia, Kentucky, Tennessee, Mississippi and Alabama, and it has been useful in providing roads and other economic development tools for the most poverty stricken parts of that part of America.

I am somebody who is going to support the final budget resolution. I am in favor of ending a lot of programs and intend to so vote. But I believe here in this particular amendment we will simply be choosing between whether we want to fund more and more Government regulators on the one hand or economic development in poverty-stricken areas on the other.

So I hope the MCCONNELL amendment on ARC, supported by Senators WARNER, COCHRAN, ROCKEFELLER, and HEFLIN, will be approved when it is offered at the end of the time.

Mr. President, I have actually done an astonishing thing. I believe I have finished before Senator DOMENICI had to ring the bell. So I will yield any remaining time.

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

Mr. DOMENICI. How much time did he give back?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 26 minutes and 45 seconds.

The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I yield 6 minutes to the Senator from North Dakota, followed by 2 minutes for the Senator from Florida.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, today we are engaged in a historic debate on our economic future. There are many of us on both sides of the aisle who are committed to balancing our budget. But a group of us have worked for a number of weeks on producing a plan that we call the Fair Share plan, because we believe the Republican alternative that has been presented does not call on all of our citizens on a fair basis to contribute to this effort.

Perhaps the conservative commentator Kevin Phillips said it best when he said, ''If the budget deficit were really a national crisis we would be talking about shared sacrifice, with business, Wall Street and the rich, the people who have the big money, making the biggest sacrifice. Instead, the richest one or two percent, far from making sacrifices, actually get new benefits and tax reductions.''

That does not strike some of us as fair. We believe everyone in this country ought to be asked to contribute to solving this budget problem. So we have created an alternative that we call the fair share balanced budget plan. It balances the budget by the year 2004 without counting the Social Security trust fund surpluses. The Republican plan claims to achieve balance by the year 2002, but they do that by counting Social Security trust fund surpluses. In fact, if you look at the Republican budget resolution you will find that they have a $113 billion budget deficit, when it is fairly stated, in the year 2002. We understand they do not achieve a balanced budget without counting Social Security surpluses until the year 2006.

Our plan offers even more deficit reduction in the year 2002 than their plan. Without counting the Social Security surpluses, the Republicans have a $113 billion deficit in 2002, while the Fair Share plan has a $97 billion deficit, $16 billion less in deficit than the Republican plan.

We freeze defense spending, like the Republican plan does.

We freeze nondefense discretionary spending while the Republicans cut it $190 billion below a freeze. In other words, we have frozen both defense spending and nondefense discretionary spending for 7 years in our plan. In the Republican plan, they have cut, on domestic discretionary spending, $190 billion below freeze. That means the high-priority areas of the budget are devastated under the Republican plan: Education, infrastructure, research and development, technology. We add back $47 billion to education. We add back $54 billion to infrastructure, and some $13 billion to R&D and technology because those are the keys to America's future.

We also cut other important priorities less than the Republican plan. We restore $100 billion of the $256 billion Republicans cut in Medicaid. We have full funding for student loans, some $14 billion. We restore $24 billion of the $46 billion the Republicans cut in nutrition and agriculture. We restore $60 billion of the $86 billion cut in income assistance in the Republican plan. And we restore $5 billion of the $10 billion Republicans cut in veterans benefits.

To fund these changes we reject the Republican tax cuts targeted at the wealthy. The fair share plan eliminates $170 billion reserved in the Republican plans for tax cuts targeted primarily for the wealthy.

We also ask the wealthiest among us to contribute to a balanced budget by limiting the growth of tax breaks, tax loopholes and tax benefits, tax preferences that benefit the wealthy and the big corporations. Tax entitlements are the largest entitlement in dollar terms and the third fastest growing major area of the Federal budget. The Republican budget plan lets these tax loopholes and tax preferences grow without discipline, at twice the rate of overall Federal spending. Our plan limits the growth in tax entitlements to inflation plus 1 percent, producing $228 billion in savings over 7 years.

We are simply saying, as the Republicans have argued, that entitlement growth ought to be limited. We agree. But we do not think we should forget the biggest entitlement of them all, the tax preferences, tax benefits, tax loopholes that go to those who have the most in our society. Let us ask everyone in our country to contribute to an effort to reduce the deficit and let us ask them to contribute on a fair basis.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired. The Senator from Florida is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I wish to add my voice in support of the amendment to be offered by the Senator from North Dakota. I believe it speaks to two important principles in this debate. One, there has been an assumption that there is a single path to the heaven of a balanced budget; if we did not ride on the chariot that has been provided to us by the Republican leadership that we could not get to that destination. Senator CONRAD has clearly outlined that there are alternative means of reaching the goal of a balanced budget. And we stand second to no Member of this body in terms of our commitment and the length of our commitment toward the goal of a balanced budget.

Second, I believe we will not reach a balanced budget with the Republican plan, and we will not because it fails to meet a fundamental requirement and that is the requirement of fairness; the requirement that all Americans be asked to contribute to the balancing of the budget in an evenhanded manner.

The wheels and wings of this chariot of the Republican leadership for a balanced budget will fall off before we reach the year 2002 because the American people will object. They will reject the proposal to reach that balanced budget which attempts to do so primarily by reducing the already meager capability of the poorest and the oldest of Americans.

The most dramatic example of that is in the area of health care. We have beaten upon our respective breasts about how we are holding down entitlements. Here is what we are doing. According to the Congressional Budget Office, overall health care expenditures are projected to increase by over 7 percent per capita between now and the year 2002. This budget would restrain Medicare, the program for our oldest Americans, by less than 6 percent, and 1.5 percent for our poorest Americans.

That is unfair. That plan will not reach the year 2002. Senator CONRAD's plan will.

I urge its adoption.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, how much time remains on each side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are 26½ minutes for your side, and 18½ minutes for the other side.

Mr. DOMENICI. I am using my time.

I hope Senators understand that is literal. There are 26 minutes left on our side, 18 minutes left on Senator EXON's side. I intend to make that where it comes out even.

I yield 3 minutes to Senator SANTORUM in opposition to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FAIRCLOTH). The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. SANTORUM. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I wanted to talk about the Conrad amendment and just suggest that this is more of the same, again smoke and mirrors, no defined plan of how you are going to get there, more taxes, $230 billion is what they tell you about, but go ahead and spend $170 billion in the reserve fund. We do not know how that necessarily will work and whether that is really there.

I ask the Senator from North Dakota. Has that been scored by the Congressional Budget Office that your budget gets a bonus of $170 billion? Do you get that bonus?

Mr. CONRAD. Am I to respond?

Mr. SANTORUM. Yes.

Mr. CONRAD. We have treated the $170 billion in the same way that the Republican resolution has treated it. In other words, only that money—

Mr. SANTORUM. Has the CBO scored $170 billion in savings in your budget as a result of it going to balance as it did the Domenici budget?

Mr. CONRAD. We do have CBO scoring for the 7 years that indicate we will save $1.250 trillion. We will balance without using Social Security surpluses.

Mr. SANTORUM. I am running out of time.

Mr. CONRAD. We have more deficit reduction in the year 2002 than the Republicans.

Mr. SANTORUM. If I can reclaim my time, I am not getting an answer to the question. I guess the answer is the CBO has not scored $170 billion in bonus savings as a result of getting to balance in 9 years. So they are using money that they do not even have. So it is already potentially $170 billion out of balance.

They have $230 billion in tax increases. They do not solve the Medicare problem because they add money back which does not take care of the problem with the insolvency of the trust fund. They have $443 billion in new spending, but only $398 billion in offset. So that falls short.

This plan looks remarkably like a 10-year plan that the President supposedly is eyeing over at the White House of how to get to a balanced budget in 10 years, which this budget does in 9 years.

Mr. GRAHAM. Will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield for a question?

Mr. SANTORUM. Let me finish my time. Then I be would happy to yield, if I have any time left.

I did a little homework. I found the Chief of Staff at the White House, Leon Panetta, who was Budget Committee chairman when I was on the Budget Committee and offered a budget resolution. ''The Story of America's Future, Preparing the Nation For the 21st Century,'' which was a 10-year balanced budget, just being produced over at the White House, basically presented here today, and they are remarkably similar—big cuts in defense, cuts in entitlements, which the Conrad budget does, and up to a $400 billion in tax increases.

It is the same old song.

Mr. GRAHAM. Will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield for a question?

Mr. FAIRCLOTH. The time of the Senator from Pennsylvania has expired.

Who yields time?

Mr. DOMENICI. I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. President, let me say to Senator CONRAD and those who joined him, that we are—

Mr. GRAHAM. Will the Senator from New Mexico yield for a question?

Mr. DOMENICI. No, I will not. I have not had a chance to speak yet. Let me do this. I am not shying away from questions. Let me say to Senator CONRAD that it is very good that you would bring a balanced budget to the floor at 1 o'clock when there is 30 minutes left to debate.

The President sent a budget up about 4 months ago. The Republicans sent a budget to the Budget Committee about 2½ to 3 weeks ago. We have been on the floor a little more than a week. Frankly, there is no way to analyze the budget. But, frankly, I am absolutely positive that it does contain a couple of things that everybody should understand.

The Senator would say he is just taking care of loopholes, just not letting those grow as much, not letting the tax credits and other things grow. He is freezing them at 1-percent growth.

The truth of the matter is that equals a number. That is a dollar number. My estimate is that it is $230 billion in new taxes no matter how you cut it, because in this resolution, if it is done right, they tell the Finance Committee to raise revenues in the amount of $230 billion. Obviously, if you raise revenues $230 billion, you can spend a lot of money. You can spend $230 billion of the taxpayers' money. We did not do that. Americans should understand that.

In addition, the Senate budget resolution said when you balance, there is a dividend. We do not know if they have a dividend on that side. But we said when that dividend accrues we cut Americans' taxes by $170 billion. It is very easy to sit up here and say we are only going to cut for the rich. It is not true. If they did not have that in their vocabulary on that side, they would not have anything to talk that about. Every time they get up, they talk about taxing the rich.

The budget resolution says when we have tax cuts, if we do, they will not go to the rich. I do not know how many times I can say it, but that is the truth. Read the resolution.

In addition, that $170 billion which the Republicans say give back to Americans, they spend that. Of course, $230 billion and $170 billion is $400 billion. It seems to me, if you have $400 billion to spend, you can save a lot of programs.

I yield 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico is recognized for 1 additional minute.

Mr. DOMENICI. The question is, should the American people be taxed $230 billion more at this time in history, and should they not be entitled to at least take a look at whether they should get a tax cut when we get things in balance, or should we spend it all? That is the issue, plain and simple. All the rest is an interesting discussion which nobody has enough time to analyze. But I still commend the Senator. It is better than nothing. We did not have anything until now.

So I thank him for doing something better than having nothing to offer. Frankly, it is a false gesture. There will be a lot of people who will vote for it. They will say they voted for a balanced budget also. Frankly, I think it is a little too late. Nonetheless, we will probably vote on it later today.

I yield the floor at this point and reserve the remainder of the time.

Mr. GRAHAM. Will the Senator from New Mexico yield for a question or yield time to the Senator from Pennsylvania?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. DOMENICI. I do not have any time.

Mr. EXON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, unfortunately, the Senator from Nebraska is placed in the position where I have a great number of Senators who want to address this. If I have any time left for myself at all, I would like to answer some of the statements that have been made. But in view of the fact that I have Members on this side who are very vitally involved in this whole matter at this time, I would like to yield 2 additional minutes for whatever purposes he sees proper to my colleague from North Dakota. I would like to yield, following that 2 minutes, to my colleague from the State of Illinois and 2 minutes to my colleague from the State of New Jersey, 6 minutes in total.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CONRAD. I thank the Senator from Nebraska.

In answer to my colleague from Pennsylvania, this is not the same old song. This is a balanced budget and one that does it without using or without counting Social Security trust funds. It is a significant breakthrough. We do it by less draconian cuts on the high-priority programs of education, Medicare, Medicaid, veterans, and many others.

We are able to do that because we reject the tax reduction aimed and targeted primarily at the wealthiest among us, and we say there is no need to defend every tax preference, every tax loophole, every tax break that is in the current code.

This chart shows it—$4 trillion of tax preferences over the next 7 years. We say let us limit the growth to inflation plus 1 percent. That saves us $228 billion.

Now, my friends may be able to defend every tax preference, every tax break, every tax loophole. I am not. I do not understand the practice of allowing 73 percent of the foreign corporations doing business in this country to get by without paying one dime of tax. Those are not U.S. taxpayers. They are foreign taxpayers doing business here, and we allow 73 percent of them to get by without paying a penny. It makes no sense.

I do not understand the practice of having a section 936 in the code that costs $57,000 for every job created in Puerto Rico under that section of the code. I think we could do away with that loophole, and overwhelmingly the people of this country would agree. I do not see any reason we should not say to the billionaires who renounce their U.S. citizenship to avoid taxes, that loophole should now be closed.

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

Mr. CONRAD. I thank the Chair.

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

Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, I rise in strong support of the Conrad amendment. In response to my colleague from Pennsylvania, who said this is smoke and mirrors, it took about 10 of us about six meetings to put this together, plus our staffs. It is substantial. I do not suggest that the budget offered by the Senator from New Mexico is smoke and mirrors. This is not smoke and mirrors. The question is, which is more equitable? And I think clearly the Conrad amendment is.

The second question is the growth of tax loopholes or tax entitlements. I have heard the Senator from New Mexico speak often about entitlements and the need to get hold of them. He is absolutely correct. But that also applies to tax entitlements, and what the Conrad amendment does is say on tax loopholes, they can grow at the rate of inflation plus 1 percent.

Finally, I would say I am a pessimist that any of these things will stand without the teeth of a constitutional amendment. Our history is after 2 years they blow up. But I believe the Conrad plan has a greater chance of standing up through the test of time because it is more fair. The burden is

spread more evenly. I strongly support the Conrad amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. President, the issue of whether there will be a tax increase in the budget resolution, of course, is yesterday's story. There already is a tax increase in the Republican budget proposal. It is the elimination of the earned-income tax credit. It is a tax increase of $20 billion on families that earn under $28,000 a year.

So make no mistake, the issue is not whether or not there will be a tax increase. The issue is who is going to pay the tax. And I believe that this measure is appropriate. It says that corporations and wealthy individuals who use tax loopholes should lose them or have them limited. The Senator from South Dakota and I might disagree on which tax loopholes should be eliminated, but there is no question that we should tell the Finance Committee to work to achieve that amount of deficit reduction through the elimination of the tax loopholes.

If this amendment does not succeed, when we get to the end and we are offering amendments that will not be able to be debated, I will be offering another alternative budget that will cut discretionary spending more, Medicaid and Medicare less, tax expenditures less, have a tobacco tax, cut defense more, and cut agriculture more. That will be an alternative budget to the one that is being offered now by the distinguished Senator from North Dakota. So that, indeed, we will have two Democratic amendments that would produce a balanced budget—not one but two. And I hope that this amendment is seriously addressed by the Senate and passed, because it is clearly better than the current budget proposal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, how much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 19 minutes 2 seconds.

Mr. DOMENICI. That is all that is remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic side has 12 minutes 9 seconds.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I have a number of comments I wish to make. I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. President, on Federal workers, there will be an amendment called up that Senator SARBANES offered, and, frankly, I want the body to know that I worked very hard with Federal employees representative groups. We did a lot better in this budget resolution for Federal workers than the House did.

First of all, we did not freeze their pay. They get their regular pay increases. We provided sufficient money. The House provided a freeze. Unlike the House approach, we did not put a tax on them to put in the pension fund of 2.4 percent. The only thing that is in this budget resolution is use the top 5 instead of the top 3 for your averages. And we hope to do some grandfathering in the committee so that it has the least damaging effect. On the other hand, I would like to do more but I am also hopeful that when we go to conference I can hold what we have done, and from what I understand from most senior groups, most Federal employee groups, with some grandfathering this is much more palatable than what the House did.

Second, I would like to talk about WIC. Some people have talked about the Women, Infants and Children Program. I think it was Senator LEAHY. We accommodated an increase in the WIC Program. There is no argument that other programs should be restrained, but we said we think that should be increased; that is very important, nutrition. In fact, it is a $1.6 billion increase.

With reference to the power marketing, there is and there will be an amendment and discussion about it. Let me just suggest we understood from Members on our side and the Democrat side that the PMA's as proposed by the House was too tough; it would raise utility rates very high in some areas of the country. We scaled it back tremendously in this budget resolution. For those who are interested, we reduced the savings in the President's budget by two-thirds, or $2.9 billion, the assumption of savings.

We also assumed that existing customers get preferential rights to purchase the PMA's. I think we did a very credible and good job in that area, and I hope that the Senate would not further change that during the waning moments.

In addition, I repeat one more time, this budget resolution says by adoption of a sense-of-the-Senate resolution, if taxes are granted to the American people, 90 percent of them shall go to Americans earning $100,000 or less.

If I did not use all of my time, I will reserve the remainder of it and yield at this time.

Mr. SARBANES. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOMENICI. I will be pleased to yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. DOMENICI. I yield.

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

Mr. SARBANES. I will be very brief.

That this resolution is more sensitive toward the Federal employees than the House-passed resolution is correct. I think we have done better than the House. I offered the amendment on the retirement provision because I feel strongly we ought not to change the rules on people who have given long service and planned this retirement. But the overall package in the Senate resolution is better than what the House has done, and I am hopeful that we can do even better in the conference. But I offered this particular proposal because I am very concerned about people having the retirement rules changed on them along the way in their working career.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 12 minutes 9 seconds.

Mr. EXON. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Michigan and following that 2 minutes to the Senator from Minnesota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan has 2 minutes.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Nebraska.

The budget resolution before us assumes a 15 percent reduction in overhead for programs in nondefense agencies. It assumes no reduction in overhead for the Defense Department. I think that is the wrong signal to send to the Defense Department, particularly given the fact that we know there has been remaining waste in the defense budget. We have identified literally hundreds of millions of dollars that the GAO has pointed out could be saved by improved efficiency in travel management. We know of the billions of dollars of expenditures where they cannot even identify authority for the expenditures.

We can reduce somewhat the overhead in the Defense Department. My amendment which I will send to the desk says it is the sense of the Senate that the Armed Services Committee and the Appropriations Committee should reduce the overhead in the Defense Department by 3 percent—just 3 percent. And again the contrast here is very clear. We have in this budget assumed a 15-percent reduction in overhead of nondefense agencies, but the budget makes no cut, no assumption about the reduction in overhead in the Defense Department. And given the fact there has been identification of excess and waste in overhead in the Defense Department, we ought to at least ask the Appropriations Committee and the authorizing committee to cut overhead—and I emphasize the word ''overhead''—by 3 percent. This does not reduce the programmatic activities of the agency.

Just the way the 15-percent reduction in overhead was directed to be taken out of things like travel and rent and not out of the programs of the agencies, so this minimum 3 percent reduction in defense is directed not to come out of the programmatic activities of the defense agencies.

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

Mr. EXON. As I understand it, the Senator will send the amendment to the desk for later consideration.

Mr. LEVIN. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized for 2 minutes.

AGRICULTURE AND NUTRITION PROGRAMS

Mr. WELLSTONE. I thank you, Mr. President.

Later on, we will be voting on an amendment offered by Senator EXON and, I believe, Senators DASCHLE and DORGAN, and I am an original cosponsor. This amendment would restore $15 billion from the tax cuts to agriculture and nutrition programs.

Mr. President, I will tell you, a minute and a half is not enough time to talk about nutrition programs, but I want to just remind my colleagues that some 13 million children received food stamp benefits in 1992. Families with children receive 1.9 percent of food stamp benefits.

In addition, we are talking about the child and adult care food program which is nutritional assistance for children at child care centers—and I have visited those centers—we are talking about $20 billion-plus of cuts in the Food Stamp Program. And I say to my colleagues, not that long ago, the Senate unanimously supported an amendment that I offered that we would take no action that would increase hunger among children in America. Three times I tried to get a vote on that and lost. The fourth time we went on record supporting it.

I just simply want to say that these cuts in these nutrition programs will lead to increased hunger among children. The food stamp program in the United States of America is not perfect, but, given the tremendous disparities of welfare benefits, very low benefits, way below poverty level in many States, it is the true safety net for children.

To have these kinds of reductions in this food assistance program is one of the cruelest things we could do. And this summer, well before that final reconciliation bill, I am going to be on the floor over and over and over again reminding my colleagues of the consequences of what we are doing with these cuts. These are real children, real faces, real people, in our country. They do not have the political clout but they deserve much more of our support.

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

Who yields time?

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I have an additional speaker that I would be glad to yield to at this time.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I say to Senator ROTH, do you want to discuss an amendment you were going to offer?

Mr. ROTH. Yes.

Mr. DOMENICI. I yield 2 minutes to Senator ROTH and 1 minute to Senator STEVENS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico yields 2 minutes to the Senator from Delaware.

PREVENTING OIL AND GAS LEASES IN THE ARCTIC NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, when the time has expired, I intend to offer an amendment to prevent oil and gas leases to be made in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge.

Mr. President, a financial debt is not the only threat that hangs over the heads of future generations. There is an environmental debt, as well. We have a moral duty to give them a world that has clean water and clean air, and open vistas where wildlife runs free. One of the great birthrights of every American citizen is the wealth of superlative public lands.

Unfortunately, the budget resolution before us today jeopardizes one of the most spectacular places in America: the coastal plain of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. There is a provision in the budget that provides for oil and gas lease sales in this sanctuary. Located in the northeastern corner of Alaska, this unique piece of our natural heritage is bordered on the north by the Arctic Ocean and Beaufort Sea, and on the south by the snow-capped Brooks Range.

As a lead sponsor of S. 428, the bill that designates the coastal plain of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge as wilderness area, I am concerned by the provision in the budget proposal that uses revenues taken from sales of leases to drill the coastal plain.

My concern arises on two levels: first, that the budget is assuming revenue from a pristine wilderness area; and second, that the revenue raised from drilling in this wilderness area will not amount to such an insignificant amount of money that it could easily be found elsewhere.

Mr. President, as I've said before, the best thing we have learned from nearly 500 years of contact with the American wilderness is restraint, the need to stay our hand and preserve our precious environment and future resources rather than destroy them for momentary gain.

For this reason, I have been active in the effort to designate the refuge coastal plain of Alaska as a wilderness area. And I am not alone. Only 4 years ago, Congress rejected the idea of sacrificing a prime part of our national heritage, the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, for what would be a minimal supply of oil. The Arctic National Wildlife Refuge is an invaluable region with wildlife diversity that has been compared to Africa's Serengeti.

As I've said in earlier statements, the Alaskan wilderness area is not only a critical part of our Earth's ecosystem—the last remaining region where the complete spectrum of arctic and subarctic ecosystems comes together—but it is a vital part of our national consciousness. It is a place we can cherish and visit for our soul's good. It offers us a sense of well-being and promises that not all dreams have been dreamt.

The Alaskan wilderness is a place of outstanding wildlife, wilderness, and recreation, a land dotted by beautiful forests, dramatic peaks and glaciers, gentle foothills, and undulating tundra. It is untamed—rich with Caribou, polar bear, grizzly, wolves, musk oxen, Dall sheep, moose, and hundreds of thousands of birds—snow geese, tundra swans, black brant, and more. In all, about 165 species use the coastal plain. It is an area of intense wildlife activity. Animals give birth, nurse and feed their young, and set about the critical business of fueling up for winters of unspeakable severity.

Addressing my second concern—that the revenue raised from drilling in this wilderness area will not result in such a significant amount of money that it couldn't be found elsewhere—let me say that the estimated revenue is only two-tenths of 1 percent of the total savings.

And that's why I'm here today, to offer an amendment that will prohibit the leasing of the coastal plain of ANWR to pay for deficit reduction and to recommend that we pay for the loss in revenue with an offset that would come from taxing millionaire ex-patriots. I don't think there's any question that the small number of wealthy individuals who choose to renounce or relinquish their citizenship for the purpose of avoiding taxes—or any other reason—are still responsible to pay taxes on the estate, income, trust and gift revenue they received while still Americans.

My amendment to prohibit the sale of leases for oil and gas development in the coastal plain of ANWR is revenue neutral. The revenue loss of $2.3 billion over 7 years is fully offset by closing tax loopholes that have been used by wealthy Americans who renounce their citizenship.

My amendment is consistent with the current law—with the dictates of Congress—law that prohibits oil and gas drilling in the coastal plain of ANWR. It is also consistent with agreements that we have made with Canada to preserve and protect this wilderness area, especially the habitat and culture of the native people who live in the area.

My amendment prevents oil and gas leasing in the coastal plain of ANWR without hearings in Congress. It does not preclude future development of this area, but only prevents Congress from using these savings from oil and gas leasing in the current budget process.

The coastal plain—where the oil and gas leasing would occur is the biological heart and the center of wildlife activity in the refuge. It is a critical part of our Nation's preeminent wilderness and would be destroyed by oil development.

There are those who may think the northern coast of Alaska is too remote for us to worry about. I urge them to read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS from the 1870's. The men who initially urged the Congress to protect a place called Yellowstone were subject to ridicule. Why, critics asked, should we forgo the opportunity to dig up minerals from the area? It's a remote place, and few Americans will ever venture there.

Today, as we wrestle with America's future, let's be as far-sighted as that Congress eventually proved to be. Let's not cash in a unique piece of America for a brief, hoped-for rush of oil. Let's protect the coastal plain of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge—forever.

Mr. President, this amendment will not allow revenues to be used in this budget that are supposed to come from doing something that Congress has not allowed.

This is how it should be done. My amendment accomplishes this purpose. And I encourage my colleagues to support this important effort.

Mr. DOMENICI. I yield one 1 minute to the Senator from Alaska.

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

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, the basic concept of this resolution is that it assumes no increase in revenue. Senator ROTH's amendment is one of the first to assume increased taxes. It is a tax increase. His amendment will require an increase in revenue because it takes out the revenue that would be generated by leasing 1.5 million acres of the North Slope. It is not wilderness. It has never been wilderness. It is the largest potential area of oil and gas production in the United States.

I oppose this amendment. The audacity of those that would keep that blocked up. They are leading to the concept where we are now purchasing 55 percent of our oil from overseas, roughly $70 billion a year, because we are not producing oil from our own public lands.

I want to respond to suggestions that the coastal plain Congress set aside in 1980 within the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge for a study of its oil and gas potential is wilderness. This land is not wilderness. Congress has not declared it wilderness. Congress set this area aside to study the oil potential of this area, the potential which we now wish to develop.

Mr. President, in 1980, Congress withdrew 19 million acres in northeast Alaska to establish the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, an acreage that equals the entire State of Maine. Of that, Congress designated as wilderness 8 million acres, an acreage exceeding the combined area of the States of New Jersey and Connecticut. Congress designated the other 11 million acres non-wilderness refuge lands. At that time, Congress also set aside 1.5 million acres within the non-wilderness area of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge to study them for oil potential. It is this area which we want to develop, not wilderness within the Refuge.

I also want to respond to the suggestion of some Members and people outside this body continue to argue that this 1.5 million acre set-aside represents the only, or the last, great wilderness. This is just not so. Alaska, which has been singled out among all the states, is full of lands that have been given a wilderness designation by Congress. Alaska, in fact, with over 56 million acres of wilderness, has 64 percent of all wilderness acreage in the United States. This is an area larger than the States of North Carolina and South Carolina combined. In the Arctic of Alaska, there are 21.2 million acres of wilderness, an area larger than the States of Vermont, New Hampshire, Connecticut, and Rhode Island.

In 1991, Alaska had over 57.5 million acres of wilderness. Compare this with the State with the next greatest amount of wilderness—California—which had, in 1991, less than 6 million acres of wilderness. Compare this also with the fact that Connecticut, Delaware, Iowa, Kansas, Maryland, Rhode Island, and the District of Columbia have no wilderness.

Within Alaska, we have individual wilderness areas larger than some other States. For example, Gates of the Arctic National Park, which at 8.4 million acres, is twice the size of New Jersey, contains 7.1 million acres of wilderness—an area 6 times the size of Delaware. Within the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, too, there are 8 million acres of wilderness, an area the size of Massachusetts and Delaware combined.

But this area should not be confused with the 1.5 million acres that we are discussing today for development of its oil potential. In section 1002 of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act of 1980, Congress set this area aside and required Interior to report on the resources and oil potential in this area for the future.

Interior conducted seismic studies of the area and concluded that there is a 46-percent chance of discovering commercial quantities of oil. It estimated that there may be as much as 9.2 billion barrels of oil in the coastal plain—which would make it the largest remaining oil reserve in North America. To give some perspective of how much oil that is, 10 billion barrels have been pumped out of the Prudhoe Bay field—and it has been supplying 25 percent of this country's domestic oil need since the late 70's.

Some have argued that oil and gas development would destroy the wildlife in the area. The same arguments were made when Congress considered the Trans Alaska Pipeline Authorization bill in 1973. But the facts prove otherwise. Since oil and gas was developed at Prudhoe Bay, the caribou population in the area has skyrocketed, increasing by a whopping 600 percent. Likewise, populations of musk oxen, waterfowl, and polar bear have either remained stable or increased. In fact, with modern drilling technology, only 5,000 to 7,000 acres—roughly one-half of one percent—of the 1.5 million acres in the coastal plain area would be impacted by roads, structures, or other development activities.

I urge you to let Alaska's oil resources go to work to reduce the budget deficit, increase domestic oil production, and create jobs. I urge you not to be swayed by inaccurate statements about the ''1002 area'' on the Arctic coastal plain—inaccurate statements about its wilderness designation or its importance as the last great wilderness. Congress set aside this area to be studied for development of oil, and we need to do it today for the future of this country's needs for energy and jobs.

Mr. GLENN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, at this time, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Ohio, followed by 2 minutes to the Senator from Virginia, followed by 2 minutes to the Senator from Connecticut.

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

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, I thank the floor manager of the bill.

Mr. President, do I have a bargain for the U.S. Senate. This is the best deal you are going to get all day, I think. For every dollar spent, you are going to get $5 back and no new taxes. How do we do that? Sounds like blue smoke and mirrors, but it is not.

Mr. President, this amendment makes sure that we do not jeopardize more than $9 billion in deficit reduction. I am pleased to be joined in this amendment by my good friend from Illinois, Senator SIMON.

Let me stress that there are a number of things about this budget resolution I support, not the least of which is its strong approach to reducing the deficit and controlling the costs of Government. And while I disagree with many of the priorities chosen by the chairman of the Budget Committee, I commend his commitment and perseverance in seeking to balance the budget so that we can leave our children and grandchildren a legacy of hope, rather than debt.

Mr. President, I believe the amendment I am offering today furthers that goal by preserving the antifraud compliance initiative of the Internal Revenue Service which will bring in almost $5 for every $1 we spend.

Currently $164.3 billion in unpaid taxes are owed to the Government. Much of that is not collectible because of defunct corporations, bankruptcy, death or loss of employment. But $30.1 billion of that total is collectible right now. I think that bears repeating: $30.1 billion is rightfully owed to the Government and is collectible right now.

That is where the compliance initiative comes in. Last year, with bipartisan support, the Congress approved and funded the compliance initiative to collect this debt and it is projected that $9.2 billion will be collected over the next 5 years. I think that is a conservative estimate, I am happy to report that collections are ahead of schedule. In the first quarter of the initiative alone, $101 million has been collected—money that will reduce the deficit which is what the budget resolution before us is all about.

Mr. President, the first quarter results are laid out for all to see in this report which I ask unanimous consent to be printed in the RECORD.

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

STATUS OF ACCOUNTS RECEIVABLE

Currently, gross accounts receivable are $164.3 billion. Included in that amount are an active accounts receivable inventory and a currently uncollectible portion.

As of March 1995 the active portion of the accounts receivable inventory was $81.4 billion; $30.1 billion of the $81.4 is the net collectible portion of these receivables—this is the part we can collect right now.

The remaining $51.1 billion of the $81.1 is the allowance for doubtful accounts (ADA) of the uncollectible portion—the part most likely to be written off.

Some of the reasons why these receivables will not be collected are: defunct corporations; taxpayers who have died, or suffered such other personal hardship as serious illness or loss of employment; bankrupt businesses; inability to locate taxpayers, and abatements due to IRS and taxpayer errors.

The portion of our receivables in currently uncollectible status is $82.9 billion. A large portion of this amount is accrued penalties and interest. This category represents accounts not included in the active portion because a collection employee has determined a taxpayer cannot currently pay owed taxes. There is a likelihood that some portion of the amount owed could still be collected in the future.

In FY 94 alone, the IRS collected $1.2 trillion in net tax receipts. Also in FY 94, the active accounts receivables increased 7 percent ($5.1 billion), the smallest growth in active accounts receivable in 4 years.

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, this bipartisan antifraud program was placed outside the discretionary spending caps for a very simple reason: the Budget Enforcement Act precludes scoring revenue gains from these kinds of compliance activities.

Unfortunately, language placed in this year's budget resolution shifts the initiative back within the caps. That will have the effect of penalizing the initiative—and its substantial revenue gains—in the appropriations process, since it forces appropriators to consider the initiative's costs without allowing them to account for its much greater revenue gains.

This would likely lead to deep cuts, or even the abandonment, of an initiative that brings almost five times what we spend on it. Those cuts would show up as short-term savings of $2 billion to the Treasury. But it would ultimately lead to a net loss of at lest $9.2 billion over 5 years. This is shortsighted, and it's bad business.

Mr. President, that is why members of both parties chose to remove the compliance initiative from the caps last year. It is why the House budget resolution continues that structure. This is not a partisan issue. When it came up before the Senate Budget Committee, my colleague from Missouri, Senator BOND, voted to keep the initiative outside the caps. It is a sound business investment.

But Mr. President, the compliance initiative is not only about bringing in revenue properly owed the Government, it is also about fairness. I know that some view the IRS as an easy target because of public animosity toward the agency. Of course, no one enjoys paying taxes. But what really burns people up is to feel that they are paying their taxes while others are getting off scot-free.

I have talked with countless Ohioans who tell me that they diligently fill out their tax forms, go through all of the hassles with our all-to-complicated Tax Code, send in their payments, only to then hear about those who are getting away with falsifying their returns or submitting none at all. Or corporations that have developed tax schemes to walk away from their liability while everyone else picks up the tab. It is infuriating. Alot of people may not like the IRS, but I will guarantee you they like tax cheats a lot less.

Well, if our amendment fails tax cheats everywhere can rest easy. Quite simply, by putting the compliance initiative under the spending caps, the budget resolution could force the IRS to abandon this important initiative which not only generates revenue, but also assures honest Americans that others are also going to be paying their fair share. This notion of fairness is the underlying principle behind the Tax Code.

Eliminating the compliance initiative not only cuts revenue to the Treasury by more than $9 billion, even worse, it undermines confidence in our Tax Code by signalling to Americans that the Senate believes in double standards, that there are rules for hard-working Americans who pay their taxes, and no rules for people who don't. More effective compliance sends the right message: that there are no double standards when it comes to tax fairness. Everyone must pay their fair share, and we will enforce the laws against those who don't.

Mr. President, I would urge my colleagues to recall that this entire issue was settled last year. The Senate and the House both approved and funded the IRS compliance initiative, and the IRS has since done its part. The IRS is already ahead of schedule in collecting the taxes targeted for this year, and that's before most of the new compliance employees are even fully trained.

Now, I have heard that some Senators share my view that the compliance initiative makes a lot of sense, but think that, to avoid smoke and mirrors, it belongs on budget. In other words, they say that if the IRS and the administration think this is so important, they should fund the Initiative within the caps. That is a reasonable notion that in years past might have worked, and I probably would have agreed with them.

However, as we all know, our efforts to eliminate the deficit have necessitated that funds available in previous years simply don't exist any longer. But this initiative was developed to assist in that effort—to help reduce the deficit. That is why the current structure was established. We all want to collect delinquent taxes, and a $5 return for every dollar spent is a wise investment by any standard.

I would argue, in fact, that those Senators who support the compliance initiative but insist on placing it under the caps are perhaps the ones engaging in smoke and mirrors. These Senators get to say that they support compliance, while knowing full well that under the caps there is no money to pay for it. Unfortunately, the only ones who stand to gain are dishonest people and corporations who are not willing to pay their fair share. They mock the honest American taxpayer. And who are the losers, the American taxpayer who has to pick up the tab, the Federal treasury which will lose more than $9 billion, and the big loser—deficit reduction.

Senator SIMON and I want no part of an effort that so flies in the face of rationality. The amendment that we have introduced strikes that part of the budget resolution which requires that the compliance initiative be funded on budget. The affect of the amendment would simply be to return the compliance initiative to its off-budget status, where the Congress put it last year, and where it has been working to bring in delinquent taxes ever since.

Mr. President, I would urge by colleagues to support this amendment, so that we can get on with the task of deficit reduction.

I ask unanimous consent that a summary of the IRS compliance initiative be printed in the RECORD.

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

IRS COMPLIANCE INITIATIVE

NEED FOR COMPLIANCE INITIATIVE

Last year, Congress approved a $405 million annual investment to collect an additional $9.2 billion to reduce the deficit over five years.

The structure under which the Compliance Initiative was originally approved has provided the Congress and the IRS the flexibility to meet budgetary objectives, while at the same time strengthen compliance.

IRS COMPLIANCE INITIATIVE IS WORKING

Early results show that IRS will meet or exceed the goal of generating the additional $9.2 billion. Through the first quarter of FY 1995, the initiative has generated an additional $101 million, 31% of the FY 1995 commitment. The payoff in later years will be higher when the new people become fully productive.

Initiative results are being tracked. A new system for tracking this initiative and related revenues raised by it was developed by the IRS and accepted by GAO. The First Quarter Report was delivered to Congress, on schedule, on March 31.

CUTTING THE INITIATIVE WOULD INCREASE THE DEFICIT

Congress is working hard to shrink government costs. With regard to the initiative, however, for every appropriated dollar ''saved'', tax revenues are reduced by nearly five dollars. Elimination of the five-year initiative commitment for FY 1996 and beyond would dramatically hinder the IRS' ability to address significant areas of noncompliance that the Congress has urged it to focus on—boosting examination coverage, reducing accounts receivable, and curbing filing fraud.

Further, only $300 million in additional revenues will have been realized, sacrificing $8.9 billion that will be achieved in FY 1996–

1999, and an additional $2.1 billion in years past FY 1999.

And this revenue loss relates only to direct revenues—the Service's enforcement activities also encourage voluntary compliance. Every one percent increase in voluntary compliance increases tax revenues by $10 billion annually.

ELIMINATING THE INITIATIVE SERIOUSLY DAMAGES COLLECTIONS

IRS has put in place a long range hiring and training plan. By the end of May, over 5,000 people will have been hired or redeployed to compliance jobs as part of this initiative. These employees are collecting taxes already due, which if not collected, increase the burden on those taxpayers who voluntarily meet their tax obligations.

Elimination of the Initiative would require IRS to immediately institute a hiring freeze and in FY 1996 furlough the approximately 70,000 Compliance employees for up to 17 days to reduce expenditures by $405 million. In FY 1997, either further furloughs or a reduction in force would be necessary to reduce employment. Attrition alone would not be sufficient to get to lower staffing levels.

SAFEGUARDING TAXPAYER RIGHTS

As tax administrators, one of the IRS' most important responsibilities is to ensure that taxpayers are treated fairly, courteously and with respect. The IRS is committed to respecting the rights of all taxpayers.

In the last several years, the IRS has taken many steps administratively to safeguard taxpayer rights. And IRS is working with the Congress on proposed legislative changes that would further enhance safeguards.

The commitment to taxpayer rights will continue to drive IRS' work with regard to the compliance initiative and, in fact, *all* of the IRS' efforts.

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, DC, May 22, 1995.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: We are writing to inform you about an important issue in the Senate Budget Resolution which, if left unchanged, could cost the government and the American people more than $9 billion in deficit reduction.

Last year, with bipartisan support, the Congress approved and funded the IRS Compliance Initiative to collect over $9.2 billion in unpaid taxes to reduce the deficit. And it has been a real success—for every dollar we invest in this program we will receive nearly five dollars in return.

Last year's budget resolution placed the Compliance Initiative outside the discretionary caps for a very simple reason: The Budget Enforcement Act precludes scoring revenue gains resulting from these kinds of compliance activities. However, language placed in this year's budget resolution shifts the initiative back within the discretionary caps. That will have the effect of penalizing the initiative in the appropriations process, since it will force appropriators to consider the initiative's costs without allowing them to account for its much greater revenue gains.

As a result, this year's budget resolution will likely lead to deep cuts in the Compliance Initiative, or even force the IRS to abandon the initiative entirely. Those cuts would show up as a short-term savings of $2 billion to the Treasury. But it would ultimately result in a net loss of $9.2 billion over 5 years (and up to $11.3 billion including the out years). Such short-sightedness would not be tolerated in the private sector, and it should be rejected by the U.S. Senate, as well.

During floor debate on the Budget Resolution, we will offer an amendment to strike the proposed language on the Compliance Initiative budget structure, so that we can continue to reduce the deficit as Congress intended last year. We urge you to support his amendment. Please have your staff contact John Haseley with Senator Glenn (4–1519) or Aaron Rappaport with Senator Simon (4–5573), with any questions.

Sincerely,

JOHN GLENN.
PAUL SIMON.

I urge support for this amendment. I will submit it at the appropriate time. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired. The Senator from Virginia is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. ROBB. Thank you, Mr. President. I thank the managers of the bill.

Mr. DOMENICI. Did I yield the Senator time, or did the Senator from Nebraska yield time?

Mr. ROBB. The time was yielded by the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. DOMENICI. Can I yield it so the Senator from Nebraska has time left? How much time does the Senator from Virginia want, 3 or 4 minutes?

Mr. ROBB. Two minutes will be adequate.

Mr. DOMENICI. I yield 2 minutes to Senator ROBB.

FAIR SHARE

Mr. ROBB. Mr. President, I rise in support of the fair share amendment that was offered by the Senator from North Dakota, Senator CONRAD. I, with a number of other Senators, worked with him to try to develop an alternative to the budget resolution that is on the floor. I continue to accord to Senator DOMENICI and others credit for moving us in the right direction.

Their amendment, if you include the $113 billion of Social Security trust funds, would come to balance under that math by the year 2002. This amendment comes by the year 2004 and gives us true balance without using the trust funds.

There are some very difficult choices still ahead of us. We are talking about budget resolutions and not budgets. When we get down to the hard work of the authorizing and appropriating, we are going to have to be making some very, very painful and difficult choices. This particular approach, in my judgment, spreads that burden more equitably and more fairly. Hence, I am very much in favor of it.

I, again, commend the Senator from New Mexico for his leadership and I, like some of the other folks on this side of the aisle, may end up even voting for the final version, even if this particular distribution fails, because I think it is important that we make the statement about the seriousness of our intent to move toward true deficit reduction, and we can continue to disagree about some of the details.

With that, I thank the Chair, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Connecticut for 2 minutes.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I rise to speak in favor of the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. CONRAD], the one on the fair share budget; and the one offered by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. ROTH] on the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge.

ARCTIC NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE AMENDMENT

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I am pleased to be an original cosponsor of Senator ROTH's amendment to protect the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge from oil and gas development. The budget resolution before us directs the Energy Committee to authorize the lease of 1.5 million acres of this internationally significant refuge to oil companies. If this happens, it will virtually destroy one of the world's crown jewels of nature for a small supply of oil. Yet, only last week in Senate debate, oil from wilderness areas of Alaska's North Slope was characterized as a surplus that should be made available for export. Clearly, oil from the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge is not a vital energy need for the United States.

The social and environmental cost of developing the refuge would be huge. It would severely impact major calving grounds and disrupt migration for one of the largest caribou herds on Earth. The Porcupine herd, estimated recently at over 152,000 caribou, uses the coastal plain of this refuge where development is targeted, to raise their calves and prepare for the incredibly harsh winter migration. It is one of the few areas hospitable enough for calving and summer habitation. The Canadian government provided permanent protection for their portion of this habitat in recognition of its importance and highly threatened status.

Development of this refuge will eliminate a significant amount of habitat for other wildlife, including denning and feeding areas for polar bears and Arctic wolves. Forty three percent of all polar bear dens in and around the refuge occur in this area. It will destroy a major habitat of musk oxen, and threaten staging grounds for millions of migratory birds. It has the potential to contaminate water supplies for vast areas of wilderness so pristine that they define the very term itself. It will degrade one of the last scrapes of Arctic wilderness with each of the elements of the Arctic North Slope ecosystem preserved intact. Ninety percent of this system is already open to oil and gas development. Without question, oil development will result in major environmental damages to this unique wilderness.

It also has the potential to destroy the economic and social basis for Indian cultures that have depended on these herds for thousands of years. We know them as the Gwich'in, the Inuvialuit, the Aklavik and others. We have heard their songs of the caribou. They remind us of Native Americans who once followed vast herds of bison on the Great Plains, and sang to their future as well. In the words of these Alaskan Natives, ''Our Arctic way of

life has endured for 20,000 years. Why should it die now for 6 months of oil?''

As a result of Senate action to lift the oil export ban last week, it is no longer clear whose 6-month supply of oil this might be. Repeatedly, we were told during Senate debate that a glut of North Slope oil exists. So much so, that we need to export this surplus to more profitable locations, such as Japan. Oil from the refuge, in all probability, will not fill American gas pumps. Therefore, the whole energy independence rationale for drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge is now clearly without any foundation. We would be drilling for oil company profits, not energy independence. In the process, we will deplete our domestic oil reserves and destroy one of our most valuable environmental assets. I think this is a very bad tradeoff, and I think most Americans will agree.

The plan to develop the refuge is a bad idea for another very big reason: it doesn't make budget sense. Senator ROTH offers a replacement offset that more than covers the projected revenues from oil leases, the closure of the tax break for expatriate millionaires. This tax break is for people who renounce their U.S. citizenship to shield their enormous wealth from the taxes every hard-working American must pay. It should not be preserved at the expense of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge or any other significant resource of this Nation.

The deficit reduction value of the proposed Arctic National Wildlife Refuge lease is clouded by several unresolved issues. First, the $1.4 billion figure scored by CBO assumes a 50-percent State share, even though State law calls for a 90-percent share. Second, there are uncertainties about the ownership of submerged lands within the refuge. If it is determined that these lands belong to Alaska, it reduces the lease value of the refuge further. Third, the most recent offshore State lease near the refuge yielded only $48.41 per acre, compared to the estimated $1,533.00 per acre assumed by CBO—a huge discrepancy. Finally, the budget process itself is simply the wrong place to authorize major, irreversible actions of this kind because it limits normal debate, testimony, and public input.

The current budget rule on public asset sales, which this budget resolution seeks to change, prohibits the scoring of these sales for deficit reduction for good reason. It was created in 1985 during the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings Act to avoid bogus, shortsighted asset sales in the name of deficit reduction. Nothing has changed to reduce the need for this rule today as we debate the fate of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge.

Much has been said since last November about the views of the American people on protecting the environment. So often we hear the presumption that Americans care less. But, this past week a national poll by ABC and the Washington Post found quite the opposite, as has every national poll since the election. Seventy percent of Americans feel the Federal Government has not done enough to protect the environment. In the case of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge and many other treasured public lands across this Nation, I can only agree. We should not transfer public refuges, parks, forests or energy reserves without extensive hearings, informed testimony, and debate, particularly when they are so near and dear to the American people.

I want read a few words from some of the many letters I have received urging me to protect the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge:

The Ambassador of Canada, Mr. Raymond Chretien, wrote:

> Canada believes that opening the Arctic Refuge to oil and gas development will lead to major disruptions in the sensitive calving grounds and will affect migratory patterns of the Porcupine Caribou Herd on which thousands of Canadian and American Aboriginal people depend.
>
> In signing the 1987 Canada-United States Agreement on the Conservation of the Porcupine Caribou Herd, the United States and Canada both recognized the transboundary nature of these wildlife resources and our joint responsibility for protecting them.
>
> In 1984, Canada gave wilderness protection to its portion of the caribou calving grounds by creating the Northern Yukon National Park. The critical calving grounds in the United States, however, do not have formal protection and remain vulnerable to development, as evidenced by the recent budgetary proposals.
>
> Canada believes that the best way to ensure the future of the shared wildlife population of the Arctic Coastal Plain is to designate the ''1002'' lands as wilderness, thereby providing equal protection on both sides of this border to this irreplaceable living resource.

Gwich'in Tribe, Renewable Resource Board, Mr. Robert Charlie, wrote:

> Opening up the Arctic Refuge to (oil and gas) development would have a drastic negative impact on the Porcupine Caribou Herd which calves in the area. In turn, the decline of the herd would devastate the aboriginal cultures in Yukon and Northwest Territories which rely on caribou for cultural and economic survival . . .
>
> Both President Clinton and Prime Minister Chretien oppose drilling in the refuge.
>
> Oil development is opposed by all First Nations in Canada and Alaska, with exception of the Inupiat who have financial interests there.
>
> The calving grounds in the ''1002'' lands are recognized by the International Porcupine Caribou Board as the most sensitive habitat of the herd.
>
> A study released last week by the Alaska Department of Fish and Game links the drop in growth rate of the Central Arctic Herd at Prudhoe Bay to eviction of cows and calves by oil development.
>
> Other department reports in preparation collaborate on the negative impacts of development on caribou calving.

Wildlife Management Advisory Council of the North Slope, Mr. Lindsay Staples, wrote:

> Allowing oil development in the Arctic Refuge would severely impact on the Porcupine Caribou herd. A decline in the herd would mean social and economic ruin for the indigenous peoples who rely on the herd. The Inuvialuit of Aklavik, Northwest Territories are among those whose lifestyle and culture would be at risk.

President Jimmy Carter, op-ed to the New York Times, wrote:

> The new Congress must be reawakened to protecting the interests of all Americans by protecting public lands in Alaska. For what is at stake is an unparalleled system of Federal reserves protecting wildlife, fish and wilderness. Polar bears, musk ox, wolves and a herd of 150,000 caribou roam the remote Coastal Plain of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge in the far north—a place often called ''America's Serengeti . . .
>
> November's election was not a mandate to damage Alaska's environmental treasures. Poll after poll has shown that the American people remain fully committed to the protection that makes the unspoiled reaches of our Nation the envy of the world.

Mr. President, I believe it is essential for this Nation to balance its budget. I salute the budget committee for taking bold and concrete steps to reach this goal. This is a very difficult, complicated task that requires sacrifice by all of us. I believe Senator ROTH's amendment provides a better way to reach this goal than the proposed development of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. It trades something we do not need, a tax break for rich people who do not care about our country enough to maintain their citizenship, for something we do need and are willing to take care of, one of or most precious natural resources.

In 1991, I was 1 of 44 Senators who voted against a motion to proceed with an energy bill that contained a plan to develop oil on this refuge. Today, we must renew this commitment to safeguarding this national treasure. We must continue our stewardship of our natural resources and natural heritage. I ask all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join Senator ROTH, me and the many other Senators supporting this amendment today. We may not have a second chance.

TECHNOLOGY RESEARCH AND TRAINING

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I wanted to speak briefly on the amendment I am pleased to cosponsor with Senators BINGAMAN and ROCKEFELLER on technology research and training.

The Federal Government, since the Second World War, by its investments in research and support of technology, has really driven this economy. This budget begins to dismantle the apparatus that has created so much wealth, growth, and jobs, and we desperately need to compete in the world today. It is the beginning of kind of an economic disarmament as the world becomes more competitive. In this budget, while other nations are increasing their relative investment in research and development and training and technology, we actually decrease the investment that America is making.

In Japan and Germany, and other industrialized nations, the investments that are made in research and training and technology are beyond partisan and political debate. They stand up there with national defense. Those

folks in Japan and Germany are probably the ones who will not only find this debate shocking but will get a big laugh out of the fact that we are cutting some of these programs.

The Commerce Department, the agency that has finally brought together our effort to take the research from the laboratories, convert it into technologies that create jobs and then have an aggressive export promotion program that sells those products abroad is actually being dismantled in the budget before us.

While I support the bottom line that the budget achieves, these are the wrong priorities, and I hope through the sense of the Senate that we will express our support for different priorities.

I find it ironic that the budget resolution, by cutting critical investments in science, technology and trade, depletes future sources of revenues for the national budget, and ultimately weakens our economy rather than strengthens it. In trying to save dollars today, we are throwing away the investments with the biggest payoffs tomorrow. We are stealing from our own pockets tomorrow, and from our children to pay for budget cuts today. The strategy simply makes no sense.

Research and development, applied research, export promotion, and trade law enforcement. These efforts are the fuel of our economy. Traditionally, the Government has played an important role in stoking our economic furnace with selected, well-defined R&D programs that stimulate the economy and protect and promote our interests abroad. They have been a critical engine for economic growth in the United States and are one of its major competitive advantages. The budget resolution's deep cuts into research and development have the potential to devastate our research institutions, institutions that have international reputations for excellence. These institutions spawn the new ideas that form the basis for innovation in the marketplace. No major research institution is left unscathed—the Department of Commerce trade and technology programs, the National Institutes of Health, the Department of Energy Labs, NASA, and even the premiere basic research institution, the National Science Foundation. The lack of judgment in cutting these programs is obvious when one notes that the direct return on investment to our economy, from research and development is 30 percent. This figure does not even take into account indirect social benefits from research and development.

Currently, our Federal investment is research and development is 1.1 percent of GDP, split almost evenly between defense and civilian R&D. If we remove the defense component and add on the investment by the private sector, we find that our investment, as a nation, in civilian R&D is 2.1 percent of GDP. We can compare the R&D investment trends in the United States with those of other industrialized nations. Today, we are behind Japan and Germany in this critical factor. This historic pattern relative to Japan and Germany has had a direct impact on our economies. Since the 1950's, our per capita GDP has risen an average of 1.8 percent per year, while in Japan the rate has been 5.2 percent per year, and in Germany, 3.1 percent per year. R&D means new products and new technologies. The correlation between R&D investment and economic growth is real.

While other nations are increasing their relative investment in R&D, the current budget resolution would decrease our R&D investment. It marks a historic reversal in U.S. policy toward science and R&D. By the year 2002, the budget resolution would decrease our Federal investment in R&D by approximately 40 percent. The result would be to decrease our national investment in R&D from 1.1 percent of GDP to 0.68 percent of GDP. Even if other nation's R&D investments remain constant, and do not grow, as is the trend, we fall behind countries like France and the United Kingdom. The lead that Japan and Germany have over us grows substantially. This graph does not consider the multitude of rapidly growing emerging nations, who are rapidly becoming fierce competitors in the global marketplace.

These conservative estimates of the results of the decrease is investment in R&D have major implications for our ability to compete in the global marketplace with products that incorporate the innovations conceived by our R&D efforts. It is not sufficient to just conceive of good ideas. These ideas must become products and then be brought to market, at home and abroad. Our success in the global marketplace is directly reflected in our standard of living and our quality of life. The budget resolution completely dissolves the agency that has been the most effective in technology development and trade promotion, the Department of Commerce, ending its programs in these areas up front.

The effort to get our creative ideas to market, to feed our economy, has had a bipartisan history. Landmark legislation by Senator DOLE and then Senator Bayh led to a Federal initiative in technology transfer from the federal laboratory bench to industry. I applaud the forward-looking, innovative thinking that was pioneered by our current majority leader. The Advanced Technology Program was crafted by congressional leaders on both sides of the aisle during the Bush administration. These programs are leading us into the 21st century, with significant potential for enormous returns on investment. For example, the Manufacturing Extension Program, out of the Department of Commerce, was designed to help some 370,000 small- and medium-sized manufacturers, raise their performance to world standards. This program has returned $8 to the economy for every dollar the Federal Government has invested. These technology programs account for less than 2 percent of total Federal R&D investment but are critical to our ability to capitalize on our innovations. We must not cede to other nations the economic benefits of American ingenuity. Along with the elimination of the Department of Commerce, these programs are either slated for deep cuts or elimination.

Getting our products into markets around the world has been one of the real achievements of the Department of Commerce in recent years. The Department of Commerce has worked aggressively to increase exports. In the last 18 months, the Commerce Department successfully advocated, on behalf of U.S. companies, contracts with a total U.S. export content of $25 billion. In other words, for every dollar spent on the Department of Commerce, $6 have been generated in the economy. Commerce has eliminated unnecessary and outmoded regulations on more than $32 billion in exports, allowing domestic companies the freedom to succeed in overseas markets. And, these accomplishments have been made with the smallest Cabinet budget. The advocacy for U.S. trade will be even more critical in coming years as the global marketplace becomes a larger and larger component of our economy.

There are new international competitiveness issues on our horizon and we will need to be effective and efficient in our responsiveness to the rapidly changing global economy. New markets are emerging in developing countries. Conservative estimates suggest that 60 percent of the growth in world trade will be with these developing countries over the next two decades. During a time when we will need increased emphasis on international trade we are contemplating eliminating the only agency that advocates for American business, in the Cabinet and abroad.

The United States has a large share of imports in big emerging markets. We are doing well, but much of our edge is due to our large share in Latin America. Vigorous efforts are necessary in other parts of the world, particularly Asia, where Japan heavily out-invests the United States. These markets combined, make up the largest component of United States exports, and these markets are growing rapidly. But, with the cuts in the budget resolution, we cannot maintain these efforts. We will forfeit the money they bring into our country. We will lose their impetus to our economy. Instead, we are cutting the most critical programs in the smallest Cabinet budget, in the name of decreasing the deficit. It just does not make sense to cut these revenue producing functions. Cutting these trade functions, and the Department of Commerce, will ultimately increase the deficit, not decrease it. I often lament the nearsightedness of a corporate America forced to focus on the next quarter's

profits. I hate to see my Senate colleagues succumb to a similar narrow focus.

In conclusion, I support this amendment in order to assure that when we cut government spending, which I strongly support, we cut wisely, and we do not cut government investments that build our economy. We must maintain our investments in research, technology and trade promotion to ensure our future economic strength and international competitiveness. This amendment stands for exactly that point.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD a letter to Senator BINGAMAN from the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers.

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

INSTITUTE OF ELECTRICAL AND ELECTRONICS ENGINEERS, INC.,
Washington, DC, May 24, 1995.

Hon. JEFF BINGAMAN,
U.S. Senate, Senate Hart Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR BINGAMAN: As a representative of the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers, Inc., an organization that promotes the career and policy interests of 240,000 U.S. electrical engineers (IEEE–USA), I am compelled to alert you to our unwavering support for the U.S. research and development base. We have become increasingly alarmed at the pace and scope of the rescissions and proposed funding reductions and eliminations of R&D programs that we see as vital to U.S. industry, the economy and our global competitiveness. Estimates of a 30–40% reduction over the next 5 years in Federal support for research and technology development will have a lingering and deleterious effect on our economy.

In the budget resolution recently passed by the House and in the pending Senate counterpart, drastic reductions to R&D programs across the board are assumed. No one will argue against the merits of deficit reduction. A widening national debt has a very draining effect on our economy and our ability to invest wisely for the future. But in our zeal to find ways to cut government spending, programs which are designed to boost our economy and, in turn revenues, are being sacrificed. This short sightedness needs to be short lived before irrevocable harm is done to the U.S. R&D base and jobs are lost.

We at IEEE–USA are very glad to learn of your intention to offer an amendment to S. Con. Res. 13, the Senate Budget Resolution, to express a sense of the Senate that research, technology and trade promotion are vital to the future of the U.S. economy. Research programs are vulnerable because they do not always have the visibility of many other government programs and therefore are easy targets for budget cutters. Your amendment reminds the whole Congress of the importance of research and technology and hopefully will urge the budget cutters and appropriators to use extreme caution before haphazardly cutting or eliminating needed programs.

The IEEE–USA supports your amendment and commends you for your leadership on this issue and stands ready to assist you and your staff in this effort. Please contact Jim Anton of the Washington staff for further information or support at 202–785–0017.

Sincerely,

JOEL B. SNYDER, P.E.,
Vice President, Professional Activities and Chair, U.S. Activities Board.

I thank the Chair, and I yield the floor.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, I rise to, in the strongest terms, support this amendment which I am pleased to cosponsor. I congratulate the Senator from New Mexico, Mr. BINGAMAN, for his continued leadership on behalf of the Nation's economic needs and potential, and join Senator LIEBERMAN in helping to make this case to our colleagues.

The proposal to eliminate the U.S. Department of Commerce is incredibly short-sighted and will be extremely harmful to the competitive position of the United States. The Commerce Department's responsibility for trade enforcement, export promotion, manufacturing, and technology is a focused mission for American jobs and growth, and quite simply, its elimination is tantamount to economic surrender.

To begin with, the Commerce Department acts as the cop on the beat, enforcing U.S. trade laws against internationally recognized unfair trading practices. Domestic industry is a huge fan of the Department's Import Administration, and a move to eliminate it, or roll it into another agency with a very different mandate, is only going to be red meat for our competitors. I know this from painful experience. Those of us who represent industries such as steel have seen what unfair trade, dumping and subsidized imports, can mean to local economies and our Nation's overall economy. The Import Administration does yeomen's work enforcing our domestic trade laws—which look out for American businesses and American jobs—and to move it somewhere else is not only thoughtless, it is dangerous.

Mr. President, I will not sit by while the one agency that is looking out for American business, at home and abroad, is dismantled for political gain. The Department of Commerce's trade promotion arm is the matchmaker for thousands of businesses promoting products made in the United States—by American workers—in markets all over the world. I speak from experience here. In January, I led a trade mission of West Virginia businesses to Japan and Taiwan, we called it Project Harvest because that is what we were trying to do, sow the seeds of relationships that would reap tangible benefits for small and large West Virginia companies and their workers. In all this we worked closely with the Department of Commerce's Foreign Commercial Service, and in less than 6 months, these companies have already secured millions of dollars' worth of contracts.

I know what my friends across the aisle are saying about their so-called mandate, but I challenge any one of them to tell me that they have one company in their State such as Precision Samplers, that want to see the Department of Commerce eliminated. As a result of our trade mission, and with the help of the Department of Commerce, Precision Samplers has already signed contracts worth half a million dollars. And the list doesn't end there, West Virginia companies such as the Dean Co., and FCX Systems and Precision Coil have all signed lucrative contracts since our trade mission, and a big thanks goes to the experts at the Department of Commerce who helped make these deals happen. Small companies such as these owe a great deal to Department of Commerce export promotion programs, and I doubt they would want to see that support network eliminated.

I also want to make a special note of the role played by the Bureau of Export Administration [BXA]. BXA evaluates national security interests when American companies seek applications for the export of dual use goods and technology; those are products that could have military applications. There are a lot of things that need to be considered in these applications, but as a Commerce entity, BXA has longstanding close relations with exporters and the business community that other agencies simply don't have. However, BXA has to work with all those other agencies in making its evaluations. Export licensing has foreign policy implications, so involves the State Department; it has national security implications, so works with DOD; it has to clear the sale of nuclear equipment that DOE is expert in, or other things that the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency has a role to play. And BXA coordinates all this while always looking out for the needs of American businesses.

We need to maintain an umbrella organization that looks out for America's business interests at home and across the globe. Creating a Department of Trade would be better than breaking up all the trade functions of the Department of Commerce and moving them all over the Government, to Justice, DOD, Treasury, the ITC, USTR, wherever. But why reinvent the wheel? The Department of Commerce works. This idea of making a Department of Trade or expanding USTR is merely moving around the deck chairs. And maybe it is even worse. This particular ship is standing tall and sailing true. Breaking it down and moving it around is a bad idea.

I also want to discuss a related set of proposed cuts—support for new breakthrough technologies. It is an astounding proposal, and one that shows how soon some forget what it takes for America to win in the new global economy.

We should remember the lessons of the 1970's and early 1980's. During those years, America led in science and new ideas, only to see American inventions such as the VCR commercialized first by other countries. Other governments

have long used research consortia and other aid to help their firms overcome the technical hurdles associated with critical but risky new ideas. And time after time, we found our competitors taking our ideas and sending them back to us in the form of VCRs and other new products.

Over the past 10 years, both American industry and the U.S. Government have taken steps to make sure Americans profit more from our new inventions and discoveries. Industry and the venture capital industry have focused their attention sharply on getting the next generation of products out the door. Both competitive pressures and Wall Street's push for short-term results have led our firms to focus their limited R&D dollars on developing new products. That is good in the short term, but it also means that even our largest firms have been forced to cut longer-term research that is essential for the future but which will not pay off for 10 years.

In the real world, as opposed to some theoretical world, American companies—both large and small—increasingly have turned to cost-shared projects with the Government and each other to develop these risky but vital longer-term technologies. These are the breakthrough technologies that will create new industries and jobs in the future—technologies such as next-generation electronics, low-cost composite materials for bridges and other structures, low-cost but highly reliable processes for making biotechnology products, and advanced techniques for computer-aided manufacturing. Cost-shared projects in such areas create the new seed corn for a new generation of American industry.

At the Federal level, these cost-shared technology partnerships with industry now constitute less than 3 percent of the Government's $72 billion annual R&D budget. The entire budget of the Government's civilian technology agency—the Commerce Department's National Institute of Standards and Technology, NIST—constitutes little more than 1 percent of Federal R&D. With the cold war over and the world economic race in full swing, this is hardly overspending.

And mark my words, other nations will not drop out of the world economic race just because Congress has thrown in the towel in the fight to help develop and market leading edge technologies. Along with Japan and Europe, we now see major new industry-government technology investments in South Korea, Taiwan, and even smaller states such as Singapore. In the real world, these countries are out to clean our clocks—and they want to use America's own university discoveries and entrepreneurial ideas to do it.

The United States has just now climbed back to a solid, but fragile, lead in most key technologies. Well-run, cost-shared Government programs have played an important role in helping American industry regain that lead. But we now combine government cutbacks with ever increasing Wall Street pressures for companies to focus their own funds only on the short term, then we will most certainly fall behind again. And the American worker and the American dream will be the losers.

Killing Federal technology programs, including those of the Commerce Department, will send our companies into economic battle with second-rate support and one arm tied behind their backs. It is a prescription for economic retreat and economic stagnation. In the name of some ideology, we risk destroying key foundations of future prosperity. And future generations will wonder why the Nation that used industry-government R&D cooperation to create the modern agriculture, aircraft, and biotechnology sectors abandoned a proven formula and let other nations walk all over us.

Which brings me back to the amendment and the Department of Commerce. This amendment is quite simple, it states that ''the public welfare, economy, and national security of the United States have benefitted enormously from the investment the Federal Government has made over the past fifty years in research, technology, and trade promotion and trade law enforcement,'' and that these should remain a national priority for the 21st century.

Again, Mr. President, the elimination of an agency of Government so vital to our Nation's interests is tantamount to economic surrender. I think our international competitors will see it as just that. In my view, proposals to eliminate the Department of Commerce amount to unilateral disarmament, and I will fight against those who are determined to raise this white flag.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I have no one seeking time on my side. I need some time, but does the Senator from Nebraska want another 2 or 3 minutes of my time, if he needs it?

Mr. EXON. I will simply advise the Senator, possibly could we take care of the matters that have been agreed to now? I have one Senator who asked to have 3½ minutes. I have the 3½ minutes remaining, but now I do not have the Senator. I would like to give the remainder to him.

Maybe the Senator from New Mexico has some time to give me for closing matters. If not, may we take care of those matters agreed to?

AMENDMENT NO. 1145

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order to send to the desk and the Senate adopt, if they see fit, a technical amendment which has been agreed to on the other side. I send that to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will report the amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. DOMENICI] proposes an amendment numbered 1145.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 4, line 19, strike ''$937,800,000,000'' and insert ''$973,800,000,000''.

On page 5, line 12 strike ''comparison with the maximum deficit amount under section 601(a)(1) and 606 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and for purposes of''.

On page 6, line 8, strike ''$1,324,400,000,000'' and insert ''$1,342,400,000,000''.

On page 6, line 10 strike ''comparison with the maximum deficit amount under section 601(a)(1) and 606 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and for purposes of''.

On page 7, line 10 strike ''comparison with the maximum deficit amount under section 601(a)(1) and 606 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and for purposes of''.

On page 10, line 3, strike ''$347,700,000,000'' and insert ''$374,700,000,000''.

On page 11, line 2, strike ''2000'' and insert ''2002''.

On page 40, line 3, strike ''$1,000,000,000'' and insert ''$100,000,000''.

On page 40, line 10, strike ''$1,000,000,000'' and insert ''$100,000,000''.

On page 40, line 17, strike $1,000,000,000'' and insert ''$100,000,000''.

On page 40, line 24, strike $1,000,000,000'' and insert ''$100,000,000''.

On page 41, line 6, strike $1,000,000,000'' and insert ''$100,000,000''.

On page 41, line 13, strike $1,000,000,000'' and insert ''$100,000,000''.

On page 41, line 20, strike $1,000,000,000'' and insert ''$100,000,000''.

On page 64, line 14, strike ''Foreign Relations'' and insert ''Rules and Administration''.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I have nothing further to say.

Mr. EXON. It has been agreed to on both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further debate, the question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 1145) was agreed to.

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

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 1146

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Senate regarding the establishment of a nonpartisan advisory commission on budgeting and accounting)

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order to offer a Bingaman amendment on accounting. It has been agreed to on both sides. I send it to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will report the amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. DOMENICI], for Mr. BINGAMAN, proposes an amendment numbered 1146.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 86, strike line 11 through line 25 on page 87 and insert the following:

SEC. 305. SENSE OF THE CONGRESS ON A UNIFORM ACCOUNTING SYSTEM IN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AND NONPARTISAN COMMISSION ON ACCOUNTING AND BUDGETING.

(a) FINDING.—The Congress finds the following:

(1) Much effort has been devoted to strengthening Federal internal accounting controls in the past. Although progress has been made in recent years, there still exists no uniform Federal accounting system for Federal Government entities and institutions.

(2) As a result, Federal financial management continues to be seriously deficient, and Federal financial management and fiscal practices have failed to identify costs, failed to reflect the total liabilities of congressional actions, and failed to accurately report the financial condition of the Federal Government.

(3) Current Federal accounting practices do not adequately report financial problems of the Federal Government or the full cost of programs and activities. The continued use of these practices undermines the Government's ability to provide credible and reliable financial data, contributes to waste and inefficiency, and will not assist in achieving a balanced budget.

(4) Waste and inefficiency in Federal Government undermine the confidence of the American people in the Government and reduces the Federal Government's ability to address adequately vital public needs.

(5) To rebuild the accountability and credibility of the Federal Government and restore public confidence in the Federal Government, a uniform Federal accounting system, that fully meets the accounting standards and reporting objectives for the Federal Government, must be immediately established so that all assets and liabilities, revenues and expenditures or expenses, and the full cost of programs and activities of the Federal Government can be consistently and accurately recorded, monitored, and uniformly reported throughout all government entities for budgeting and control and management evaluation purposes.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Congress that the assumptions underlying the functional totals in this resolution include the following assumptions:

(1) UNIFORM FEDERAL ACCOUNTING SYSTEM.—(A) A uniform Federal accounting system should be established to consistently compile financial data across the Federal Government, and to make full disclosure of Federal financial data, including the full cost of Federal programs and activities, to the citizens, the Congress, the President, and agency management.

(B) Beginning with fiscal year 1997, the President should require the heads of agencies to—

(i) implement and maintain a uniform Federal accounting system; and

(ii) provide financial statements; in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles applied on a consistent basis and established in accordance with proposed Federal accounting standards and interpretations recommended by the Federal Accounting Standards Advisory Board and other applicable law.

(2) NONPARTISAN ADVISORY COMMISSION ON ACCOUNTING AND BUDGETING.—(A) A temporary advisory commission should be established to make objective and nonpartisan recommendations for the appropriate treatment of capital expenditures under a uniform Federal accounting system that is consistent with generally accepted accounting principles.

(B) The Commission should be appointed on a nonpartisan basis, and should be composed of public and private experts in the fields of finance, economics, accounting, and other related professions.

(C) The Commission should report to the President and the Congress by August 1, 1995, on its recommendations, and should include in its report a detailed plan for implementing such recommendations.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I would like to thank the very distinguished floor managers of the budget resolution, Senator DOMENICI and Senator EXON, for their willingness to work with me on this amendment, which would establish a temporary, nonpartisan advisory commission on accounting and budgeting. I appreciate their support for the amendment, and I am grateful to their staff, Austin Smythe and Jodi Grant, who have been extremely helpful and pleasant to work with.

The amendment I am proposing modifies section 305 of the resolution currently before the Senate. Section 305 recognizes that unlike most private business and state governments, no uniform Federal accounting system exists for Federal entities and institutions. This lack of uniformity contributes to the difficulty of accurately reporting the financial condition of the Federal Government and achieving a balanced Federal budget.

To help rebuild accountability and credibility in the Federal Government and advance the trend toward a ''private sector'' type financial management policy, section 305 calls for a uniform Federal accounting system that is consistent with generally accepted accounting principles and proposed Federal accounting standards recommended by the Federal Accounting Standards Advisory Board. Once in place, a uniform accounting system should enable us to better assess the full cost of Federal programs and activities. Actual costs will be consistently and accurately recorded, monitored, and uniformly reported by all government entities for budgeting and control and management evaluation.

Mr. President, I believe to achieve the commendable goals set forth in section 305, we first must address the issue of the treatment of capital expenditures for Federal accounting and budgeting purposes. Private businesses throughout the country and many States already have in place accounting systems and budgets that deal with capital expenditures in realistic terms. I believe we in the Federal Government can learn from their experiences.

I am proposing the establishment of a temporary advisory commission on accounting and budgeting that would study and make recommendations on the appropriate treatment of capital expenditures under a uniform Federal accounting system that is consistent with generally accepted accounting principles.

Commission members, to be appointed on a nonpartisan basis, would include public and private experts in the fields of finance, economics, accounting, and related professions.

By August 1, 1995, the Commission would report its recommendations to the President and the Congress. In the report, Commission members would set forth a detailed plan for implementation of their recommendations. It is my hope that if the Commission includes a recommendation on the use of a capital budget, its report will specify the components of such a budget in the context of a unified, balanced Federal budget. I understand many of my colleagues currently oppose the use of a Federal capital budget. I believe that as we take steps to streamline the Federal Government, improve efficiency, and operate Federal systems in a manner more consistent with the private sector, all options should be reexamined and given a fresh analysis. In my view, this is particularly relevant in the context of section 305 of the budget resolution, which as I stated earlier, calls for a uniform Federal accounting system consistent with generally accepted accounting principles.

Mr. President, the commission I am advocating can serve a very important service to the Nation. The Commission will examine, in an objective, nonpartisan forum, the treatment of capital expenditures and long-term investments in the context of a uniform Federal accounting system. By reporting on this work to the President and the Congress within the time frame specified in the amendment, which I calculate to be before final reconciliation of the fiscal year 1996 Federal budget, the Commission's recommendations could serve as the basis for resolution of some the serious and divisive problems we in the Congress have encountered, and will continue to encounter, as we work through the budget process. I look forward to the results of the Commission's work, and again, I thank the distinguished floor managers of the resolution for their assistance with this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 1146) was agreed to.

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

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I yield the remaining 3½ minutes of the time to the final Senator to debate the issue, as of now at least, my colleague from New Jersey.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the distinguished Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I thank the Chair, and I thank my colleague from Nebraska.

Mr. President, in the fairly short time that I have available—and I am pleased to have the precious time taken for these couple of moments—I would like to describe several amendments that I have prepared which will be voted on this afternoon.

First, Senator ROCKEFELLER and I will offer an amendment to close the so-called Benedict Arnold billionaires' tax loophole. We would transfer the savings to veterans programs. I call this the ''from expatriates to patriots'' amendment. Then I will be offering four amendments that would create exceptions to the so-called firewall that prohibits transfers between the military and domestic programs.

The amendment would allow the Senate, by a majority vote, as opposed to 60 votes, to transfer funds from the wasteful bureaucratic overhead and procurement in the military budget for specific and compelling reasons. The purposes would be up to $2 billion to address the problem of domestic violence; up to $1 billion to strengthen reinforcement of immigration laws; up to $5 billion to hire police officers for community policing and to do prison building; and up to $100 million for research on breast cancer.

My final amendment would create a 60-vote point of order against cutting Medicare or Medicaid to pay for any tax cuts for the rich.

Some of my Republican friends have claimed that that is not their intent, and I say, well, then let us put it in writing and make it enforceable. Certainly, the intent was challenged when we saw the chart go up at an earlier time in this debate when the Senator from Texas proposed tax cuts amounting to over $300 billion.

So, Mr. President, when I look and see those who have made their fortunes in this country and decide to renounce their citizenship so they do not have to pay a State tax, they do not have to pay capital gains taxes; they move out of here, give up their American citizenship, leave this place where their fortunes were made, where their families were raised just to avoid some taxes, to take something out of these huge fortunes that went abroad, I want to give it to the patriots, those who served their country, those who need help, those who are turning to the VA for hospital care, those who are turning to the VA for prostheses, those who are turning to the VA for counseling. I want to take it from the Benedict Arnolds and give it to those who served their country.

With that—I do not see the ranking Member—is there any time left on our side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New Jersey has expired.

The Senator from New Mexico has 7 minutes 52 seconds.

Mr. DOMENICI. The Democrats have how much?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time has expired on the Democratic side.

AMENDMENT NO. 1147

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Senate of the United States that the reforms and proposals contained within the Independent Budget for Veterans Affairs, Fiscal Year 1996, should be given careful consideration in an effort to ensure the Nation's commitment to its veterans)

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. DOMENICI], for Mr. DOLE and Mr. SIMPSON, proposes an amendment numbered 1147.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place insert the following new section:

SEC. . CONSIDERATION OF THE INDEPENDENT BUDGET FOR VETERANS AFFAIRS, FISCAL YEAR 1996.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds as follows:

(1) Whereas over 26,000,000 veterans are eligible for veterans health care;

(2) Whereas the Veterans Health Administration of the Department of Veterans Affairs operates the largest Federal medical care delivery system in the United States, providing for the medical care needs of our Nation's veterans;

(3) Whereas the veterans' service organizations have provided a plan, known as the Independent Budget for Veterans Affairs, to reform the Veterans' health care delivery system to adapt it to the modern health care environment and improve its ability to meet the health care needs of veterans in a cost-effective manner;

(4) Whereas current budget proposals assume a change in the definition of service-connected veterans;

(5) Whereas proposals contained within the Independent Budget may provide improved service to veterans;

(6) Whereas current budget proposals may not have fully considered the measures proposed by the veterans' service organizations in the Independent Budget

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the Sense of Congress: the reforms and proposals contained within the Independent Budget for Veterans Affairs, Fiscal Year 1996 should be given careful consideration in an effort to ensure the nation's commitment to its veterans.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I rise this afternoon to offer a Sense-of-the-Senate amendment regarding the Nations 26 million veterans.

Over the past few days, some have argued that the budget resolution before us is mean-spirited in its treatment of veterans—that it does not take into consideration the real needs of those who served and sacrificed on behalf of our country. Well, I would like to set the record straight on this matter.

Before the White House or those on the other side of the aisle start attacking Republicans on this issue, they had better take a hard look at the Congressional Budget Office's reestimate of the President's fiscal year 1996 budget request. Over 5 years, the President's own budget gives the Department of Veterans Affairs $339 million less for discretionary medical spending than it would receive under a hard freeze.

However, a coalition of veterans' groups has put together a plan called the Independent Budget for Veterans Affairs: Fiscal Year 1996. The coalition claims that the recommendations set forth in the this document will help to improve the Department of Veterans Affairs' health care system while saving taxpayer dollars. The coalition—Which includes AMVETS, Disabled American Veterans, Paralyzed Veterans of America, and Veterans of Foreign Wars—submitted its plan to Congress and to the Clinton administration earlier this year.

The amendment I offer today simply states that Congress should give this proposal careful consideration. It is a nonpartisan document, crafted by the people who know the system best—the veterans themselves. Let us consider their expertise and rise above partisan accusations as we work to improve the efficiency and quality of service to veterans.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, this amendment has been cleared on both sides.

I yield back any time I may have on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 1147) was agreed to.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, let me state the way I understand things. When the 3½ minutes that I have are used up, all time will have expired on the bill.

I will pose a parliamentary inquiry. When that event occurs and there is no more time, what would the pending business be?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business is the Boxer amendment No. 1134.

Mr. DOMENICI. I say to the distinguished majority leader, the Boxer amendment has been debated. Many other amendments will be offered that have not been debated. I think I am going to yield back my 2½ minutes. I do not know that anybody wishes to speak, unless the majority leader does.

Mr. EXON. May I inquire at this particular time, if we have a little time left. We have been having various discussions. Has there been an agreement reached on how we are likely to handle a whole series of amendments, especially those not debated, with regard to brief statements from the Senators—30 seconds or a minute? Has there been a determination on that, I ask my colleague?

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, we have discussed it briefly with the Senator

from New Mexico. I hope there will not be many amendments. We have had 50 hours of debate and a lot of votes. There may be one or two on this side. Is there a specific number on that side?

Mr. EXON. Yes. I will tell you now that we have 31 sure amendments. And, as the Senator knows, other Senators may reserve their rights by appearing and offering their amendments. But there will be 31 amendments filed to be voted on from this side of the aisle.

Mr. DOLE. So we are talking about 5, 6, 7 hours of votes, right, which we will do today. We will save final passage until tomorrow sometime.

Mr. EXON. Of course, that is up to the leader. I certainly say that I have suggested to Senator DASCHLE and to the chairman of the Budget Committee—and maybe it has not reached you—that possibly we can cut down some of those at some time. I hope we can work out something to cut down the time that has to be taken for all those votes.

Mr. DOLE. I am going to ask unanimous consent that after the first vote, all votes be 10 minutes in length.

Mr. BYRD. Will the majority leader yield?

Mr. DOLE. Yes.

Mr. BYRD. Would it be possible to get consent that each vote go for 7½ minutes? I believe that can be done. I have seen it done in here. And possibly we can have a minute or half a minute on a side, so as to have some explanation. By cutting it back to 7½ minutes for the vote, perhaps that will accommodate both sides' concerns.

Mr. EXON. I had made a suggestion along those lines that I think Senator BYRD outlined, and maybe even to speed things up, we can cut the votes to 5 minutes.

Mr. DOLE. They are concerned about doing it in 7½ minutes, unless we remain in our seats. But I think the bottom line is that we are actually going to have to vote on 31 amendments on the other side. If that is the bottom line, and people—ordinarily, you would have a right to have your amendment read. If it is a delaying tactic, we can be here a couple more days. The last time around, I recall that Senator Mitchell advised the Chair that if we insisted on having the amendment read, the ruling of the Chair would be appealed.

So we then decided that when the clerk called up the amendment, they would state the purpose, period, and that is it—you know, economic growth, tax relief, or whatever. That was all the explanation there was. If we start giving everybody 30 seconds, or 1, 2, 3 minutes, we are looking at another 2 or 3 hours, and we will never finish action on this budget resolution. We will be in recess this afternoon for at least 40 minutes, from 4:20 until 5 p.m. I will suggest the absence of a quorum briefly——

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, before that, I will make one statement that I think may be helpful. Certainly, we would enter into a unanimous-consent agreement on this side that the reading of the amendments would not be in order. We are not going to be dilatory about this. We think that for everybody that wants a vote on their amendment—and it has been customary to have that in this body—there would be no reason to do that.

Mr. DOLE. I ask unanimous consent that there not be a requirement that amendments be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOLE. So the clerk can state the purpose if we have the purpose.

Mr. BYRD. If the leader will yield, I am not sure the clerk can state the purpose in a way that we can understand what we are voting on.

Mr. DOLE. The last time we did this, I think we had an agreement that the staff would put ''purpose'' and they would read the purpose, such as tax relief, economic growth, or whatever. At least you had some idea what you were voting on. And it would be agreed upon by the two managers.

Mr. DOMENICI. With your permission, I will talk to the senior Senator from West Virginia. I was accommodating today in what we did for your side, I think 10, 12, maybe even 14 of your amendments. Does anybody have a number of how many were already discussed? Senators took the floor and somewhere between 10 and 12 of those have had anywhere from 2 minutes to 6 minutes which might not have occurred otherwise. So I think we have given a pretty good opportunity——

Mr. EXON. I appreciate the accommodation, and I think there has been accommodation on both sides.

Mr. DOLE. I ask unanimous consent that after the first vote, all other votes be limited to 8 minutes in length.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. EXON. Reserving the right to object. The minority leader is here. Are you also going to agree that with an 8-minute vote, there will be an explanation of some type before each vote, or not?

Mr. DOLE. The clerk can state the purpose, to be agreed upon by the two managers.

Mr. EXON. I would like our leader to give you his feelings.

Mr. DOLE. We have had 50 hours. I do not think we need another 50.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I hope that we could have just a short description of what the amendment is prior to the time we are called upon to vote. In some cases, Senators in good faith have been waiting for an opportunity to offer their amendments and have been precluded from doing so.

If we can accommodate each author of an amendment with a very short two-sentence explanation, I think it would be in the interest of everybody so that we do not make mistakes on what these votes may be.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, where we are now is there will be 15 minutes on each vote, unless the Senate agrees later on, which I am sure when we get 15 or 20 of these votes in, we will agree.

There will be no reading of the amendment. We have no agreement on any comments on the amendment. So there will be no comments on the amendment. That is the way it is now.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, let me say that for the first vote we will add the customary 5 minutes, so there will be 15 plus 5; after that it will be 15 minutes, period. No additional 5 minutes. I do not need consent for that.

AMENDMENT NO. 1134

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question occurs on agreeing to the amendment No. 1134, offered by the Senator from California.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, the pending amendment is not germane to the provisions of the budget resolution pursuant to section 305(b)(2) of the Budget Act. I raise a point of order against the pending amendment.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, pursuant to section 904 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, I move to waive the act for the consideration of the pending amendment.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 46, nays 54, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 187 Leg.]

YEAS—46

Akaka	Feinstein	Mikulski
Baucus	Ford	Moseley-Braun
Biden	Glenn	Moynihan
Bingaman	Graham	Murray
Boxer	Harkin	Nunn
Bradley	Heflin	Pell
Breaux	Hollings	Pryor
Bryan	Inouye	Reid
Bumpers	Johnston	Robb
Byrd	Kennedy	Rockefeller
Conrad	Kerrey	Sarbanes
Daschle	Kerry	Simon
Dodd	Kohl	Snowe
Dorgan	Lautenberg	Wellstone
Exon	Leahy	
Feingold	Levin	

NAYS—54

Abraham	Frist	Mack
Ashcroft	Gorton	McCain
Bennett	Gramm	McConnell
Bond	Grams	Murkowski
Brown	Grassley	Nickles
Burns	Gregg	Packwood
Campbell	Hatch	Pressler
Chafee	Hatfield	Roth
Coats	Helms	Santorum
Cochran	Hutchison	Shelby
Cohen	Inhofe	Simpson
Coverdell	Jeffords	Smith
Craig	Kassebaum	Specter
D'Amato	Kempthorne	Stevens
DeWine	Kyl	Thomas
Dole	Lieberman	Thompson
Domenici	Lott	Thurmond
Faircloth	Lugar	Warner

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 46, and the nays are

54. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

The point of order is sustained, and the motion falls.

Mr. DOLE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I have had a discussion with the distinguished Democratic leader and the managers of the bill. I now ask unanimous consent that votes be limited from here on to 9 minutes, and that the manager have 1 minute to explain the purpose of any amendment that has not been debated.

Mr. DASCHLE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority leader.

Mr. DASCHLE. This is a very workable agreement, Mr. President. The only way it can work, however, is that we anticipate the order in which these amendments can be brought for a vote. We have that order.

So I encourage all the sponsors of these amendments to give the managers their descriptions so that these descriptions can be read and put in the order in which the amendments will be brought up.

But the managers will have 1 minute to describe the amendment, and that description can be anything the sponsors may suggest they want it to be. But I think it will work out well. And it will allow us to cut back substantially the degree of time.

I urge everyone's cooperation.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I want to make it clear we are talking only about those amendments that will not be debated. Those already debated we will not take another minute on. They have had plenty of time. This will apply to amendments that have not been debated because of the time constraints, and they will be explained briefly by the manager on either side.

Mr. DASCHLE. That is our understanding.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. HARKIN. Reserving the right to object, I understand that what is being propounded is that we have 9 minutes to vote, and we have 1 minute to explain it by the manager. If you are going to take 1 minute, why not let the proponent of the amendment take 1 minute? You are going to take a minute anyway.

Mr. DOLE. We are just trying to cut down the time. If we have to stop and recognize everybody up and down—it seems to me you can tell the manager what it says, and they can read it. We will have the vote. We are trying to accommodate Senators, particularly on that side, because you have all the amendments, I understand. If you will just give the manager a one-sentence or two-sentence statement, we are just trying to save time. We thought it might save time.

Mr. DASCHLE. There is another practical concern, if the Senator will yield; that is, that assumes that the sponsor of the amendment is going to be on the floor right at the time the amendment is to be called up. In many cases, we will not be able to guarantee that. So if we are assured that the manager has the description, we will know there will be an explanation.

I hope we can accommodate this process. I think all Senators will have the opportunity to have this amendment at least explained prior to the time we have our vote.

Mr. SARBANES. Reserving the right to object, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I would like to put a question to the two leaders. Some of the amendments have been debated. Will they be called up first, the ones on which there has been debate?

Mr. DOMENICI. The order is going to be worked out between Senators who have amendments and staff, Senator EXON's staff and Senator DOMENICI's. We are starting to put that in some kind of sequence right now.

Was that the question?

Mr. SARBANES. The question was there are some amendments that have been debated, and some amendments that have not been debated. The ones that have not been debated, I take it the managers will make a statement about them. I was wondering whether the ones that have been debated by the sponsors of them could be called up.

Mr. DOLE. No; we have already had debate.

Mr. SARBANES. Not for debate. We have had debate on some amendments. I have an amendment that we had a debate on. I was here to sort of send it to the desk and get a vote on it. We have had debate on that amendment which just recently occurred.

Mr. DOLE. What would be your request?

Mr. SARBANES. That that amendment be up near the top, the front of the list, since we have had the debate recently.

Mr. DOLE. I agree with that.

Mr. BAUCUS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Senator from Montana.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, might I renew the request of Senator HARKIN from Iowa? It seems to me that the managers know the amendments best. They can still be confined to the same length of time, the proponents of the amendment, the same time as the managers. It would be my suggestion that the amendment is called up, and if the author of the amendment is not here, he loses the right to offer the amendment.

I just think a better explanation would be given of what the amendments are if the proponents of the amendment describe them during the 1 minute, then the other side offers their description during that same period. And if the author of the amendment is not here when it is called up, I suggest he lose the opportunity to call up the amendment.

Mr. DOLE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. DOLE. I think it is fair to say we are trying to find some middle ground. We do not have to do anything. We do not have to let anybody explain them; just say nothing. We already have consent that the amendment cannot be read. So you will not have any debate. We are trying to accommodate everybody by going to the managers. If you have a 1-minute statement, let the manager read it. We are just trying to accommodate everybody at the same time to hopefully save some time.

If Senator EXON, for example, had a statement that Senator DOMENICI disagreed with, then we have to understand the other manager, or whoever, would have the same rights.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. EXON. I shall not object. It seems that we cannot agree on anything around here. Let me set the stage. We are making a change here under unanimous consent, or attempting to, to change the rules. Now, for good reason, we set a 50-hour limit for debate on the budget resolution and you cannot filibuster.

Now, we have been here through a very difficult process, as we always do go through. I would simply say that I happen to feel in this particular case the majority has come a long way to make some changes which benefit us. The fact is we have far more amendments that can be offered under the rules and it turns out there is not time to have debate.

Now, certainly I feel we should recognize that we have gone through a lot of effort, give and take, trying to work out something that is reasonable. It has been agreed to by the minority leader. It has been agreed to by the majority leader.

I would simply say that any Democratic Senator who has an amendment, if he wants to write out what he wants to say on his amendment, he can give it to me, and I can read it just as well as he or she can without going through the folderol that we are going to find ourselves in, as we always do, to start recognizing people back and forth—where are they? Are they not here?

It would seem to me that we have a reasonable process which people can pick to pieces but can we agree after a lot of effort to come to an understanding that I think should be acceptable to our side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the unanimous-consent request is agreed to. Who seeks recognition?

Mr. MCCONNELL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

AMENDMENT NO. 1148

(Purpose: Continue funding for economic development in Appalachian region)

Mr. MCCONNELL. I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment by number.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL], for himself, Mr. WARNER, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. HEFLIN, and Mr. COCHRAN, proposes an amendment numbered 1148:

On page 29, line 10, increase the amount by $100,000,000.

On page 29, line 18, increase the amount by $200,000,000.

On page 30, line 2, increase the amount by $200,000,000.

On page 30, line 3, increase the amount by $100,000,000.

On page 30, line 10, increase the amount by $200,000,000.

On page 30, line 11, increase the amount by $100,000,000.

On page 30, line 18, increase the amount by $100,000,000.

On page 30, line 19, increase the amount by $100,000,000.

On page 31, line 2, increase the amount by $100,000,000.

On page 31, line 3, increase the amount by $100,000,000.

On page 20, line 7, decrease the amount by $100,000,000.

On page 20, line 15, decrease the amount by $200,000,000.

On page 20, line 23, decrease the amount by $200,000,000.

On page 20, line 24, decrease the amount by $100,000,000.

On page 21, line 7, decrease the amount by $200,000,000.

On page 21, line 8, decrease the amount by $100,000,000.

On page 21, line 15, decrease the amount by $100,000,000.

On page 21, line 16, decrease the amount by $100,000,000.

On page 21, line 23, decrease the amount by $100,000,000.

On page 21, line 24, decrease the amount by $100,000,000.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I rise today to offer an amendment that will continue a program that is very important, not only to Kentucky, but also to a great number of other States.

Unlike a lot of other Government programs, this one is targeted to assist those who are in greatest need; and it has had a tremendous, positive impact over the years.

Unlike a lot of other Government programs, this one spends most of its funds making a difference in people's lives—rather than wasting taxpayer dollars on administrative expenses.

The program I am speaking of is the Appalachian Regional Commission, commonly known as ARC.

Before I discuss the substance of my amendment, I would like to commend the authors of this budget resolution, especially the chairman of the Budget Committee, Senator DOMENICI, for making literally thousands of tough but intelligent choices with regard to this Nation's spending priorities.

They have done a superb job, and they have done it with care and compassion and concern for those who will necessarily be impacted by this resolution.

But of course, on an issue as complex and multifaceted as the Federal budget, there are bound to be honest differences of opinion. And it is in that spirit that I am offering my amendment to save the Appalachian Regional Commission from the budget ax.

Let me also point out, however, that this amendment hardly preserves the status quo. I do not think anyone from this side of the aisle would contend that business as usual is going to achieve a balanced budget by the year 2002.

Every Federal program and agency is going to have to adapt, and cut costs, and become more efficient in response to the country's fiscal pressures. Every program and agency will need to do more with less, or face total extinction.

That is what my amendment envisions: An Appalachian Regional Commission of the future that continues to provide excellent services and programs in distressed areas, but with a more targeted approach and, frankly, with less funding.

I should add that the people in my State, and many who work for ARC, are more than willing to make the changes necessary to preserve the agency as a vital and active force in the region. But all of them also believe, as I do, that the mission of the ARC has not yet been completed; and we need to continue to support its positive efforts.

Although ARC has made a dramatic impact in improving the economic opportunities and quality of life for people living in Appalachia, there continues to be a real need for assistance in this region. Poverty, out-migration, and high levels of unemployment are especially prevalent in central Appalachia, which includes some of the poorest counties in the Nation.

In all, the ARC serves parts of 13 States, totaling 399 counties from New York to Mississippi. This is a region that lags behind the Nation in most, if not all, major economic measures. It experiences chronically higher unemployment levels, substantially lower income levels, and perniciously high poverty rates. In eastern Kentucky, for example, the poverty rate stood at 29 percent in 1990—16 percent higher than the national average.

Of the 399 counties served by ARC, 115 of these counties are considered severely distressed.

This means that these counties suffer from unemployment levels and poverty rates that are 150 percent of the national average and receive per capita incomes that are only two-thirds of the national average.

The ARC was designed to address the unique problems of this region which has been afflicted by over a century of exploitation, neglect, geographic barriers, and economic distress. These are not problems born of cyclical economic fluctuations but are the result of years of unremitting underdevelopment, isolation, and out-migration.

That is the bad news. The good news is that ARC has worked hand in hand with each of the 13 States in its jurisdiction to develop flexible and effective programs, tailored to the specific needs of each community or region.

And there is more good news. ARC is unusually lean, as Federal agencies go, with respect to administrative and personnel expenses. Total overhead accounts for less than 4 percent of all expenditures. That is largely achieved through cooperation with the States.

State Governors contribute 50 percent of the administrative costs as well as the full cost of their own regional ARC offices.

In fact, Mr. President, I would urge my colleagues to look to the ARC as a model of efficiency, cost sharing, and State cooperation for other Federal programs.

Some people have said that ARC represents a special windfall for a single area of the country. That is simply not true. The stark reality is that Appalachia receives 14 percent less per capital spending from the Federal Government than the rest of the country, and that includes the amount it receives through ARC. If anything, Appalachia is an underserved area.

The ARC's mission has been to provide the assistance needed to make Appalachian areas economically self-sustaining, rather than to simply hand out government largess.

This is an important distinction.

The ARC is not a traditional poverty program but an economic development program, with a lot of work still ahead of it. If we were to ax the ARC outright, the fact is that much of the investment we have made up to now would have been for naught.

It would be like laying the foundation of a building, putting in the beams and supports, and then deciding to stop before putting on the roof and the walls. Unless the work is seen to completion, much of what has been done to this point will have been in vain.

At the same time, because of the tremendous fiscal pressures we are facing, my amendment would not restore funding for ARC to its current level. Instead, it puts the ARC on a glidepath of reduced spending through the year 2002. The partially restored funding is entirely offset and will fully comply with guidelines established by the Budget Committee to reach a balanced budget by the year 2002.

The way we achieve these goals is quite simple. First, we start with a 35-percent reduction from the current funding level for ARC. There is no question that this is a considerable cut, and it will have an impact on the ARC's ability to fully serve its target areas. But I think it underscores how serious we are about preserving this agency.

From the 35-percent-reduction level in 1996, my amendment will continue

to lower funding levels each year through 2002. Overall, if we use as a baseline a hard freeze at 1995 funding levels for ARC, my amendment would achieve a 47-percent reduction in spending. This amounts to $925 million in savings over 7 years.

Mr. President, I would ask that a table reflecting the savings proposed by my amendment appear in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, nobody can charge that this amendment is an attempt to preserve the status quo. Instead, it is an effort to preserve an essential Federal program by making some very tough but necessary choices.

In order to provide the necessary budget offset, I have proposed a reasonable reduction in the regulation and technology account of the Office of Surface Mining. The regulatory arm of OSM has served its statutory purposes well over the years, but the fact is that much of its current activities are now being handled effectively at the State level.

In fact, primary responsibility for regulation in this area has been passed on to 23 of the 26 coal-producing States.

Further, the size of the industry being regulated by OSM has shrunk dramatically over the last decade and a half. While the number of active coal mines has dropped from over 6,000 in 1979 to barely 3,000 in 1993, OSM staff has increased by more than 50 percent. Even since 1983, when the last of the 23 States assumed primary regulatory authority, OSM staff grew by a quarter.

About half of the OSM budget for regulation and technology funds activities that duplicate existing state resources.

So what you have here is a smaller industry—smaller by half—being regulated by 50 percent more bureaucrats. That is the kind of anomaly that our constituents want us to change.

Voters believe that 52 cents on every tax dollar is waste by the Federal Government. If there is any program that suggests this might be true, it is the regulation account at OSM which serves a smaller and smaller industry, and whose activities are being duplicated by more and more States.

Further, I am told that OSM has actually become a burden on State regulatory agencies, making excessive requests for data collection and studies that divert valuable resources from their own regulatory activities.

The proposed reduction in OSM's title V program should come out of the agency's inspection and regulatory activities which duplicate State programs. Adequate funding for State regulatory grants should be maintained, and my amendment is in no way intended to affect such grants.

Mr. President, in these tight budgetary times, a 28-percent reduction in the OSM regulatory budget is entirely reasonable. This cut will actually force OSM to streamline operations and eliminate many duplicative services that are a burden to State regulatory agencies.

I would suggest that the remaining cuts be from other Federal programs that duplicate State regulatory or oversight functions within function 300. If we intend to streamline the Federal Government, we can start with Federal activities that overlap with State agencies and programs. Overall, my amendment would cut three-fourths of 1 percent from this function. This small cut will provide substantial benefit to severely distressed regions of Appalachia.

In drafting this amendment, I have consulted with officials at ARC to help redesign the focus and size of the agency. It is my view that ARC should eliminate those functions that are beyond the central mission of economic development.

We also need to critically assess which areas that are currently under the jurisdiction of ARC no longer need its support, due to the success of ARC's programs.

There are a number of counties that have achieved the goal of economic self-sufficiency and therefore have outgrown the need for ARC funding.

My amendment would enable the ARC to focus its resources on those counties that struggle with the most severe economic hardships.

Let me conclude. If my colleagues believe that eliminating ARC will save money, they are sadly mistaken. The poverty and economic distress of central Appalachia will only deepen, imposing higher costs on other Federal programs. On the other hand, if we keep ARC alive, and help this region to help itself, we will be saving a lot more money in the long run.

Of course, all programs must make every effort to revaluate their mission and eliminate those functions that are no longer needed. I have proposed eliminating certain authorities of the ARC that are no longer needed, and reforming the eligibility criteria to take certain economically stabilized counties off the rolls. These reforms are assumed in the lower spending levels contained in my amendment.

In sum, this is a creative and commonsense way to save one of the few Federal programs that has actually worked: the ARC. Just as important, my proposal is consistent with the goal of balancing the budget which all of us want to achieve. I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

McCONNELL AMENDMENT—HARDLY KEEPING THE STATUS QUO

[In billions of dollars]

	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	Total
McConnell Amendment:[1]								
Annual budget authority	.183	.177	.173	.166	.150	.100	.100	1.049
Freeze at 1995 levels:								
Annual budget authority	.282	.282	.282	.282	.282	.282	.282	1.974
Current funding adjusted for inflation:								
Annual budget authority	.291	.301	.312	.323	.334	.....	.....	1.561

[1] The McConnell amendment saves more than $900 million over a 7 year freeze at 1995 ARC funding levels. The McConnell amendment saves more than $500 million over 5 year—inflation adjusted—ARC funding levels.

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I would like to clarify the RECORD. I believe the distinguished junior Senator from Kentucky may have misspoke earlier with regard to the need for this amendment to address payments made by the Federal Election Commission [FEC] from the Presidential Election Campaign Fund for settlement of alleged sexual harassment claims.

The entire $37,500 payment referred to by the Senator was disallowed by the FEC as a qualified campaign expense and the FEC required repayment of all Federal matching funds used to pay this expense. As my colleague knows, the courts have held that the FEC may only require repayment of disallowed campaign expenses to the extent Federal funds were used.

In this instance, the FEC determined that of the $37,500 in disallowed campaign expenses, $9,675 were paid with Federal matching funds. Consequently, the campaign repaid the Presidential Election Campaign Fund that amount.

Therefore, no taxpayer funds were used to pay this settlement.

But I agree that taxpayer funds should not be used for this purpose and I support the amendment.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I rise today in support of the McConnell amendment to ensure that the essential services provided by the Appalachian Regional Commission are continued for some of this Nation's most destitute areas.

At a time when we are correctly terminating or scaling back outdated Federal programs, I believe the Appalachian Regional Commission is the type of Federal initiative we should be encouraging. It is important to recognize that the ARC uses its limited Federal dollars to leverage additional State and local funds. This successful partnership enables communities in Virginia to have tailored programs which help them respond to a variety of grassroots needs.

In the Commonwealth of Virginia, 21 counties rely heavily on the assistance they receive from the Appalachian Regional Commission. Income levels for this region of Virginia further indicate that, on average, my constituents who reside in this region have incomes which are $6,000 below the average per capita income for the rest of the Nation.

In 1960, when the ARC was created, the poverty rate in Virginia's Appalachian region was 24.4. In 1990, the poverty rate statistics of 17.6 show improvement which can be attributed to the effectiveness of the ARC. However, we are still a long way from achieving the U.S. average poverty level of 13.1 and also the regional poverty level of other ARC-member States of 15.2.

With these statistics in mind, I would like to offer some specific points one should keep in mind regarding the effectiveness of ARC programs, its relationship with the Commonwealth of Virginia, and the direct impact that this relationship has on the private sector.

In recent years, a significant portion of ARC funds have been dedicated to local economic development efforts. Were it not for this assistance, the LENOWISCO Planning District and Wise County would not have been able to complete construction of the water and sewage lines to provide utility services to the Wise County Industrial Park at Blackwood. These lines were financed by a $500,000 grant from the ARC and a $600,000 grant from the U.S. Economic Development Administration. The construction of these utilities to serve a new industrial park has attracted a major wood products manufacturing facility which has created 175 new jobs for the community.

The Fifth Planning District serving the Alleghany Highlands of Virginia is a prominent example of leveraging other State and local funds and stimulating economic development with partial funding from the ARC. For fiscal year 1995, with $350,000 from the ARC, the Alleghany Regional Commerce Center in Clifton Forge, VA was established. This new industrial center already has a commitment from two industries, providing new employment opportunities for over 220 persons.

The ARC funds for this project have generated an additional $500,000 in State funds, $450,000 from the Virginia Department of Transportation, $145,000 from Alleghany County, and $168,173 from the Alleghany Highlands Economic Development Authority. As a result of a limited Federal commitment, there is almost a 4 to 1 ratio of non-Federal dollars compared to Federal funds.

In many cases, these funds have been the sole source of funding for local planning efforts for appropriate community development. For example, such funds have been used to prepare and update comprehensive plans which are required by Virginia State law to be updated every 5 years in revise zoning, subdivision, and other land use ordinances. In addition, funds are used to prepare labor force studies or marketing plans in guiding industrial development sites.

Mr. President, the mission of the Appalachian Regional Commission is as relevant today as it was when the program was created. This rural region of the Nation remains beset with many geographic obstacles that have kept it isolated from industrial expansion. It is a region that has been attempting to diversify its economy from its dependency on one industry—coal mining—to other stable employment opportunities. It is a program that provides essential services and stimulates the contributions of state and local funds.

I thank Senator MCCONNELL for his leadership on this issue and I urge the amendment's adoption.

AMENDMENT NO. 1148

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, I rise in strong support of this amendment to preserve funding for the Appalachian Regional Commission, and I thank the Senator from Kentucky for offering it. Without his amendment, the budget proposal before us includes a plan to wipe out a very small and valuable agency over the next 5 years. This amendment is the Senate's chance to reject the idea of eliminating the tools dedicated to the economic development and future of 13 Appalachian States, including West Virginia.

Senators listening to this debate may think this is an amendment that only deserves the votes of those of us representing those States. I hope our case will be heard so that won't be the conclusion of our colleagues. The people of every State have a stake in the economic strength of the rest of the country. When floods ravage the Mid-West or the Gulf States; when a major defense installation or space center is located in a State like Texas or Alabama; when payments are made to farmers for crop losses; when billions are spent to shore up S&L institutions in certain States; when special aid is given to cities or to California after its riots or earthquakes; when research labs get special funds in New Mexico or Massachusetts—when any of this support and assistance is extended, it is the country's way of investing in each region and in the futures of Americans everywhere.

The Appalachian Regional Commission is the Nation's effort to help a part of this country overcome tremendous barriers. In many parts of the region, major progress has been achieved. But the ARC's job is not finished, and the agency should not be abolished until it is.

Like so much else in this budget debate, this amendment is about priorities. For me, this represents a choice between two programs that affect the people of West Virginia. It calls for a little less support for the Office of Surface Mining, in order to put more into the ARC.

The key message in this amendment is its call for continuing the ARC's partnership with West Virginia and the Appalachian region to finish the foundation we need for more growth, more jobs, and more hope for our people.

To that end, I accept the idea that the Office of Surface Mining should reduce its bureaucracy and excessive regulatory activity in order to finish ARC's work for families and businesses in Appalachia. This amendment will not add to the deficit or prevent us from reaching a balanced budget in 2002—it will simply redirect funding from certain activities at OSM so that the ARC can continue its mission for the people of Appalachia.

This amendment accepts a fair share of responsibility for deficit reduction. But instead of saying wipe out the ARC, it charts a course of gradual reductions, starting with a 35 percent cut in ARC funding for 1996, with continued reductions through 2002. Overall, it would be a 47 percent cut in ARC funding if the commission were frozen at its 1995 level. This is going to require changes and further streamlining at the ARC, which should be tough but doable. Under the McConnell amendment, ARC is still contributing its fair share to deficit reduction. Without it, one region of the country is asked to suffer more than is fair and to a point that will hurt the region.

As a former Governor, and now as a U.S. Senator from West Virginia, I know—vividly—the value of the ARC and how it improves the lives of many hard-working citizens. Whether the funding is used for new water and sewer systems, physician recruitment, adult literacy programs or the Appalachian corridor highways, it has made the difference in West Virginia, Kentucky, and the other Appalachian States.

The highways are the most visible and best known investments made by the ARC for the people of Appalachia. As of today, over two-thirds of the ARC highway system has been completed. But if the ARC is simply abolished, the job will not be completed. What a waste of money to pull out before a road system is finished.

At this very moment, some of these highways are called highways halfway to nowhere, because they are just that—half built, and only halfway to their destination. The job has to be completed, so these highways become highways the whole way to somewhere. And that somewhere is called jobs and prosperity that will benefit the rest of the country, too.

Appalachia simply wants to be connected to our national grid of highways. Parts of the region weren't lucky enough to come out as flat land, so the job takes longer and costs more. But it is essential in giving the people and families in this part of the United States of America a shot—a chance to be rewarded for a work ethic and commitment with real economic opportunity and a decent quality of life.

I won't speak for my colleagues from other Appalachian States, but West Virginia was not exactly the winner in the original Interstate Highway System. And Senators here represent many States that were. As a result, areas of my State have suffered, economically and in human terms. Without roads, people are shut off from jobs. That's obvious. But without roads, people also cannot get decent health care. Dropping out of school is easier sometimes than taking a 2-hour bus ride because the roads are not there.

The structure of the ARC makes it more efficient and effective than many other agencies. The ARC is a working, true partnership between Federal, State, and local governments.

This structure expects responsibility from citizens and local leaders, Federal funding is designed to leverage State and local money for any activity. Accordingly to the ARC, throughout its lifetime, it has contributed less than half of the total amount of project funds. Administrative costs have accounted for less than 4 percent of total costs over ARC's lifetime.

Long before it was fashionable, ARC used a from the bottom up approach to addressing local needs, rather than a top down, one-size-fits-all mandate of the type that has become all too familiar to citizens dealing with Federal agencies. It works, too.

I urge everyone in this body to keep a promise made to a region that has been short shrifted. Each region is unique. Solutions have to differ, depending on our circumstances. When it comes to Appalachia, a small agency called the Appalachian Regional Commission should finish its work. Abolishing it overnight will only create more problems and more costs that can be avoided. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the McConnell amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask for a rollcall vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 51, nays 49, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 188 Leg.]

YEAS—51

Abraham	Dole	Kerrey
Akaka	Exon	Leahy
Biden	Feinstein	Levin
Breaux	Ford	Lieberman
Bryan	Frist	Lott
Burns	Glenn	Lugar
Byrd	Harkin	McConnell
Coats	Hatch	Mikulski
Cochran	Heflin	Moseley-Braun
Coverdell	Helms	Nunn
Craig	Hollings	Pell
Daschle	Hutchison	Pryor
DeWine	Inouye	Reid
Dodd	Johnston	Robb
Rockefeller	Shelby	Stevens
Santorum	Snowe	Thurmond
Sarbanes	Specter	Warner

NAYS—49

Ashcroft	Feingold	Mack
Baucus	Gorton	McCain
Bennett	Graham	Moynihan
Bingaman	Gramm	Murkowski
Bond	Grams	Murray
Boxer	Grassley	Nickles
Bradley	Gregg	Packwood
Brown	Hatfield	Pressler
Bumpers	Inhofe	Roth
Campbell	Jeffords	Simon
Chafee	Kassebaum	Simpson
Cohen	Kempthorne	Smith
Conrad	Kennedy	Thomas
D'Amato	Kerry	Thompson
Domenici	Kohl	Wellstone
Dorgan	Kyl	
Faircloth	Lautenberg	

So the amendment (No. 1148) was agreed to.

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

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 1149

(Purpose: To restore the cuts to Federal Retirement Programs by providing that the Federal Retirement programs will continue to calculate retirement benefits from the average of an employee's high 3 years of service. The restoration of these cuts will be paid for by closing tax loopholes regarding billionaires who renounce their citizenship)

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. SARBANES], for himself, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. WARNER, Mr. ROBB and Mr. BINGAMAN, proposes an amendment numbered 1149.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 3, line 10, increase the amount by $47,000,000.

On page 3, line 11, increase the amount by $144,000,000.

On page 3, line 12, increase the amount by $197,000,000.

On page 3, line 13, increase the amount by $257,000,000.

On page 3, line 14, increase the amount by $322,000,000.

On page 3, line 15, increase the amount by $392,000,000.

On page 3, line 16, increase the amount by $412,000,000.

On page 3, line 20, increase the amount by $47,000,000.

On page 3, line 21, increase the amount by $144,000,000.

On page 3, line 22, increase the amount by $197,000,000.

On page 3, line 23, increase the amount by $257,000,000.

On page 3, line 24, increase the amount by $322,000,000.

On page 3, line 25, increase the amount by $392,000,000.

On page 4, line 1, increase the amount by $412,000,000.

On page 4, line 18, increase the amount by $47,000,000.

On page 4, line 19, increase the amount by $144,000,000.

On page 4, line 20, increase the amount by $197,000,000.

On page 4, line 21, increase the amount by $257,000,000.

On page 4, line 22, increase the amount by $322,000,000.

On page 4, line 23, increase the amount by $392,000,000.

On page 4, line 24, increase the amount by $412,000,000.

On page 5, line 4, increase the amount by $47,000,000.

On page 5, line 5, increase the amount by $144,000,000.

On page 5, line 6, increase the amount by $197,000,000.

On page 5, line 7, increase the amount by $257,000,000.

On page 5, line 8, increase the amount by $322,000,000.

On page 5, line 9, increase the amount by $392,000,000.

On page 5, line 10, increase the amount by $412,000,000.

On page 5, line 17, increase the amount by $47,000,000.

On page 5, line 18, increase the amount by $144,000,000.

On page 5, line 19, increase the amount by $197,000,000.

On page 5, line 20, increase the amount by $257,000,000.

On page 5, line 21, increase the amount by $322,000,000.

On page 5, line 22, increase the amount by $392,000,000.

On page 5, line 23, increase the amount by $412,000,000.

On page 6, line 16, increase the amount by $47,000,000.

On page 6, line 17, increase the amount by $144,000,000.

On page 6, line 18, increase the amount by $197,000,000.

On page 6, line 19, increase the amount by $257,000,000.

On page 6, line 20, increase the amount by $322,000,000.

On page 6, line 21, increase the amount by $392,000,000.

On page 6, line 22, increase the amount by $412,000,000.

On page 39, line 24, increase the amount by $47,000,000.

On page 39, line 25, increase the amount by $47,000,000.

On page 40, line 6, increase the amount by $144,000,000.

On page 40, line 7, increase the amount by $144,000,000.

On page 40, line 13, increase the amount by $197,000,000.

On page 40, line 14, increase the amount by $197,000,000.

On page 40, line 20, increase the amount by $257,000,000.

On page 40, line 21, increase the amount by $257,000,000.

On page 41, line 2, increase the amount by $322,000,000.

On page 41, line 3, increase the amount by $322,000,000.

On page 41, line 9, increase the amount by $392,000,000.

On page 41, line 10, increase the amount by $392,000,000.

On page 41, line 16, increase the amount by $412,000,000.

On page 41, line 17, increase the amount by $412,000,000.

On page 63, line 19, decrease the amount by $47,000,000.

On page 63, line 20, decrease the amount by $967,000,000.

On page 63, line 21, decrease the amount by $1,771,000,000.

At the appropriate place in the resolution insert the following:

SEC. . FEDERAL RETIREMENT.

It is the sense of the Senate that—

(a) the assumptions underlying the revenue and functional totals in this resolution assume that the Federal Retirement programs will continue to calculate retirement benefits from the average of an employee's high 3 years of service; and (b) the restoration of Federal Retirement benefits will be restored by closing the tax loophole which allows billionaires to escape taxes by renouncing their citizenship.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I would like to speak for a few minutes regarding the Sarbanes amendment, of which I am an original cosponsor. This amendment eliminates the provision in the budget resolution which changes the basis for calculating retirement benefits for Federal employees from the average of an employee's highest 3 years to the average of the highest 5 years.

The Government cannot change the rules in the middle of the game for these loyal public servants who are relying on and planning for retirement using longstanding practices. Government personnel, civilian or military, active or retirees, should not be singled out to bear the burden of balancing the budget.

While I am a strong advocate of balancing the budget, I do not believe that a disproportionate share of the budget cuts should fall on Federal employees. I strongly agree with the mandate which American people delivered in the 1994 elections. I am committed to working to cut spending and reduce big government, while striving to see that benefits to the truly needy are not unfairly affected.

We cannot and must not allow those who have given years of service to the Federal Government to be uncertain about their retirement decisions and their future financial well-being.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment No. 1149 offered by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SARBANES]. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 50, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 189 Leg.]

YEAS—50

Akaka	Byrd	Glenn
Baucus	Campbell	Graham
Biden	Conrad	Harkin
Bingaman	Daschle	Heflin
Boxer	Dodd	Hollings
Bradley	Dorgan	Inouye
Breaux	Feingold	Jeffords
Bryan	Feinstein	Johnston
Bumpers	Ford	Kennedy
Kerrey	Moseley-Braun	Robb
Kerry	Moynihan	Rockefeller
Kohl	Murray	Sarbanes
Lautenberg	Nunn	Shelby
Leahy	Pell	Simon
Levin	Pressler	Warner
Lieberman	Pryor	Wellstone
Mikulski	Reid	

NAYS—50

Abraham	Faircloth	Mack
Ashcroft	Frist	McCain
Bennett	Gorton	McConnell
Bond	Gramm	Murkowski
Brown	Grams	Nickles
Burns	Grassley	Packwood
Chafee	Gregg	Roth
Coats	Hatch	Santorum
Cochran	Hatfield	Simpson
Cohen	Helms	Smith
Coverdell	Hutchison	Snowe
Craig	Inhofe	Specter
D'Amato	Kassebaum	Stevens
DeWine	Kempthorne	Thomas
Dole	Kyl	Thompson
Domenici	Lott	Thurmond
Exon	Lugar	

So the amendment (No. 1149) was rejected.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 1150

(Purpose: Deficit neutral amendment that would prohibit including revenues in the budget resolution based on oil and gas leasing within the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge)

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. ROTH] proposes an amendment numbered 1150.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 3, line 10 increase the amount by $200,000,000.

On page 3, line 11 increase the amount by $200,000,000.

On page 3, line 12 increase the amount by $300,000,000.

On page 3, line 13 increase the amount by $300,000,000.

On page 3, line 14 increase the amount by $400,000,000.

On page 3, line 15 increase the amount by $400,000,000.

On page 3, line 16 increase the amount by $500,000,000.

On page 3, line 20 decrease the amount by $200,000,000.

On page 3, line 21 decrease the amount by $200,000,000.

On page 3, line 22 decrease the amount by $300,000,000.

On page 3, line 23 increase the amount by $300,000,000.

On page 3, line 24 increase the amount by $400,000,000.

On page 3, line 25 increase the amount by $400,000,000.

On page 4, line 1 increase the amount by $500,000,000.

On page 4, line 18 increase the amount by $200,000,000.

On page 4, line 19 increase the amount by $200,000,000.

On page 4, line 20 increase the amount by $300,000,000.

On page 4, line 21 increase the amount by $300,000,000.

On page 4, line 22 increase the amount by $400,000,000.

On page 4, line 23 increase the amount by $400,000,000.

On page 4, line 24 increase the amount by $500,000,000.

On page 5, line 4 decrease the amount by $200,000,000.

On page 5, line 5 decrease the amount by $200,000,000.

On page 5, line 6 decrease the amount by $300,000,000.

On page 5, line 7 increase the amount by $300,000,000.

On page 5, line 8 increase the amount by $400,000,000.

On page 5, line 9 increase the amount by $400,000,000.

On page 5, line 10 decrease the amount by $500,000,000.

On page 5, line 19 increase the amount by $1,400,000,000.

On page 5, line 22 increase the amount by $900,000,000.

On page 6, line 5 increase the amount by $1,400,000,000.

On page 6, line 8 increase the amount by $900,000,000.

On page 6, line 18 increase the amount by $1,400,000,0000.

On page 6, line 21 increase the amount by $900,000,000.

On page 7, line 5 increase the amount by $1,400,000,000.

On page 7, line 8 increase the amount by $900,000,000.

On page 7, line 15 decrease the amount by $200,000,000.

On page 7, line 16 decrease the amount by $200,000,000.

On page 7, line 17 increase the amount by $1,100,000,000.

On page 7, line 18 decrease the amount by $300,000,000.

On page 7, line 19 decrease the amount by $400,000,000.

On page 7, line 20 increase the amount by $500,000,000.

On page 7, line 21 decrease the amount by $500,000,000.

On page 8, line 1 decrease the amount by $200,000,000.

On page 8, line 2, decrease the amount by $200,000,000.

On page 8, line 3, increase the amount by $1,100,000,000.

On page 8, line 4, decrease the amount by $300,000,000.

On page 8, line 5, decrease the amount by $400,000,000.

On page 8, line 6, increase the amount by $500,000,000.

On page 8, line 7, decrease the amount by $500,000,000.

On page 20, line 15, increase the amount by $1,400,000,000.

On page 20, line 16, increase the amount by $1,400,000,000.

On page 21, line 15, increase the amount by $900,000,000.

On page 21, line 16, increase the amount by $900,000,000.

On page 62, line 14, decrease the amount by $1,400,000,000.

On page 62, line 15, decrease the amount by $2,300,000,000.

Mr. BAUCUS. I rise today in support of the amendment offered by my colleague, Senator ROTH, to protect the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge in Alaska from oil and gas development. The proposed budget resolution assumes that the Committee on Energy

and Natural Resources will reach its budget target by opening up this magnificent wildlife refuge to oil and gas development. By striking $2.3 billion over 7 years from that committee's required reduction in budget outlays, and adding that amount to the reduction required by the Finance Committee, Senator ROTH's amendment would protect the refuge, while preserving the budget resolution's bottom line.

To ensure that this amendment is deficit neutral and therefore does not impair our progress toward a balanced budget, a goal I strongly support, Senator ROTH has suggested that those funds instead be obtained by eliminating the ability of persons to avoid taxes by relinquishing their U.S. citizenship. As a result, this amendment would allow us to continue to protect a national treasure for future generations by closing a tax loophole for wealthy expatriates who choose to give up their American citizenship to avoid paying taxes.

A word about the refuge. It is a truly special place. Located in the northeast corner of Alaska, the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge has been referred to, for good reason, as ''America's Serengeti.'' The refuge supports a spectacular array of wildlife, including polar bears, grizzly bears, wolves, and snow geese. In addition, the porcupine caribou herd, numbering over 150,000 animals, bear their young on the coastal plain and provide an important source of food for the native people that live near the refuge.

Oil and gas development is now prohibited in the refuge, unless authorized by Congress. Senator ROTH's amendment is therefore consistent with current law. However, regardless of whether you believe, as I do, that the coastal plain should be permanently protected as a wilderness area or, as the Budget Committee proposes, that the law should be changed to authorize leasing for oil and gas, the budget process is not the time or the place to settle this important issue. It should be fully and objectively debated, taking into consideration not only the immediate economic return of leasing but the potential loss to future generations of developing this pristine wilderness.

The Roth amendment will remove the budget incentive to develop the refuge while maintaining the deficit reduction totals. I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I rise to speak in support of the amendment proposed by the distinguished Senator from Delaware. It is my belief that this amendment would accomplish two very important goals with one simple action, namely, closing an outrageous tax loophole for the super-rich, and preserving one of this continent's most fragile treasures, the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge.

Now as some of my colleagues are no doubt well aware, as long as I have been coming down to this floor to speak, I have been speaking in opposition—strong opposition—to opening up ANWR to oil and gas drilling. My position has not changed one bit, for those of my colleagues who have not heard me address this issue before, I want to take this opportunity to again state the reasons why I am so opposed to drilling.

Mr. President, opening up the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge is not an energy policy, it is a non-energy policy. Even if—and this is a big ''if''—even if the big oil companies were to tap the 3.2 billion barrels of oil the Department of Interior has estimated may lie under ANWR, the United States would be no more energy secure than it is now. The oil reserves under ANWR would compose only a fraction of this country's huge appetite for oil for a short period of time, and at a tremendous, perhaps catastrophic ecological cost. We will be no less dependent on foreign oil, and perhaps more so, now that the Senate has apparently expressed its willingness to see Alaskan oil exported overseas to the highest bidder. We will have gained nothing except the experience of witnessing, once again, the grand exercise of greed.

And at what cost, Mr. President? I will tell you what cost. We will have squandered one of the last remaining, irreplaceable treasures that belong not to us, not to the oil companies, not to this Government, but to our children, and their children and their children's children. The Arctic National Wildlife Refuge is the biological heart of the Arctic; and once it is gone, Mr. President, it is gone forever.

Let us not continue any further down this path of foolishness. I urge my colleagues to vote for their children's sake to accept the Roth amendment.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I rise today to strongly support the amendment by Senator ROTH to remove language in the budget resolution which might allow drilling in the coastal plain of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge.

A provision in the budget resolution assumes leasing revenues of $1.4 billion from leasing rights in the coastal plain. It is, in reality, nothing more than a yard sale to special interests of the resources in this critical Arctic wilderness. Additionally, the $1.4 billion revenue estimate is highly speculative, at best. All and all, the provision is misplaced and misguided.

The issue of whether to drill in the coastal plain in the Arctic Refuge deserves full, open and deliberative debate. This is an embarrassing backdoor attempt to allow development of our last remaining wilderness. We should not consider a decision of major importance to be made under the time restrictions required by the budget resolution—we should pursue this discussion through separate legislation. That's the responsible thing to do.

Including this discussion in the context of the budget resolution denigrates the natural values of the coastal plain which, unlike barrels of oil on the open market, cannot be quantified. The budget resolution concerns itself primarily with identifying revenues and directing spending. It is not the place to develop Federal policy on land use or natural resources. The ecological values of the coastal plain, many of which are intangible, will lose out when compared to the CBO scoring of potential revenues of barrels of oil.

Mr. President, I oppose the budget committee proposal because it continues, and even strengthens, the existing misplaced energy priorities that have yet to reduce our need for foreign oil. The language in the resolution emphasizes environmentally destructive energy development when what we need to do is develop cleaner, nonpetroleum-based fuels and seek important energy conservation opportunities.

If we allow drilling in the coastal plain, we are destroying what the Fish and Wildlife Service calls the biological heart of the only complete Arctic ecosystem protected in North America. We will be destroying that resource for a one in five chance of finding any economically recoverable oil in the coastal plain. And, even worse, we will destroy that biological heart in an effort to recover what many experts suggest will be only 200 days worth of oil for the Nation.

In addition, Mr. President, we cannot be sure that the revenues the committee assumes from the leasing are real. First, the leasing revenues are speculative in light of what has been bid on other highly prospective leases near the Arctic Refuge. The State of Alaska's most recent onshore lease sale located west of the Refuge brought in an average of $48.41 per acre, and leases immediately offshore the refuge in the Beaufort Sea only gained an average of $33–$153 per acre, versus the estimated $1,533 per acre the committee assumes would be paid if the entire coastal plain were leased.

Second, the Federal treasury may take in as little as ten percent of all leasing revenues, not a split of 50 percent as it appears that the Budget Committee currently assumes. The State of Alaska can be expected to sue to get 90 percent of the leasing revenues, as it does currently for other leases on Federal lands in Alaska.

Mr. President, after the *Exxon Valdez* spill, I visited the tragic spill site, the industrial complex at Prudhoe Bay, and the coastal plain of the Arctic Refuge. What I saw was the best of nature and the failings of humanity. I saw the best of nature in the Arctic Refuge, an area that the renowned biologist George Shaller calls ''unique and irreplaceable, not just on a national basis, but also on an international basis.'' He notes, ''most remote ecosystem, both inside and outside reserves, are rapidly being modified. The refuge has remained a rare exception. The refuge was established not for economic value, but as a statement of our nation's vision.''

Beauty, wilderness, pristine—these words simply fail to capture what I saw and what is at stake if we allow oil and gas drilling to proceed. The infrastructure alone will severely impact the ecosystem. The oil rigs, roads, pipelines, airstrips, production facilities, seismic testing and air and water pollution associated with the development will have dramatic negative impacts on the fragile coastal plain ecosystem.

We also threaten the food and culture of one of the most traditional subsistence peoples in the world, the Gwich'in indians who depend on the healthy and undisturbed porcupine caribou herd which gives birth and raises its young in the coastal plain.

Unfortunately, in seeing the spill in Prince William Sound, I saw how empty promises and humanity's carelessness despoiled a rich ecosystem. Dead wildlife, oil-coated beaches, fishing towns and villages of native Alaskans turned upside down with the destruction. Today, seabird, seal, sea otter, and herring populations still have not recovered, and the social disruption still is felt by the villagers. Most natural resources injured by the spill still show little or no sign of recovery, according to the Exxon Valdez Trustee Council.

If we drill in the refuge, we threaten the unique wilderness system. And if we destroy the wilderness values in the Arctic Refuge, we also threaten an undisturbed ecosystem with its polar bears, snow geese and international porcupine caribou.

The very nature of the budget process will denigrate the values of the coastal plain which the public and previous Congresses have sought to protect. The debate will not be about whether wildlife and wilderness are worth more than the chance of finding oil—the debate will hinge on what scores for budget deficit purposes. How do you score polar bears, musk oxen and caribou? How do you measure the loss of an intact, undisturbed ecosystem to science? How will the Budget Committee account for the wilderness values which will be gone forever?

For all these reasons, Mr. President, I strongly object to the provision assuming leasing revenues from the coastal plain in the budget resolution. I strongly urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the Roth amendment.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, this Congress should not have a yard sale to balance the budget.

A yard sale is an opportunity to clean house, to clear out things that have outgrown their usefulness, and to get rid of junk you don't need. The Alaska National Wildlife Refuge is not junk. It should not be drilled for oil to balance the budget.

The refuge is one of a kind—in fact, it's the last of its kind. The Alaska National Wildlife Refuge is the only place we have left that resembles the kind of land that gave birth to our Nation centuries ago.

I wonder how many people realize that outside this chamber, 500 years ago, the first Americans could hunt bison and elk in the open forests on the banks of the Potomac. I wonder how many people remember that outside this building passenger pigeons used to roost in American chestnut trees, sometimes in flocks of thousands.

Today the bison and elk are gone, the passenger pigeon is extinct, and the American chestnut has been wiped out in this region by an exotic disease. The first Americans wouldn't recognize this place.

Now we turn to a remote corner of our country, the last expanse of true wildness left, and Congress is saying ''we need that too—to balance the budget.'' On behalf of the children, I object.

Drilling for oil in the Alaska Wildlife Refuge has been a controversial issue for almost ten years. This is not a reason to sneak it into the budget resolution. This is an issue for the light of day, not for legislative tricks.

Drilling for oil in Alaska is not even going to be a major contribution to our deficit—the leasing revenues are only one-fifth of one percent of the budget gap.

Finally, Alaska, the State that gets more Federal dollars per person than any other State in the Union, will get at least 50 percent of the revenues, and the State wants to take 90 percent according to previous arrangements.

The Alaska National Wildlife Refuge is American treasure that does not belong to us—it is the heritage of our country. Just like the bald eagle, the grand canyon, and a good trout stream—ANWR exists for our enjoyment today and for the enjoyment of generations to come. It should not be laced with roads and drilled for oil.

I urge support of this bipartisan amendment.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I am in strong support of the Roth amendment.

We cannot sacrifice the incomparable wilderness of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge to support our bad spending habits. This refuge is one of the only remaining complete and undisturbed arctic ecosystems in the world. It is home to an abundance of wildlife, including grizzly and polar bears, muskoxen, wolves, and a host of migratory bird species. It is also home to the magnificent porcupine caribou herd, whose 160,000 members rely on this coastal plain for their calving grounds.

ANWR also provides essential habitat for people. The Gwich'in people have inhabited this arctic ecosystem for more than 20,000 years. They are dependent upon the caribou herd for their food source, clothing supply and culture.

Mr. President, this body could, today, begin a process that will signal the beginning of the end for many of the people and wildlife of ANWR. With this budget resolution, the doors will be opened wide for oil development in the Refuge. Oil development will likely disrupt the porcupine caribou and force them to change their calving grounds and migratory routes. This, in turn, will affect other wildlife and impact the lifestyle and culture of the Gwich'in people.

Proponents of development claim that only 13,000 acres of the Refuge will be impacted. While this may be true, that development will take place in the biological heart of ANWR and have a devastating impact on the wilderness values of the area. In this biological heart, developers will create a major industrial complex. They will build hundreds of miles of roads and pipelines, erect housing for thousands of workers, and construct two sea ports and one airport. These developments will lead to mining of enormous amounts of gravel, will require diversion of streams and will result in pollution of fragile tundra.

In addition to harming this precious piece of our heritage, I am skeptical about the revenue assumptions made in the budget resolution. The resolution assumes an intake of $1.4 billion from ANWR oil leases. This assumption is based on a split between the Federal Government and the State of Alaska of 60/40. While the Federal Government may push for this division, the state of Alaska has historically received 90 percent of the money from Arctic leases. It is likely that Alaska would file lawsuits to ensure that 10/90 split continues.

Leasing ANWR will not result in a balanced budget. Leasing ANWR will result in an imbalanced ecosystem in one of our greatest wilderness areas. I urge this body to protect the Refuge for future generations of Americans. Support the Roth amendment.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I rise in strong support of the Roth-Lautenberg amendment. This is a deficit neutral amendment that will correct a misguided policy assumption in the current budget resolution.

Mr. President, the 1996 budget resolution assumes 2.3 billion dollars in revenue over 7 years from leases to oil companies for oil exploration and development in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. It assumes the opening up of a unique wildlife refuge for the sake of oil development.

Mr. President, the 1980 passage of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act opened up 95 percent of Alaskan lands with high or favorable oil and gas potential to exploration and development.

That same act did NOT allow oil and gas exploration in an area of the coastal plain designated ''section 1002'' because of its uniqueness as a natural resource.

This ''Section 1002'' of the Arctic coastal plain is precisely the land area that the budget resolution assumes will be leased to oil companies for oil exploration activities.

Mr. President, in other words, the budget resolution assumes that exploration will occur in an area where in current law, it is explicitly illegal to do so.

What would the consequences be of opening up the Arctic plain to development?

I would like to quote to you from a passage written by Peter Matthiessen in his forward to the Natural Resources Defense Council report Tracking Arctic Oil:

> Today the oil companies have set their sights on the last undeveloped lands to the eastward, pressuring Congress for permission to exploit the 125 mile-long coastal plain of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, the very last protected stretch of our arctic coastline, where polar bears still hunt over the ice and come ashore, where a mighty herd of 180,000 caribou, with its attendant wolves, migrates each year from Canada to give birth to its young. . . . The danger posed by destructive and inefficient drilling in the Arctic with irremediable loss to wilderness and wildlife, is not an Alaskan problem. It is a national problem, a world problem.

Mr. President, the first step toward victory for those hungry oil companies occurred last week in the Senate, with the passage of a bill that would lift the ban on the export of Alaska North Slope Oil.

The lifting of the ban goes against all the principles on which Congress based its controversial and expensive decision to construct the Trans-Alaska Pipeline.

Today, we face step two: a budget resolution that assumes 2.3 billion dollars in revenue from oil exploration and development leases along the pristine coastal plane of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge.

Republicans in the budget committee say that they are ''only leasing 8 percent of the 19 million acres of the Arctic Wildlife Refuge'', and that ''The development of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge would only affect 13,000 acres''.

Those 13,000 acres are on the last pristine arctic coastal plain—and are part of the original wildlife range established by President Eisenhower in 1960. Those 13,000 acres are in an area that the House of Representatives has twice voted to designate as wilderness in order to give it permanent protection from any development.

The fact is, Mr. President, that what we are talking about here is turning the only remaining protected stretch of our arctic coastline into an immense industrial desert.

Mr. President, leadership is about finding long term solutions to problems—not temporary solutions.

The proposal to open the Alaska National Wildlife Refuge demonstrates lack of long term vision and a lack of leadership—I firmly believe this is not where the citizens of this Nation want to go.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now occurs on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, the Roth amendment would reduce the instructions to the Energy Committee by $2.3 billion over 7 years and offset that reduction by increasing revenues $2.3 billion over the same period of time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. DOMENICI. The Senator assumes this would be ANWR. I add that to my explanation.

Mr. President, I move to table the amendment and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to table.

The yeas and nays have been ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 56, nays 44, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 190 Leg.]

YEAS—56

Abraham	Ford	Lugar
Akaka	Frist	Mack
Ashcroft	Gorton	McCain
Bennett	Gramm	McConnell
Bond	Grams	Murkowski
Breaux	Grassley	Nickles
Brown	Gregg	Packwood
Burns	Hatch	Pressler
Campbell	Hatfield	Santorum
Coats	Heflin	Shelby
Cochran	Helms	Simpson
Conrad	Hollings	Smith
Coverdell	Hutchison	Specter
Craig	Inhofe	Stevens
D'Amato	Inouye	Thomas
DeWine	Johnston	Thompson
Dole	Kempthorne	Thurmond
Domenici	Kyl	Warner
Faircloth	Lott	

NAYS—44

Baucus	Feinstein	Moseley-Braun
Biden	Glenn	Moynihan
Bingaman	Graham	Murray
Boxer	Harkin	Nunn
Bradley	Jeffords	Pell
Bryan	Kassebaum	Pryor
Bumpers	Kennedy	Reid
Byrd	Kerrey	Robb
Chafee	Kerry	Rockefeller
Cohen	Kohl	Roth
Daschle	Lautenberg	Sarbanes
Dodd	Leahy	Simon
Dorgan	Levin	Snowe
Exon	Lieberman	Wellstone
Feingold	Mikulski	

So the motion to lay on the table the amendment (No. 1150) was agreed to.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

ARCTIC OIL RESERVE

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I am glad to see that amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware to strike a major source of new Federal revenues from the budget resolution was rejected by my colleagues. This source of new revenue is $2.3 billion from competitive bonus bids from leasing the oil and gas resources of an area in the northeast part of my State. This is an issue that is important to my State and to our Nation. This vote to keep those funds in the budget resolution is a clear indication that my colleagues would like to see the revenues from the leasing of this area considered in context of the budget deficit reduction effort.

Together with the other members of the Alaska delegation I opposed this amendment. The amendment was also opposed by the Inupiat Eskimo people who live on the North Slope; by the local government for this region, the North Slope Borough; by the Eskimo-owned Arctic Slope Regional Corp.; by the State of Alaska; by our Governor Tony Knowles, and by an overwhelming majority of Alaskans.

Mr. President, I want to review the history and the potentially huge benefits that opening the coastal plain to oil and gas leasing can provide to the Nation.

In the 1980 Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act Congress withdrew more than 19 million acres in northeast Alaska, 8 million acres were designated wilderness and another 11 million acres nonwilderness refuge lands. However, under section 1002 of that act Congress set aside about 1.5 million acres to study for oil potential. The purpose of the study was to evaluate the oil and gas values and the fish and wildlife values of this area.

In April 1987 the Department of the Interior released the legislative environmental impact statement and coastal plain report to the Congress.

This led to the recommendation of the Secretary of the Interior to open the 1002 area to oil and gas leasing. Let me quote from the report:

> The 1002 area is the Nation's best single opportunity to increase significantly domestic oil production. It is rated by geologists as the most outstanding petroleum exploration target in the onshore United States. Data from nearby wells in the Prudhoe Bay area and in the Canadian Beaufort Sea and Mackenzie Delta, combined with promising seismic data gathered on the 1002 area, indicate extensions of producing trends and other geologic conditions exceptionally favorable for discovery of one or more supergiant fields (larger than 500 million barrels).
>
> There is a 19-percent chance that economically recoverable oil occurs in the 1002 area. The average of all estimates of conditional economically recoverable oil resources (the ''mean'') is 3.2 billion barrels. Based on this estimate, 1002 area production by the year 2005 could provide 4 percent of total U.S. demand; provide 8 percent of U.S. production (about 660,000 barrels/day); and reduce imports by nearly 9 percent. This production could provide net national economic benefits of $79.4 billion, including Federal revenues of $38.0 billion.

The report continues:

> Discovery of 9.2 billion barrels of oil could yield production of more than 1.5 million barrels per day. Estimates of net national economic benefits based on 9.2 billion barrels of oil production, and other economic assumptions, are as high as $325 billion.

On April 8, 1991, the Department of the Interior issued a formal update of the recoverable petroleum reserves 1987 study and report. The major finding from the update was that the probability of economic success of finding commercial oil in the 1002 area was increased from 19 percent to 46 percent.

Let me place this in context. The probability of finding oil in the lower 48 States in an unexplored area is about 1 percent. As a result, 46 percent is unprecedented.

Mr. President, let me quote from the 1991 update:

The 1991 update of recoverable petroleum resources in the 1987 Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, Alaska Coastal Plain Assessment, also known as the 1002 Report, makes a considerable contribution to the knowledge and understanding of the petroleum geology of the 1002 area of the Arctic National Wildlife Rufuge (ANWR). This study reaffirms most of the conclusions and estimates made in the 1002 Report, and increases the level of confidence that ANWR is part of the North Slope oil province. This is demonstrated by the increase in the marginal probability of economic success from 19 percent in the original assessment to 46 percent in the current assessment. The increase in marginal probability means that ANWR has a higher potential for oil discovery. The overall Minimum Economic Field Size (MEFS) for the 1002 area has been lowered from about 0.44 billion barrels of oil (BBO) to about 0.40 BBO. The mean resource estimate has increased from 3.23 to 3.57 BBO.''

Mr. President, since this 1991 update, a number of new wells have been drilled near the 1002 area. A large number discovered oil and gas. Some of these wells may be commercial oilfields. These discoveries reflect very favorably on the prospect that the coastal plain contains major reserves of oil and gas.

As the reports quoted above make clear, the economic benefits of the coastal plains oil and gas reserves far exceed the $2.3 billion assumed in the pending budget resolution. The 1987 report notes that a discovery of 3.2 billion barrels of oil would produce net national economic benefits of $79.4 billion, including new Federal revenues of $38 billion. A discovery of 9.2 billion barrels would yield net national economic benefits of $325 billion and new Federal revenues of around $150 billion over the life of the oil fields.

The Department of Energy and Wharton Econometrics have done independent studies which project that leasing the coastal plain could create 250,000 to 732,000 new direct and indirect jobs in all 50 of our States.

Mr. President, in addition to providing a major stimulus to the economy and creating new jobs, opening the 1002 area will allow my State to continue to produce 25 percent or more of the Nation's domestic oil for an additional 30 or 40 more years. This is very important because Prudhoe Bay is now in decline. Since 1990, oil production has fallen from 2 million barrels a day to 1.6 million barrels a day. Every barrel of oil produced in Alaska is a barrel the United States does not have to buy abroad.

Senator Henry M. ''Scoop'' Jackson authored the Alaska Statehood Act and the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act of 1971. Senator Jackson was a tough, no nonsense moderate Democrat. He was fair. He was accessible. He was informed. And he was balanced. Senator Jackson heard from all of the special interest groups, but he made his own decisions, based upon all of the facts and the interest of people and of the Nation.

Jackson, along with the senior Senator from Alaska, authored the legislation to open Prudhoe Bay to oil production by authorizing the Trans Alaska Pipeline Act in 1973. In the face of major opposition from the national environmental organizations, this legislation was adopted. As a result, the Nation has enjoyed two decades of major economic benefits.

Scoop also worked out the compromise that was reached which led to the study and report authorized in section 1002. The reason the 1.5 million acres was set aside was to consider the great oil potential in the area. Scoop included the provision of the national security concerns associated with our country being reliant on foreign oil. We are more reliant on foreign oil than ever before. We imported more than 50 percent of our oil consumption for the first time in 1994.

Mr. President, the opposition to opening the coastal plain to oil and gas leasing comes from the leaders of some of the Nation's large environmental organizations. My view is that the leaders of these organizations are misguided and poorly informed. I suspect that their opposition has more to do with ''fundraising'' objectives than it does with ''wilderness'' values.

The leaders of the environmental community have invested a great deal of time, effort, and money in the Gwich'in Indian steering committee. The steering committee is composed of some of the 400 Athabascan Indians who live in two villages on the Venetie Indian Reservation. The steering committee opposes opening the coastal plain. They are concerned that leasing and development might, in some unknown way, adversely impact the porcupine caribou herd. This herd of 160,000 animals annually migrates between Canada and the United States. In some years, the herd uses the southern portion of the coastal plain for forage and calving. Last year, North Slope Eskimos and Athabascan Indians took about 380 caribou from this herd of 160,000 animals for subsistence uses.

I respect the right of the Gwich'in steering committee to oppose resource development in the coastal plain. It is a decision, however, which is contrary to experience at Prudhoe Bay and elsewhere in the Arctic. Caribou are very adaptable. At Prudhoe Bay, the central Arctic caribou herd is flourishing with oil development. Since oil was discovered in Prudhoe Bay the central Arctic caribou herd has increased from 3,000 to 23,000 animals.

Further, the Gwich'in steering committees opposition to oil and gas leasing is a new development. In 1980 the Gwich'in people of Arctic village and Venetie villages leased all of the lands in their 1.7 million acre reservation to the Rouget Oil Co. of Tulsa, OK. This 20-page oil and gas lease did not contain any meaningful provisions to protect the porcupine caribou herd. This herd migrates annually through or near the Venetie Reservation. Yet, the Gwich'in leased all of their lands for $1.8 million on the basis that oil exploration and oil development would not adversely impact the herds well-being. I believe this leasing decision by the Gwich'in was correct. It is supported by studies of caribou and oil industry experience elsewhere, including Alaska's North Slope.

In 1984, the Gwich'in people hired a consultant to lease their reservation lands a second time after the Rouget Oil Co. oil and gas lease expired. And again, no concerns were expressed by the Gwich'in about any adverse impact on caribou.

The North Slope Inupiat Eskimo people are now asking for the same opportunity the Gwich'in had in the 1980's. They regret and I regret that the oil company that Gwich'in leased their lands to did not discover major reserves of oil and gas on their lands. The North Slope Eskimo people want the same right to do as the Gwich'in did in 1980. They want the right to explore the 92,000 acres of land they own at Kaktovik along with the surrounding Federal lands. And if these lands contain oil and gas in commercial amounts, they want the right to develop their land.

Mr. President, I am glad to see that the amendment from my colleagues from Delaware was defeated. We now can proceed with consideration of responsible oil and gas exploration and development of the best prospect for a major oil find in North America.

AMENDMENT NO. 1151

(Purpose: To restore funding for agriculture and nutrition programs)

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. EXON], for himself, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. CONRAD, and Mr. WELLSTONE, proposes an amendment numbered 1151.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 74, strike lines 12 through 24 and insert the following: ''budget, the revenue and spending aggregates may be revised and other appropriate budgetary aggregates and levels may be revised to reflect the additional deficit reduction achieved as calculated under subsection (c) for legislation that reduces revenues, and for legislation that will provide $15,000,000,000 in outlays to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry for the purpose of restoring outlay reductions required of that committee pursuant to section 6 of this resolution.

''(b) REVISED ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.—Upon the reporting of legislation pursuant to subsection (a), and again upon

the submission of a conference report on such legislation (if a conference report is submitted), the Chair of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may submit to the Senate appropriately revised allocations under sections 302(a) and 602(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974; budgetary aggregates; and levels under this resolution, revised by an amount that does not exceed the additional deficit reduction specified under subsection (d).''.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, Senator EXON's amendment to restore $15 billion in agricultural spending is a step in the right direction for rural America. It is a step in the right direction for the American families who depend on USDA nutrition programs. It stands in stark contrast to the Republican budget that takes these funds from rural America, not to reduce the deficit, but to fund tax breaks for some of the wealthiest Americans.

The Exon amendment instead directs the $15 billion where it is most needed, to farmers who struggle each year to stay on the farm, to keep producing America's food and fiber supply, and to families who strike a rough patch when there is job loss or other bad luck, people trying to put food on the table and keep their families together.

The Republican budget, on the other hand, raids rural America to aid the comfortable. The Republican budget proposal would cut $45.9 billion out of the Agriculture Department over the next 7 years. That is likely to translate to around $12 billion in direct cuts to farm programs. It is a 20-percent cut in farm spending. It will contribute to the further deterioration of the economic and social fabric of rural America. No other sector of American life is being asked to absorb such a hit. We cannot have a prosperous Urban America riding on the back of an impoverished Farm America. Yet that's what Republican budget cuts will produce.

Farmers in South Dakota would see a devastating decline in their income of over $57 million. Other rural States will suffer similar pain. This budget is shortsighted for rural America and self-interested for the best off. It is not a balanced, fair proposal. It is not a budget that sustains the American tradition of building a strong farm sector, a tradition that has enjoyed bipartisan support until this Republican majority.

Make no mistake, the agricultural community recognizes the enormity of the Federal budget and is committed to reducing it. Farmers are some of our most fiscally conservative citizens. But America's producers—rightly—feel they should not be asked to bear a disproportionate share of spending reductions.

They are right. America's producers have already contributed their share. Long before the budget cutters turned to other programs to see where we could cut, farm producers over the last decade have already seen commodity program spending decline more than 60 percent. Other parts of the Federal budget have expanded, while agriculture has consistently been cut back. Now we are cutting into live growth, not deadwood. If other Federal sending had been reduced at anything near the same rate as agricultural spending has been, we would have a budget surplus. In this context, to make farmers take another deep cut just to give the richest Americans a tax break adds insult to injury.

Ideas have consequences and so do choices. If we choose to sacrifice a healthy farm sector to the momentary impulse to finance a tax cut, we will pay more down the road. We cannot disinvest and disinvest and disinvest in rural America, channeling support to virtually every other sector, without finally paying the price. The fact is, these cuts could easily cost us more than they save. Barely 10 years ago, in the mid-1980's, we learned the price of misguided and mistaken policies that starved rural America. We paid billions to repair the damage done by shortsighted farm policies, unforeseen weather patterns and changing economic conditions. There were more farm and rural business foreclosures and bankruptcies than at any time since the Great Depression.

Right now, producers in South Dakota and across the Midwest are suffering from unseasonably wet weather and destructive flooding. They cannot get their crops in the ground. So they will be struggling to make it through this difficult year even with the current level of farm spending. With the cuts in the Republican budget proposal, net income will plummet, and land prices will fall again. Another bad year could push many producers over the edge into insolvency.

We can and should do more to streamline agricultural programs, both to make them farmer friendly and to curb costs. But there is a difference in curbing costs and what this budget proposal does. This budget imposes a straightjacket on Congress as we are trying to write a better, more responsive and more flexible farm bill. This budget will prevent reasonable reform, not promote it. It is exactly the wrong way to go.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, this amendment, using a $170 billion bonus surplus, gives $15 billion to the Agriculture Committee. The rest can still be used for tax cuts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Are we ready to vote?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We are ready to vote.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, the pending amendment is not germane to the provisions of the budget resolution. Pursuant to section 305 of the Budget Act, I raise the point of order against the pending amendment.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, pursuant to section 904 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, I move to waive section 305(b) of that act for consideration of the pending amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays are ordered on the amendment.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

VOTE ON MOTION TO WAIVE THE BUDGET ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion to waive the Budget Act.

The yeas and nays have been ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber who desire to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 31, nays 69, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 191 Leg.]

YEAS—31

Akaka	Feingold	Kohl
Baucus	Feinstein	Leahy
Bingaman	Ford	Moseley-Braun
Breaux	Harkin	Murray
Bumpers	Heflin	Nunn
Byrd	Hollings	Pryor
Conrad	Inouye	Robb
Daschle	Jeffords	Simon
Dodd	Johnston	Wellstone
Dorgan	Kennedy	
Exon	Kerrey	

NAYS—69

Abraham	Glenn	McConnell
Ashcroft	Gorton	Mikulski
Bennett	Graham	Moynihan
Biden	Gramm	Murkowski
Bond	Grams	Nickles
Boxer	Grassley	Packwood
Bradley	Gregg	Pell
Brown	Hatch	Pressler
Bryan	Hatfield	Reid
Burns	Helms	Rockefeller
Campbell	Hutchison	Roth
Chafee	Inhofe	Santorum
Coats	Kassebaum	Sarbanes
Cochran	Kempthorne	Shelby
Cohen	Kerry	Simpson
Coverdell	Kyl	Smith
Craig	Lautenberg	Snowe
D'Amato	Levin	Specter
DeWine	Lieberman	Stevens
Dole	Lott	Thomas
Domenici	Lugar	Thompson
Faircloth	Mack	Thurmond
Frist	McCain	Warner

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 31, the nays are 69. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn, not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected, and the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the motion was rejected.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. FAIRCLOTH addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

AMENDMENT NO. 1152

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Senate regarding reimbursement to the States for the costs of implementing the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 under budget function 800)

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. COVERDELL] proposes an amendment numbered 1152.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING THE COSTS OF THE NATIONAL VOTER REGISTRATION ACT OF 1993.

It is the sense of the Senate that within the assumptions under budget function 800 funds will be spent for reimbursement to the States for the costs of implementing the National Voter Registration Act of 1993.

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, the Coverdell amendment is a sense-of-the-Senate resolution stating that the funds within this resolution should be spent for reimbursement to States for motor-voter mandates.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, as the lead Republican sponsor of the National Voter Registration Act, I was very interested in a recent New York Times article reporting on the progress of voter registration since the bill's implementation in January of this year. Over 2 million new voters have been registered in the first quarter of 1995 and the National Motor-Voter Coalition estimates that approximately 20 million new voters will be registered by the 1996 Presidential election.

It is very gratifying to hear that this important program is being implemented successfully and that the results are exceeding our expectations. I realize there are concerns about this law being a burden to the States and its financial impact on them. However, I would remind my colleagues that many innovative States, including Oregon, led the way for the Federal Government by adopting State motor-voter laws and supported a national law. Additionally, according to the Congressional Budget Office study on the implementation costs of motor-voter, the aggregate costs for States would be 20 to 25 million annually for 5 years. Mr. President, this does not meet the requirements of the Federal unfunded mandate legislation passed earlier this year by the Senate—which I supported.

It is our obligation as policy-makers to protect the voting process and, at the same time, to make it accessible. The motor-voter law effectively achieves both of these important responsibilities and, therefore, I voted against the Coverdell amendment to the budget resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Georgia. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber who desire to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 51, nays 49, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 192 Leg.]

YEAS—51

Abraham	Gorton	McConnell
Bennett	Gramm	Murkowski
Bond	Grams	Nickles
Brown	Grassley	Packwood
Burns	Gregg	Pressler
Campbell	Hatch	Roth
Coats	Helms	Santorum
Cochran	Hutchison	Shelby
Cohen	Inhofe	Simpson
Coverdell	Kassebaum	Smith
Craig	Kempthorne	Snowe
D'Amato	Kohl	Specter
DeWine	Kyl	Stevens
Dole	Lott	Thomas
Domenici	Lugar	Thompson
Faircloth	Mack	Thurmond
Frist	McCain	Warner

NAYS—49

Akaka	Feingold	Levin
Ashcroft	Feinstein	Lieberman
Baucus	Ford	Mikulski
Biden	Glenn	Moseley-Braun
Bingaman	Graham	Moynihan
Boxer	Harkin	Murray
Bradley	Hatfield	Nunn
Breaux	Heflin	Pell
Bryan	Hollings	Pryor
Bumpers	Inouye	Reid
Byrd	Jeffords	Robb
Chafee	Johnston	Rockefeller
Conrad	Kennedy	Sarbanes
Daschle	Kerrey	Simon
Dodd	Kerry	Wellstone
Dorgan	Lautenberg	
Exon	Leahy	

So the amendment (No. 1152) was agreed to.

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

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 1153

(Purpose: To maintain public funding for Presidential campaigns)

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. EXON], for Mr. KERRY, proposes an amendment numbered 1153.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 64, strike lines 17 through 19 and insert the following: ''$2,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, $37,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1996 through 2000, and $72,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1996''.

On page 66, line 6, decrease the amount by $70,000,000.

On page 66, line 13, decrease the amount by $70,000,000.

On page 66, line 14, decrease the amount by $28,000,000.

On page 66, line 20, decrease the amount by $70,000,000.

On page 66, line 21, decrease the amount by $215,000,000.

On page 67, line 2, decrease the amount by $70,000,000.

On page 67, line 3, decrease the amount by $4,000,000.

On page 67, line 9, decrease the amount by $70,000,000.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, this removes instructions to the Rules Committee that repeals spending limits and public financing for Presidential campaigns, returning to pre-Watergate rules for those campaigns. Offset approximately $250 million over 7 years, of reduced overhead and administrative costs spread across Government by the Appropriations Committee.

PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGN FUND

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, and I would like to thank the junior Senator from Massachusetts for offering his amendment that would derail this misguided effort to eliminate the Presidential election campaign fund.

It came as a surprise—and a disappointment—to many of us that when the Republican Party announced last fall their new Contract With America and declared their commitment to reforming the Congress and ending business as usual in Washington, that they did not even bother to mention campaign finance reform in their contract.

Well, we are now out from under the first 100 days of the contract, and there is still no indication that the Senate will be turning to campaign finance reform anytime soon.

But not only are we going to be prevented from taking a step forward, the budget resolution before us today would push us back—20 years back—to the days before Congress recognized how fundamentally flawed our system of Presidential campaigns was.

Mr. President, what in the world is the logic behind this? As far as I know, even the most vocal opponents of the Presidential campaign system are not willing to suggest that we have had a single unfair Presidential election in the past 20 years. Nor has any general election candidate for President, to my knowledge, ever said in the past 20 years that their loss was attributable to the lack of financial resources.

That is because the Presidential campaign finance system is based on simple principles. One principle is that money should not determine the outcome of elections. Another is that elected officials should not be spending inordinate amounts of time on the phone soliciting campaign funds.

That is what the Presidential system is about. If there is a problem of inadequate funding of the Presidential campaign fund, then that should be addressed. We did it 2 years ago and we can do it again.

But instead, this resolution is trying to fix a wristwatch with a sledgehammer, preferring to discard the one

Federal campaign system that has produced fair and competitive elections during the last 20 years rather than finding a targeted solution to ensuring the solvency of the Presidential fund.

Finally, I have to ask why the Republicans are trying to do this under the camouflage of the budget resolution. If opponents of the Presidential system want to eliminate it, then let us have public hearings in the Rules Committee and have an intelligent discussion about it.

If opponents of public financing are so convinced that the American people are also opposed to public financing, why are the opponents so reluctant to have a public debate on this issue on the floor of the U.S. Senate?

There is not a single word in the budget resolution about what we are going to replace the Presidential system with.

But again, I have not heard anyone in the nearly 20 years of this system's existence criticize it for being unfair to challengers, unfair to either party, or dominated by special interests.

This is a system we need to emulate, not eliminate.

I thank the Senator from Massachusetts for his leadership on this issue and I yield the floor.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, since I was elected to the Senate in 1972, one of my central themes has been to get special-interest money out of political campaigns. The first testimony I every gave as a U.S. Senator was before the Senate Rules Committee in favor of public funding—instead of special-interest funding—of political campaigns.

Unfortunately, we have not moved forward as much as I would have liked or as much as I have repeatedly advocated. And, what little we have done is now on the chopping block.

The Republican budget would eliminate the only positive step we have taken in the last 20 years to clean up our political campaign system—getting special-interest money out of the general election campaigns for President and limiting the amount Presidential candidates can spend. Now, the Republicans are trying to let the special-interest, big money back in.

The Republican budget would repeal the Presidential campaign check-off system. It is a rather simple system. When you file your income taxes each year, you can check off the box at the top of the tax form to have $3 of your taxes go to finance Presidential campaigns. It is a voluntary system. No one has to check it off. No ones taxes are affected by the decision. And, the only money that goes to Presidential campaigns is the money that people check off voluntarily. In exchange for taking the money, Presidential candidates must limit how much they spend.

A simple system. A voluntary system. And, yet the system has worked. No more special interest money in the general election, and no more runaway spending.

In the last 20 years, very few people have accused Presidential candidates of being beholden to special interest. Less than 1 percent of the money in Presidential campaigns comes from PAC's—political action committees. And, once the Presidential primaries are over, the quest for money essentially ends. Candidates can spend their time debating the issues—not catering to special-interests.

Meanwhile, spending has been held down. Consider this: in the 1992 Presidential election, President Clinton and President Bush combined spent less in constant dollars then President Nixon spent all by himself in the Watergate election of 1972—before there were spending limits and before there was the Presidential check-off system.

What has been the result of all of this compared to the old system? Cleaner campaigns, fairer campaigns, more competitive campaigns, campaigns more focuses on the issues, and campaigns with limited spending.

Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to support the Kerry amendment, which I have cosponsored. It would keep the Presidential check-off system in tact. Now is not the time to return Presidential campaigns to the days of runaway spending controlled by special interests.

This system is not broken. We should not break it.

AMENDMENT NO. 1154 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1153

(Purpose: To express the Sense of the Senate on use of the Presidential Election Campaign Fund in regard to sexual harassment)

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a second-degree amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. McCONNELL] proposes an amendment numbered 1154 to amendment No. 1153.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE.

It is the sense of the Senate that the assumptions underlying function 800 include the following: that payments to presidential campaigns from the Presidential Election Campaign Fund, as authorized by the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1974, should not be used to pay for or augment damage awards or settlements arising from a civil or criminal action, or the threat thereof, related to sexual harassment.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, today—on C–SPAN—we answer the question: can we ever get rid of any government program?

Even if the program is wasteful, even if it is a proven failure, even if we've been spending taxpayers' money on it against their will—will we put a stop to it?

Even if the program is a complete boondoggle for politicians—in fact, politicians receive every dime from it—can Congress bring itself to kill such a program? Stay tuned.

The Budget Committee, under the able leadership of Chairman DOMENICI, wisely chose to end the failed Presidential Election Campaign Fund program. Make no mistake: the Presidential Election Campaign Fund is not simply troubled or fraught with problems—it is an utter failure.

It has not achieved any of its stated objectives. It does not limit special interests. It does not lessen the money chase. It does not even limit spending. On the other hand, it does distort the political process, by causing campaigns to employ battalions of lawyers to seek out and exploit loopholes. It does fork over millions of taxpayer dollars to fringe candidates like Lenora Fulani, and even criminals like Lyndon LaRouche.

It was the reformers' dream. It has become the taxpayers' nightmare.

From beginning to end, the Presidential system of spending limits and voluntary taxpayer funding is a hoax that 85 percent of American taxpayers are not falling for. The tax return checkoff mechanism, which feeds the fund, is itself a fraud. The checkoff appropriates money out of the Treasury. It gives a tiny minority—14.5 percent of filers checked ''yes'' on their 1993 returns—the power to appropriate tax dollars paid by all Americans.

The system is not voluntary for the 85 percent of American taxpayers who choose not to check ''yes,'' but are forced to pay for the few who do. These checkoff dollars don't come out of the pocket of those who check ''yes''—anymore than appropriations bills come out of the pockets of the Senators who vote for them.

Democracy would be aided—not imperiled—by the demise of the Presidential fund. Every year, Americans vote on this fund, via the tax checkoff. It is the largest single public opinion poll conducted annually in this country, on the popularity of taxpayer financing of campaigns.

The high water-mark—28.7 percent checking ''yes''—was realized on the 1980 tax returns. It's been a downward trajectory since, even though the dollar checkoff has itself been eroded by inflation and presumably would be an increasingly inexpensive proposition. Therefore, to get more money out of fewer people, President Clinton's 1993 budget/tax bill tripled the checkoff to $3. The result was a 23-percent decrease in the checkoff rate—fewer people than ever supporting it—while the total amount diverted from the Treasury increased 258 percent, from $28 million to $71 million.

I can tell you there is no outpouring of support among Kentuckians, or residents of any other State, for this program. In fact, they are crying out that

they do not want their tax dollars paying for anyone's campaign. Not the President's. Not Lenora Fulani's. Not anybody's.

And certainly they aren't interested in paying for a campaign that Lyndon LaRouche ran from his prison cell. Nevertheless, LaRouche received Federal matching funds for the Presidential campaign he conducted while serving a 15-year sentence for fraud. Having run in 1980, 1984, 1988, and 1992, he's now planning another run in 1996—courtesy of the taxpayers. Maybe the fifth time's a charm.

And then there's Lenora Fulani—I'm hoping to make Ms. Fulani as famous as Senator GRAMM has made Dicky Flatt; because no one knows who she is. Well, you may not know Ms. Fulani, but you're paying her campaign bills through the presidential fund.

Lenora Fulani is with the New Alliance Party, another household word in politics. Ms. Fulani is the lucky recipient of over $3.5 million in taxpayer dollars over the course of three elections—1994, 1988, 1992.

In fact, she's gotten so good at the game that she was the first candidate—ahead of George Bush, Bill Clinton, and all the rest—to qualify for matching funds for the 1992 campaign. Anyone want to bet there will be another Fulani candidacy in 1996? Who could resist millions of dollars in taxpayer largesse?

As these fringe candidates proliferate, I can imagine the Presidential fund enlisting Ed McMahon to notify all those who qualify that they have won the grand prize: an all-expense-paid Presidential election campaign—not from Publishers Clearinghouse, but from the American taxpayers.

Some proponents of taxpayer-financed campaigns say it is inappropriate—even hypocritical—for those who have participated in the Presidential system to oppose it. That is absurd. If that were the case—that participating in the system is tantamount to endorsing it—then what should be said about all those from the other side who run for the Senate under a system they want to replace with taxpayer financing and spending limits?

Mr. President, playing by the rules as they exist does not, nor should it, preclude anyone from trying to change them for the better. I haven't seen anyone from the other side volunteer to abide by spending limits because they think they're such a great idea. Is that what is being suggested?

In the same way, Presidential candidates must participate in the system as it is, not as they would like it to be. That being the case, every single candidate running for President but two has decided, quite logically, to accept the funding—because not to do so would cede a huge financial advantage to other candidates.

Not surprisingly, the only two major candidates who have turned down this generous subsidy were extremely wealthy: millionaire John Connally in 1980 and billionaire Ross Perot in 1992.

So the notion that you are precluded from reforming a program that you have almost no choice but to participate in is absolutely ludicrous, and should be ignored.

But there is another argument against reforming the Presidential system that should not just be ignored—it should be condemned.

Common Cause—which has perfected the art of hysterical, money-grubbing direct-mail appeals—issued a letter on May 11 in which it said that opposition to taxpayer financing of Presidential campaigns is an endorsement of corruption. It went on to charge that a vote for the budget resolution—as is—is a vote for corruption.

Over the years, Common Cause has dished up so much disinformation on campaign finance reform, under the guise of good government, that even the Democrats ignore them—or barely tolerate them. They have become a parody of their former selves—just another self-interested Washington lobby, adding to the cacophony of government-bashing, while making a tidy sum in the process. But this goes beyond the pale.

The Presidential Election Campaign Fund is a failed relic from the post-Watergate reform era. In fact, most of the proposals that were enacted in that era were struck down by the Supreme Court as wholesale trampling of constitutional freedoms. So the fact that this system was conceived in the wake of Watergate is not necessarily an impressive pedigree.

But since the proponents of taxpayer financing like to invoke Watergate, I'd like to read directly from the report prepared by the Senate Select Committee on Watergate, which was charged with making legislative recommendations to deal with the issues raised by this scandal.

Recommendation No. 7, which appears on page 572 of that report, reads as follows:

> The committee recommends against the adoption of any form of public financing in which tax moneys are collected and allocated to political candidates by the Federal Government. * * * [t]he committee takes issue with the contention that public financing affords either an effective or appropriate solution. Thomas Jefferson believed 'to compel a man to furnish contributions of money for the propagation of opinions which he disbelieves and abhors, is sinful and tyrannical.'
>
> The Committee's opposition is based, like Jefferson's, upon the fundamental need to protect the voluntary right of individual citizens to express themselves politically as guaranteed by the first amendment. Furthermore, we find inherent dangers in authorizing the Federal bureaucracy to fund and excessively regulate political campaigns.
>
> The abuses reexperienced during the 1972 campaign and unearthed by the Select Committee were perpetrated in the absence of any effective regulation of the source, form, or amount of campaign contributions. In fact, despite the progress made by the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, in requiring full public disclosure of contributions, the 1972 campaign still was funded through a system of essentially unrestricted, private financing.
>
> What now seems appropriate is not the abandonment of private financing, but rather the reform of that system in an effort to vastly expand the voluntary participation of individual citizens while avoiding the abuses of earlier campaigns.

That is what the Watergate Select Committee had to say about the matter. So you can call taxpayer financing of campaigns a Common Cause reform, but don't call it a Watergate reform, because the Senate committee in charge of formulating a response to the crisis rejected the idea, flat-out.

The fact that the Presidential Election Campaign Fund slipped through, thereby putting the Government in the business of bribing people to forfeit their constitutional rights, is an unfortunate legacy of those tumultuous years. But just because the fund has barely survived for two decades—teetering on the brink of bankruptcy before President Clinton bailed it out 2 years ago with taxpayers' money—does not justify its perpetuity.

It is the myopia of big-Government liberals that prevents them from seeing that anything could possibly replace a Government program. So we need to answer the question: What would exist after the Presidential fund's demise?

Why, a system in which private citizens voluntarily contribute publicly disclosed and limited donations to the candidates of their choice—in other words, the system contemplated by the Watergate Select Committee.

Perhaps now, 20 years after Watergate, Congress can finally get it right.

Of course, I expect the professional government-bashers like Common Cause to say that reverting to a privately funded Presidential system is somehow a guarantee of corruption. They have been calling the privately financed congressional system corrupt for years. In their view, the only clean money is the taxpayers' money.

You see, they have this theory that your hard-earned money is dirty and corrupting until it's been laundered by the Internal Revenue Service. It's a very interesting theory, to say the least.

However, we have already pumped nearly a billion dollars of the taxpayers' money into the Presidential system, and it has not achieved any of the purported goals of that system. The congressional system, on the other hand, doesn't use a dime of taxpayers' money for political campaigns, and if there are instances where it has bred corruption, then—as chairman of the Senate Ethics Committee—I would like to hear about them and we will investigate them to the fullest.

If the issue really is corruption, then contribution limits and public disclosure are the best preventive measures—not another taxpayer-funded Government program.

But I think the charge of corruption here is just a convenient smoke-screen to maintain the status quo and to let this failed and wasteful system continue in perpetuity.

I think the real issue before us is whether this Congress, faced with a $4.7 trillion-dollar debt, will step up to the challenge of eliminating any Government program, even one with as dismal a record as the failed Presidential system.

As I said at the outset: despite the expenditure of millions of tax dollars, this system has not curbed special interests. It has not ended the money chase. It has not reduced the emphasis on fundraising. It has not even limited campaign spending, as misguided a goal as that is.

In fact, this Government program is an utter embarrassment: the Federal Election Commission can't even finish its audits of candidates until they're ready to run again. Every candidate except one has been cited for inadvertent violations. Accountants and lawyers are blowing open new loopholes every election that hold the entire system up to ridicule.

And what is the money being spent on? Convenient balloons. Negative ads. Consultants. Opposition research. Just the things that American taxpayers are telling us they want more of.

Will Congress step up to the plate and put at least one wasteful Government program out of business? Will Congress let the taxpayers off the hook—just once? Will Congress get rid of this exclusive perk for politicians?

Inquiring taxpayers want to know.

It's time to pull the plug on the taxpayer-financed Presidential system. It should surprise no one that this Republican Congress, in pursuant of a balanced budget, should seek to abolish a proven failure like the Presidential Election Campaign Fund. This is one entitlement program on which the sun should have set—a long time ago.

SECOND-DEGREE—SEXUAL HARASSMENT

However, if the Senator from Massachusetts prevails in his quest to continue taxpayer-financing of Presidential campaigns, then at the least we should take some steps to reassure taxpayers that their money is used for legitimate campaign purposes. The Presidential Election Campaign Fund should not be used to quash scandals such as allegations of sexual harassment. Such abuse of taxpayer funds itself impairs public confidence in Government.

The second-degree amendment that I am putting forth simply states:

> It is the sense of the Senate that the assumptions underlying function 800 include the following: that payments to presidential campaigns from the Presidential Election Campaign Fund, as authorized by the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1974, should not be used to pay for or augment damage awards or settlements arising from a civil or criminal action, or the threat thereof, related to sexual harassment.

Mr. President, this is not a hypothetical. It came to light—2½ years after the fact—that President Clinton's 1992 taxpayer-funded Presidential campaign used $37,500 to settle a sexual harassment suit against one of the then-candidate's top aides.

This expense item was discovered during the course of an audit of the Clinton campaign which resulted in a recommendation that the campaign repay to the Treasury a record $4 million. The Commission ultimately scaled back the repayment. Along with items including $180,000 in questionable petty cash disbursements, $70,000 for lost rental cars, computers and other equipment, was the $37,500 to settle what the campaign termed an ''employment dispute.''

The Clinton campaign had listed the expense as consulting fees. How much of it was in fact for consulting and how much was for keeping quiet, is unclear. The Washington Post reported on February 15 of this year that ''. . . given the dearth of information the campaign provided, the FEC has ordered it to repay $9,675 in Federal funds that were used in the payment.''

Mr. President, the confidentiality clause in the agreement between the claimant and the Clinton campaign impeded the audit and with repayment of part of the money the Federal Election Commission has reportedly closed the investigation. Considering that taxpayer funds intended for Presidential campaigning are involved, perhaps the matter should be revisited. In any event, the Senate should make clear that taxpayer funds drawn from the Presidential Election Campaign Fund should not be used to coverup charges of sexual harassment.

Mr. DOMENICI addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, Senator McCONNELL's second-degree amendment is a sense of the Senate that Presidential campaign fund moneys should not go toward settling sexual harassment suits.

Mr. McCONNELL. I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I simply would like to say to the manager, we are prepared to accept this. We can save the Senate time and proceed to the underlying amendment.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I would like to have a vote on this.

Mr. DOMENICI. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment No. 1154 offered by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. McCONNELL]. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 100, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 193 Leg.]

YEAS—100

Abraham	Biden	Breaux
Akaka	Bingaman	Brown
Ashcroft	Bond	Bryan
Baucus	Boxer	Bumpers
Bennett	Bradley	Burns
Byrd	Harkin	Moynihan
Campbell	Hatch	Murkowski
Chafee	Hatfield	Murray
Coats	Heflin	Nickles
Cochran	Helms	Nunn
Cohen	Hollings	Packwood
Conrad	Hutchison	Pell
Coverdell	Inhofe	Pressler
Craig	Inouye	Pryor
D'Amato	Jeffords	Reid
Daschle	Johnston	Robb
DeWine	Kassebaum	Rockefeller
Dodd	Kempthorne	Roth
Dole	Kennedy	Santorum
Domenici	Kerrey	Sarbanes
Dorgan	Kerry	Shelby
Exon	Kohl	Simon
Faircloth	Kyl	Simpson
Feingold	Lautenberg	Smith
Feinstein	Leahy	Snowe
Ford	Levin	Specter
Frist	Lieberman	Stevens
Glenn	Lott	Thomas
Gorton	Lugar	Thompson
Graham	Mack	Thurmond
Gramm	McCain	Warner
Grams	McConnell	Wellstone
Grassley	Mikulski	
Gregg	Moseley-Braun	

So the amendment (No. 1154) was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. At this time, we will proceed to the vote on the adoption of amendment No. 1153, as amended.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, is the pending amendment the Glenn amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No, it is the Exon for Kerry amendment No. 1153.

Mr. DOMENICI. I do not need to say anything. I am going to sit down.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 1153, AS AMENDED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 1153, as amended.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 56, nays 44, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 194 Leg.]

YEAS—56

Akaka	Feinstein	Lugar
Baucus	Ford	Mikulski
Biden	Glenn	Moseley-Braun
Bingaman	Graham	Moynihan
Boxer	Harkin	Murray
Bradley	Heflin	Nunn
Breaux	Hollings	Pell
Bryan	Inouye	Pryor
Bumpers	Jeffords	Reid
Byrd	Johnston	Robb
Campbell	Kassebaum	Rockefeller
Chafee	Kennedy	Sarbanes
Cohen	Kerrey	Simon
Conrad	Kerry	Snowe
Daschle	Kohl	Specter
Dodd	Lautenberg	Stevens
Dorgan	Leahy	Thompson
Exon	Levin	Wellstone
Feingold	Lieberman	

NAYS—44

Abraham	Cochran	Faircloth
Ashcroft	Coverdell	Frist
Bennett	Craig	Gorton
Bond	D'Amato	Gramm
Brown	DeWine	Grams
Burns	Dole	Grassley
Coats	Domenici	Gregg

Hatch	Mack	Santorum
Hatfield	McCain	Shelby
Helms	McConnell	Simpson
Hutchison	Murkowski	Smith
Inhofe	Nickles	Thomas
Kempthorne	Packwood	Thurmond
Kyl	Pressler	Warner
Lott	Roth	

So the amendment (No. 1153), as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 1155

(Purpose: To restore the IRS compliance initiative)

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. EXON], for Mr. GLENN and Mr. SIMON, proposes an amendment numbered 1155.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 79, strike lines 1 through 3.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, this amendment would restore the budget structure of the IRS compliance initiative which now is established in last year's budget resolution with bipartisan support. The initiative was established off budget because of its return of $5 for every $1 spent. This budget resolution would change that structure, placing the IRS initiative under the spending caps.

The amendment strikes that language to ensure that the compliance initiative will be fully funded at $9.2 billion over 5 years and delinquent taxes brought to the Treasury.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I do not object to the statement, but frankly I hope we will exchange statements in the future. That statement is a little more editorialized comment than I thought we would have, but nonetheless it has been done.

AMENDMENT NO. 1156

(Purpose: To retain the budget resolution's prohibition against off-budget funding for the IRS and add a Sense of the Senate that the Senate should pass the ''Taxpayers Bill of Rights 2'')

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I send an amendment in the nature of a substitute on behalf of myself and Senator GRASSLEY to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. DOMENICI], for himself and Mr. GRASSLEY, proposes an amendment numbered 1156.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

In lieu of the language proposed to be stricken insert the following:

SEC. 209. REPEAL OF IRS ALLOWANCE.

(a) Section 25 of House Concurrent Resolution 218 (103d Congress, 2d Session) is repealed.

(b) It is the sense of the Senate that the revenue levels contained in the budget resolution should assume passage of the ''Taxpayers Bill of Rights 2'' and that the Senate should pass the Taxpayers Bill of Rights 2 this Congress.

(c) It is the sense of the Senate that funding for tax compliance efforts should be a top priority and that the assumptions underlying the functional totals in this resolution include the administration's full request for the Internal Revenue Service.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, this amendment repeals the special off-budget treatment of the IRS compliance initiative. The budget resolution already provides full funding of the initiative within the discretionary caps.

I ask for the yeas and nays.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Ohio.

AMENDMENT NO. 1157 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1156

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk in the second degree and ask for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. GLENN] proposes an amendment numbered 1157 to amendment No. 1156.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

In the pending amendment, strike lines 1–3.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The majority leader is recognized.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I have had discussion with the distinguished Democratic leader. I would like to enter into a unanimous-consent agreement. I understand the amendments have climbed to 50, so there will be 50 votes. We started at 31, got down to 20, and now it has gotten up to 50.

So I ask unanimous consent that the only first-degree amendments in order to the budget resolution be those submitted by 5:15 this evening.

Is there objection to that?

Mr. FORD. What about second degree?

Mr. DOLE. This only applies to first degree.

Mr. DASCHLE. We have been discussing this agreement. This would not preclude second-degree amendments. The sponsors of the amendments would have to turn them in to the managers prior to 5:15. I think it is a good suggestion and I hope we can accommodate it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. STEVENS. Which one are we voting on now?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, the second-degree amendment strikes language in the Grassley-Domenici amendment which would restructure the IRS compliance initiative placing it within the budget caps.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, the second-degree amendment returns the situation to where it was before I offered my amendment, which means that if this amendment is adopted, the IRS will continue to have special off-budget treatment of their budget instead of it being included in the budget like others.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the second-degree amendment.

VOTE ON MOTION TO TABLE AMENDMENT NO. 1157 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1156

Mr. DOMENICI. I move to table the second-degree amendment. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 58, nays 42, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 195 Leg.]

YEAS—58

Abraham	Feingold	McConnell
Ashcroft	Frist	Murkowski
Baucus	Gorton	Nickles
Bennett	Gramm	Packwood
Bingaman	Grams	Pressler
Brown	Grassley	Pryor
Bumpers	Gregg	Roth
Burns	Hatch	Santorum
Campbell	Hatfield	Shelby
Chafee	Heflin	Simpson
Coats	Helms	Smith
Cochran	Hutchison	Snowe
Cohen	Inhofe	Specter
Coverdell	Kassebaum	Stevens
Craig	Kempthorne	Thomas
D'Amato	Kyl	Thompson
DeWine	Lott	Thurmond
Dole	Lugar	Warner
Domenici	Mack	
Faircloth	McCain	

NAYS—42

Akaka	Ford	Levin
Biden	Glenn	Lieberman
Bond	Graham	Mikulski
Boxer	Harkin	Moseley-Braun
Bradley	Hollings	Moynihan
Breaux	Inouye	Murray
Bryan	Jeffords	Nunn
Byrd	Johnston	Pell
Conrad	Kennedy	Reid
Daschle	Kerrey	Robb
Dodd	Kerry	Rockefeller
Dorgan	Kohl	Sarbanes
Exon	Lautenberg	Simon
Feinstein	Leahy	Wellstone

So the amendment (No. 1157) was agreed to.

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

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 1156

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question recurs on amendment No. 1156 offered by the Senator from New Mexico.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 1156) was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The adoption of the Domenici amendment renders the underlying amendment moot.

Mr. GORTON addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Washington.

Mr. GORTON. I am authorized to make an announcement by the majority leader that there will be no further votes until 5 p.m.

RECESS

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the previous order, the Senate will stand in recess until 5 p.m.

Whereupon, at 4:19 p.m., the Senate recessed until 5 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. JEFFORDS).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority manager of the bill is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 1158

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, on behalf of Senators BOXER, MURRAY, LAUTENBERG, and FEINSTEIN, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. EXON], for Mrs. BOXER, for herself, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. LAUTENBERG, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN, proposes an amendment numbered 1158.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place add the following: ''It is the sense of Congress that no Member of Congress may use campaign funds to defend against sexual harassment lawsuits.''

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, this a sense of the Congress that no Member of Congress may use campaign funds to defend against sexual harassment lawsuits.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. DOMENICI. Are we prepared to vote?

Mr. EXON. We are prepared for the vote. I asked for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I move to lay the amendment on the table.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

VOTE ON MOTION TO LAY ON THE TABLE AMENDMENT NO. 1158

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table amendment No. 1158.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber who desire to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 1, nays 99, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 196 Leg.]

YEAS—1

Packwood

NAYS—99

Abraham	Feingold	Lott
Akaka	Feinstein	Lugar
Ashcroft	Ford	Mack
Baucus	Frist	McCain
Bennett	Glenn	McConnell
Biden	Gorton	Mikulski
Bingaman	Graham	Moseley-Braun
Bond	Gramm	Moynihan
Boxer	Grams	Murkowski
Bradley	Grassley	Murray
Breaux	Gregg	Nickles
Brown	Harkin	Nunn
Bryan	Hatch	Pell
Bumpers	Hatfield	Pressler
Burns	Heflin	Pryor
Byrd	Helms	Reid
Campbell	Hollings	Robb
Chafee	Hutchison	Rockefeller
Coats	Inhofe	Roth
Cochran	Inouye	Santorum
Cohen	Jeffords	Sarbanes
Conrad	Johnston	Shelby
Coverdell	Kassebaum	Simon
Craig	Kempthorne	Simpson
D'Amato	Kennedy	Smith
Daschle	Kerrey	Snowe
DeWine	Kerry	Specter
Dodd	Kohl	Stevens
Dole	Kyl	Thomas
Domenici	Lautenberg	Thompson
Dorgan	Leahy	Thurmond
Exon	Levin	Warner
Faircloth	Lieberman	Wellstone

So the motion to lay on the table the amendment (No. 1158) was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 1159 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1158

Mr. DOLE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. DOLE. I send a second-degree amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. DOLE] proposes an amendment numbered 1159 to amendment No. 1158.

The amendment is as follows:

In the pending amendment strike all after the words ''It is the sense-of-the-Congress'' and insert the following: ''That no member of Congress or the executive branch may use campaign funds or privately donated funds to defend against sexual harassment lawsuits.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 55, nays 45, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 197 Leg.]

YEAS—55

Abraham	Frist	McCain
Ashcroft	Gorton	McConnell
Bennett	Graham	Murkowski
Bond	Gramm	Nickles
Brown	Grams	Pressler
Burns	Grassley	Roth
Byrd	Gregg	Santorum
Campbell	Hatch	Shelby
Chafee	Hatfield	Simpson
Coats	Helms	Smith
Cochran	Hutchison	Snowe
Cohen	Inhofe	Specter
Coverdell	Jeffords	Stevens
Craig	Kassebaum	Thomas
D'Amato	Kempthorne	Thompson
DeWine	Kyl	Thurmond
Dole	Lott	Warner
Domenici	Lugar	
Faircloth	Mack	

NAYS—45

Akaka	Feinstein	Lieberman
Baucus	Ford	Mikulski
Biden	Glenn	Moseley-Braun
Bingaman	Harkin	Moynihan
Boxer	Heflin	Murray
Bradley	Hollings	Nunn
Breaux	Inouye	Packwood
Bryan	Johnston	Pell
Bumpers	Kennedy	Pryor
Conrad	Kerrey	Reid
Daschle	Kerry	Robb
Dodd	Kohl	Rockefeller
Dorgan	Lautenberg	Sarbanes
Exon	Leahy	Simon
Feingold	Levin	Wellstone

So the amendment (No. 1159) was agreed to.

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

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. BROWN. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President. Is it true that the unanimous consent agreement that we are operating under required any further amendments to be considered by this body—first-degree amendments—to be considered by this body to be presented to the managers of the bill by 5:15?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BROWN. Is it then true that because none of those amendments have

been delivered by 5:15, no further first-degree amendments are in order to the bill?

Mr. President, I note that it is now 5:39 and that as of 5:15 none of the amendments had been presented.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments were to be presented to the managers of the bill, not the clerk.

Mr. BROWN. Do we have any indication that those amendments were indeed presented by 5:15?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The chair does not know what amendments have been submitted to either of the managers.

Mr. EXON. You can get the word of the two managers, if that will suffice for the distinguished Senator from Colorado.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I do not mean to obstruct proceedings but I have been trying to get copies of amendments after 5:15. I have asked the managers, and they are still not available. If amendments are not made available, I intend to make a point of order against amendments offered from this point forward.

AMENDMENT NO. 1158, AS AMENDED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending measure is amendment No. 1158, as amended.

Mr. BROWN. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President. Was this amendment presented to the managers prior to 5:15?

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, it was.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment was offered prior to 5:15.

Mr. BROWN. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 1158, as amended.

The amendment (No. 1158), as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We have been very liberal regarding the time on votes. We were 5 minutes over on that last vote.

I urge all Members to stay in the Chamber, or close to the Chamber, so we can get finished in a more orderly and quicker fashion.

Mr. EXON. Is it in order to proceed now in a semi-orderly fashion with amendments that are properly of record?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Amendments are in order.

AMENDMENT NO. 1160

(Purpose: To limit increases in the public debt)

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. EXON] proposes an amendment numbered 1160.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 63, strike beginning with line 8, though page 65, line 5, and insert the following: ''The Senate Committee on Finance shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that increase the statutory limit on the public debt to the amount set forth for the public debt for fiscal year 1996 in section 2(5), of this resolution.

''(8) COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS.—The Senate Committee on Foreign Relations shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending to reduce outlays $0 in fiscal year 1996, $0 for the period of fiscal years 1996 through 2000, and $0 for the period of fiscal years 1996 through 2002.

''(9) COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS.—The Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending to reduce outlays $118,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, $3,023,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1996 through 2000, and $6,871,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1996 through 2002.

''(10) COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY.—The Senate Committee on the Judiciary shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending to reduce outlays $119,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, $923,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1996 through 2000, and $1,483,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1996 through 2002.

''(11) COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES.—The Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending to reduce outlays $1,141,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, $9,165,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1996 through 2000, and $13,795,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1996 through 2002.

''(12) COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION.—The Senate Committee on Rules and Administration shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending to reduce outlays $2,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, $280,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1996 through 2000, and $319,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1996 through 2002.

''(13) COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS.—The Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending to reduce outlays $301,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, $5,760,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1996 through 2000, and $10,002,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1996 through 2002.

TITLE II—BUDGETARY RESTRAINTS AND RULEMAKING

SEC. 200. LIMITING INCREASES IN THE STATUTORY LIMIT ON THE PUBLIC DEBT.

(a) RECONCILIATION DIRECTIVES WITH RESPECT TO PUBLIC DEBT LIMIT.—

(1) BUDGET RESOLUTION.—Any concurrent resolution on the budget for a fiscal year that contains directives of the type described in paragraph (1) or (2) of section 310(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 for such fiscal year shall also include a directive of the type described in paragraph (3) of that subsection for that fiscal year.

(2) RECONCILIATION.—Any change in the statutory limit on the public debt that is recommended pursuant to a directive of the type described in paragraph (3) of section 310(a) shall be included in the reconciliation legislation reported pursuant to section 310(b) for that fiscal year.

(b) POINT OF ORDER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—

(A) Notwithstanding any other rule of the Senate, except as provided in subparagraph (B), it shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill or joint resolution (or any amendment thereto or conference report thereon) that increases the statutory limit on the public debt during a fiscal year above the level set forth as appropriate for such fiscal year in the concurrent resolution on the budget for such fiscal year agreed to under section 301 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(B) Subparagraph (A) shall not apply to any reconciliation bill or reconciliation resolution reported pursuant to section 310(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 during any fiscal year (or any conference report thereon) that contains a provision that—

(i) increases the statutory limit on the public debt pursuant to a directive of the type described in section 310(a)(3) of such Act; and

(ii) becomes effective on or after the first day of the following fiscal year.

(2) PROHIBITION ON STRIKING PROPER DEBT LIMIT CHANGES.—Notwithstanding any other rule of the Senate, it shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any amendment to a reconciliation bill or resolution that would strike a provision reported pursuant to a directive of the type described in section 310(a)(3) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(3) WAIVERS.—This section may be waived or suspended in the Senate by a roll call vote of a majority of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(c) EXERCISE OF RULEMAKING POWERS.—The Senate adopts the provisions of this title—

(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate, and as such they shall be considered as part of the rules of the Senate, and such rules shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent therewith; and

(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of the Senate to change those rules (so far as they relate to the Senate) at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of the Senate.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, this amendment is offered by myself. It creates a majority vote point of order against legislation which increases the public debt beyond that set forth in the budget resolution. It is something that we discussed in the committee.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, the pending amendment is not germane to the provisions of the budget resolution pursuant to 305(b). I raise a point of order against the pending amendment.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, pursuant to section 904 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, I move to waive that act for the consideration of the pending amendment.

I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays are ordered.

VOTE ON MOTION TO WAIVE THE BUDGET ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question occurs on agreeing to the motion to waive the Budget Act.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 40, nays 60, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 198 Leg.]

YEAS—40

Akaka	Ford	Lieberman
Baucus	Glenn	Mikulski
Biden	Graham	Moseley-Braun
Boxer	Harkin	Moynihan
Bradley	Heflin	Murray
Breaux	Hollings	Pell
Bryan	Inouye	Pryor
Bumpers	Johnston	Reid
Conrad	Kerrey	Robb
Daschle	Kerry	Rockefeller
Dorgan	Kohl	Simon
Exon	Lautenberg	Wellstone
Feingold	Leahy	
Feinstein	Levin	

NAYS—60

Abraham	Faircloth	McCain
Ashcroft	Frist	McConnell
Bennett	Gorton	Murkowski
Bingaman	Gramm	Nickles
Bond	Grams	Nunn
Brown	Grassley	Packwood
Burns	Gregg	Pressler
Byrd	Hatch	Roth
Campbell	Hatfield	Santorum
Chafee	Helms	Sarbanes
Coats	Hutchison	Shelby
Cochran	Inhofe	Simpson
Cohen	Jeffords	Smith
Coverdell	Kassebaum	Snowe
Craig	Kempthorne	Specter
D'Amato	Kennedy	Stevens
DeWine	Kyl	Thomas
Dodd	Lott	Thompson
Dole	Lugar	Thurmond
Domenici	Mack	Warner

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this question, the yeas are 40, the nays are 60. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

The point of order is sustained and the amendment falls.

AMENDMENT NO. 1161

(Purpose: To restore funding to the AFDC and JOBS programs by using amounts set aside for a tax cut)

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. EXON] for Mr. MOYNIHAN, proposes an amendment numbered 1161.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 74, strike lines 12 through 24 and insert the following: ''budget, the appropriate budgetary allocations, aggregates, and levels shall be revised to reflect $55,000,000,000 in budget authority and outlays of the additional deficit reduction achieved as calculated under subsection (c) for legislation that retains AFDC as a Federal entitlement and restores budget authority and outlays for other income security programs.

''(b) REVISED ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.—Upon the reporting of legislation pursuant to subsection (a), and again upon the submission of a conference report on such legislation (if a conference report is submitted), the Chair of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may submit to the Senate appropriately revised allocations under sections 302(a) and 602(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, budgetary aggregates, and levels under this resolution, revised by an amount that does not exceed the additional deficit reduction specified under subsection(d).''.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, Senator MOYNIHAN has proposed this amendment which will enable Congress to improve our welfare system rather than dismantle it. Under the amendment, Aid to Families with Dependent Children will remain a Federal entitlement program.

The amendment will, over 7 years, restore $55 billion to the income security programs, including Aid to Families with Dependent Children, supplemental security income and unemployment insurance under the jurisdiction of the Finance Committee.

The amendment is deficit neutral. It is financed in part by the fiscal dividend that will accrue to the Federal Government if we balance the budget.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I might say to my friend, Senator EXON, I thought matters might get better after the last one, but they are getting worse. Maybe we will have to jointly look at some of these.

I would just say from our side what this does is take $55 billion of the reserve fund that we have in contingency and it would spend it for an entitlement under AFDC.

Mr. President, the pending amendment is not germane to the provisions of the budget resolution pursuant to 305(b) of the act. I raise a point of order against the pending amendment.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, pursuant to section 904 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, I move to waive the act for consideration of the pending amendment.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

VOTE ON MOTION TO WAIVE THE BUDGET ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is reminded this is a 9-minute vote. I intend to close the vote at 9 minutes.

The question is on the motion to waive the Budget Act. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The yeas and nays resulted, yeas 41, nays 59, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 199 Leg.]

YEAS—41

Akaka	Feinstein	Lieberman
Biden	Glenn	Mikulski
Bingaman	Graham	Moseley-Braun
Boxer	Harkin	Moynihan
Bradley	Heflin	Murray
Breaux	Hollings	Pell
Bryan	Inouye	Pryor
Bumpers	Johnston	Reid
Conrad	Kennedy	Robb
Daschle	Kerrey	Rockefeller
Dodd	Kerry	Sarbanes
Dorgan	Lautenberg	Simon
Exon	Leahy	Wellstone
Feingold	Levin	

NAYS—59

Abraham	Chafee	Domenici
Ashcroft	Coats	Faircloth
Baucus	Cochran	Ford
Bennett	Cohen	Frist
Bond	Coverdell	Gorton
Brown	Craig	Gramm
Burns	D'Amato	Grams
Byrd	DeWine	Grassley
Campbell	Dole	Gregg
Hatch	Lugar	Shelby
Hatfield	Mack	Simpson
Helms	McCain	Smith
Hutchison	McConnell	Snowe
Inhofe	Murkowski	Specter
Jeffords	Nickles	Stevens
Kassebaum	Nunn	Thomas
Kempthorne	Packwood	Thompson
Kohl	Pressler	Thurmond
Kyl	Roth	Warner
Lott	Santorum	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMPSON). On this vote the yeas are 41, and the nays are 59. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected. The point of order is sustained, and the amendment falls.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the motion was rejected.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 1162

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Senate on the importance of research, technology, and trade promotion and trade law enforcement programs)

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. EXON], for Mr. BINGAMAN, for himself, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. BIDEN, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. BYRD, Mr. KERRY, Mr. DODD, and Mr. PRYOR, proposes an amendment numbered 1162.

The amendment is as follows:

At the end of the concurrent resolution, add the following:

SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE ON THE IMPORTANCE OF RESEARCH, TECHNOLOGY, AND TRADE PROMOTION AND TRADE LAW ENFORCEMENT PROGRAMS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) the public welfare, economy, and national security of the United States have benefited enormously from the investments the Federal Government has made over the past fifty years in research, technology, and trade promotion and trade law enforcement;

(2) these investments are even more important at the dawn of the twenty-first century in order to insure that future generations of Americans can remain at the forefront of exploring the endless scientific and technological frontier in the face of ever greater challenges from abroad and thereby maintain and improve their health, standard of living, and national security; and

(3) enforcement of United States trade laws and promotion of United States exports, especially programs in support of small and medium sized businesses, serve an invaluable function in creating jobs, promoting national economic growth, and allowing American workers and businesses to have the resources to compete in an ever more competitive global economy.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that, in the assumptions for the overall accounts, it is assumed that—

(1) in allocating discretionary spending in fiscal years 1996 through 2002 within the discretionary spending limits established in section 201, the Committee on Appropriations will make it a high priority to maintain the overall fiscal year 1995 investment

level (without adjustment for inflation) in research, technology and trade promotion, and trade law enforcement programs; and

(2) the conferees on the concurrent budget resolution will not agree to any revenue reductions below current law unless the discretionary spending limits established in the conference report will permit the Committee on Appropriations to achieve the goal established in paragraph (1).

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, this amendment expresses the sense of the Senate that it should be a high priority to maintain the overall fiscal year 1995 investment level, without adjustment for inflation, in research, technology, trade promotion, and trade law enforcement programs over the next 7 years.

The amendment further expresses the sense of the Senate that the conferees should not agree to any tax cuts below current law unless the discretionary spending limits in the conference report permit the achievement of the above goal.

The GOP budget will reduce civilian research and technology programs to a four decade low as a percentage of GDP and Federal spending. By 2002, Federal civilian research will be 0.26 percent of gross domestic product. The Bingaman amendment would effectively urge that this be raised to 0.31 percent of GDP.

For comparison purposes in 1969, the last year we balanced the budget, civilian research was 0.76 percent of GDP. The lowest it ever was in the Reagan years was 0.38 percent of GDP in 1986. It is currently 0.46 percent of GDP. No one can claim that it is research that has caused our deficit. Quite the contrary. Almost every economist believes our investments in civilian research pay for themselves many times over in economic growth and the taxes that corporations pay on the fruits of our federally supported scientific enterprise.

The governments of other industrialized nations, such as Japan and Germany, invest about six-tenths of 1 percent of GDP in civilian research. We are already below them, even if you include the Pentagon's dual-use basic and applied research investments. And we are pointing under the GOP budget to spending less than half of what our economic rivals spend.

The cuts in Federal support of civilian research will not be made up by the private sector. The reason: they have an ever-shorter focus and an ever greater unwillingness to invest in long-term research projects, the benefits of which are uncertain and usually not capturable by a single firm.

Every other nation is following the American model of the last half century. They are seeking to invest more, not less, in civilian research.

Our model has succeeded. It put men on the Moon, revolutionized medicine, developed computers, communications, and advanced materials unimagined a half century ago. Vannevar Bush, the giant of the post-World War II generation, predicted just this in his monograph ''Science: the Endless Frontier'' that served as the basis of a social compact between government and the research community for the last half century.

For the past half century, the Federal Government has acted on that vision to foster a science and technology enterprise in this country second to none. Government research funds have helped conquer diseases, win the cold war, and spur incredible advances in electronics, computers, molecular biology, communications, and materials science. These advances enrich our daily lives and are at the heart of our nation's status as an economic and military superpower.

It is not an accident that American industries from aerospace to agriculture to pharmaceuticals in which the Federal Government has made substantial research investments enjoy world leadership.

As we enter the 21st century, we can not afford a Luddite approach. The scientific and technogical frontier is still endless. We risk condemning our children and grandchildren to a less prosperous, less healthy, and less secure future if we follow the course in the budget resolution.

The Bingaman amendment is intended to provoke a debate and to serve as a warning. It does not fix the problem. Even if its prescription is followed, we will still be spending half of what our rivals spend in 2002. But it is a step in the right direction, a finger in a breaking dike.

If action is not taken to deal with this, we will lose a generation of research and a generation of young researchers who will choose other professions. We will not be able to recover for years from this damage once the pendulum swings back in favor of Federal research investments as it will when the full damage of the GOP budget becomes clear.

Almost a century ago in 1899 the head of the Patent Office, Charles Duell, proposed to close up shop because ''everything that can be invented has been invented.'' Luckily we did not follow such Know-Nothing advice as we prepared for the 20th century. A half century later Vannevar Bush laid out his vision for the Federal role in science and technology.

Now we face a choice again between these competing visions, Duell's and Bush's. We must reject the notion the endless frontier is over, that every invention has been made, and continue to commit to a brighter future for our children. We cannot afford to short-change research if the 21st century is to be an American century as the 20th century was.

I ask unanimous consent that several newspaper articles be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, May 22, 1995]

G.O.P. BUDGET CUTS WOULD FALL HARD ON CIVILIAN SCIENCE

BASIC RESEARCH AT RISK

EXPERTS FORESEE A CRIPPLING OF SCIENCE ESTABLISHMENT AND LAYOFFS AT UNIVERSITIES

(By William J. Broad)

The glory days of the Federal science establishment may be over, science leaders fear, as cuts proposed by Republicans to wipe out the budget deficit fall hard on civilian research.

Under the cuts, annual appropriations for nonmilitary research might drop to about $25 billion by 2000 from the current level of $32 billion, for total reductions of $24 billion or more over the period.

At risk is the type of Government-financed basic science that has put men on the moon, explored the deep sea, unlocked the atom, cured cancers, found the remains of lost civilizations, tracked earthquake faults, and discovered the chemistry of life, among other feats.

Specific casualties of the cuts might include atom smashers, new weather satellites, space probes and dozens of large Federal laboratories that study everything from solar power to violent storms.

Republicans say their goal is to trim fat and corporate welfare rather than cripple basic science, which economists agree is a powerful engine for promoting economic growth and high standards of living.

Representative Robert S. Walker, a Republican of Pennsylvania who is chairman of the House Science Committee, said this month that the proposed budget would keep ''a robust science policy while providing for the fundamental science base we need to move forward.''

But Democrats and private experts say the cuts would undo the Federal science establishment, crippling parts of it beyond repair.

To be sure, science leaders in past budget battles, clearly working in their own self-interest, have been known to exaggerate how painful reductions might be. And some pain might be averted as Democrats and Federal agencies fight the cuts, or if President Clinton successfully vetoes spending bills.

Even so, the momentum for change is now so great that many private experts, as well as Democrats, say Federal support of civilian science is destined to weaken and shrink no matter what, its budget declining by as much as a third if inflation is taken into account. Such cuts portend wide changes in American science and American life.

''Any sensible person knows you have to make prudent investments to get ahead,'' Representative George E. Brown, Jr., a Democrat of California and former chairman of the House Science Committee, said in an interview last week. ''But the Government doesn't. We're dominated by fools.''

Agency heads, university officials and private experts say the fabric of science is likely to fray widely as the Republican juggernaut rolls forward and as the Clinton Administration makes its own cuts in an attempt to regain lost political ground.

''Nationally, there's been a massive sticking of heads in the sand, of not looking at the problem,'' said John Wiley, provost at the University of Wisconsin in Madison, one of the nation's top science schools. ''There's going to be a price of pay.''

Experts say the repercussions could include the abandoning of much long-term environmental monitoring, the virtual end of applied research to aid corporations, layoffs at colleges and universities, and a flight of students from scientific careers.

''We don't want to get so lost in the frenzy to balance the budget that we throw babies

out with the bath water,'' John H. Gibbons, President Clinton's science adviser and director of the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy, said in an interview.

''What ever the reduction is—a quarter or a third—it's big, and it's a reversal of historical trends,'' he added, referring to how Republican cuts would end years of budget growth.

''There's no question that we have to be sharper with our knives, to streamline the agencies,'' Dr. Gibbons said. ''But if you take away a third, that's going to push us way down in terms of international competition.''

During the last four decades, the Federal Government has spent nearly $1 trillion on civilian research and development, laying the basis for a powerful wave of prosperity that has touched most facets of American life. In pushing back the frontiers of knowledge, the Federal money has supported tens of thousands of scientists at universities across the country and has financed the work that led to scores of Nobel Prizes.

Spending on nonmilitary science has grown fairly steadily in the last decade. It peaked this year at $31.9 billion, according to the National Science Foundation, a Federal agency that finances much basic research at universities.

The civilian science budget of the Federal government is puny compared to the $100 billion that American industry is putting into reseach and Development this year. Yet its importance is greater than size alone suggests, for while industry typically looks years ahead, aiming to please shareholders, the Government often looks decades and sometimes centuries ahead, pursuing fundamental issues of understanding that may ultimately lead to wide social benefits.

Another difference is that industrial science is often shrouded in secrecy. By contrast, Government-financed civilian work is usually published openly so it can serve as intellectual kindling for other social and commercial endeavors.

After their sweep in the midterm elections last November, the Republicans devised a balanced-budget plan that went easy on military research, currently about $40 billion a year, and hard on civilian science, especially on Federal programs with ties to industry. An aim of the Clinton Administration has been to help high-technology industries better compete with foreign rivals.

House Republicans produced the most detailed plan for science cuts, which was endorsed Thursday by the full House as part of a comprehensive package to balance the budget by 2002. The Senate is debating a companion measure.

Democrats of the House Science Committee portray the House plan as an extensive cracking of the foundations of Federal science. By their calculation, spending under the committee's jurisdiction would fall by a total $24 billion from 1996 to 2000, relative to 1995 levels. If 3 percent annual inflation is assumed during that period, the overall drop would be 34.7 percent in terms of real purchasing power.

The committee oversees most civilian science spending in the Federal budget, with responsibility for $27.2 billion this year. The exceptions are the National Institutes of Health and the Agriculture and Interior Departments. The latter's Geological Survey, which monitors water, hunts minerals and makes maps, has been targeted for eventual elimination by the Republicans. Its current budget is $571 million.

The biggest cuts are slated for the Federal Government's largest scientific agency, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. Among possible victims is tiny Pioneer 10, now nearly six billion miles from Earth and still sending back data more than two decades after it was launched.

''A lot more than Pioneer will go,'' NASA's Administrator, Daniel S. Goldin, said in an interview.

The Republicans would squeeze a series of planned satellites for global climate monitoring, trimming the budget by $2.7 billion, or about half, to the end of the decade. Overall, the agency's annual budget would drop from $14.3 billion to $11 billion by 2000.

On Friday, Mr. Goldin outlined a plan that would move toward eventually turning over operation of the space shuttles to private industry, something the Republicans have called for. The NASA plan would also reduce the work force of the agency and its contractors by about 25,000 people, bringing it to 1961 levels.

''We're right at the edge,'' he said. ''The Republican cuts would roughly double that, pushing about 20,000 people out the door.''

A similar tale comes from the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, whose parent, the Commerce Department, has been targeted for elimination by the Republicans. Among other things, NOAA runs weather satellites, makes forecasts, tracks hurricanes and tornadoes, probes the deep ocean and monitors fisheries.

James D. Baker, NOAA's Administrator, said in an interview that the agency was already losing 2,300 employees and that the proposed Republican cuts would trim another 1,000 in 1996 alone. Its budget for that year would fall to $1.7 billion from a current $2 billion, with deeper cuts in following years.

''What we see coming is a real tragedy,'' he said. ''We'll have to cut services and stop future investments on all kinds of things.''

NOAA runs 11 environmental research labs around the country to study things like air quality, climate changes and severe storms. Some labs would have to be cut back or closed down. And proposed Republican cuts for 1996 would force the agency to abandon plans for a new weather satellite.

Ultimately, NOAA officials say, lives will be at risk if weather forecasts decline in quality.

''We're a service agency,'' said Douglas K. Hall, NOAA's Deputy Administrator. ''We have people on duty 24 hours a day at the union's airports. They're critical to the safety of millions of Americans.''

More esoteric is the work of the Energy Department, which studies new kinds of solar and geothermal energy production, struggles to harness the nearly limitless power of nuclear fusion, and probes the atom with big particle accelerators. It also is conducting a costly cleanup of sites contaminated by decades of nuclear weapons production.

Its current budget is $17.5 billion. The Republicans would cut that by a total of $7 billion over five years.

The department says the cuts would trim 2,000 university science jobs and 3,500 jobs from its sprawling system of laboratories, would end the large fusion experiment at Princeton University and would force the cancellation of one of its atom-smasher projects. In addition, hundreds of companies, universities and Federal laboratories that are trying to improve energy efficiency would lose funds.

One bright spot in the Republican proposal is the National Science Foundation, whose current budget is $3.3 billion. The Republicans would slightly boost basic research to match expected inflation but would squeeze the social sciences, which include economics, anthropology, psychology, sociology, geography and archeology.

The National Institutes of Health, the nation's biomedical research giant and a main patron of university research, would also get some preferential treatment. Its $11.3 billion budget would drop slightly in 1996 and then freeze. Even without severe reductions, however, N.I.H. officials say their programs would be devastated by inflation.

For the nation's system of big research universities, said Dr. Wiley of the University of Wisconsin, ''there's likely to be a shakeout'' as the cuts hit home and universities shut down programs.

''We'll probably emerge from the next 15 or 20 years with far fewer universities that try to be comprehensive,'' he said.

Robert L. Park, a physicist at the University of Maryland and a spokesman for the American Physical Society, the nation's leading group of physicists, said the race between Republicans and Democrats to make science cuts boded ill for the future.

''Enormous promises have been made and it's hard to see how they can back away from those,'' he said, referring to the Republican promise to balance the budget.

''Social Security and most of Medicare is off the table,'' he added. ''There's not much left in the discretionary budget, except for science.''

[From the New York Times, May 23, 1995]

CRIPPLING AMERICAN SCIENCE

The budget plan passed by the House mounts an assault on scientific research, science training and American research universities that are the envy of the world. Blinded by ideological fury at government, House Republicans seek to abandon a crucial function of government, the provision of public goods like research that are undersupplied by private markets. Private companies will invest in research that is likely to raise their profit, but they are unwilling to invest in research whose benefits leak out to competitors. By abandoning government's irreplaceable role, the House budget would undermine America's technological base.

The magnitude of the House-passed cuts is shocking. Civilian research would fall over five years from about $32 billion to $25 billion, a 35 percent cut after accounting for inflation. Medical research, other than for AIDS, would fall by more than 25 percent. Robert Walker, chairman of the House Science Committee, says the plan would protect basic science. He dissembles. His budget would increase spending on research by the National Science Foundation. But the small increases would not keep pace with inflation, so the number of university-based scholars, graduate students and research projects that the N.S.F. supports would steadily fall. Indeed the plan envisions wiping out support for social science research.

The House budget would continue to support the space shuttle and space station, two costly hardware projects with constituencies in key electoral states, but it would provide little money for other aeronautical and space research. It would cut several energy research programs by between 35 and 80 percent—eliminating thousands of university jobs—and reduce research on high-speed rail and other transportation projects. Republicans say their cuts eliminate only applied research that business can undertake for itself, but they propose slashing nearly every program in sight.

Not all the research that Washington pays for makes sense. Some university-based research can sound ridiculously abstruse. But there is danger in indiscriminately chopping research and undermining a system that has for decades produced the best scientists and graduate programs in the world. The sectors in which America has led the world—from computers and software to agriculture and

aircraft manufacturing—can trace their success to heavy Federal support.

Mr. Walker could have performed a valuable service by carefully sifting through Federal programs to weed out those that needlessly subsidize corporations for research and development projects that they would undertake for themselves. But massive cutting just to reach a balanced budget quickly risks damaging important economic assets.

The party that preaches cost-benefit analysis for Federal agencies ought to practice what it preaches. Cutting the science budget will save a few billion dollars a year in a $6 trillion economy. Knocking out innovative research can lead to stagnant productivity and growth. By that calculation, the House plan is an irresponsible gamble.

[From the Washington Post, May 19, 1995]

THE GOP NEEDS A BIT MORE R&D ON ITS SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY POLICY

(By Michael Schrage)

Charred, smoldering and in ruins: The budget bills pending in Congress leave the Clinton administration's ambitious science and technology agenda looking as if it were zapped by one of those space-based X-ray lasers from the Strategic Defense Initiative that never quite got built. The destruction is near-total. Never have a sitting president's programs promising new public-private partnerships for innovation been so thoroughly extirpated so soon after launch. The Commerce Department's Advanced Technology Program—a $430 million-plus effort to turn the National Institutes of Standards and Technology into a high-tech venture capitalist—is toast. The Technology Reinvestment Program, designed to encourage commercial participation in defense technology development, is targeted for extinction.

Even a $500 million ''national security'' initiative to build flat-panel displays for the Pentagon now shrivels into silicon scraps. Techno-''welfare'' for rich corporations with billion-dollar research and development budgets of their own is being slashed as rigorously and assiduously as welfare for the poor.

Of course, in the context of the biggest proposed budget cuts in U.S. history, there's nothing special about the dismantling of the Clinton science and technology apparat. And why should there be? Everything else is getting cut.

What's disturbingly different, however, is that while the Republican majority cheerfully fuses ideas and ideology when it takes on the nation's health care and welfare budgets, its take on federal science and technology budgets seems oddly disjointed. It looks decoupled not only from the marketplace, but from the marketplace of ideas. The same politicians championing the virtues of America's ''Third Wave'' future prescribe federal science and technology policies that would have been deemed simplistic during the country's agrarian heyday.

The reflexive anti-Washington, pro-market, neo-federalist sentiment that so energizes the right obscures the essential issues that need to be openly debated: What role should the federal government play in supporting non-defense-related research in science and technology? Further, how far should the federal government go in defining regulations and standards that promote innovation in the marketplace? The Republicans insist that market forces are always the best arbiter—but that obviously is not true.

Let's make these conceptually flavored questions more specific and provocative: Would an Internet—with its unique, nonproprietary, flexible, expandable, multimedia architecture—have been an inevitable byproduct of market forces alone? Or did the federal government's active participation play a valuable role in shaping a new kind of medium?

Did federal safety and fuel efficiency standards foisted on the automobile and aerospace industries over the past 25 years promote technical innovation and customer satisfaction? Or did the costs of consumers and the manufacturers clearly outweigh the benefits?

Was the agricultural extension service, created to promote the decentralized diffusion of agricultural innovation among farmers and researchers, an appropriate medium for a central government to support? What about the Morrill Act, which funded the rise of land-grant colleges and universities?

Does a Centers for Disease Control and Prevention to monitor the emergence of potentially dangerous viruses and microorganisms make more sense as a federal or state institution?

The answer to any one of these questions speaks volumes about why the proffered policy choice between ''centralized government'' and ''market forces'' is a false one. In a democracy, of course, the government is the marketplace and vice versa.

Instead of having the courage to deal with these kinds of issues honestly and directly, we have legislators who prefer to cast them into anachronistic vocabularies where it's okay for government to fund ''basic'' and ''pure'' science but ever so bad for taxpayers to sponsor anything that might be ''commercial'' research and development.

But traditional definitions of science and technology have become dangerously obsolete. In key research fields, from computer software to new materials to molecular biology, the distinction between basic science and applied technology has blurred into meaninglessness. The applied technology drives the basic science every bit as much as the basic science drives the applied technology.

For example, finding the umpteenth gene marker in the human genome is ''basic science.'' But building a machine that lets biologists find gene markers 10 times faster is called ''technology.'' Guess which gets funded? Is a data-compression algorithm that squeezes five video streams onto a single copper wire by using a novel topological equation an example of pure science or commercial technology? What if the student who discovered that algorithm is doing his thesis funded by the National Science Foundation but while working at a Japanese electronics company?

Just as it would be crazy to write banking legislation for tomorrow that focused on passbook savings accounts, legislators are kidding themselves if they believe they are doing taxpayers a service by pretending that federally funded science in the 1990s can be managed with the same vocabulary it was in 1975. It can't.

One of the biggest lies inside the Beltway is that ''you can't beat something with nothing.'' Of course you can, as long as you're writing the checks. Say this for the Clintonistas: At least this administration presented a model of how the federal government should ally and align itself with industry to facilitate innovation in science and technology.

The new Republican majority has yet to present a coherent proposal that explains what kinds of investments and returns taxpayers have a right to expect from their federal R&D dollars. It is a most glaring policy weakness from a group that wants to push America into the future.

[From the Wall Street Journal, May 22, 1995]

CORPORATE RESEARCH: HOW MUCH IS IT WORTH?

TOP LABS SHIFT RESEARCH GOALS TO FAST PAYOFFS

(By Gautam Naik)

In the late 1980s, Bob Lucky had what he calls ''a great fantasy.''

As a research at AT&T Corp's. celebrated Bell Laboratories, he was designing a silicon robot the size of a grain of sand. Injected into the human body, it would act as a microsurgeon, traveling to specific locations to fix problems.

''I was damn proud of the stuff we did. The benefits to society could be tremendous,'' Mr. Lucky says. But AT&T scrapped the research because it had no bearing on its main business. Mr. Lucky, a 31-year veteran of Bell Labs, is now at Bellcore.

Chasing far-out notions has long been a hallmark of industrial research in America. But some of the biggest U.S. corporations have cut back sharply on research into ''basic science''—the exploration of how nature works at a fundamental level—to pursue short-term goals and to commercialize products more quickly. Corporate labs, home to 75% of the nation's scientists and researchers, are replacing a cherished culture of independence with a results-oriented approach.

In past decades, the devotion to basic research without regard to boosting the bottom line spawned a steady stream of breakthroughs, including the transistor, the solar cell and the forerunner to today's laser—all at Bell Labs. Now, in the 1990s, the cutbacks are taking a toll. Some disillusioned scientists have fled to academia. Already, U.S. companies are falling behind in advanced data-storage devices and technology for oil exploration.

Some experts worry the shift in an even greater threat to the future. ''It's a short-term response aimed at keeping stockholders happy. Without question this will hurt American competitiveness,'' warns Albert Link, an economics professor at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

Companies counter that as competition intensifies and technology accelerates, they must push harder to get more direct value out of their research. ''We need to focus on customers' needs,'' says Daniel Stanzione, who has hammered at that doctrine since becoming president of Bell Labs in March. A former president of AT&T's $6 billion public network equipment division, he is the first hard-core business manager to run the famed research arm.

The National Science Foundation calculates that U.S. companies' spending on basic research declined slightly to $9.7 billion in 1993 and didn't rise last year. In a survey by R&D magazine, half of all companies with ''research and development'' budgets of $50 million or more plan to cut spending this year, for a 3.5% decline overall (About 10% of the R&D budget is typically devoted to basic research.)

Those figures mask far more significant cuts in some areas. Among U.S. makers of communications gear and electronics, spending on basic research dropped 64% between 1988 and 1992 to $350 million. Even government-funded basic research at universities and colleges, which has risen in the last five years, is expected to fall slightly in 1995, according to the National Science Foundation.

International Business Machines Corp. has chopped $1.7 billion from its annual R&D budget since 1992, a 33% reduction to $3.38 billion by last year. In the science-oriented research division, annual spending has fallen to $450 million from $625 million in 1990. The staff of scientists has been cut nearly 20% to 2,600; the number pursuing basic research is down by half to 200.

In the 1980s, IBM labs explored the subatomic mysteries of neutrino particles. In the 1990s, an IBM lab perfected the collapsible ''butterfly'' keyboard in just a year; it might have taken seven years in the old days. Impressive, but keyboards are hardly the stuff of high science.

Bernard Meyerson, an IBM fellow and senior manager at the IBM lab in Yorktown Heights, N.Y., says that despite the reductions, ''core research was preserved.'' But he concedes that cutting back is ''a dicey process'' because ''you won't see the impact of funding cuts until it's too late.''

Elsewhere the changes have been subtle but no less significant. Xerox Corp.'s PARC lab, which invented laser printing and on-screen icons, now gets detailed ''contracts'' from the company's product divisions directing its research. At General Electric Co., the portion of R&D spending devoted to long-term projects is down to 15% from 30% in the 1980s.

Such changes are sweeping Bell Labs, perhaps the most famous lab in the world. AT&T still devotes 10% of its annual $3 billion R&D budget to basic research, but ever bigger chunks will be shifted away from physical science—the lab's traditional strength—to information science, which is closely tied to AT&T's core business. Bell Labs managers used to be promoted solely on the basis of technical achievement. Now they must also display business acumen.

''That wonderful culture at Bell Labs'' is disappearing, laments Phillip Griffiths, director of the Institute for Advanced Study in Princeton, N.J., one of the last strongholds of purely theoretical research in the U.S.

It is difficult to quantify what may be lost because of such shifts. Fiber optics, for one, might have been delayed for decades if not for fundamental discoveries made at Bell Labs, GE and IBM. In the early 1960s, scientists stumbled on a curious find: Gallium arsenide was a natural laser. When they zapped an electrical current through it, it emitted an intense beam of light, thus making practical the laser that was first demonstrated by Hughes Aircraft in 1960. Scientists realized this ''semiconductor injection laser'' could be manipulated to transmit vast amounts of data at nearly the speed of light.

As many big U.S. companies are backing away, some foreign concerns are pushing on. Major high-tech companies overseas increased R&D spending 23% from 1988 to 1993, says Schonfeld & Associates of Lincolnshire, Ill.

At NEC Corp.'s Research Institute in Princeton, N.J., about 30 miles from Bell Labs' campus, scientists delve into condensed matter physics, quantum mechanics and biology. Joseph Giordmaine, a physicist, put in 28 years at Bell Labs but bolted for Japan's NEC in 1988.

Now, as a senior vice president, he presides over some truly far-out projects. In one, a fly, its limbs affixed in wax, is set before a TV screen flashing a series of images. A delicate probe connects a single neuron in the fly's brain to an instrument that measures how fast it registers the TV images.

The research may one day yield insights into how to design a super-fast computer. ''Basic research means you have to be able to take risks and accept failure,'' says Mr. Giordmaine.

Greg Blonder, who invented the wristphone at Bell Labs, has spent most of his career studying physical sciences and their role in future technologies. In January, he switched to ''human-centered engineering'' aimed at making AT&T products more ''customer friendly.''

He admits to nostalgia for bygone days. ''There's no thrill equivalent to the feeling when you discover something late at night, and you know that no one else in the universe knows it,'' he says. ''I miss that.''

[From the Wall Street Journal, May 22, 1995]

BABY BELLS FIND IT HARD TO PUT PRICE ON BELLCORE

(By Leslie Cauley)

How do you value a company that has never turned a profit, is prohibited from designing real products and has no experience competing for customers?

That question faces Bell Communications Research Co., the jointly owned research arm of the seven regional Bell telephone companies. The Bells have announced plans to sell or spin off Bellcore by next year.

The shedding of the company, familiarly called Bellcore, comes at a time when even the most respected technology giants are cutting corporate-research budgets. For the Baby Bells' lab, that raises the question: Who would want it? ''I have no idea,'' answers one Wall Street analyst. ''It isn't commercially oriented, and it's been operated as a nonprofit [entity] that hasn't been accountable to anyone in particular. It's a seven-headed monster right now.''

Bellcore came into being 11 years ago when the old AT&T empire was dismantled, and the seven Baby Bells were spun off. AT&T Corp. held on to the famed Bell Labs, inventor of cellular technology, the transistor and the satellite. The Bells got newly formed Bellcore.

Despite its formal name, only about 10% of Bellcore's work is devoted to outright research. And unlike Bell Labs, Bellcore doesn't engage at all in the blue-sky realm of ''pure,'' or basic, research.

The bulk of Bellcore's work is in software programming and consulting. Bellcore experts often are among the first in an emergency, as in the terrorist bombing in Oklahoma City last month. Bellcore software helps the Bells keep track of which phone wires go where, no small feat considering the more than 150 million telephone lines in the U.S. It also handles such tasks as assigning area codes and designing a phone system aimed at surviving a nuclear attack.

Some of the top engineers and network designers in the world work at Bellcore. They have racked up more than 600 patents. For all the technical muscle, however, the lab has never produced a single commercial product. It can't. Bellcore is shackled by the terms of the AT&T breakup that bar the Baby Bells from making equipment or offering long-distance service. It also can't design production-ready prototypes or steer customers to particular brands of gear.

Once freed from its seven owners, Bellcore would escape these restraints. ''It's about time we were able to start cashing in on what we know and what we have,'' says Alexander Gelman, a Bellcore engineer who experiments with advances in video conferencing.

That's why the future is filled with exhilarating possibilities—but also fraught with fear—for the 6,000 people who work at the lab's five sites in New Jersey. Some senior Bell executives say Bellcore may have to get rid of 2,000 workers and install a new top tier of outsiders to gird for competition.

Technical ability alone won't carry Bellcore in a competitive environment, says Bud Wonsiewiez, vice president of advanced technologies at U S West Inc., the Denver-based Bell. ''Their challenge is to move from a monopoly culture to a competitive culture, which is exactly the same challenge the seven owners face,'' he says.

Many Bellcore insiders acknowledge the risk and even seem energized by it. ''If you're up the challenge it can be quite exhilarating,'' says Rob Zieglar, a Bellcore wireless specialist. ''If not, if can be paralyzing.'' (Some colleagues, he says, are thinking of leaving,) He adds: ''Given the chance, ideas are going to jump here. We're going to be a player.''

From all indications, they have the potential: Following a major fire in a central switching site a few years ago, Bellcore technicians came up with a fire sensor that could detect a problem long before conventional sensors. Then they had to load it up with clunky circuits to make sure it wasn't manufacturable and didn't violate the ban on designing a production-ready device.

''It's not that our people didn't know how'' to make a commercial product, says George Heilmeier. Bellcore's president and chief executive officer. ''They had to do it that way.'' A manufacturer later refined Bellcore's prototype to build a commercial sensor, Mr. Heilmeier says, leaving Bellcore with some royalties, but little glory.

''We know our concepts are doable—we just have to wait for the right time,'' adds Vincent Vecchio, a Bellcore network specialist. Eric Addeo, a research manager, says operating under the restrictions of the AT&T breakup pact ''was like being in a dark room with the door cracked. Now the door is opening.''

But cutting loose from the Bells also means eventually losing guaranteed financial support. The regional phone companies supply more than 80% of Bellcore's $1 billion in annual funding. Bellcore generated the other $200 million or so from non-Bell clients last year, but that isn't nearly enough to support its operations.

The Bells are drafting multiyear contracts with Bellcore to help attract outside investors, but most probably won't commit to more than five years. ''The world is too unpredictable to write contracts that go beyond'' that time frame, says one senior Bell executive.

Its technical expertise might make Bellcore an attractive acquisition for a maker of telecommunications gear or perhaps a large ''systems integrator'' that lashes together a client's computers and phone systems. But the Baby Bells say they won't sell to a direct competitor such as, say, AT&T; they want Bellcore's technology to remain within easy reach.

That point is one of the few on which the Baby Bells have been able to reach easy agreement these days. Bellcore's mission has grown muddled as its owners have begun pursuing divergent and sometimes colliding strategies.

U S West last year acquired two cable systems in Atlanta, home base of BellSouth Corp., with an eye toward offering competitive local phone service. ''That had a sobering influence'' on Bellcore's board, says U S West's Mr. Wonsiewicz, who sits on the Bellcore board. He found himself ''sitting around the table with BellSouth and others [who were] asking, 'When are you going to start offering telephone service against us, Bud?' ''

Yet to pursue even routine matters, Bellcore has been required to win the unanimous approval of all seven Bells. Asked if he'll miss anything once Bellcore is turned loose, Mr. Heilmeier, the lab's CEO, doesn't miss a beat. ''Oh yes, I'll miss those board meetings where we had to have a 7–0 vote on everything,'' he replies sarcastically. ''The tears are welling up in my eyes now.''

[From the New York Time, May 22, 1995]

CLINTON'S AID TO INDUSTRY IS G.O.P. TARGET

TECHNOLOGY AND TRADE PROGRAMS WOULD END

(By David E. Sanger)

WASHINGTON, May 22.—Buried among the Republicans' sharp cost-cutting proposals to

balance the Federal budget is the swift dismantling of two of the Clinton Administration's most prominent economic innovations: the Use of the Government to promote exports and the underwriting of new technologies that corporate America considers too risky.

During his Presidential campaign, Mr. Clinton briefly called those strategies ''industrial policy,'' until Republicans seized on the phrase as proof that Mr. Clinton wanted the Government to meddle in the workings of the market. Once in office, the White House dropped the terminology but went ahead anyway with an aggressive program, declaring that the United States needed to develop partnerships with industry and use Government pressure to promote exports, two skills that Japan and Germany turned in to an art after World War II.

The Republican budget proposals would bring many of those efforts to a halt and drastically shrink others, from the Energy Department to the Pentagon. The most sweeping cutback proposal, the ''The Department of Commerce Dismantling Act,'' is scheduled to be introduced on Tuesday by House Republicans. The act would immediately terminate six of the Cabinet department's offices and slice up the organization that provides the skills for trade negotiations with Japan, China and several other nations.

Many of the functions of the Commerce Department's highest-profile organization, the International Trade Administration, would be carved up or eliminated. It is unclear what would happen to the economic ''war room'' that calls in ambassadors, Cabinet secretaries and sometimes the President to put pressure on foreign governments to buy American goods.

Curiously, the White House has said almost nothing in public about the attack on the core of its economic strategy, partly for fear that it would detract from its warnings about proposed cuts to Medicare and other popular social programs.

''Our global competitors are laughing at us,'' Secretary of Commerce Ronald H. Brown said today in a telephone conversation from Paris, where he is attending a meeting of the organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. ''Just at the moment when we've finally learned that there is no way to win without a public-private partnership, without getting the Government involved in promoting a nation's exports, people are incredulous that Congress would be doing this.

''The French are apoplectic that we have been so pro-active and successful,'' Mr. Brown said, a reference to Washington's role in winning a huge contract in Brazil last year over French competition. ''And now they are delighted that we are thinking about not doing it anymore.''

The Republican theory is that the Commerce Department has become a brazen example of ''corporate welfare,'' a term coined by one of Mr. Clinton's Cabinet members and close friends, Labor Secretary Robert B. Reich. To the White House's horror, the phrase—which Mr. Reich has not repeated since—has become a rallying call for the freshman class of Republicans, who do not share their party's traditional closeness or dependence on big business.

''There are 19 different departments in the Government that deal with trade,'' said Representative Dick Chrysler, the Michigan Republican who drafted the legislation to dismantle the Commerce Department 92 years after its creation. ''They could all be reduced to a single Department of Trade.''

Another target of Mr. Chrysler's is the department's Advanced Technology focused on the programs that most people understand,'' said Hazel R. O'Leary, the Secretary of Energy, whose department's budget would shrink by roughly $7 billion over the next five years.

''It's a little early,'' said Laura D'Andrea Tyson, the head of the National Economic Council, an office that was created at the start of the Administration to give economics equal weight with issues of national security. ''There should be a good debate about the wisdom of this, but it is still early in the budget process.''

It may be early, but it seems clear that most of the trade and technology promotion programs will be sharply reduced, if they survive at all.

As a result, the White House's reticence has not kept the departments themselves from starting allout survival campaigns. Capitol Hill these days is flooded with under secretaries and assistant secretaries explaining and justifying programs that have never before come under intense scrutiny.

Many of those programs were started under Republican administrations. The theme of the presentations often boil down to one argument: In an age of economic conflict, cutting out political and economic support for industry is the equivalent of unilateral disarmament. Program, which provides backing for technologies that small companies—and some large ones—consider promising but too risky to attempt. ''This has grown from $10 million in 1990 to $250 million in 1993, and now they want $750 million,'' Mr. Chrysler said. ''This is nothing other than picking winners and losers.''

Such arguments underscore the sharp difference in the way technology and trade policy is dealt with in Washington and in the capitals of its major economic competitors, where trade is considered national security and ''picking winners and losers'' is a phrase with no political resonance.

In Japan and Germany, there is virtually no debate over government programs to provide seed money for risky technologies or to use the influence of top officials to win contracts. It is taken as a given that such roles fall to the central government, along with defending the nation's territory and making foreign policy.

In Japan, for example, officials will freely acknowledge that more than 50 percent of the money committed to new technologies will result in utter failure. But even a 20 percent success rate, they argue, should be considered a success. No one would even attempt such an argument in Washington.

''You can't go up on the Hill and talk about a 40 percent success rate, even if that is a brilliant performance,'' Ms. O'Leary said last week. ''People will say: 'What? We are throwing away 60 percent?' ''

Instead, Ms. O'Leary's department has been churning out news releases about its industrial breakthroughs in energy conservation. A giant sulfur lamp now hangs over the Energy Department's entrance on Constitution Avenue, a single light that replaces 250 bulbs. ''It was developed with $1 million in Government money and much more in private funds,'' she said. ''That is hardly a waste.''

On the Hill, though, no one wants to talk about sulfur lamps, unless they are designed to illuminate a balanced budget. ''This is the tail-wagging-the-dog syndrome,'' Mr. Chrysler said. ''If it is a good invention, let the private sector invent it.''

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President; I rise today to express my strong support for the amendment of my friend from New Mexico, Mr. BINGAMAN, which urges continued funding for Federal investments in research, technology, export promotion and trade law enforcement. I take strong exception to the position espoused by the Republican budget resolution—that technology research and trade promotion are not proper and appropriate functions of the Federal Government. They are, in fact, not only appropriate but vital to continued U.S. economic growth and competitiveness in today's global economy.

I have long maintained that our Nation needs to be more, not less, cognizant of the crucial role technology plays in affecting our position in the world economy. Without it we would not enjoy the industrial and military strength we have today. Our Government has traditionally played a critical role in this area and I am convinced we must continue to invest prudently in research and technology development if we are to maintain our position in an increasingly competitive global economy. And with all due respect to my Republican friends, the private sector cannot and will not commit sufficient resources to make up for the cuts proposed by the Republican budget.

Eroding and/or eliminating the Federal Government's role in scientific research and technology development is like eating our seed corn, short sighted and ill advised in the extreme.

I would assign the same labels—short-sighted and wrong-headed—to the proposed elimination of Federal programs which promote U.S exports. Undeniably trade has become a major factor in the U.S. economy. According to the Trade Promotion Coordinating Committee, ''long-term forecasts of the U.S. economy put exports as the fastest growing component of GDP—increasing perhaps two and a half times faster than the overall economy.''

As the 3rd largest exporter of manufactured goods among the 50 States, Ohio has benefited greatly from, and has a vital economic stake in, robust international trade. We cannot turn a blind eye to the fact that all our major trade competitors spend considerably more than we do to push their products in overseas markets. Nevertheless, our relatively modest investments at the Federal level, prudently targeted and efficiently managed, effectively complement private sector marketing efforts and maintain our position is an increasingly competitive international economic environment. Because governments are major purchasers in most of the primary categories of U.S. exports, for example aerospace, power generation, transportation, and telecommunications, the government-to-government contacts are particularly useful and appropriate.

The least we can and should do in the interest of future economic growth, jobs and prosperity is to maintain the current modest level of Federal investment in research, technology and trade promotion.

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, I am proud to be a cosponsor of Senator BINGAMAN's amendment to protect funding for the important investments

that our Nation currently makes to help our businesses compete in the evolving global economy.

Mr. President, as the cold war passes into our memories, a new type of global challenge to the health and welfare of America has emerged. It is an economic war that American businessmen and women are fighting in the US marketplace and in global markets against foreign competitors support and encouraged by their governments.

As Commerce Secretary Ron Brown recently said, the budget before us today is tantamount to unilateral disarmament of the United States. It is the business equivalent of shutting down the Pentagon to save money in the middle of a world war.

Mr. President, don't believe me or Secretary Brown. Believe the words of the customers, the American businesses on the front line of global competition.

This morning's Arkansas Democrat-Gazette had a strong story in which businessmen were asked what they thought about the idea of eliminating trade and technology efforts at the Commerce Department. I ask that ''Cutting out Commerce Finds Few Fans in Trade'' be placed in the RECORD following my statement and urge my colleagues to read it.

The Vice Chairman of the Arkansas District Export Council, Dave Eldridge, said ''For a person who has been an international businessman for 30 years, I can tell you that (closing the Commerce Department) would be a serious mistake.''

As businesspeople in Arkansas point out, at stake is no less than the future economic health of our Nation and our standing and power in the international community.

At stake are American jobs threatened by tariffs or other restrictions on US products in foreign markets. At stake are American businesses, large and small, that must beat foreign competitors to the market with new and better products, cut costs and improve quality through better manufacturing technologies, and position themselves in the emerging overseas that will generate huge new consuming publics in the future.

To help American businesses compete, the US Government has made modest but effective investments in export promotion, trade law enforcement, technology and research. All of these investments are under attack in this budget.

TRADE

Mr. President, one of the great success stories in our work to support US businesses overseas is the International Trade Administration (ITA) at the Commerce Department. During the first 2 years of the Clinton administration, ITA advocacy of US business has boosted US exports by $23.6 billion, thereby creating over 300,000 American jobs.

Taxpayers invested roughly $500 million in the ITA and received a return of $23 billion in exports. That would pass anyone's cost-benefit test.

ITA has helped to open foreign markets for American business and to enforce US trade laws that protect us against unfair competition.

This budget resolution apparently would dissolve the ITA. Again, Mr. President, that is unilateral disarmament.

TECHNOLOGY

Helping American businesses stay at the cutting edge of new technologies is vital to long term competitiveness and that is exactly what the National Institute of Standards and Technology, or NIST, is in the business of doing. According to studies, 25 percent of America's economic growth since the end of World War II can be attributed to technology advances. NIST's primary mission is to bolster US competitiveness by advancing civilian technology by investing in long term, high-risk research and development.

This formula for technology advancement is working. NIST leverages scarce resources, cost sharing, and risk sharing with industry and other government entities. It is maximizing returns to American businesses and minimizing costs to taxpayers.

Another technology program that has proven itself is the Technology Reinvestment Project (TRP). TRP has worked to integrate our military and civilian technology sectors in a way that will strengthen our economy and military. TRP is another useful example of how partnerships between government and industry are useful in pooling Federal and non-Federal resources toward a common goal.

Mr. President, quite simply, we can not afford to cut TRP. For years the US military relied on its own separate technology sector and the American taxpayers were forced to pay the huge bills. If we want our military to deploy the most technologically advanced equipment at the lowest cost possible, we must tap into civilian markets more often. By doing so, everyone wins—the US military, the American taxpayer, businesses and our economy.

These technology advancement efforts are under attack in this budget. Their demise would effectively mortgage our future competitiveness and economic health to buy short term budget savings.

MANUFACTURING

To help small and medium sized manufacturers put new technologies to work in global competition, this administration has opened 25 new manufacturing centers. These centers bring proven technology to our nation's 370,000 small and medium-sized manufacturers. The Centers have received rave reviews from their customers.

Again, this successful investment in future jobs and economic growth is also under attack in this budget.

In nations around the world, investments in technology and trade development are top budget priorities. Japan, Germany and others will be glad to hear that this budget resolution strips the United States of its most effective weapons for global economic competition.

Mr. President, it is vitally important that we maintain funding for our investments in research, technology, and export promotion. The U.S. should be investing more in making our workers and our firms more competitive around the globe so that we can win the battle for markets and profits, as well as higher wages for our workers.

The U.S. can no longer prevail in international economic competition based solely on its vast supply of capital and natural resources, or its large educated work force. The economic battles of today and tomorrow will be won by the firms that can employ the latest technology and the latest information to be the first to market, the highest quality competitor, and the most competitive in pricing. These battles will be won by firms that work in concert with their government to break down foreign trade barriers and open new channels into the mature and the emerging markets of the world.

This amendment preserves the essential functions of trade promotion, technology, and research activities. This funding is critical to our nation's competitiveness. It is critical to the creation of quality jobs in the future. And it is critical to the survival of many American businesses and industries. I urge its adoption.

The article referred to follows:

CUTTING OUT COMMERCE FINDS FEW FANS IN TRADE

(By Randy Tardy)

Arkansas international trade officials reacted strongly to a Republican budget-cutting move Tuesday to abolish the U.S. Department of Commerce and transfer its functions to other agencies of government.

A bill introduced in the House would terminate six Commerce Department programs, including the Economic Development Administration, the Minority Business Development Agency and the Technology Administration, which promotes public-private cooperation in new technology.

The department's export-promoting International Trade Administration would have its functions moved to other agencies, including the State Department, which handled export trade policies until 1980.

''For a person who has been an international businessman for 30 years, I can tell you that would be a serious mistake,'' said Dave Eldridge, vice chairman of the Arkansas District Export Council and director of economic development for Arkansas Power & Light Co.

Eldridge served as moderator Tuesday for the 1995 World Trade Conference on European markets featuring a trio of Commerce Department officers representing four European countries.

''If the United States is going to maintain its ability to compete effectively in the world market, then we are going to need a strong advocacy in Washington and throughout the world,'' said Hartsell Wingfield, president of TCBY International, the Little Rock-based frozen yogurt franchiser with operations in 30 countries.

That advocate is not Congress; ''it is the strong, effective Commercial Service'' sector of the Commerce Department's International

Trade Administration, Wingfield told the conference luncheon in the Excelsior Hotel.

''If we take a hands-off approach to international trade from a political perspective,'' he said, ''we will lose our edge as an international exporter, because other countries are not taking a hands-off approach.''

Joseph O'Brien, an international trade consultant and president of the Arkansas World Trade Club, agreed. ''I've had personal experience on behalf of Arkansas clients with the Commercial Service guys stationed in Paris and Madrid and Mexico City and Guatemala City,'' he said, ''and in every case, they were enthusiastic and they tried hard. They really made a big difference.''

Putting the Commerce Department's international trade role under the State Department would mean a different set of priorities, O'Brien added. ''We really do need to export more in this country, and this is the one way for small companies to get help overseas. The big boys don't need it; the smaller ones do.''

Meanwhile, global trade competition is getting keener, and some of the best potential European markets for Arkansas exports may be in the least-known countries, the Commerce Department's senior commercial officers told the world trade conference.

''Italy is one of the least-known markets in the U.S.; it's a marketplace people don't look at often,'' said Keith Bovetti, minister counselor with the department's Commercial Service in Italy.

The country's ''close to a $1 trillion gross domestic product has the fifth leading economy in the world, and major privatization is going on there,'' he said, ''but there are no shortcuts to being there on the spot to do business.''

Spain and Portugal are also lesser-known economies, said minister counselor Emilio Iodice, who is assigned to the two countries.

''Spain is not just a land of bullfighters and flamenco dancers,'' he said, ''it has a stable government and the highest growth rate in Europe for the last 12 years.'' Spain in 1994 had $6 billion in U.S. investment and, while that's sizable, foreign investment there was greater, he said.

Portugal, with one-fourth Spain's population, ''is a new country, economically,'' Iodice said, noting increased investments in foreign goods and services to help the country become more competitive globally.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, let me be very brief and concise.

This amendment by Senator BINGAMAN expresses the sense of the Senate regarding the importance of research, technology, trade promotion, and trade law enforcement programs all very important to America. This particular amendment is cosponsored by Senators LIEBERMAN, ROCKEFELLER, BIDEN, HOLLINGS, BYRD, KERRY, DODD, and PRYOR.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, this amendment says that the conferees have to keep spending limits at a certain level to accomplish the goals that the amendment contemplates, and there shall be no revenue reductions unless we do. Some of the goals are rather vague, and it is pretty difficult to know what we must do.

It is with reluctance that I move to table the amendment, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. DOMENICI] to lay on the table the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. BINGAMAN]. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER Are there any other Senators in the Chamber who desire to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 53, nays 47, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 200 Leg.]

YEAS—53

Abraham	Frist	McConnell
Ashcroft	Gorton	Murkowski
Bennett	Gramm	Nickles
Bond	Grams	Packwood
Brown	Grassley	Pressler
Burns	Gregg	Roth
Campbell	Hatch	Santorum
Chafee	Hatfield	Shelby
Coats	Helms	Simpson
Cochran	Hutchison	Smith
Cohen	Inhofe	Snowe
Coverdell	Kassebaum	Specter
Craig	Kempthorne	Stevens
D'Amato	Kyl	Thomas
DeWine	Lott	Thompson
Dole	Lugar	Thurmond
Domenici	Mack	Warner
Faircloth	McCain	

NAYS—47

Akaka	Feinstein	Levin
Baucus	Ford	Lieberman
Biden	Glenn	Mikulski
Bingaman	Graham	Moseley-Braun
Boxer	Harkin	Moynihan
Bradley	Heflin	Murray
Breaux	Hollings	Nunn
Bryan	Inouye	Pell
Bumpers	Jeffords	Pryor
Byrd	Johnston	Reid
Conrad	Kennedy	Robb
Daschle	Kerrey	Rockefeller
Dodd	Kerry	Sarbanes
Dorgan	Kohl	Simon
Exon	Lautenberg	Wellstone
Feingold	Leahy	

So the motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the motion was agreed to.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 1163

(Purpose: To protect children receiving health care insurance under Medicaid)

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, on behalf of Senator MURRAY, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. EXON], for Mrs. MURRAY, proposes an amendment numbered 1163.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 79, between lines 3 and 4, insert the following:

SEC. . PROHIBITION OF LEGISLATION THAT WOULD DEPRIVE CHILDREN OF THEIR HEALTH INSURANCE UNDER MEDICAID.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report that would cause children eligible to receive benefits under Medicaid (whether currently or in the future) to lose any of those benefits.

(b) WAIVER.—This section may be waived or suspended in the Senate by a majority vote of the Members voting, a quorum being present, or by the unanimous consent of the Senate.

(c) APPEALS.—Appeals in the Senate from the decisions of the Chair relating to this section shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided between and controlled by, the appellant and the manager of the bill or resolution, as the case may be. An affirmative vote of a majority of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required in the Senate to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this provision.

(d) CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE REPORTS.—Whenever the Director of the Congressional Budget Office prepares a report pursuant to section 308 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 in connection with a bill, resolution, or conference report that the Director believes would cause children eligible to receive benefits under Medicaid (whether currently or in the future) to lose any of those benefits, the Director shall so state in that report and, to the extent practicable, shall include an estimate of the number of children eligible to receive benefits under Medicaid (whether currently or in the future) who would lose any of those benefits as a result of that legislation.

(e) ESTIMATES.—Solely for the purposes of enforcement of this section in the Senate, the number of children eligible to receive benefits under Medicaid shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the Committee on the Budget of the Senate.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, a majority vote point of order against this legislation will cause children currently receiving health care insurance under Medicare to lose their insurance. What this does is simply requires a majority vote if such an event would take place.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, this amendment is not germane to the budget resolution. It establishes another procedure on how the Senate should consider future Medicaid reform legislation. Because of that, I raise a point of order against the pending amendment.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, pursuant to section 904 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, I move to waive that act for consideration of the pending amendment.

I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

VOTE ON MOTION TO WAIVE THE BUDGET ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question occurs on agreeing to the motion to waive the Congressional Budget Act. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 45, nays 55, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 201 Leg.]

YEAS—45

Akaka	Feingold	Leahy
Baucus	Feinstein	Levin
Biden	Ford	Lieberman
Bingaman	Glenn	Mikulski
Boxer	Graham	Moseley-Braun
Bradley	Harkin	Moynihan
Breaux	Heflin	Murray
Bryan	Hollings	Pell
Bumpers	Inouye	Pryor
Chafee	Johnston	Reid
Conrad	Kennedy	Robb
Daschle	Kerrey	Rockefeller
Dodd	Kerry	Sarbanes
Dorgan	Kohl	Simon
Exon	Lautenberg	Wellstone

NAYS—55

Abraham	Gorton	Murkowski
Ashcroft	Gramm	Nickles
Bennett	Grams	Nunn
Bond	Grassley	Packwood
Brown	Gregg	Pressler
Burns	Hatch	Roth
Byrd	Hatfield	Santorum
Campbell	Helms	Shelby
Coats	Hutchison	Simpson
Cochran	Inhofe	Smith
Cohen	Jeffords	Snowe
Coverdell	Kassebaum	Specter
Craig	Kempthorne	Stevens
D'Amato	Kyl	Thomas
DeWine	Lott	Thompson
Dole	Lugar	Thurmond
Domenici	Mack	Warner
Faircloth	McCain	
Frist	McConnell	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this question, the yeas are 45, the nays are 55. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having not voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

The point of order is sustained and the amendment falls.

AMENDMENT NO. 1164

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Senate that the Federal Government has a financial responsibility to schools in our Nation's communities which are adversely affected by Federal activities and that funding for such responsibilities should not be reduced or eliminated)

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. EXON] for himself, and Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. PRESSLER, Mr. AKAKA, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. PELL, Mr. DORGAN, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. KERREY, and Mrs. KASSEBAUM proposes an amendment numbered 1164.

The amendment is as follows:

At the end of title III, insert the following:

SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds as follows:

(1) In order to fulfill its responsibility to communities that were adversely affected by Federal activities, the Congress established the Impact Aid program in 1950.

(2) The Impact Aid program is intended to ease the burden on local school districts for educating children who live on Federal property. Since Federal property is exempt from local property taxes, such districts are denied the primary source of revenue used to finance elementary and secondary education. Most Impact Aid payments are made for students whose parents are in the uniformed services, or for students who reside on Indian lands or in federally subsidized low-rent housing projects. Over 1,600 local educational agencies enrolling over 17,000,000 children are provided assistance under the Impact Aid program.

(3) The Impact Aid program is one of the few Federal education programs where funds are sent directly to the school district. Such funds go directly into the general fund and may be used as the local educational agency decides.

(4) The Impact Aid program covers less than half of what it costs to educate each federally connected student in some school districts, requiring local school districts or States to provide the remainder.

(5) Added to the burden described in paragraph (4) is the fact that some States do not rely upon an income tax for State funding of education. In these cases, the loss of property tax revenue makes State and local education funding even more difficult to obtain.

(6) Given the serious budget constraints facing State and local governments it is critical that the Federal Government continue to fulfill its responsibility to the federally impact school districts in our Nation's States.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that in the assumptions for the overall accounts it is assumed that—the Federal Government has a financial responsibility to schools in our Nation's communities which are adversely affected by Federal activities and that funding for such responsibilities should not be reduced or eliminated.

Mr. EXON. This is sense of the Senate on impact aid, to recognize the fact that the Federal Government has a financial obligation to schools in our communities adversely affected by some of the proposed activities, and that we should not reduce or eliminate funding for these responsibilities.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I am prepared to accept the amendment if there will be no rollcall vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 1164) was agreed to.

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

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 1165

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Senate regarding student loan cuts)

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. EXON] for Mr. PELL proposes an amendment numbered 1165.

At the end of title III, insert the following:

SEC. . STUDENT LOAN CUTS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) in the 20th century, educational increases in the workforce accounted for 30 percent of the growth in our Nation's wealth, and advances in knowledge accounted for 55 percent of such growth;

(2) the Federal Government provides 75 percent of all college financial aid;

(3) the Federal student loan program was created to make college accessible and affordable for the middle class;

(4) increased fees and interest costs discourage college participation by making higher education more expensive, and more of a risk, for students and their families;

(5) full-time students already work an average of 25 hours per week, taking time away from their studies; and

(6) student indebtedness is already increasing rapidly, and any reduction of the in-school interest subsidy will increase the indebtedness burden on students and families.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the assumptions underlying the functional totals in this resolution assume the Labor and Human Resources Committee, in seeking to achieve mandatory savings, should not increase the cost of borrowing for students participating in the Robert T. Stafford Federal Student Loan Program.

Mr. EXON. The Pell amendment expresses the sense of the Senate that the Labor and Human Resources Committee, in seeking to achieve mandatory savings, should not increase the cost of borrowing for students participating in the Robert T. Stafford Federal Student Loan Program.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, who is the sponsor of that amendment?

Mr. EXON. Senator PELL.

Mr. DOMENICI. Could he change a couple of the words?

Mr. EXON. I am advised we cannot accept this until we clear it with Senator PELL. I apologize to my friend. Can we lay this aside?

Mr. DOMENICI. Pleased to do it. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, there will be one more vote tonight, and whatever it is, that will be the last vote.

Then at 7 o'clock we will proceed to debate the rescission conference report, but that will not be voted on until tomorrow. The first vote tomorrow will be at 9 o'clock, if it is all right with the Democratic leader, on the conference report. Then we will start voting on amendments from 9 o'clock until some time late in the day, I assume.

I would hope that some of my colleagues will take another look at their amendments and see if they really feel it is important.

The point I want to make is I made a promise to the President we would try to do the counter—antiterrorism bill. I want to try to keep that promise. I do not know how we can do it if we spend all day tomorrow voting.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, might I say to the distinguished majority leader, I believe they are working diligently to try to cut back on the amendments. I thank him for urging that. We believe we can modify the Pell amendment and accept it.

Mr. EXON. Would the Senator please state how he would like to have it amended? It has been agreed to and Senator PELL has authorized it. He is

right here. He has authorized me to agree to the changes you had suggested, Senator.

Mr. DOMENICI. That is not the amendment.

Mr. FORD. It is at the desk.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, we will temporarily set aside the Pell amendment.

AMENDMENT NO. 1166

(Purpose: To repeal the ex-patriots billionaires tax loophole and put the money into veterans programs to assist American patriots)

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. EXON], for Mr. LAUTENBERG for himself, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. WELLSTONE, Mr. REID, Mr. DASCHLE, and Ms. MIKULSKI proposes an amendment numbered 1166.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 3, line 10, increase the amount by $47,000,000.
On page 3, line 11, increase the amount by $144,000,000.
On page 3, line 12, increase the amount by $197,000,000.
On page 3, line 13, increase the amount by $257,000,000.
On page 3, line 14, increase the amount by $322,000,000.
On page 3, line 15, increase the amount by $392,000,000.
On page 3, line 16, increase the amount by $412,000,000.
On page 3, line 20, increase the amount by $47,000,000.
On page 3, line 21, increase the amount by $144,000,000.
On page 3, line 22, increase the amount by $197,000,000.
On page 3, line 23, increase the amount by $257,000,000.
On page 3, line 24, increase the amount by $322,000,000.
On page 3, line 25, increase the amount by $392,000,000.
On page 4, line 1, increase the amount by $412,000,000.
On page 4, line 18, increase the amount by $47,000,000.
On page 4, line 19, increase the amount by $144,000,000.
On page 4, line 20, increase the amount by $197,000,000.
On page 4, line 21, increase the amount by $257,000,000.
On page 4, line 22, increase the amount by $322,000,000.
On page 4, line 23, increase the amount by $392,000,000.
On page 4, line 24, increase the amount by $412,000,000.
On page 5, line 4, increase the amount by $47,000,000.
On page 5, line 5, increase the amount by $144,000,000.
On page 5, line 6, increase the amount by $197,000,000.
On page 5, line 7, increase the amount by $257,000,000.
On page 5, line 8, increase the amount by $322,000,000.
On page 5, line 9, increase the amount by $392,000,000.
On page 5, line 10, increase the amount by $412,000,000.
On page 5, line 17, increase the amount by $47,000,000.
On page 5, line 18, increase the amount by $144,000,000.
On page 5, line 19, increase the amount by $197,000,000.
On page 5, line 20, increase the amount by $257,000,000.
On page 5, line 21, increase the amount by $322,000,000.
On page 5, line 22, increase the amount by $392,000,000.
On page 5, line 23, increase the amount by $412,000,000.
On page 6, line 16, increase the amount by $47,000,000.
On page 6, line 17, increase the amount by $144,000,000.
On page 6, line 18, increase the amount by $197,000,000.
On page 6, line 19, increase the amount by $257,000,000.
On page 6, line 20, increase the amount by $322,000,000.
On page 6, line 21, increase the amount by $392,000,000.
On page 6, line 22, increase the amount by $412,000,000.
On page 43, line 24, increase the amount by $47,000,000.
On page 43, line 25, increase the amount by $47,000,000.
On page 44, line 7, increase the amount by $144,000,000.
On page 44, line 8, increase the amount by $144,000,000.
On page 44, line 15, increase the amount by $197,000,000.
On page 44, line 16, increase the amount by $197,000,000.
On page 44, line 23, increase the amount by $257,000,000.
On page 44, line 24, increase the amount by $257,000,000.
On page 45, line 7, increase the amount by $322,000,000.
On page 45, line 8, increase the amount by $322,000,000.
On page 45, line 15, increase the amount by $392,000,000.
On page 45, line 16, increase the amount by $392,000,000.
On page 45, line 23, increase the amount by $412,000,000.
On page 45, line 24, increase the amount by $412,000,000.
On page 64, line 24, decrease the amount by $47,000,000.
On page 64, line 25, decrease the amount by $967,000,000.
On page 65, line 2, decrease the amount by $1,771,000,000.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I am a proud cosponsor of the amendment offered by my colleagues, Senators LAUTENBERG and ROCKEFELLER, to restore funding to veterans' programs by closing the ex-patriots tax loophole.

This provision, which allows billionaires to renounce their citizenship to avoid paying taxes, has been quite popular this year. On two occasions, the Senate has resoundingly supported changing this tax loophole. Unfortunately, final legislation to close this loophole has not yet passed. Today we have an important opportunity to close this unfair loophole once and for all and to help those individuals who must now face personal battles each and every day because they sacrificed for their country.

The Lautenberg-Rockefeller amendment provides that money saved from repealing this tax loophole will be used to restore funds for critical veterans' programs. These individuals have been unfairly and continually targeted as a means to help balance the budget. During the balanced budget amendment debate earlier this year, I supported an amendment by Senator ROCKEFELLER that exempted current veterans' benefits from cuts. That amendment failed 33 to 62, signaling the intent to further cut the benefits of these individuals.

This budget resolution seeks to cut $15.4 billion in funding for veterans' programs through 2002. This will result in denying care to almost 1 million veterans, and closing the equivalent of 35 of its hospitals. Clearly, this is not an effective or responsible way to care for the needs of our Nation's veterans. We should be working on ways to improve care for veterans, not diminish it.

Mr. President, I understand the need to make difficult choices about which programs to cut in our push to balance the budget, and that certain sacrifices must be made. However, we must not lose sight of the promises made to those men and women who fought to help preserve democracy in our country and around the world. We cannot revoke the very care and benefits that were promised to these individuals when they put their lives on the line and served their country.

As the daughter of a disabled veteran, I understand the toll debilitating diseases take on a family. I understand the value of the VA health system and the critical research being done to help improve patient care. This amendment seeks to right a serious wrong. It will help restore funding for veterans programs that provide medical care and medical research for the true patriots of this country, and stop an egregious abuse of a tax loophole by those individuals who wish to be ex-patriots.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support this amendment and help maintain the promises made to the veterans of this country.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, this year marks the 50th anniversary of the end of the Second World War and the 20th anniversary of the end of the Vietnam war. It is a sad irony that at the same time we honor the brave men and women who served so valiantly in these two wars, Senate Republicans are seeking to cut funding for veterans' programs.

I support a balanced budget, and I want to work with my Republican colleagues to get there. However, we can get to a balanced budget without damaging veterans' programs. To do otherwise says that the sacrifices of those who were ready to risk their lives can be cheaply bought and easily forgotten. It says that solemn promises by Government to those who have risked all in the service of Government can be casually disregarded.

The Republican budget resolution would slice almost $16 billion from veterans' programs over the next 7 years. Part of this savings would come from freezing VA medical care at the fiscal year 1995 level for the next 7 years. This would be a drastic blow to a system that is already sorely underfunded. It will affect every VA health care facility at the same time resources will be withdrawn from Medicare and Medicaid, leading to additional pressures on the VA system.

The budget resolution also proposes to phase out VA construction by 1999. According to the Disabled American Veterans, that would lead to the cancellation of 215 projects needed to meet current health care delivery standards. Clearly, this ill-advised move would jeopardize the quality of veterans' care across the country.

At the same time it cuts funding for needed veterans' programs, this budget resolution does nothing to prevent billionaires living abroad from renouncing their U.S. citizenship solely to avoid U.S. taxes on their fortunes. Although relatively few individuals choose expatriation for this purpose, the resulting revenue loss to the U.S. Treasury is significant. Specifically, closing this tax loophole would raise $3.6 billion in the first 5 years from an estimated two dozen individuals.

The Lautenberg-Rockfeller amendment addresses both of these shortcomings in the current budget resolution. Simply, the amendment would deny huge tax benefits to ex-patriots and use that savings to restore some of the funding being taken from the VA.

As this important amendment illustrates, we don't have to sacrifice the goal of a balanced budget to correct what's wrong with this budget resolution. We need only correct the badly unbalanced priorities it establishes.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, this amendment I am offering on behalf of Senator LAUTENBERG is called the ex-patriots amendment. This amendment would close the loophole that allows billionaires and others to avoid Federal taxes by renouncing their citizenship, and would apply the savings for restoring funding for the veterans programs.

AMENDMENT NO. 1167 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1166

(Purpose: To repeal the ''Ex-Patriots'' loophole and use the money to eliminate the Social Security earnings penalty)

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I send a second-degree amendment to the desk for Senator MCCAIN and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. DOMENICI], for Mr. MCCAIN and Mr. BROWN, proposes an amendment numbered 1167 to amendment 1166.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed, insert the following:

On page 3, line 10, increase the amount by $0.

On page 3, line 11, increase the amount by $0.

On page 3, line 12, increase the amount by $0.

On page 3, line 13, increase the amount by $0.

On page 3, line 14, increase the amount by $0.

On page 3, line 15, increase the amount by $0.

On page 3, line 16, increase the amount by $0.

On page 3, line 20, increase the amount by $0.

On page 3, line 21, increase the amount by $0.

On page 3, line 22, increase the amount by $0.

On page 3, line 23, increase the amount by $0.

On page 3, line 24, increase the amount by $0.

On page 3, line 25, increase the amount by $0.

On page 4, line 1, increase the amount by $0.

On page 4, line 18, increase the amount by $0.

On page 4, line 19, increase the amount by $0.

On page 4, line 20, increase the amount by $0.

On page 4, line 21, increase the amount by $0.

On page 4, line 22, increase the amount by $0.

On page 4, line 23, increase the amount by $0.

On page 4, line 24, increase the amount by $0.

On page 5, line 4, increase the amount by $0.

On page 5, line 5, increase the amount by $0.

On page 5, line 6, increase the amount by $0.

On page 5, line 7, increase the amount by $0.

On page 5, line 8, increase the amount by $0.

On page 5, line 9, increase the amount by $0.

On page 5, line 10, increase the amount by $0.

On page 5, line 17, increase the amount by $0.

On page 5, line 18, increase the amount by $0.

On page 5, line 19, increase the amount by $0.

On page 5, line 20, increase the amount by $0.

On page 5, line 21, increase the amount by $0.

On page 5, line 22, increase the amount by $0.

On page 5, line 23, increase the amount by $0.

On page 6, line 16, increase the amount by $0.

On page 6, line 17, increase the amount by $0.

On page 6, line 18, increase the amount by $0.

On page 6, line 19, increase the amount by $0.

On page 6, line 20, increase the amount by $0.

On page 6, line 21, increase the amount by $0.

On page 6, line 22, increase the amount by $0.

On page 43, line 24, increase the amount by $0.

On page 43, line 25, increase the amount by $0.

On page 44, line 7, increase the amount by $0.

On page 44, line 8, increase the amount by $0.

On page 44, line 15, increase the amount by $0.

On page 44, line 16, increase the amount by $0.

On page 44, line 23, increase the amount by $0.

On page 44, line 24, increase the amount by $0.

On page 45, line 7, increase the amount by $0.

On page 45, line 8, increase the amount by $0.

On page 45, line 15, increase the amount by $0.

On page 45, line 16, increase the amount by $0.

On page 45, line 23, increase the amount by $0.

On page 45, line 24, increase the amount by $0.

On page 64, line 24, increase the amount by $0.

On page 64, line 25, increase the amount by $0.

On page 65, line 2, increase the amount by $0.

SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE.

It is the Sense of the Senate that the assumptions underlying the functional totals in this resolution include that the increased revenues resulting from the revision of the expatriate tax loophole should be used to eliminate the earnings penalty imposed on low and middle income senior citizens receiving social security.

Mr. DOMENICI. This repeals the expatriots tax loophole and uses the money to eliminate the Social Security earnings penalty.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 1167 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1166

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced, yeas 97, nays 3, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 202 Leg.]

YEAS—97

Abraham	Conrad	Gregg
Akaka	Coverdell	Harkin
Ashcroft	Craig	Hatch
Baucus	D'Amato	Hatfield
Bennett	Daschle	Heflin
Biden	DeWine	Helms
Bingaman	Dodd	Hollings
Bond	Dole	Hutchison
Boxer	Domenici	Inhofe
Bradley	Dorgan	Inouye
Breaux	Faircloth	Jeffords
Brown	Feingold	Johnston
Bryan	Feinstein	Kassebaum
Bumpers	Ford	Kempthorne
Burns	Frist	Kennedy
Byrd	Glenn	Kerrey
Campbell	Gorton	Kerry
Chafee	Graham	Kohl
Coats	Gramm	Kyl
Cochran	Grams	Lautenberg
Cohen	Grassley	Leahy

Levin	Packwood	Simpson
Lieberman	Pell	Smith
Lott	Pressler	Snowe
Lugar	Pryor	Specter
Mack	Reid	Stevens
McCain	Robb	Thomas
McConnell	Rockefeller	Thompson
Moseley-Braun	Roth	Thurmond
Murkowski	Santorum	Warner
Murray	Sarbanes	Wellstone
Nickles	Shelby	
Nunn	Simon	

NAYS—3

Exon	Mikulski	Moynihan

So, the amendment (No. 1167) was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now occurs on amendment No. 1166, as amended.

So the amendment (No. 1166), as amended, was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 1165, AS MODIFIED

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, on behalf of Senator PELL, I send a modification of amendment No. 1165 to the desk and ask unanimous consent that the amendment be so modified, agreed to, and the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

Mr. DOLE. We have no objection.

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

The amendment (No. 1165), as modified, is as follows:

At the end of title III, insert the following:

SEC. . STUDENT LOAN CUTS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) in the 20th century, educational increases in the workforce accounted for 30 percent of the growth in our Nation's wealth, and advances in knowledge accounted for 55 percent of such growth;

(2) the Federal Government provides 75 percent of all college financial aid;

(3) the Federal student loan program was created to make college accessible and affordable for the middle class;

(4) increased fees and interest costs discourage college participation by making higher education more expensive, and more of a risk, for students and their families;

(5) full-time students already work an average of 25 hours per week, taking time away from their studies; and

(6) student indebtedness is already increasing rapidly, and any reduction of the in-school interest subsidy will increase the indebtedness burden on students and families.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the assumptions underlying the functional totals in this resolution assume the Labor and Human Resources Committee, in seeking to achieve mandatory savings, should do their best to not increase the cost of borrowing for students participating in the Robert T. Stafford Federal Student Loan Program.

ALTERNATIVE BUDGET

Mr. ROBB. Mr. President, I rise today as a supporter and original cosponsor of the amendment offered by my distinguished friend from North Dakota, which presents an alternative budget resolution to the committee-passed version before us.

While both plans theoretically achieve balance by the year 2002, I believe our alterative is a better budget in many important ways.

It is a better budget because it maximizes our future investments in our people, restoring partial funding in such critical areas as education, infrastructure, and research and development.

It is a better budget because it eases the unprecedented cuts in our Federal health programs contained in the Republican budget, replacing $100 billion in Medicare and $50 billion in Medicaid.

It is a better budget because it restricts current tax loopholes for citizens who make more than $140,000 a year, bringing greater and urgently needed equity to our current tax structure.

And it is a better budget, Mr. President, because it does not designate the so-called economic dividend to an indefensible tax cut which may ultimately benefit our wealthiest citizens.

I participated in efforts to craft this budget resolution, Mr. President, because I believe strongly that we Democrats cannot simply be against everything on the table. Rather, we have a profound obligation to be for something as well.

While no document crafted by more than one Senator can make any Senator completely happy, I am comfortable that this budget brings much needed equity to our debate. It gives us a plan where revenues are on the table along with spending cuts, where critical investments in our people are preserved whenever possible, where our wealthiest do not benefit at the expense of our neediest, and, where—very importantly—our Federal budget is balanced.

Let me repeat that final point, Mr. President.

We offer today a budget resolution that commits us to more deficit reduction than the Republican alternatives by the year 2002. In fact, the budget we propose reaches true balance without using the surplus in the Social Security trust fund by the year 2004. In this amendment, we call for the elimination of our deficit and we outline the budgets that get us there.

This debate is not about whether or not we should have a balanced budget. This debate is how to balance it.

While I believe the cuts in the Republican budget resolution may be unsustainable when committees try to implement them, the plan we offer today, Mr. President, is fair and defensible. It is about meeting our obligation to our children and our grandchildren in a manner that more responsibly protects the strength and security of their future.

I urge my colleagues to support the very serious alternative resolution we bring before the Senate today, Mr. President, and I yield the floor.

AMENDMENT NO. 1127

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, Senator FEINGOLD's amendment would prohibit us from applying any savings above and beyond a balanced budget to tax cuts. The majority has estimated that those savings would be in the range of $170 billion over the next 7 years.

I believe we should have used the estimated $170 billion in savings to reduce cuts imposed by Senate Concurrent Resolution 13 on Medicare, education, EITC and farm programs. As I noted in the statement I delivered to this body yesterday, those cuts are too severe and will hurt the elderly, young people looking to educate themselves, as well as the ordinary fellow trying to support grandparents and put his kids through college.

Amendments which would have applied the $170 billion in savings to reduce the cuts did not pass.

Today, we consider Senator FEINGOLD's amendment which bars using the $170 billion savings for tax cuts and would instead apply it to create a budget surplus.

Mr. President, I strongly support the need to bring our annual deficit to zero. I voted for the balanced budget amendment and would do so again.

Yet, selective, focused tax cuts would be appropriate. Tax cuts that will specifically benefit the middle class taxpayers who find their expectations of a better future challenged or reduced from day to day and who are struggling to support aging parents and who want their children to have the benefit of a college education. At this early point in time, we should not rule out giving them a break.

For that reason, Mr. President, I oppose the Feingold amendment.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, as the discussion on the budget resolution has progressed, it appears that there are fundamental and partisan differences on our spending priorities and programs. Some of these differences go to the heart of the Democratic and Republican approaches to governance, and call into question the Federal Government's role in society. Soon we may be dismantling the core components of a decades-old social compact between the American government and people.

Our social safety net—Medicare and Medicaid, education, support and assistance for our Nation's poor—is the priority one issue of our time. It is one of the most important functions of our Government, and it encompasses the matters about which the American people care most deeply. As critical as they are, however, this budget debate is about more than just our domestic spending priorities. The spending cuts in the budget plan are so wholesale and comprehensive that they will drastically curtail the U.S. ability to conduct diplomacy and advance our interests abroad.

I would like to take a moment, Mr. President, to focus on the impact of the proposed spending cuts on foreign affairs—the so-called 150 account. This budget will slash funding for U.S. foreign affairs agencies, personnel and assistance programs; virtually eliminate U.S. financial support for the United Nations; and shackle the ability of the United States to participate in U.N. peacekeeping missions.

Even though it has yet to be adopted, the resolution already has had a debilitating impact on our foreign policy

agencies and programs. Last week the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations reported—on a straight party-line vote—foreign relations authorizing legislation that will cut spending for the Department of State and U.S. foreign policy programs by $3.5 billion during the next 4 years. Yesterday the Committee began to mark up foreign aid authorizing legislation, which if reported will have an equally devastating effect on our overseas assistance program.

Together, these bills will abolish three major foreign affairs agencies—ACDA, USIA, and USAID. They will curtail U.S. participation in the United Nations Organization and support for U.N. peacekeeping. They will slash foreign aid spending and virtually eliminate U.S. support for multilateral lending institutions. They will arbitrarily prohibit U.S. participation in multilateral environmental organizations and adversely affect the implementation of critical environmental initiatives. The rush to cut spending is such that the Foreign Relations Committee bills will authorize spending at levels far below even what the budget resolution currently recommends—perhaps as much as $600 million.

On its surface, I acknowledge that for some, this news will not be entirely disappointing. There are those who do not understand the value of spending money on foreign affairs programs, and most opinion polls place foreign aid near the bottom in terms of public support. At the same time, Americans want the United States to remain a prominent world power in the post-cold war era. The people understand this, and the times demand it. Our economic future lies in a global trading system; if we want to protect our national interests we must be active players in the international system.

The problem, however, is that the scope and scale of the budget and spending proposals will force the United States to retreat into isolation. All of these initiatives are negative in tone; they dictate or suggest that we should not engage in certain activities. They do not offer affirmative policy prescriptions. In the post-cold war era, Republicans and Democrats should be working together to fashion a bipartisan strategy for U.S. foreign policy in the 21 century. Instead, we are wasting our time debating neo-isolationist proposals which, if adopted, will result in the United States becoming a feeble, second-rate power. We will be unable to exert influence or work cooperatively with the international community to resolve conflicts, advance our interest, or promote democratic and free market principles.

As written, the budget resolution would set us squarely down the road toward retrenchment and withdrawal. If we choose to go this route, we will do grave disservice to the next generation of Americans. At the end of World War II, we chose not to yield to the temptation of isolationism, and our country prospered as it never had before. I think we should have learned our lesson by now.

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, overall, I am supportive of this budget resolution. I believe it provides a sensible roadmap toward balancing the Federal budget over the next 7 years and I commend my colleagues on the Budget Committee for their efforts.

However, there is one area of the budget resolution with which I disagree: the proposal to sell the Power Marketing Administrations. This sale would have a devastating effect on South Dakota's rural communities and small cities—and on people across the country.

That is why I rise today to join my colleague from Montana in offering a sense-of-the-Senate to strike the Budget Committee's recommendation to sell the Western Area, Southwestern, and Southeastern Power Marketing Administrations—collectively known as the PMA's.

Public power serves many functions in South Dakota. As a sparsely populated State, utilities are faced with the challenge of how to get affordable electricity into small cities and rural communities where there are less than two people per mile of transmission line. Public power provides the solution.

In public power utilities, the only investors are the consumers. Revenues are reinvested in the community—in the form of taxes and services. And, the low cost of power is essential to encourage economic development in small cities and towns.

Public power, purchased through the Western Area Power Administration, known as WAPA, costs South Dakotans an average of 2.5 cents less than the market rate. This allows revenue to be reinvested in additional transmission lines, and better service. The availability of hydropower from the Missouri River to rural cooperatives and municipals has helped to stabilize rates. With 7,758 miles of transmission lines in the Pick-Sloan region, WAPA can serve 133,100 South Dakotans—without charging them an arm and a leg.

Public power has brought more than electricity to South Dakota. For example, Missouri Basin Municipal Power Agency, based in Sioux Falls, has embarked on a program offering incentives for planting trees. The goal is to plant at least one tree for each 112,500 meters in the agency's membership territory. In fact, Missouri Basin was recognized by the Department of Energy for outstanding participation in this Global Climate Change Program. I congratulate Tom Heller of Missouri Basin for this excellent community service program.

Public power also brings new jobs to the communities it serves. In part due to the low cost of power from East River Electric, there are now three injection molding plants based in Madison, SD—creating snowmobile parts. Arctic Cat, PPD, and Falcon Plastics employ approximately 200 people in Madison.

East River also is involved in other economic development activities. It provides classes to help the community attract businesses, and offers grants for feasibility studies associated with economic development projects. South Dakota clearly has benefitted from the work of Jeff Nelson, as the general manager of the East River Electric Power Cooperative.

Public power is a South Dakota success story. It is the source of innovation, development, and community pride. I am sure the same is true in other small cities and rural communities across America. That is why I disagree with the Budget Committee's recommendation to sell WAPA and two other power marketing administrations. This is simply economic smoke and mirrors used to cover up a backdoor tax on rural and small city Americans.

In essence, this would force South Dakotans—and public power consumers everywhere—to cover for the rest of America. Why? Because the sale of the PMA's could result in rate increases totaling more than $47 million.

In addition, many of my colleagues claim that the sale of the PMA's would generate revenue for the Federal Government. Will it? Let us look at the facts.

PMA's still owe almost $15 billion in principal. Also, more than $9 billion in interest already has been paid to the Federal Government. By selling the PMA's, the Government would forfeit future interest payments.

In fact, a recent report prepared by the Congressional Research Service demonstrates just how much money the PMA's are expected to contribute to the Federal Government. This year, WAPA is expected to pay back $225.1 million borrowed from the Federal Government. But WAPA will also return another $153.4 million to the Treasury. Given these figures, it is clear that this plan does not make good economic sense.

As my colleagues know, this is not a new issue. I have been fighting the proposed sale of the PMA's ever since I came to Congress. In 1986, the Reagan administration made similar attempts to privatize the PMA's. I worked with many of you to pass a law to prevent the Department of Energy form pursuing any future plans to sell the PMA's, unless specifically authorized by Congress. As the debate over the sale of the PMA's rises again, it seems this law has been forgotten.

Mr. President, once again, we are fighting to prove the worth of public power. Once again, we must demonstrate how necessary it is to the lives of rural and small city Americans. The people of South Dakota have stated their message loudly and clearly—through thousands of postcards, letters, and phone calls. South Dakotans such as Ron Holstein. Bob Martin, and Jeff Nelson have been leaders in their opposition to the proposed AMA sale and I appreciate their hard work.

Public power is a solid investment for the Nation. Public power is one of the great success stogie of South Dakota. I urge all my colleagues to stand united behind this amendment to allow the continued existence of the public power, and the essential service it provides to the Americans who reside in small cities and rural communities. Now is not the time to mess with success.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I wanted to take a few moments to comment on the effect of the pending budget resolution on the Medicare Program.

I believe history will indicate there is no one in this body who has risen to give a more vigorous defense against unwise Medicare reductions than I.

Medicare is an important program. It provides needed, valuable, and indeed vital, services for millions of elderly and disabled Americans. Thirty-seven and one-half million to be exact.

Our job is to ensure that beneficiaries have the services they need, that the services are of the highest quality possible, and that they are cost-efficient. We need to ensure that services are available in rural as well as urban areas. We need to make sure that we have a system which provides incentives for providers to deliver this high-quality, cost-efficient care.

In sum, on this, the 30th anniversary of Medicare's inception, we must do everything we can to preserve the program, not tear it apart.

What is largely ignored, however, is the fact that absent any congressional action, Medicare will go bankrupt by 2002. In fact, it will run into the red by next year.

My question is that: Is it the budget that threatens Medicare—or the very design of the program?

The answer is clearly the latter, as most experts will concur.

Let us look at the facts.

First, Medicare is going bankrupt. The 1995 Annual Report of the Board of Trustees of the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund, issued on April 3, indicate that the present financing schedule for the HI—Hospital Insurance, or part A—program is sufficient to ensure the payment of benefits only over the next 7 years. The situation for physician payments under part B of Medicare, is only slightly more optimistic.

Second, we cannot sustain the current growth rate of Medicare. Over the next 7 years, the period of this budget resolution, Medicare hospital benefits are projected to grow more than twice the rate of revenues.

Mr. President, at this time, it takes about four covered workers to support the benefit payments to each enrollee on Medicare A. That ratio is declining quickly, so that the trustees have estimated by the middle of the next century, only two covered workers will support each enrollee. In fact, absent any legislative changes, that scenario won't come to pass, because Medicare will have been bankrupt long before then.

According to the most recent estimates of Medicare spending—the March baseline issued by the Congressional Budget Office—in 1995, Medicare is expected to spend $181.2 billion—$113.6 billion in outlays for hospital costs, and $67.6 billion for physician and related costs.

Ten years from now, however, total hospital outlays are expected to grow to $247 billion, and physician costs to $215.8 billion.

These numbers are troublesome for two reasons. First of all, they show a level of spending which cannot be sustained. They indicate that spending for the Medicare Program is expected to increase over the next decade to almost half a trillion dollars, to $463.2 billion to be exact—more than double current levels.

And second, they show the dramatic rise in spending for part B. This year, part B costs are roughly half of the amount for part A. In 10 years, they are almost equal.

Third, projected shortfalls in Medicare are astronomical. The Congressional Budget Office has estimated that it will take $345 billion in additional revenues just to keep Medicare solvent over the next decade. This is $345 billion extra.

The budget resolution assumes a $265-billion reduction in the rate of increase over the next 7 years, thus keeping the program solvent for that time period.

Fourth, the budget resolution does not cut Medicare, it cuts its rate of growth. Under this budget resolution, Medicare spending will still exceed $1.65 trillion over the next 7 years. Medicare spending is projected to grow by 94 percent between fiscal years 1995 and 2002 under this budget. Put another way, on average Medicare spending is projected to grow at nearly 10 percent annually, while private health spending will average less than 7 percent. Under the budget resolution, Medicare spending will still grow on average 7.1 percent per year.

Fifth, to do nothing would be fiscally and morally irresponsible. As I have said, absent congressional action, Medicare will go bankrupt, pure and simple. But there is another compelling fact to consider. Total Medicare expenditures this fiscal year will account for 11.5 percent of the entire Federal budget. Clearly this growth rate is unsustainable; it threatens both current and future beneficiaries.

Sixth, there are no easy answers. I wish there were a simple answer to the Medicare conundrum.

Two weeks ago, Stuart M. Butler, vice president and director of domestic policy studies for the Heritage Foundation, wrote a very compelling article entitled, ''The High Cost of Not Reforming Medicare.''

Mr. Butler clearly and concisely outlined the choices available to the Congress. He wrote:

There are only two choices available to the Congress:

Choice #1: Do not change the way in which Medicare is run by the government, and pay for future benefits by raising new revenues through higher payroll and other taxes or by diverting money from other programs. This means Medicare survives only by draining money away from the rest of the budget or by raising taxes.

Choice #2: Change the way Medicare is run so that benefits are delivered more efficiently, avoiding future tax increases or a diversion of money from other programs. Making the program more efficient would improve the quality of benefits and the choices available to retirees while reducing the double-digit rate of outlay increases. This would slow the depletion of the trust fund and stabilize the program.

As an illustration of the impact of choice No. 1, Mr. Butler noted that the Medicare Hospital Insurance Trust Fund could be put on a sound, permanent actuarial footing right now—by raising payroll taxes 3.52 percent on top of the current 2.9-percent rate. The impact, however, would be enormous. A worker earning $45,000 would pay an additional $1,584 a year, obviously an unwise step which would not be acceptable to the Congress.

Clearly, the better course of action is to improve the Medicare program, making it more efficient and cost conscious. This will not be an easy task. Indeed, it will be extremely difficult, perhaps the most difficult task that has faced the Congress in decades. But it must be done.

In closing, Mr. President, I wish to make one final point.

I do not wish to give the impression that I am diminishing the enormity of the task before us.

I am extremely concerned about Medicare reductions of this magnitude.

I could not vote for this budget if I thought that we were taking an action that would lead to the demise of Medicare. Medicare is a promise we made to our Nation's elderly and future elderly.

On the contrary, after considerable study of this issue, I can come to no other conclusion than that taking no action will lead to the demise of Medicare.

I believe it would be both fiscally and morally irresponsible to stand aside and propose no changes in Medicare, knowing all the while that a staunch adherence to the status quo would lead to bankruptcy of the program.

Let me hasten to add that I will be monitoring this situation very, very carefully.

Under the budget resolution, the Committee on Finance will now begin work to outline specific Medicare changes to meet the instructions contained in this bill.

As a member of the Finance Committee, I intend to participate fully in those deliberations, to make certain that the changes we craft are as equitable and responsible as possible.

It is not my intent that the changes we undertake drive providers out of business, force hospital net operating margins into the red, or deprive beneficiaries of needed services, although some changes will certainly have to be

made to save Medicare. We must face this situation realistically.

If we find that these proposed changes have an adverse effect that affects patient health, whether in Utah or anywhere else in the Nation, I pledge to work closely with my colleagues to rectify the situation.

Mr. President, I do not mean to downplay the gravity of the situation. Reductions of this magnitude, even though they are reductions in the rate of growth, are difficult for me—and I would venture to say for every Senator—to support. Such reductions will indeed have an impact.

But, in the Senate, as in life, there are times when we have to do the right thing, even if it is also the hard thing. Members of the Senate and House simply must see beyond their next elections. We must force ourselves to look at the long term.

The alternative—bankruptcy of the Medicare system—is unthinkable and must be avoided. If we fail in this task, the health care safety net that Medicare provides for millions of current seniors—not to mention those who are approaching senior status—will be lost.

I appreciate that the Budget Committee's recommendations were adopted with considerable angst. I commend Senator DOMENICI and members of the committee for doing the right thing. We must all focus on solutions to this urgent national fiscal dilemma.

PROTECTING AMERICA'S INFLUENCE ABROAD

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, this budget resolution calls for elimination of the budget deficit. I support that goal, but there are many different ways to achieve it. I do not support the formula proposed by the Republicans. It will hurt the poorest people, and reward the wealthiest. There is no better example of the fundamental differences between Republicans and Democrats.

Right now, I would like to focus on what the other side's proposed budget would do to Function 150, the part of the budget that finances programs to advance U.S. foreign policy.

Function 150 is not a large item in the Federal budget. It amounts to only a little more than 1 percent of total Federal expenditures. It is only 8 percent of our budget for national defense.

But it is vitally important to every man, woman, and child in this country. The United States is the world's only remaining superpower. We have an historic opportunity to influence global events, and to make sure that political and economic developments around the world are consistent with American interests.

The momentum is already in the right direction. American investments over the past 40 years have paid off. Not only has the direct threat of Communist aggression disappeared. The end of confrontation between the two superpowers has also caused the world to refocus attention on the evils of dictatorship and abuse of human rights that persist in many places. And the collapse of centrally planned economic systems has discredited state ownership of the economy all around the world. For the first time in history, the trend is almost single-mindedly toward adopting the values that Americans hold dear—democracy, human rights, private property, open markets, competition.

But it is much too early yet to relax our vigilance. The world remains an unpredictable, violent and unstable place. The United States still has a vital interest in leading the way towards peace and democracy and prosperity and away from conflict and instability.

The military threat to America has receded, but it is more true today than ever that American prosperity is linked to conditions in the rest of the world. Millions of Americans jobs depend upon persuading other countries to open their borders to U.S. exports and helping them to raise their incomes so they can afford to buy those exports. Providing Americans clean air and clean water depends upon international action to protect the environment. Keeping Americans healthy depends on cooperative action to fight disease in other countries. Stemming the flow of illegal immigrants and refugees to the United States depends on advancing democracy and economic development in the countries from which the refugees are fleeing.

For all that people complain about the U.S. Government wasting money overseas, Americans overwhelmingly reject isolationism. They want the President of the United States to continue to project American power and influence abroad.

Maintaining a strong military provides underpinning for that exercise of leadership. But who wants us to have to risk shedding American blood? We need the President to conduct an aggressive, preventive foreign policy that will secure America's interests peacefully. This is where Function 150 is absolutely critical.

It is Function 150 that provides the funding for the President to lead:

It pays for the State Department and U.S. Embassies around the globe that maintain communication with foreign governments and pursue cooperation with them. It funds the diplomacy that just a few weeks ago secured the indefinite extension of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, with the enormous promise it offers for reducing the threat of nuclear explosions.

It funds U.S. contributions to the various international organizations that are the glue that holds our international economic system together:

The United Nations which notwithstanding its weaknesses—weaknesses that stem primarily from the differences of its members—plays a critical role in focusing international attention on world problems and helping resolve them;

The International Monetary Fund which brings governments together to protect the stability of the international monetary system; and

The World Bank and regional development banks that mobilize capital to help the poorer countries develop economic policies that will produce equitable, sustainable economic growth.

It funds America's bilateral assistance programs. These include programs for helping Rwandans fleeing from genocide; programs for containing the spread of AIDS and other deadly, infectious diseases; programs for assisting Russia to install democratic systems and privatize state-owned enterprises; programs for advancing the Middle East peace process.

It funds the efforts of the Export Import Bank of the United States and other agencies to promote U.S. exports.

The budget resolution envisions a $2.4 billion reduction in Function 150 spending in the 1996 fiscal year, with additional reductions in subsequent years. This may not seem like much in a $1.5 trillion budget, but it amounts to over 12 percent of the current Function 150 budget. Subtracting out accounts that cannot be reduced, it means cuts of over 30 percent in many of the remaining accounts. This is not streamlining, this is decapitation.

Mr. President, quite simply, the cuts in Function 150 that the budget resolution contemplates would undermine the President's ability to protect American interests abroad by non-military means. Let me cite just a few examples:

We would abandon efforts to promote political and economic reform in Russia and the other former centrally planned economies. Given the opportunity to help turn our worst enemy into a friend, the Republicans want us to shrug and turn our backs. I am not thrilled with everything Russia is doing. The destruction of Chechnya embodies the worst of old-style Soviet heavy-handed repression. But there have been many astonishingly positive developments in Russia, Ukraine, and the other central and eastern European countries over the past couple of years too. Enhanced freedom of the press. Privatization of enterprise. Elections. Our aid is aimed at advancing reform. What folly for us not to seek to nurture what is good in the new Europe.

We would virtually terminate efforts through the World Bank to promote economic reform and growth in the poorest countries of sub-Saharan Africa and Asia. This is no trivial matter. If these countries, with their hundreds of millions of people, start to grow, they will offer vast new markets for employment-generating U.S. exports. If, on the other hand, they descend into fratricidal war and economic decay, they will produce ever-more-overwhelming flows of refugees and disease. Representing not just the United States but the entire world community, the World Bank and the other multilateral development banks are the most promising instrument for bringing change to these desperate countries. In the past few years, they have finally begun to record success in

producing broad-based growth in some of these countries. For less than $2 billion per year, the United States has the prospect of promoting the development of economies accounting for a third or more of the world's population. This is a sound investment. The Republican budget resolution would cancel that investment.

We would slash spending on bilateral development assistance. This is assistance that is keyed directly to U.S. interests. We promote democracy and sustainable development in countries that are major sources of refugees and migrants. The Agency for International Development has taken decisive steps during the Clinton administration to bring its activities fully into sync with U.S. foreign policy priorities. It is grossly inaccurate to call its programs tax-dollar throw-aways, as some have said.

Programs of special interest to many Senators, like aid to Eastern Europe and the Baltics, Cyprus and Ireland, and military aid to Greece and Turkey, would be eliminated. The Ex-Im Bank, Peace Corps, PL–480 food aid, and educational exchanges would all be slashed.

Of course, the United States cannot do any of this by itself. But no one is asking us to. The United States has already fallen to 21st among foreign aid donors in the percentage of national income that it devotes to development assistance. We aren't even the largest donor in terms of dollar amount anymore. Japan has now left us in the dust. The budget resolution would force us to withdraw from broad areas of development assistance entirely.

When I became chairman of the Foreign Operation Subcommittee in fiscal year 1990, the Foreign Operations budget, which makes up two-thirds of the Function 150 account, was $14.6 billion. During my 6 years as chairman, we cut that budget by 6.5 percent—not even taking into account inflation—while the remainder of the discretionary spending in the Federal budget increased by 4.8 percent. Most of those cuts were in military aid. They were a calculated response to the end of the cold war. But that job is now pretty well done. Foreign aid today is substantially less than it was during the Reagan and Bush administrations.

Mr. President, we must recognize that there is a limit to how far we can cut our budget for international affairs. Our allies are scratching their heads, wondering why the United States, with the opportunity to exercise influence in the world more cheaply than ever before, is turning its back and walking away. We are inviting whoever else wants to—friend or foe—to step into the vacuum and pursue their interests at our expense.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, this is an historic moment—today we are closer than ever before to putting America's economic house in order. The last time Congress balanced the budget was 1969—more than a quarter-century ago. Since that time, and despite the will of the American people, Congress has been overdrawing the public checkbook year after year after year.

Today the opportunity has come to put an end to out of control Federal spending—spending that has taken money from the private sector, the very sector that creates jobs and economic opportunity for all Americans, spending that gambles away our children's future—spending that costs us jobs in the workplace and economic security in the home.

For too long, Congress has faced the deficit dilemma like an errant alcoholic or perpetual dieter, with the words: We'll start tomorrow. Well, Mr. President, this is tomorrow, and the budget that Senator DOMENICI and others have crafted is the cure. It is the only cure.

The President's budget proposals for next year offer clear evidence of the lack of political will to make the hard choices when it comes to cutting government spending. At first, his decision was not to fight for further deficit reduction this year. Now, because he sees what the House and Senate have done, he's revisited the issue, offering another watered-down proposal. It's kind of like the little boy who—wanting to bend the rules to benefit himself—holds his breath until he turns blue, then, realizing he can hold it no longer, tries to save face by renegotiating the rules of the game.

This is no time for politics. The American people are crying out for a smaller, more efficient government. They are concerned about the trends that for too long have put the interests of big government before the interests of our families and job-creating private sector. They are irritated by the double standard that exists between how our families are required to balance their checkbooks and how government is allowed to continue spending despite its deficit accounts.

It is clear, Mr. President. The time has come to heed the will of the people. It is our duty, not only to heed their will, but to act in their best interest. And that is what this budget is all about. It makes the hard choices, eliminating some 140 programs. It consolidates duplication and makes Federal programs run more efficiently, more effectively, placing many of the existing programs back in the States where they belong. The Republican budget also allows for a $175 billion reserve fund to finance tax cuts when the budget reaches balance.

The budget holds Congress and the White House up as leaders—as examples in the effort to reduce government spending. Both the legislative and executive are required to reduce spending by 25 percent. This budget protects Social Security and Medicare—vital programs to the well-being of millions of Americans, but programs that would be bankrupt within a few years without the provisions offered in this budget. And, Mr. President, this budget does not cut those programs; spending continues to increase. What this budget does is slow down the rate of increased spending to a level that will allow the programs to survive! It is that simple, and do not let anyone tell you otherwise.

Social Security spending will increase from $334 billion to $482 billion over the next 7 years. Medicare spending will increase at an average of 7.1 percent annually, rising from $178 billion this year to $283 billion by fiscal year 2002. This budget is the only workable answer on the table. President Clinton himself has warned about how these programs are going to be insolvent in the near future. Yet, he has offered no viable alternative.

His most recent effort to counter the House and Senate budgets plan is little more than political twaddle. The Washington Post itself noted that this counter budget which we have yet to see is ironic in that just 3 months ago the President ''sent Congress a budget that increases the federal deficit.'' Mr. President, this is not a game. We are talking about real life, real jobs, real families and communities and the future of our children. Balancing the budget for our Nation is one of the most important steps we can take to ensure the economic opportunities for prosperity for our children and for our children's children.

As a nation—and as individuals—we are morally bound to pass opportunity and security to the next generation. This is what the budget we are proposing today will help us do. As Thomas Paine has written, no government or group of people has the right to shackle succeeding generations with its obligations. Without this budget, children born today will have a tax burden of up to 84 percent of their lifetime earnings; without this budget, each child who owes $18,500 in his share of the national debt will find that obligation increasing to $23,000 in just 5 years. Without this budget, there will be no real and meaningful reduction in the size and overbearing power of the Federal Government.

As chairman of the Senate Governmental Affairs Committee I have outlined a plan to reduce the Federal bureaucracy, eliminate outdated and wasteful government programs, and to strengthen government's ability to better serve the taxpayers.

In January I kicked off a series of hearings on ''Government Reform: Building a Structure for the 21st Century.'' It is my belief that as we move into the 21st century, so should our Government. Innovative technologies should allow us to cut out many layers of management bureaucracy, and reduce Federal employment. Programmatic changes should also occur.

Last month I released a report that asked the GAO to examine the current structure of the Federal Government. The GAO examined all budget and government functions and missions. They did not conduct in-depth analysis, but

simply illustrated the complex web and conflicting missions under which agencies are currently operating.

The GAO report confirms that our Federal behemoth must be reformed to meet the needs of all taxpayers for the 21st century. I am convinced that it is through a smaller, smarter government we will be able to serve Americans into the next century.

Deficit spending cannot continue. We can no longer allow waste, inefficiency, and overbearing government to consume the potential of America's future. I am committed to spending restraint as we move to balance the budget by the year 2002. And I ask my colleagues—and all Americans—to support our efforts.

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I believe that the Senate's debate on the balanced budget amendment was a turning point in this session of Congress—perhaps a turning point in the economic affairs of our country. It was important, not for its disappointing final vote, but for the issues it clarified.

During that debate, opponents of the balanced budget again and again challenged those of us supporting it. If you really want a balanced budget, propose one. One Member of this body put it like this: ''Let Senators get to work to show Americans we have the courage this amendment presumes that we lack.''

This seemed like a good argument to many people—an argument against easy hypocrisy on the budget. Opponents of the balanced budget amendment pressed it as hard and as far as they could.

They threw down a gauntlet before a watching Nation. This week, Republicans have picked it up. And those who made that challenge have fled from the field—proposing nothing constructive of their own. They revealed that their point in the balanced budget debate was not a conviction, but an alibi.

For the first time since the 1960's, thanks to this Republican 7-year budget—offered both in the House and Senate, we can see our way clear to a balanced budget. After 40 years of wandering in the desert of deficit spending, we are finally destined for the promised land of balanced budgets.

There is courage in this budget—courage we have not seen for decades, courage that makes this an historic moment. But, if we are honest, it is courage without alternatives. The status quo may be comfortable, but it is not sustainable. The road we are on may seem wide and easy, but it ends with a cliff, and the fall will be disastrous for our economy, disastrous for our people (including our seniors). Disastrous for our children, and for this Nation's future.

The figures are familiar, but they have lost none of their power to shock. Our national debt currently stands at $4.8 trillion, which translates into $19,000 for every man, woman, and child in America. This figure will jump to $23,000 by 2002. If we ignore our budget crisis, a child born this year will pay $187,150 over their lifetime just in interest on the national debt.

The argument for immediate change—immediate restraint—is simple. It is one of our highest moral traditions for parents to sacrifice for the sake of their children. It is the depth of selfishness to call on children to sacrifice for the sake of their parents. If we continue on our current path, we will violate a trust between generations, and earn the contempt of the future.

There is no doubt that we need cuts in government to balance the budget. But there is one more reason as well. We need cuts in government because government itself is too large—too large in our economy, and too large in our lives. Even if the books were balanced, we would still need a sober reassessment of the Federal Government's role and reach.

This is not a matter of money alone. We require cuts in government because endless, useless, duplicative programs should not be (to use a favorite term of the administration) ''Reinvented''—they should be terminated. Because we reject the vision of a passive Nation, where an arrogant government sets the rules. Because we want to return, not only to an affordable government, but to a limited government. And those limits will help unleash the unlimited potential of our economy and our people.

Votes we make during this debate are likely to be some of the toughest we ever cast. But if we are honest, most of those votes would not be tough calls for most Americans. I have yet to meet a man or woman from my State who believes that reducing the rate of growth in government is anything but a minimal commitment to common sense.

The changes made by this budget are bold, but not radical. They are ambitious, but not dangerous. This is a careful plan to meet a specific need.

Under the Senate resolution, Government spending will rise from its current level of $1.355 trillion to $1.884 trillion in 2002. This is an increase of nearly 40 percent. To put this in perspective, a family currently making $45,000—if its income grew at the rate Government will grow under the Republican plan—would be making $63,000 in 2002. Surely a family could construct a budget to meet this higher level of spending. The Federal Government will be required, under the Republican plan, to do the same.

There are honest disagreements about the merits and priorities of many of these reductions. I expect we will have a hard-fought debate.

On Medicare, it was the President's own commission which concluded: ''The Medicare Program is clearly unsustainable in its present form, we strongly recommend that the crisis presented by the financial condition of the Medicare trust funds be urgently addressed on a comprehensive basis.'' Reforming Medicare and slowing its growth is precisely what the administration itself proposed. ''We feel confident,'' said Hillary Clinton, ''that we can reduce the rate of increase in Medicare without undermining quality for Medicare recipients.'' Ira Magaziner added, ''slowing the rate of growth actually benefits beneficiaries considerably because it slows the rate of growth of the premiums they have to pay.''

Under this budget, Medicare will remain the fastest growing item in the Federal budget, increasing at an annual rate of 7.1 percent. Spending on Medicare alone will grow from $178 billion this year to $283 billion in 2002—an increase of 59 percent.

As promised, Social Security will remain untouched. Spending will actually increase from the current annual total of $334 billion to $480 billion in 2002. One of our central goals has been to protect the integrity of the Social Security system. Social Security benefits will be preserved.

I firmly support this budget—but I have two concerns, which will eventually come to the center of our debate.

Our Government has a budget deficit which cannot be sustained. But there is another deficit that concerns Americans as well—a deficit in the resources of families to care for their own. A deficit we have created by increased taxation over the years, an erosion in the personal exemption. Many families are in a permanent recession, directly caused by Government policies.

We must understand, first, that a balanced budget and family-oriented, growth-oriented tax relief are not mutually exclusive proposals. They are part of the same movement in America—a movement to limit our Government and empower our people. One idea implies and requires the other—when we reduce public spending, we should increase the resources of families to meet their own needs. That is a good investment, a sound investment. A dollar spent by families is far more useful than a dollar spent by Government.

America can have a balanced budget and tax relief for families. No choice is necessary between them. One proposal in particular makes this clear. An amendment that will be offered by Senator GRAMM slows the growth of spending to 3 percent rather than the 3.3 percent currently outlined in the resolution—allowing additional funds for tax cuts. Giving the American people back just 1.5 percent of total budget spending is not too much to ask.

Senator GRAMM's amendment embodies the provisions of the families first legislation that I introduced earlier this year with Senator ROD GRAMS. It proves that deficit reduction and tax relief can go hand-in-hand. We have met the challenge of those who said it could not be done. Adding this provision to the budget resolution will prove to families all across the Nation that their concerns are a central element of budget reform.

It is time to admit that when families fail, so does our society. Their financial crisis is as urgent and as important as any other priority in this

debate. The Gramm amendment is a way for the Senate to prove it.

Much of the opposition to tax relief seems to be based on a myth—a myth that tax cuts somehow cost the Government money. But Government produces nothing, and has no resources of its own to spend. Tax cuts are not a waste of Government funds. They are simply a method to allow Americans to keep their own money and care for themselves. They are a method to build working independence as an alternative to destructive government paternalism.

My second concern relates to our level of defense spending. The Clinton budget is clearly inadequate to retain our long-term readiness and the quality of life of our troops. On this issue we are talking about the primary purpose of government—to defend our national interests without placing our soldiers at needless risk. We have seen disturbing evidence in the Armed Services Committee that the Clinton level of funding will leave our forces without all the tools, training and conditions to fulfill the roles we will ask of them.

Many of us are struggling to recoup at least some of this shortfall. Senator THURMOND will be proposing an amendment to restore a portion of this funding. I hope the Senate will support it.

Mr. President, we have come to the beginning of the end of deficit spending in America. We have come to this place because there is no alternative. Two decades of promises, two decades of rhetoric, budget proposals, budget deals, tax increases, unfulfilled promises on spending cuts, all these have failed. This is the best argument for a balanced budget amendment—defeated, for the moment, by just one vote. So we turn to this effort—the only effort—the only game in town.

The President has abdicated his leadership on this most critical of all issues facing our Nation. Likewise, Democrats have offered no alternative of their own.

So we have come to a time that is unique and historic—an authentic moment of decision. It is a moment to act worthy of our words and keep faith with the future.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT PROGRAM

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the Budget Committee's proposals with respect to the Community Block Grant [CDBG] program. The Budget Committee's report that accompanies the budget resolution recommends a 50 percent cut in the CDBG Program and calls for targeting CDBG funds to the most needy areas. I strongly oppose those. CDBG funds are a critical component of this Nation's efforts to revitalize its low- and moderate-income communities. CDBG is already well-targeted to distressed communities, and, more importantly, CDBG is well-targeted to low-income neighborhoods within those communities that receive the block grants.

CDBG has been a major element of our Nation's housing and community development strategy for over 20 years. CDBG was signed into law in 1974 by then President Gerald Ford. It is surprising to me that the Republican budget-cutters have targeted this program for inordinate cuts, because CDBG is an excellent example of the policy approaches that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle espouse. CDBG is a block grant. The program distributes its funds on a formula basis to State and local governments, and provides jurisdictions with flexibility on the use of the funds within broad national objectives. CDBG embodies the principle of developing responsibility and decision-making to local governments. It allows local governments to tailor specific solutions to meet their specific community development needs.

The need for these resources is vast. Too many of our Nation's communities still suffer. Vacant housing, closed plants, and empty shops are the visible manifestations of neighborhoods with persistent unemployment, broken families, and high crime rates. We know that revitalizing distressed communities requires a multi-faceted approach: successful strategies are using community-based organizations to deliver programs that simultaneously attack the physical blight while addressing the social service needs of the residents. With its built-in flexibility, CDBG allows local governments to implement comprehensive strategies that may, for example, combine the rehabilitation of the commercial strip, with the small business start-up loans, with the job training for local residents and the child care.

The Budget Committee's notion of targeting CDBG should also be considered carefully. CDBG is already well-targeted. The formula for the program does a good job of distributing CDBG funds by need: 50 percent of the program funds go to the 20 percent most distressed cities based on a distress ranking created by HUD. Only 5 percent of the funds go to the least distressed cities. Moreover, program data shows that 90 percent of the CDBG funds go to benefit low- and moderate-income households consistent with the national purpose of the program.

In the past, proponents of targeting have proposed three types of approaches. Some have proposed to cut off formula grant funds to smaller communities, forcing these communities to compete for funds through the state-administered program. Others have proposed to eliminate grants to wealthier communities. And, still others would tighten the criteria HUD uses to measure program benefits.

CDBG currently provides a direct formula grant to more than 900 urban counties, communities with populations above 50,000 people, and consortia of smaller communities. Allowing these communities to receive annual, reliable formula grants is extremely important from the perspective of the local jurisdiction's need to plan for the use of the funds and to pursue long-term strategies.

In some wealthier jurisdictions, CDBG rules often provide the impetus for community development activities in low-income neighborhoods that would not otherwise occur—especially if the communities were entirely responsible for serving their poorer neighborhoods out of own-source revenues. CDBG's fundamental national objective of serving low- and moderate-income neighborhoods argues for a continued distribution of CDBG funds to all jurisdictions with these needs.

Finally, it would be ironic if, by calling for targeting, the Budget Committee were proposing to tighten the criteria that govern how communities use the funds. Tighter targeting criteria would take away local discretion and flexibility, and, therefore, run counter to the philosophy of those who promote block grants. Moreover, forcing grantees to spend more of their funds to benefit poorer neighborhoods is not a rationale for a 50-percent cut in program funds. Indeed, the resource needs of our poorest communities are so vast, that if the program objective was based on only strict targeting to very poor neighborhoods, this would make the case for increased funding.

I would argue that given the limited resources, preserving the current program targeting is desirable. States, counties, and cities may find that an optimal economic development strategy would be to use small amounts of CDBG assistance to leverage private investment in areas with other existing features attractive to investors. Grantees who have been losing population, may want to focus community development activities on stabilizing mixed income neighborhoods or in pursuing strategies to lure moderate-income households into low-income neighborhoods. These are local decisions and appropriate community development strategies.

I oppose the Republicans proposed cut of 50 percent in CDBG Program funds because CDBG is making a difference in thousands of American communities. A recent evaluation of the CDBG Program by the Urban Institute concludes that ''. . . the program has made an important contribution to city community development, including demonstrated successes in achieving local neighborhood stabilization and revitalization objectives. It's fair to say that in almost every city, neighborhoods would have been worse off had the program never existed, and certainly, cities would not have embarked on the housing and redevelopment programs that now comprise a core function of municipal government. Further, CDBG-funded programs clearly benefit those for whom the program was intended—low- and moderate-income persons and neighborhoods—and does so by a substantially greater degree than the minimum required under law.''

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 average 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 supplements	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	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 McDonnel-Douglas currently owns this facility. What is the fair market value of this facility? Have NASA and McDonnel-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 Redesigned 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-envelop 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 expenditures 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 vetoes 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 Armistic 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.

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

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 mouthfull 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 opponent 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?

THE SERVICE OF DR. DUANE MEYER

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, today I would like to congratulate a Missourian who has dedicated his life to helping students pursue the knowledge and gifts of higher education. He is retiring after 40 years of service to Southwest Missouri State University, located in my hometown of Springfield, MO. Duane G. Meyer has spent his entire postgraduate teaching career at Southwest Missouri State University, serving as a teacher for 18 years and an administrator for 22 years, including service from 1971–83 as the sixth president of Southwest Missouri State.

Dr. Meyer was born on June 29, 1926, in Carroll, IA, and earned a bachelor's degree from the University of Dubuque in Dubuque, IA. He went on to earn a master's degree and a Ph.D. from the University of Iowa. In 1955, Dr. Meyer arrived in Springfield to begin his career as an assistant professor and later professor of history. In 1961, he was appointed dean of faculties, a post he held until 1971. During that time, Dr. Meyer served as acting president of the university twice, in 1964 and 1970.

In 1971, Duane Meyer was selected to be the sixth president of the school. During his 12 years as president, Southwest Missouri State University experienced unprecedented growth and success. The school was renamed Southwest Missouri State University in 1972 through an enactment of the Missouri General Assembly. Enrollment increased to all time highs every year of his tenure except one, and SMSU became the second largest 4-year public institution in the State of Missouri. Other notable landmarks of Dr. Meyer's tenure include the creation and implementation of an academic master plan, the creation of a business school, and the building of a new student event center. The SMSU athletic program began competition in NCAA Division One competition during his presidency.

After his retirement as president of the university, Dr. Meyer continued to serve Southwest Missouri State as a professor of history and president emeritus. He served the State of Missouri as a member of the Missouri Council on Public Higher Education Board. My colleague in the Senate, then-governor Kit Bond, appointed Dr. Meyer to serve on the Missouri Commission on Higher Education. Dr. Meyer has also written two textbooks that are still used in classrooms today, including ''The Heritage of Missouri: A History.''

Throughout his 42-year career, Dr. Duane G. Meyer served the students and faculty of Southwest Missouri State University and the surrounding communities with dedication and pride. As a former teaching colleague of Dr. Meyer at SMSU, I am grateful to him for his selfless labors and salute his work and the role he played in the education of thousands of students from Missouri and across America.

THE SPRATLY ISLANDS

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, while the dispute surrounding the Spratly Islands in the South China Sea has seemingly disappeared from our domestic press, I would like my colleagues to know that—unfortunately—it has not been resolved. On the contrary, the frequency and tenor of the hostile rhetoric and minor tiffs between the concerned parties have increased since I last spoke about the issue on the floor on March 30 of this year. This is reflected in the Asian media, and I would like to share here a small representative sampling of those reports from just the last 2 weeks with my colleagues to keep them abreast of the most recent developments. I ask unanimous consent. That several editorials be printed in the RECORD.

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

MILITARY TO ''FIRMLY'' DEFEND TERRITORIAL WATERS

HANOI VNA, May 7.—Defending firmly the territorial waters and islands in the East Sea [South China Sea] is an important part in Vietnam's strategic task of safeguarding its national independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity, said an article in the Quan Doi Nhan Dan (People's Army) daily on Friday [5 May].

The article, run in anticipation of the 40th foundation day of the Vietnam People's Navy (May 7), praised the Navy's feats of arms in the two resistance wars against foreign invaders. Over the past 40 years, the Vietnamese Navy made a big contribution to the struggle for national independence and freedom, particularly in the fight against the enemy's air raids and harbour blockade in the north. The Navy was assigned to set up a 'Ho Chi Minh Trail on the sea' to transport military supplies to liberation fighters in the south and actively engaged in the spring 1975 general offensive which liberated the entire South Vietnam including Truong Sa (Spratly) Islands.

Vietnam has a coastal line of 3,260 km. It has one million sq. Km of sea under its jurisdiction including two archipelagoes Hoang Sa, Parag Sa (Spratly) and a great number of other islands. Endowed with rich oil and other natural resources, Vietnam is expected to tap 7.7 million tonnes of crude oil this year and about 20-25 million tonnes by the year 2000.

Regarding the East Sea issue, during his talks in Seoul last month with South Korean president, party General Secretary Do Muoi said Truong Sa and Hoang Sa belong to Vietnam, and it wants to resolve the disputes through peaceful negotiations on the basis of equality, mutual respect and in line with the 1982 UN Convention on the Law of the Sea. He expressed his wish that joint efforts should be made to build Asia-the Pacific into a region of peace, stability, cooperation and prosperity.

For his part, President Le Duc Anh in a recent message to the inhabitants and soldiers on Truong Sa on the occasion of the 20th liberation day of the archipelago stressed that it is the country's sacred territory.

TRIP IS ''SERIOUS INFRINGEMENT''

BEIJING, May 16, (XINHUA)—Foreign Ministry spokesman Shen Guofang issued a statement here today.

Shen Guofang said: Plotted and organized by the Philippine military, a formation of two Philippine warships and one pleasure-boat carrying Filipino and foreign reporters sailed to Meiji Reef of our country's Nansha Islands [Spratly Islands] on 13 May to engage in so-called ''news-gathering'' activities. Prior to that, the Chinese Foreign Ministry and the Chinese Embassy in the Philippines had made stern representations on several occasions to the Philippine side, in which they demanded the latter to call off this provocative act. The Philippine side, however, disregarded the Chinese Government's stern warning and was bent on having its own way. This was a serious infringement of China's sovereignty. The Chinese Government has lodged a strong protest with the Philippine Government over this matter.

He said: We advise the Philippine side not to misinterpret the Chinese side's restraint. The Philippine side had better return to the correct course of settling the relevant dispute through peaceful talks. If the Philippine side continues to act willfully and recklessly, it should be responsible for all consequences arising therefrom.

''RECKLESS MOVES'' DISCOURAGED

BEIJING, May 16 (XINHUA)—China repeated today its protest against the Philippines for an organized trip by the Philippine side to Nansha Islands [Spratly Islands] last week, asking it ''not to misunderstand China's restraint.''

On May 13, at the instigation of the Philippine military forces, two Philippine warships and another ship carrying Philippine and foreign reporters went to China's Meiji Reef in the Nansha Islands for a so-called ''interview'', according to a statement of Chinese Foreign Ministry spokesman Shen Guofang issued here today.

Before that, Shen said, the Chinese Foreign Ministry and Chinese Embassy to the Philippines had made many solemn representations to the Philippine side, asking that country to cancel the provocative action.

However, the Philippine side, regardless of China's serious warning, still acted willfully, the spokesman said, adding that the action seriously encroached on China's * * *.

PHILIPPINES', PRC SHIPS FACE ''STANDOFF'' IN SPRATLYS ''STANDOFF'' LASTS 70 MINUTES

(''News Focus'' by Virgilio C. Galvez)

OFF MISCHIEF REEF, SPRATLY ISLANDS, May 16 KYODO—Two Chinese ships faced off with two Philippine naval vessels Saturday [13 May] while journalists were being ferried by helicopters over a Chinese-held reef in the disputed Spratly islands in the South China Sea.

The 70-minute standoff ended several minutes after the last of seven chopper sorties landed on the deck of the BRP Benguet, a landing ship which was carrying the first ever group of foreign and Filipino reporters to Mischief Reef, 250 kilometers west of Palawan Island in the western Philippines.

''You saw for yourself what they did . . . They crossed our bow. We were just doing our thing,'' Maj. Gen. Carlos Tanega, commander of Military Forces in western Philippines, told reporters.

''We were just launching and recovering helicopters . . . and here they are, sometimes blocking our way,'' Tanega pointed out.

On Monday, Beijing formally protested Manila's decision to allow foreign journalists to visit the disputed island Chain.

Apart from the Philippines and China, Vietnam, Taiwan, Malaysia and Brunei also claim all or portions of the Spratlys, which are believed to be rich in oil and other mineral deposits.

The media group, composed mostly of members of the Foreign Correspondents Association of the Philippines, left Manila on

May 11 for Puerto Princesa, nearly 600 km southwest of the capital.

It returned Tuesday to Manila after observing special municipal elections held Sunday in Pag-Asa, the largest of seven Spratly islands held by the Philippines.

After two nights aboard a private cruise ship, the journalists reached Jackson Atoll, about 50 km northwest of Mischief Reef, where they transferred to the World War II vintage Benguet.

The first two sorties with 16 journalists on board Vietnam war-era Uhih choppers with ''press'' markings took off at about 11:15 AM when the landing ship was about 30 km off Mischief Reef.

Also on board was Tanega, the first Philippine officer to fly over the area since the Chinese built at least 14 structures on four platforms around the reef.

Manila has strongly condemned the Chinese occupation of the reef, which Filipino officials stress is well within the country's 200-km exclusive economic zone.

Beijing maintains that the reef is part of its territory and claims the structures are ''shelters for fishermen.''

Tanega pointed out the two Chinese ships raced back to the reef's lagoon after apparently seeing the choppers, journalists said.

But in the second wave of sorties, journalists saw the ships heading toward the Philippine naval ships which were about 24 km off the reef.

From the ship's foredeck, journalists saw the Chinese vessels, a small fast boat and a larger ship, assume blocking positions midway between the reef and the Philippine vessels.

At that point, about 16 km from the reef, the Benguet stopped to launch the fourth and fifth sorties.

''We stopped because . . . We knew this is the place where we could accomplish the mission in the best, expeditious and safest way,'' said Tanega at a press conference the next day.

As the Benguet was ''lying to,'' a naval term to mean that a ship has stopped without dropping anchor, its patrol escort, Miguel Malvar, maneuvered from starboard to a position to port.

Tanega said this was done to prevent the bigger Chinese ship from coming closer to the Benguet.

The smaller Chinese vessel moved to a position as close as 50 meters from the Benguet from where some its crew took photos and filmed the operations of the naval ship.

''The reaction was definitely expected because they did not know what we were doing,'' said Tanega.

''They did not know where the helicopters were taking off . . . They could not surmise how a land-based helicopter could fly 208 km from the nearest land field,'' he pointed out.

Tanega said that while the Chinese vessel, whose Chinese markings identified it as belonging to Beijing's Bureau of Fisheries, was ''too close for comfort,'' he was not bothered by its presence.

As the choppers were secured on the deck of the Benguet, a Philippine Air Force reconnaissance plane radioed Tanega about the approach of ''two savage fishes.''

The plane was referring to Chinese frigates, which journalists learned were 24 km away and racing toward them.

Shortly after, at about 2:45 PM, Tanega ordered the Benguet and its escort ship to maneuver out of the area and proceed to Pag-Asa, some 18 hours away.

The two Chinese vessels made no attempt to stop the ships and stayed behind while the frigates, whose outlines could be seen on the horizon, appeared to stop.

''What is important here is we did what we had to do because this is our territory. We were eyeball to eyeball. We did not blink,'' said Tanega.

PRC STANCE ON MEDIA'S SPRATLYS TOUR ANALYZED

(Editorial: ''Manila Scores Versus Beijing'')

Whatever substance to Beijing's claim that the Chinese structures on Mischief Reef are mere stations of Chinese fishermen has been shown spurious by the celebrated stand-off that took place last Saturday at the Kalayaan Islands. There, two Chinese warships suddenly appeared 15 nautical miles away in apparent support of Chinese vessels blocking a Philippine Navy ship carrying local and foreign journalists.

The inspection trip by our Navy would have been enough to impress upon independent journalists that the structures on Mischief Reef could not have been mere fishing stations by ubiquitous Chinese fishermen: the structures are made of metal with parabolic discs all around, giving credence to Manila's claim they could eventually become naval support facilities.

But the Chinese, not exactly known for subtlety, betrayed their own intentions; they themselves confirmed Manila's claim. Within minutes after Philippine Navy helicopters started their sorties of Mischief Reef last Saturday, two frigates from the Chinese navy raced to the sight in apparent aid of the Chinese ''fishermen''.

The trip has therefore accomplished Manila's objective of proving to the international community that the Chinese are undermining the status quo in the Kalayaan and unnecessarily causing tension there. By arranging for the coverage by foreign journalists, Manila has not only scored a public relations point against Beijing, it has also buttressed its territorial claim to the Kalayaan. As Acting Foreign Secretary Domingo Siazon put it when he turned down Beijing's request that the tour be canceled, the foreign journalists who were coming along for the inspection should be an indication of how they perceived the ''sovereignty issue''.

By drawing international opinion to the issue, Manila has hit back at Beijing in the most capable way it could, making full use of the resources of democracy and unmasking in the process China's unneighborly designs in the region. It has billed the trip as a concession to freedom of the press and made it just an item in the larger itinerary of visiting the Filipino settlements in the Kalayaan in order to conduct the elections there. In one fell swoop, the Philippines has been able to demonstrate its democratic character contrast to the authoritarian regime in China as well as the fact that the Kalayaan is hers by virtue of the Filipino living there.

The rub is that the confrontation shows China's aggressiveness in pursuing its weak claim on Kalayaan. And with the Philippine military by all accounts standing eyeball to eyeball with the Chinese display of mi last Saturday—the Italian-made jets of the Philippine Air Force screamed overhead during the stand-off to warn theinese—, what has been drummed to the international community is the seriousness of the Kalayaan dispute. In such a t, hostilities in the islands could break out any time.

But the tension could be managed by forceful diplomacy and imaginative show of force against Beijing. Manila has been able to compel Washington to issue a statement which voiced United States' interest that ''freedom of maritime investigation'' shall be preserved in the South China Sea, a clear potshot at Beijing over its mischievous incursions. Manila now has to navigate through the contentious domestic dispute over some sort of a military logistical arrangement of the US in the aftermath of the pullout of the Americans from Subic and Clark. Asian capitals and some sectors in thilippine are loath to admit it but the key to controlling China and maintaining Asian security in the future is to America militarily engaged in the region.

[From the Manila Philippine Daily, May 18, 1995]

''CREATIVE'' POLICY ON SPRATLYS LEADS TO SUCCESS

The decision to take on China on the Spratlys is the boldest foreign policy initiative ever taken by the Ramos administration. It is even more remarkable if we consider that he took a stand despite the military and economic weakness of the Philippines. That the Philippines forcefully challenged Chinese creeping expansion in the Spratlys was a shock to China, as well as a surprise to our ASEAN allies. They never expected the ''sick man of Asia'' to take on the Chinese giant on the question of territorial integrity. The diplomatic gamble paid off. It brought to the surface historic fears in Asia about the Chinese threat, which is more magnified by the modernization of its armed forces and its rapidly expanding economy.

President Ramos' gamble touched a raw nerve among Asians, and now many of our neighbors have dropped their reluctance to warn against the Chinese threat. The fear and anxieties over the Chinese move on the Spratlys are based on stronger grounds than sovereignty or who should exploit maritime resources supposed to lie underneath the atolls. The larger issue, as pointed out by Goh Chok Tong to Chinese Foreign Minister Li Peng, involves the freedom of navigation in the South China Sea, over which China claims sovereignty based on antiquarian maps.

It was the Philippines' actions that proved to be the catalyst of the new-found solidarity among ASEAN and the Asia-Pacific nations, notably Japan and the United States, to forge a common stand in persuading China that it is in her interest to bring the dispute within the framework of multilateral negotiations. The Philippine action proves that tough diplomatic decisions can give us a position of strength if we get international support behind us. This is what we call creative diplomacy.

Mr. THOMAS. Let me say in closing, Mr. President, that I am pleased the State Department has finally issued a definitive U.S. position on the Spratlys, with which I heartily agree. I believe that the Foreign Relations Committee will take up Senate Resolution 97—a sense-of-the-Senate resolution on the islands which I sponsored—in the near future and move it to the floor soon thereafter.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Thomas, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

REPORT ON AERONAUTICS AND SPACE FOR FISCAL YEAR 1994—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—PM 52

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to transmit this report on the Nation's achievements in aeronautics and space during Fiscal Year 1994, as required under section 206 of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, as amended (42 U.S.C. 2476). Aeronautics and space activities involve 15 contributing departments and agencies of the Federal Government, as this report reflects, and the results of their ongoing research and development affect the Nation as a whole in a variety of ways.

Fiscal Year 1994 featured many important developments and changes in U.S. aeronautics and space efforts. It included 7 Space Shuttle missions successfully completed, 15 Government launches of Expendable Launch Vehicles (ELVs), and 4 commercial launches from Government facilities. Among notable developments in the ELV area were the launch of the Deep Space probe, Clementine, initial use of the Titan IV Centaur upper stage, and the first launch of the Taurus launch vehicle. Highlights of the Shuttle missions included the highly successful servicing mission for the Hubble Space Telescope (HST), which replaced several faulty parts and installed a sophisticated package of corrective optics to compensate for the spherical aberration in HST's primary mirror. Also, the flight of the Space Radar Laboratory began to provide information on environmental change, and a mission with a Russian astronaut, Sergei Krikalev, as a member of the crew signalled the beginning of a three-phased cooperative program in space between Russia and the United States.

In a year of tremendous accomplishments for the international Space Station, National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) developed an initial set of specifications that included Russian elements as part of the design. Russia's agreeing to join the 12 original participating nations as a partner resulted in the expansion of the existing Shuttle/Mir program into Phase I of the international Space Station program, which officially began with Sergei Krikalev's flight on the Shuttle. All of the partners held a successful systems design review in Texas in March, and in June, Russia and the United States signed an interim agreement on the Space Station and a $400 million contract for Russian space hardware, services, and data. In August, the program completed a vehicle architecture review and in September, the Space Station Control Board ratified the recommendations it included. The redesigned Space Station costs $5 billion less than Space Station Freedom and still offers increased research capability and user flexibility.

In aeronautics, activities included development of technologies to improve performance, increase safety, reduce engine noise and other environmental degradation, improve air traffic management, lower costs, and help American industry to be more competitive in the world market. For example, high-speed research continued during Fiscal Year 1994 to focus on resolving critical environmental issues and laying the technological foundation for an economical, next generation, High Speed Civil Transport (HSCT). In this connection, the United States reached agreement with Russia to use the Tu-144 supersonic transport as a testbed for HSCT development. In addition, efforts in advanced subsonics focused on reducing aircraft and engine noise levels, on development of wind shear sensing devices, and on creating technologies that will improve general aviation aircraft.

In space science, astronomers using HST's revitalized optics discovered disks of protoplanetary dust orbiting stars in the Orion Nebula, suggesting that the formation of planets in the Milky Way and elsewhere may be relatively common. Also, HST's revelation of helium in distant constellations provides valuable information about the conditions in the universe during its initial evolution. The Spacelab Life Sciences-2, U.S. Microgravity Payload-2, and International Microgravity Laboratory-2 greatly increased our understanding of the role of gravity on biological, physical, and chemical processes. In biology, we learned that gravity affects the function of the neural connections between brain cells; this can have profound implications for rebuilding damaged brain cells due to strokes and disease. In Earth science, the Space Radar Laboratories-1 and -2, plus the Lidar In-Space Technology Experiment payload, used powerful radar and laser technology to penetrate cloud cover and map critical factors on a global scale. Also, the highly successful launch of the Clementine Deep Space Probe tested 23 advanced technologies for high-tech, lightweight missile defense. The relatively inexpensive, rapidly-built spececraft constituted a major revolution in spacecraft management and design; it also contributed significantly to lunar studies by photographing 1.8 million images of the surface of the Moon.

Additionally, on May 5, 1994, the White House announced that the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), the Department of Defense, and NASA were establishing a joint program to effect the convergence of civil and military polar-orbiting operational environmental satellite systems into a single operational program. Other White House announcements during the year included a policy for licensing U.S. firms by the Secretary of Commerce to operate private remote sensing systems and sell their images to domestic and foreign entities and a national space transportation policy that will sustain and revitalize U.S. space transportation capabilities by providing a coherent strategy for supporting and strengthening U.S. space launch capabilities to meet the growth needs of the civilian and national security sectors.

Thus, Fiscal Year 1994 was a highly successful one for the U.S. aeronautics and space programs. Efforts in both areas have contributed significantly to furthering the Nation's scientific and technical knowledge, international cooperation, a healthier environment, and a more competitive economy.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 24, 1995*.

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

At 11 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Hays, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bill:

H.R. 1421. An act to provide that references in the statutes of the United States to any committee or officer of the House of Representatives the name or jurisdiction of which was changed as part of the reorganization of the House of Representatives at the beginning of the One Hundred Fourth Congress shall be treated as referring to the currently applicable committee or officer of the House of Representatives.

The enrolled bill was subsequently signed by the President pro tempore [Mr. THURMOND].

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second time by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. SHELBY (for himself, Mr. HEFLIN, Mr. COVERDELL, and Mr. NUNN):

S. 848. A bill to grant the consent of Congress to an amendment of the Historic Chattahoochee Compact between the States of Alabama and Georgia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. D'AMATO:

S. 849. A bill to amend the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 to protect elected judges against discrimination based on age; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

By Mrs. KASSEBAUM (for herself, Mr. COATS, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. DODD, and Mr. INOUYE):

S. 850. A bill to amend the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 to consolidate Federal child care programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mrs. KASSEBAUM (for herself, Mr. COATS, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. DODD, and Mr. INOUYE):

S. 850. A bill to amend the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 to consolidate Federal child care programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

THE CHILD CARE AND DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT AMENDMENTS ACT OF 1995

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Child Care and Development Block Grant Amendments Act of 1995 on behalf of myself, Senator COATS, Senator KENNEDY, Senator DODD, Senator INOUYE, and Senator JEFFORDS. This legislation reauthorizes the child care and development block grant of 1990 and makes several important changes to the law.

The funding and leadership that the Federal Government has provided for child care has played a critical role in assisting low-income working families to maintain stable employment and helping welfare recipients gain independence. As States try to move welfare recipients into employment, the availability of affordable, quality child care will be of even greater importance. If Congress and the States are committed to having welfare reform succeed, then there needs to be a partnership between Federal and State governments to allocate funding for quality child care.

The child care and development block grant was enacted in 1990 with bipartisan support. Congress recognized that there was a lack of adequate child care for many low-income families. This continues to be a nationwide problem.

According to a 1991 report by the Bureau of the Census, 31 million children under the age of 15 had mothers employed outside the home—almost 2 million of these children were infants under 1 year of age. This trend is continuing, with more and more mothers entering the work force each year. It has become increasingly difficult for low-income working parents to find affordable child care. Despite the significant contributions the child care and development block grant and other Federal child care programs have made in assisting families with their child care needs, there are waiting lists for child care subsidies in almost every State. If Congress does not continue to commit Federal funding for child care, these waiting lists will continue to grow, and efforts to reform the welfare system will fail.

The legislation which my colleagues and I are introducing provides States funding to provide quality child care for low-income families through a unified child care system. The Child Care and Development Block Grant Amendments Act of 1995 consolidates Federal discretionary programs that provide child care services. The primary goal of this bill is to ensure that there is a seamless system of child care where it counts the most—at the point where the parent, child, and provider meet.

This legislation maintains most of the critical provisions of the child care and development block grant—a program that has been working successfully in the States since its enactment. The bill emphasizes access to quality child care, parental choice, and consumer education. The bill continues to minimal health and safety standards established in 1990. The 1995 amendments to the act provide States with the flexibility to improve the quality and supply of child care, to design eligibility requirements through a sliding fee scale, and to provide broader access to referral and resource services for parents and providers. Provisions in the legislation ensure that Federal funds that States use for child care will be funneled through the existing State system designed to implement the child care and development block grant. The legislation also includes several important provisions designed to improve the availability of quality child care for native American families.

The Child Care and Development Block Grant Amendments Act of 1995 consolidates two discretionary programs, the State Department Care Planning and Development Grants and the Child Development Associate Credential Scholarship Program. The program is authorized for $1 billion in 1996, and such sums as necessary through the year 2000. This authorization level is based on current funding levels for all three programs, with a slight increase for inflation.

I invite my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join with Senator COATS, Senator JEFFORDS, Senator KENNEDY, Senator DODD, Senator INOUYE, and me in cosponsoring the Child Care and Development Block Grant Amendments Act of 1995. I hope there is as much bipartisan support for this reauthorization as there was for the original legislation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that additional material be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE CHILD CARE AND DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT AMENDMENTS ACT OF 1995

SUMMARY

1. Authorization: The Child Care and Development Block Grant (CCDBG) is amended to include two discretionary programs, the State Dependent Care Planning and Development Grants and the Child Development Associate Credential (CDA) Scholarships, into a discretionary block grant with no state match required. This is consistent with the current CCDBG structure. The authorization for fiscal year 1996 is $1,000,000,000 and such sums as necessary through the year 2000.

II. State Requirements:

A. The health and safety standards that were included in the CCDBG when it was enacted in 1990, are maintained. These standards are broadly defined, and states are given discretion in enforcing them. The standards are: (1) the prevention and control of infectious diseases; (2) building and physical premises safety; and (3) minimum health and safety training appropriate to the provider setting. Providers receiving funds from the block grant (via contract or parent voucher) must meet any existing state and local licensing and regulatory requirements.

B. The quality set-aside, which is part of the 1990 act, is maintained. However, it is more broadly defined and gives states discretion in how they choose to spend the money. The only required quality activity is that states must provide consumer education to encourage maximum parental choice and improve availability of child care through a comprehensive referral and resource system. The set-aside is 15 percent of the state allotment.

C. States are required to submit a plan, similar to what they currently are providing under the CCDBG, which designates a lead agency and outlines procedures that are in place for assuring parental choice of providers, parental complaints, consumer education, and compliance with state and local licensing and health and safety requirements.

D. States shall submit a report to the Secretary of HHS every 2 years specifying how they used the money, the number of children who were assisted, activities that were implemented to encourage a public-private partnership, and the extent and manner in which they implemented a resource and referral network.

E. States are required to establish a sliding fee scale that ensures a representative distribution of participation among the working poor and welfare recipients.

F. States may not expend more than 5 percent on administrative costs.

G. If states expend monies for child care from other federal funding sources, then this funding shall be allocated through the CCDBG. This will reduce federal regulations and requirements by establishing one consolidated child care program. This will also provide beneficiaries with more stability in child care since eligibility requirements will be streamlined.

III. Enforcement Mechanisms: If a state is determined (via the HHS appeals and hearing process) to have improperly expended the block grant funds, the Secretary is given the option of: (1) imposing additional requirements to ensure state compliance or correct areas of noncompliance with the act; (2) require states to repay funds improperly expended; (3) deduct from the administrative portion of the state allotment an amount less than or equal to the improperly expended funds; (4) or a combination of these options.

IV. Indian Tribes: The following provisions have been added for Indian tribes: (1) allowing tribes to use funds for facilities construction if the Secretary of HHS determines that this is a barrier to providing child care (this applies only to Indian tribes); (2) allowing any tribal allotments that are not expended to be redistributed to other tribes, which is similar to what happens with unused state allotments; and (3) exempting tribes from state licensing requirements and allowing the Secretary, in consultation with the tribes, to develop minimum standards for child care providers that takes into account tribes' needs and available resources. The set-aside for Indian tribes of up to 3 percent, which is part of the 1990 law, has been maintained.

PROGRAMS TO BE CONSOLIDATED

Child Care and Development Block Grant—discretionary grant program to help low-income parents pay for child care, to expand

early childhood development programs to improve the availability and quality of care. No state match is required. (Enacted in 1990 as part of OBRA '90)

FY 94 Actual, $893 million.

FY 95 Enacted, $935 million.

State Dependent Care Planning and Development Grants—discretionary grant program for child care resource and referral and for before- and after-school child care services. Provides a 75 percent federal matching rate to states.

FY 94 Actual, $13 million.

FY 95 Enacted, $13 million.

Child Development Associate Credential (CDA) Scholarships—discretionary grant program to states to provide scholarships to qualified child care workers to cover the cost of the CDA application, assessment, and credentialing. This credential is awarded by the Council for Early Childhood Professional Recognition. No state match is required.

FY 94 Actual, $1 million.

FY 95 Enacted, $1 million.

• Mr. COATS. Mr. President, today, I am pleased to join Senator KASSEBAUM in introducing the Child Care and Development Block Grant Amendments Act of 1995. Since its passage in 1990, this program has, and continues to enjoy strong bipartisan, community and grassroots support. With the assistance provided under this act thousands of families have, for the first time, been able to work without fearing the placement of their children in less than quality child care environments.

Currently, 55 percent of all working families enroll their children in some form of child care. The dramatic increase in labor force participation of mothers continues to heighten our awareness of the need for child services. And with the imminent passage of welfare reform, the need will undoubtedly be even greater.

The goals of a Federal child care program are many. First, to ensure a safe, healthy and stimulating environment for the children. Second, to afford parents the maximum amount of choice in the selection of a provider. Third, to assist with the availability of child care slots. Fourth, to ensure that limited Federal dollars are targeted to those most in need. And fifth, to distribute funds to States in a way that makes sense, eliminates redtape, and ensures maximum use of resources.

I believe we have met each of these goals in this legislation.

First, we continue the minimum health and safety standards negotiated in 1990. These standards are not prescriptive but they do insist that child care providers provide a safe and healthy environment for children in their care. Second, parents are able to select from a wide range of child care providers through the use of direct grants, contracts, and parent certificates. These include sectarian providers and family day care homes which currently are the largest group of providers of child care services. Third, the authorization level reflect a continued Federal priority for quality child care services. Expansion of available child care slots is important, but is equally important to maintain quality in our expansion efforts. The Kassebaum-Coats bill strikes this important balance in authorizing a 15-percent set-aside for quality improvement. Fourth, the bill targets dollars to the working poor by requiring States to establish a sliding fee scale for families up to 100 percent of the State medium income. And finally, we have included language to ensure that Federal resources used for child care are consolidated into one, uniform system.

This last point is significant. In recent years, growing concern has been expressed about the number of Federal child care programs. The General Accounting Office reports there are currently 93 different child care programs administered by 11 Federal agencies and 20 offices, at a total cost to the taxpayer of at least $11.5 billion, and that does not include various tax programs targeted at families with children.

The Kassebaum-Coats bill ensures that those dollars will be used in a way that meets the goals of our Federal child care policy and not in ways that contravene it.

In addressing child care within the context of the welfare reform debate we must be careful not to force parents to choose between work, and quality day care. Many families, especially low-income working families, need help with their child care needs. Solutions and welfare reform must be pursued with compassionate realism, recognizing our budgetary limitations, but motivated by a concern for children and their best interests. The Kassebaum-Coats bill, coupled with the block grant and cash assistance program will significantly help those entering the work force with their child care needs—and does so in a way that is fiscally responsible.

I would again like to thank Senator KASSEBAUM for her leadership in this area, and hope that this legislation receives swift approval in the Senate.•

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 256

At the request of Mr. DOLE, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SANTORUM] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. GRAMS] were added as cosponsors of S. 256, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to establish procedures for determining the status of certain missing members of the Armed Forces and certain civilians, and for other purposes.

S. 388

At the request of Ms. SNOWE, the name of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. LOTT] was added as a cosponsor of S. 388, a bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to eliminate the penalties for noncompliance by States with a program requiring the use of motorcycle helmets, and for other purposes.

S. 471

At the request of Mr. BIDEN, the name of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. WARNER] was added as a cosponsor of S. 471, a bill to provide for the payment to States of plot allowances for certain veterans eligible for burial in a national cemetery who are buried in cemeteries of such States.

S. 582

At the request of Mr. HATFIELD, the name of the Senator from Montana [Mr. BURNS] was added as a cosponsor of S. 582, a bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to provide that certain voluntary disclosures of violations of Federal laws made pursuant to an environmental audit shall not be subject to discovery or admitted into evidence during a Federal judicial or administrative proceeding, and for other purposes.

S. 585

At the request of Mr. SHELBY, the names of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. KEMPTHORNE], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. ABRAHAM], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. FRIST], and the Senator from Texas [Mrs. HUTCHISON] were added as cosponsors of S. 585, a bill to protect the rights of small entities subject to investigative or enforcement action by agencies, and for other purposes.

S. 758

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. LIEBERMAN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 758, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for S corporation reform, and for other purposes.

S. 770

At the request of Mr. DOLE, the name of the Senator from Maine [Ms. SNOWE] was added as a cosponsor of S. 770, a bill to provide for the relocation of the United States Embassy in Israel to Jerusalem, and for other purposes.

S. 794

At the request of Mr. LUGAR, the name of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. THOMAS] was added as a cosponsor of S. 794, a bill to amend the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act to facilitate the minor use of a pesticide, and for other purposes.

S. 814

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the name of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. THOMAS] was added as a cosponsor of S. 814, a bill to provide for the reorganization of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 816

At the request of Mr. DEWINE, the name of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. LOTT] was added as a cosponsor of S. 816, a bill to provide equal protection for victims of crime, to facilitate the exchange of information between Federal and State law enforcement and investigation entities, to reform criminal procedure, and for other purposes.

S. 847

At the request of Mr. GREGG, the names of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BRYAN], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SANTORUM] were added as

cosponsors of S. 847, a bill to terminate the agricultural price support and production adjustment programs for sugar, and for other purposes.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 34

At the request of Mr. SMITH, the name of the Senator from Montana [Mr. BURNS] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 34, a joint resolution prohibiting funds for diplomatic relations and most favored nation trading status with the Socialist Republic of Vietnam unless the President certifies to Congress that Vietnamese officials are being fully cooperative and forthcoming with efforts to account for the 2,205 Americans still missing and otherwise unaccounted for from the Vietnam War, as determined on the basis of all information available to the United States Government, and for other purposes.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 11

At the request of Ms. SNOWE, the names of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. ROTH], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. LIEBERMAN], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] were added as cosponsors of Senate Concurrent Resolution 11, a concurrent resolution supporting a resolution to the longstanding dispute regarding Cyprus.

AMENDMENT NO. 1128

At the request of Ms. SNOWE the name of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. KEMPTHORNE] was added as a cosponsor of Amendment No. 1128 proposed to S. Con. Res. 13, an original concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for the fiscal years 1996, 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED

THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

DODD (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 1131

Mr. DODD (for himself, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. PELL, Mr. WELLSTONE, and Mr. SIMON) proposed an amendment to amendment No. 1131 proposed by Ms. SNOWE to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 13) setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for the fiscal years 1996, 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002; as follows:

Strike all after line 1 and insert:

''On page 3, line 10, increase the amount by $5,100,000,000.

On page 3, line 11, increase the amount by $3,400,000,000.

On page 3, line 12, increase the amount by $3,600,000,000.

On page 3, line 13, increase the amount by $3,800,000,000.

On page 3, line 14, increase the amount by $4,000,000,000.

On page 3, line 15, increase the amount by $4,000,000,000.

On page 3, line 16, increase the amount by $4,100,000,000.

On page 3, line 20, increase the amount by $5,100,000,000.

On page 3, line 21, increase the amount by $3,400,000,000.

On page 3, line 22, increase the amount by $3,600,000,000.

On page 3, line 23, increase the amount by $3,800,000,000.

On page 3, line 24, increase the amount by $4,000,000,000.

On page 3, line 25, increase the amount by $4,000,000,000.

On page 4, line 1, increase the amount by $4,100,000,000.

On page 4, line 18, increase the amount by $5,100,000,000.

On page 4, line 19, increase the amount by $3,400,000,000.

On page 4, line 20, increase the amount by $3,600,000,000.

On page 4, line 21, increase the amount by $3,800,000,000.

On page 4, line 22, increase the amount by $4,000,000,000.

On page 4, line 23, increase the amount by $4,000,000,000.

On page 4, line 24, increase the amount by $4,100,000,000.

On page 5, line 4, increase the amount by $5,100,000,000.

On page 5, line 5, increase the amount by $3,400,000,000.

On page 5, line 6, increase the amount by $3,600,000,000.

On page 5, line 7, increase the amount by $3,800,000,000.

On page 5, line 8, increase the amount by $4,000,000,000.

On page 5, line 9, increase the amount by $4,000,000,000.

On page 5, line 10, increase the amount by $4,100,000,000.

On page 5, line 17, increase the amount by $28,300,000,000.

On page 5, line 18, increase the amount by $3,800,000,000.

On page 5, line 19, increase the amount by $3,600,000,000.

On page 5, line 20, increase the amount by $3,800,000,000.

On page 5, line 21, increase the amount by $4,000,000,000.

On page 5, line 22, increase the amount by $4,000,000,000.

On page 5, line 23, increase the amount by $4,100,000,000.

On page 6, line 16, increase the amount by $5,100,000,000.

On page 6, line 17, increase the amount by $3,400,000,000.

On page 6, line 18, increase the amount by $3,600,000,000.

On page 6, line 19, increase the amount by $3,800,000,000.

On page 6, line 20, increase the amount by $4,000,000,000.

On page 6, line 21, increase the amount by $4,000,000,000.

On page 6, line 22, increase the amount by $4,100,000,000.

On page 31, line 12, increase the amount by $28,300,000,000.

On page 31, line 20, increase the amount by $3,800,000,000.

On page 32, line 3, increase the amount by $3,600,000,000.

On page 32, line 11, increase the amount by $3,800,000,000.

On page 32, line 19, increase the amount by $4,000,000,000.

On page 33, line 2, increase the amount by $4,000,000,000.

On page 33, line 10, increase the amount by $4,100,000,000.

On page 31, line 13, increase the amount by $5,100,000,000.

On page 31, line 21, increase the amount by $3,400,000,000.

On page 32, line 4, increase the amount by $3,600,000,000.

On page 32, line 12, increase the amount by $3,800,000,000.

On page 32, line 20, increase the amount by $4,000,000,000.

On page 33, line 3, increase the amount by $4,000,000,000.

On page 33, line 11, increase the amount by $4,100,000,000.

On page 64, line 9, decrease the amount by $1,100,000,000.

On page 64, line 10, decrease the amount by $7,900,000,000.

On page 64, line 11, decrease the amount by $12,000,000,000.

On page 65, line 17, increase the amount by $26,700,000,000.

On page 65, line 18, increase the amount by $4,000,000,000.

On page 65, line 24, increase the amount by $2,400,000,000.

On page 65, line 25, increase the amount by $2,000,000,000.

On page 66, line 6, increase the amount by $2,000,000,000.

On page 66, line 7, increase the amount by $2,000,000,000.

On page 66, line 13, increase the amount by $2,000,000,000.

On page 66, line 14, increase the amount by $2,000,000,000.

On page 66, line 20, increase the amount by $2,000,000,000.

On page 66, line 21, increase the amount by $2,000,000,000.

On page 67, line 2, increase the amount by $2,000,000,000.

On page 67, line 3, increase the amount by $2,000,000,000.

On page 67, line 9, increase the amount by $2,000,000,000.

On page 67, line 10, increase the amount by $2,000,000,000.''

HATFIELD (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 1132

Mr. HATFIELD (for himself, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. SIMON, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. PELL) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res 13, supra; as follows:

On page 11, line 7, decrease the amount by $430,000,000.

On page 11, line 8, decrease the amount by $258,000,000.

On page 11, line 4, decrease the amount by $920,000,000.

On page 11, line 15, decrease the amount by $552,000,000.

On page 11, line 21, decrease the amount by $1,000,000,000.

On page 11, line 22, decrease the amount by $600,000,000.

On page 12, line 3, decrease the amount by $1,000,000,000.

On page 12, line 4, decrease the amount by $600,000,000.

On page 12, line 10, decrease the amount by $1,000,000,000.

On page 12, line 11, decrease the amount by $600,000,000.

On page 12, line 17, decrease the amount by $1,000,000,000.

On page 12, line 18, decrease the amount by $600,000,000.

On page 12, line 24, decrease the amount by $1,000,000,000.

On page 12, line 25, decrease the amount by $600,000,000.

On page 33, line 19, increase the amount by $1,000,000,000.

On page 33, line 20, increase the amount by $430,000,000.

On page 34, line 2, increase the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 34, line 3, increase the amount by $920,000,000.
On page 34, line 9, increase the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 34, line 10, increase the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 34, line 16, increase the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 34, line 17, increase the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 34, line 23, increase the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 34, line 24, increase the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 35, line 5, increase the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 35, line 6, increase the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 35, line 12, increase the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 35, line 13, increase the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 54, line 20, increase the amount by $570,000,000.
On page 54, line 21, increase the amount by $172,000,000.
On page 55, line 2, increase the amount by $80,000,000.
On page 55, line 3, increase the amount by $368,000,000.
On page 55, line 10, increase the amount by $400,000,000.
On page 55, line 17, increase the amount by $400,000,000.
On page 55, line 24, increase the amount by $400,000,000.
On page 56, line 6, increase the amount by $400,000,000.
On page 56, line 13, increase the amount by $400,000,000.
On page 65, line 14, decrease the amount by $430,000,000.
On page 65, line 15, decrease the amount by $258,000,000.
On page 65, line 17, increase the amount by $430,000,000.
On page 65, line 18, increase the amount by $258,000,000.
On page 65, line 21, decrease the amount by $920,000,000.
On page 65, line 22, decrease the amount by $552,000,000.
On page 65, line 24, increase the amount by $920,000,000.
On page 65, line 25, increase the amount by $552,000,000.
On page 66, line 3, decrease the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 66, line 4, decrease the amount by $600,000,000.
On page 66, line 6, increase the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 66, line 7, increase the amount by $600,000,000.
On page 66, line 10, decrease the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 66, line 11, decrease the amount by $600,000,000.
On page 66, line 13, increase the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 66, line 14, increase the amount by $600,000,000.
On page 66, line 17, decrease the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 66, line 18, decrease the amount by $600,000,000.
On page 66, line 20, increase the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 66, line 21, increase the amount by $600,000,000.
On page 66, line 24, decrease the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 66, line 25, decrease the amount by $600,000,000.
On page 67, line 2, increase the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 67, line 3, increase the amount by $600,000,000.
On page 67, line 6, decrease the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 67, line 7, decrease the amount by $600,000,000.
On page 67, line 9, increase the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 67, line 10, increase the amount by $600,000,000.

HATFIELD (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 1133

Mr. HATFIELD (for himself, Mr. SPECTER, Mrs. KASSEBAUM, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. D'AMATO, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. SIMON, Mr. COHEN, Mr. DODD, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. MACK, Mr. PELL, Mr. BINGAMAN, and Mr. GLENN) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution Senate Concurrent Resolution 13, supra; as follows:

On page 33, line 19, increase the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 33, line 20, increase the amount by $430,000,000.
On page 34, line 2, increase the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 34, line 3, increase the amount by $920,000,000.
On page 34, line 9, increase the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 34, line 10, increase the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 34, line 16, increase the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 34, line 17, increase the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 34, line 23, increase the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 34, line 24, increase the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 35, line 5, increase the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 35, line 6, increase the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 35, line 12, increase the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 35, line 13, increase the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 54, line 20, increase the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 54, line 21, increase the amount by $430,000,000.
On page 55, line 2, increase the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 55, line 3, increase the amount by $920,000,000.
On page 55, line 9, increase the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 55, line 10, increase the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 55, line 16, increase the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 55, line 17, increase the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 55, line 23, increase the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 55, line 24, increase the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 56, line 5, increase the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 56, line 6, increase the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 56, line 12, increase the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 56, line 13, increase the amount by $1,000,000,000.

BOXER AMENDMENT NO. 1134

Mrs. BOXER proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution Senate Concurrent Resolution 13, supra; as follows:

On page 89, strike lines 1 through 17 and insert the following:

SEC. 306. PROHIBITION OF LEGISLATION THAT WOULD INCLUDE A TAX CUT UNLESS 90 PERCENT OF THE BENEFITS GO TO THE MIDDLE CLASS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) the incomes of middle-class families have stagnated since the early 1980's, with family incomes growing more slowly between 1979 and 1989 than in any other business cycle since World War II; and

(2) according to the Department of the Treasury, in 1996, approximately 90 percent of American families will have incomes less than $100,000.

(b) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report that contains a reduction in revenues unless at least 90 percent of the benefits of that reduction goes to working families with annual incomes less than $100,000.

(c) APPEALS.—Appeals in the Senate from decisions of the Chair relating to this section shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided between and controlled by, the appellant and the manager of the bill or resolution, as the case may be. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required in the Senate to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this section.

(d) CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE REPORTS.—Whenever the Director of the Congressional Budget Office shall prepare a report pursuant to section 308 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 in connection with a bill, resolution, or conference report that contains a reduction in revenues, the Director shall so state in that report, and, to the extent practicable, shall include an estimate of the amount of the reduction in revenues and the percent of the benefits of that reduction in revenue that will go to working families with annual incomes less than $100,000.

(e) ESTIMATES.—Solely for the purposes of enforcement of this section on the Senate floor, the percentage of benefits of a reduction in revenues going to working families with annual incomes less than $100,000 shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the Congressional Budget Office.

(f) SUNSET.—This section shall expire at the close of the 104th Congress.

KERRY (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 1135

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. KERRY (for himself, Mr. SIMON, and Mr. FEINGOLD) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them to the concurrent resolution Senate Concurrent Resolution 13, supra; as follows:

On page 64, strike lines 17 through 19 and insert the following; "$2,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, $37,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1996 through 2000, and $72,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1996"
On page 66, line 6, decrease the amount by $70,000,000.
On page 66, line 13, decrease the amount by $70,000,000.
On page 66, line 14, decrease the amount by $28,000,000.
On page 66, line 20, decrease the amount by $70,000,000.
On page 66, line 21, decrease the amount by $215,000,000.
On page 67, line 2, decrease the amount by $70,000,000.
On page 67, line 3, decrease the amount by $4,000,000.
On page 67, line 9, decrease the amount by $70,000,000.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, the Kerry amendment reduces the reconciliation

instructions to the Rules Committee by the amount attributable to repeal of the existing system of public financing and spending limits for Presidential campaigns, which the Rules Committee would be able to meet only by repealing that system. In order to offset the budget effect of reducing the instructions to the Rules Committee to save the amount of funding attributable to the Presidential public financing system, the amendment will leave a requirement for the same amount of savings in Function 800—general government—without specifying how the savings are to be achieved, but will lower the nondefense discretionary caps beginning in 1999 by the equivalent amount. This will have the effect of giving the responsibility to the Appropriations Committee beginning in that year to allocate the aggregate amount of approximately $250 million over the period covered by the budget resolution to administrative and overhead savings in various Federal agencies, leaving the judgment to the Appropriations Committee as to which agencies, for what Function 800 purposes, and in what amounts to allocate the spending reductions.

This leaves the deficit reduction effects of the budget resolution unchanged. It means that this amendment is not subject to a point of order.

WELLSTONE (AND FEINGOLD) AMENDMENT NO. 1136

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. WELLSTONE (for himself and Mr. FEINGOLD) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them to the concurrent resolution Senate Concurrent Resolution 13, supra; as follows:

On page 63, line 7, strike the period and insert the following: ''. The Senate Committee on Finance shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction to increase revenues $10,000,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, $50,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1996 through 2000, and $70,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1996 through 2002.''.

At the end of title III, insert the following:

SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING TAX EXPENDITURES.

It is the sense of the Senate that the Committee on Finance, in meeting its reconciliation instructions for revenue, will limit or eliminate excessive and unnecessary tax expenditures, including those tax expenditures which provide special tax treatment to a single taxpayer or to a group of taxpayers.

WELLSTONE AMENDMENTS NOS. 1137–1141

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. WELLSTONE submitted five amendments intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution Senate Concurrent Resolution 13, supra; as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 1137

On page 3, line 10, increase the amount by $86,815,700.

On page 3, line 11, increase the amount by $782,539,790.

On page 3, line 12, increase the amount by $804,782,000.

On page 3, line 13, increase the amount by $804,782,000.

On page 3, line 14, increase the amount by $804,782,000.

On page 3, line 15, increase the amount by $804,782,000.

On page 3, line 16, increase the amount by $804,782,000.

On page 3, line 20, increase the amount by $86,815,700.

On page 3, line 21, increase the amount by $782,539,790.

On page 3, line 22, increase the amount by $804,782,000.

On page 3, line 23, increase the amount by $804,782,000.

On page 3, line 24, increase the amount by $804,782,000.

On page 3, line 25, increase the amount by $804,782,000.

On page 4, line 1, increase the amount by $804,782,000.

On page 4, line 18, increase the amount by $86,815,700.

On page 4, line 19, increase the amount by $782,539,790.

On page 4, line 20, increase the amount by $804,782,000.

On page 4, line 21, increase the amount by $804,782,000.

On page 4, line 22, increase the amount by $804,782,000.

On page 4, line 23, increase the amount by $804,782,000.

On page 4, line 24, increase the amount by $804,782,000.

On page 5, line 4, increase the amount by $86,815,700.

On page 5, line 5, increase the amount by $782,539,790.

On page 5, line 6, increase the amount by $804,782,000.

On page 5, line 7, increase the amount by $804,782,000.

On page 5, line 8, increase the amount by $804,782,000.

On page 5, line 9, increase the amount by $804,782,000.

On page 5, line 10, increase the amount by $804,782,000.

On page 5, line 17, increase the amount by $804,782,000.

On page 5, line 18, increase the amount by $804,782,000.

On page 5, line 19, increase the amount by $804,782,000.

On page 5, line 20, increase the amount by $804,782,000.

On page 5, line 21, increase the amount by $804,782,000.

On page 5, line 22, increase the amount by $804,782,000.

On page 5, line 23, increase the amount by $804,782,000.

On page 6, line 16, increase the amount by $86,815,700.

On page 6, line 17, increase the amount by $782,539,790.

On page 6, line 18, increase the amount by $804,782,000.

On page 6, line 19, increase the amount by $804,782,000.

On page 6, line 20, increase the amount by $804,782,000.

On page 6, line 21, increase the amount by $804,782,000.

On page 6, line 22, increase the amount by $804,782,000.

On page 31, line 12, increase the amount by $804,782,000.

On page 31, line 13, increase the amount by $86,815,700.

On page 31, line 20, increase the amount by $804,782,000.

On page 31, line 21, increase the amount by $782,539,790.

On page 32, line 3, increase the amount by $804,782,000.

On page 32, line 4, increase the amount by $804,782,000.

On page 32, line 11, increase the amount by $804,782,000.

On page 32, line 12, increase the amount by $804,782,000.

On page 32, line 19, increase the amount by $804,782,000.

On page 32, line 20, increase the amount by $804,782,000.

On page 33, line 2, increase the amount by $804,782,000.

On page 33, line 3, increase the amount by $804,782,000.

On page 33, line 10, increase the amount by $804,782,000.

On page 33, line 11, increase the amount by $804,782,000.

On page 65, line 17, increase the amount by $804,782,000.

On page 65, line 18, increase the amount by $86,815,000.

On page 65, line 24, increase the amount by $804,782,000.

On page 65, line 25, increase the amount by $782,539,790.

On page 66, line 6, increase the amount by $804,782,000.

On page 66, line 7, increase the amount by $804,782,000.

On page 66, line 13, increase the amount by $804,782,000.

On page 66, line 14, increase the amount by $804,782,000.

On page 66, line 20, increase the amount by $804,782,000.

On page 66, line 21, increase the amount by $804,782,000.

On page 67, line 2, increase the amount by $804,782,000.

On page 67, line 3, increase the amount by $804,782,000.

On page 67, line 9, increase the amount by $804,782,000.

On page 67, line 10, increase the amount by $804,782,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 1138

On page 5, line 17, decrease the amount by $10,000,000,000.

On page 6, line 16, decrease the amount by $5,000,000,000.

On page 7, line 15, decrease the amount by $5,000,000,000.

On page 11, line 7, decrease the amount by $10,000,000,000.

On page 11, line 8, decrease the amount by $5,000,000,000.

On page 65, line 14, decrease the amount by $10,000,000,000.

On page 65, line 15, decrease the amount by $5,000,000,000.

At the end of title II, insert the following:

SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING DEFENSE SPENDING.

It is the sense of the Senate that in reducing defense spending by the amount provided for in this amendment, Congress shall focus on low-priority programs, and to the maximum extent possible should preserve funding for any programs and activities that directly affect force readiness or the quality of life for service members and their families.

AMENDMENT NO. 1139

On page 64, line 24, decrease the amount by $74,000,000.

On page 63, line 7, strike the period and insert the following: ''. The Senate Committee on Finance shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction to increase revenues by $74,000,000 in fiscal year 1996.''

At the end of title III, insert the following:

Sec. . SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING TAX EXPENDITURES.

It is the sense of the Senate that the Committee on Finance, in meeting its reconciliation instructions for revenue, will limit or

eliminate excessive and unnecessary tax expenditures, including those tax expenditures which provide special tax treatment to a single taxpayer or to a group of taxpayers.

AMENDMENT NO. 1140

On page 74, strike lines 12 through 24 and insert in lieu thereof the following: ''budget, the revenue and spending aggregates may be revised and other appropriate budgetary allocations, aggregates and levels may be revised to reflect the additional deficit reduction achieved as calculated under subsection (c) for legislation that reduces revenues, and for legislation that will provide $15,000,000,000 to lessen the severity of the cuts to nutrition and commodities programs under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

''(b) REVISED ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.—Upon the reporting of legislation pursuant to subsection (a), and again upon the submission of a conference report on such legislation (if a conference report is submitted), the Chair of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may submit to the Senate appropriately revised allocations under sections 302(a) and 602(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, discretionary spending limits under section 201(a) of this resolution, and budgetary aggregates and levels under this resolution, revised by an amount that does not exceed the additional deficit reduction calculated under subsection (d).''

AMENDMENT NO. 1141

At the end of title III, insert the following: ''It is the sense of the Senate that the low-priority discretionary funds to be reduced in order to offset funds restored for programs and activities of the National Institutes of Health should come from eliminating low-priority federal programs like the Space Station, and not from high-priority programs for education, food and nutrition for low-income children, anti-crime efforts, veterans programs, job training, health care, infrastructure and other such investment programs.''

LEVIN (AND SIMON) AMENDMENT NO. 1142

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. LEVIN (for himself and Mr. SIMON) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them to the concurrent resolution Senate Concurrent Resolution 13, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following new section:

SEC. . DEFENSE OVERHEAD.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) the major discretionary assumptions in this concurrent budget resolution include 15 percent reduction in overhead for programs of nondefense agencies that remain funded in the budget and whose funding is not interconnected with receipts dedicated to a program;

(2) the Committee Report (104–82) on this concurrent budget resolution states that ''this assumption would not reduce funding for the programmatic activities of agencies.''

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the Committees on Armed Services and Appropriations should make a reduction of at least three percent in overhead for Fiscal Year 1996 programs of defense agencies, and should do so in a manner so as not to reduce funding for the programmatic activities of these agencies.

BAUCUS AMENDMENT NO. 1143

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. BAUCUS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution, Senate Concurrent Resolution 13, supra; as follows:

On page 94, add after line 21 the following new section:

SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING FUNDING FOR NATIONAL RAILROAD PASSENGER CORPORATION.

It is the sense of the Senate that Congress should redirect revenues resulting from the ½ cent of the excise tax rate directed by the amendments made by the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993 for fiscal years 1996 through 1999 to the account under subsection (e) of section 9503 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to a new account under such section for grants to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation for operating expenses and capital improvements incurred by the Corporation.

BACUS (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 1144

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. BAUCUS (for himself, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. BRYAN, Mr. SIMON, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, and Mr. BUMPERS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them to the concurrent resolution Senate Concurrent Resolution 13, spra; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING THE ESSENTIAL AIR SERVICE PROGRAM OF THE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) the essential air service program of the Department of Transportation under subchapter II of chapter 417 of title 49, United States Code—

(A) provides essential airline access to isolated rural communities across the United States;

(B) is necessary for the economic growth and development of rural communities;

(C) connects small rural communities to the national air transportation system of the United States;

(D) is a critical component of the national transportation system of the United States; and

(E) provides air service to 108 communities in 30 States; and

(2) the National Commission to Ensure a Strong Competitive Airline Industry established under section 204 of the Airport and Airway Safety, Capacity, Noise Improvement, and Intermodal Transportation Act of 1992 recommended maintaining the essential air service program with a sufficient level of funding to continue to provide air service to small communities.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the essential air service program of the Department of Transportation under subchapter II of chapter 417 of title 49, United States Code, should receive a sufficient level of funding to continue to provide air service to small rural communities that qualify for assistance under the program.

DOMENICI AMENDMENT NO. 1145

Mr. DOMENICI proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution Senate Concurrent Resolution 13, supra; as follows:

On page 4, line 19, strike ''$937,800,000,000'' and insert ''$973,800,000,000''.

On page 5, line 12 strike ''comparison with the maximum deficit amount under section 601(a)(1) and 606 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and for purposes of''.

On page 6, line 8, strike ''$1,324,400,000,000'' and insert ''$1,342,400,000,000''.

On page 6, line 10 strike ''comparison with the maximum deficit amount under section 601(a)(1) and 606 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and for purposes of''.

On page 7, line 10 strike ''comparison with the maximum deficit amount under section 601(a)(1) and 606 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and for purposes of''.

On page 10, line 3, strike ''$347,700,000,000'' and insert ''$374,700,000,000''.

On page 11, line 2, strike ''2000'' and insert ''2002''.

On page 40, line 3, strike ''$1,000,000,000'' and insert ''$100,000,000''.

On page 40, line 10, strike ''$1,000,000,000'' and insert ''$100,000,000''.

On page 40, line 17, strike ''$1,000,000,000'' and insert ''$100,000,000''.

On page 40, line 24, strike ''$1,000,000,000'' and insert ''$100,000,000''.

On page 41, line 6, strike ''$1,000,000,000'' and insert ''$100,000,000''.

On page 41, line 13, strike ''$1,000,000,000'' and insert ''$100,000,000''.

On page 41, line 20, strike ''$1,000,000,000'' and insert ''$100,000,000''.

On page 64, line 14, strike ''Foreign Relations'' and insert ''Rules and Administration''.

BINGAMAN AMENDMENT NO. 1146

Mr. DOMENICI (for Mr. BINGAMAN) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution Senate Concurrent Resolution 13, supra; as follows:

On page 86, strike line 11 through line 25 on page 87 and insert the following:

SEC. 305. SENSE OF THE CONGRESS ON A UNIFORM ACCOUNTING SYSTEM IN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AND NONPARTISAN COMMISSION ON ACCOUNTING AND BUDGETING.

(A) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds the following:

(1) Much effort has been devoted to strengthening Federal internal accounting controls in the past. Although progress has been made in recent years, there still exists no uniform Federal accounting system for Federal Government entities and institutions.

(2) As a result, Federal financial management continues to be seriously deficient, and Federal financial management and fiscal practices have failed to identify costs, failed to reflect the total liabilities of congressional actions, and failed to accurately report the financial condition of the Federal Government.

(3) Current Federal accounting practices do not adequately report financial problems of the Federal Government or the full cost of programs and activities. The continued use of these practices undermines the Government's ability to provide credible and reliable financial data, contributes to waste and inefficiency, and will not assist in achieving a balanced budget.

(4) Waste and inefficiency in Federal Government undermine the confidence of the American people in the Government and reduces the Federal Government's ability to address adequately vital public needs.

(5) To rebuild the accountability and credibility of the Federal Government and restore public confidence in the Federal Government, a uniform Federal accounting system, that fully meets the accounting standards and reporting objectives for the Federal Government, must be immediately established so that all assets and liabilities, revenues and expenditures or expenses, and the full cost of programs and activities of the Federal Government can be consistently and accurately recorded, monitored, and uniformly

reported throughout all government entities for budgeting and control and management evaluation purposes.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Congress that the assumptions underlying the functional totals in this resolution include the following assumptions:

(1) UNIFORM FEDERAL ACCOUNTING SYSTEM.—(A) A uniform Federal accounting system should be established to consistently compile financial data across the Federal Government, and to make full disclosure of Federal financial data, including the full cost of Federal programs and activities, to the citizens, the Congress, the President, and agency management.

(B) Beginning with fiscal year 1997, the President should require the heads of agencies to—

(i) implement and maintain a uniform Federal accounting system; and

(ii) provide financial statements;

in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles applied on a consistent basis and established in accordance with proposed Federal accounting standards and interpretations recommended by the Federal Accounting Standards Advisory Board and other applicable law.

(2) NONPARTISAN ADVISORY COMMISSION ON ACCOUNTING AND BUDGETING.—(A) A temporary advisory commission should be established to make objective and nonpartisan recommendations for the appropriate treatment of capital expenditures under a uniform Federal accounting system that is consistent with generally accepted accounting principles.

(B) The Commission should be appointed on a nonpartisan basis, and should be composed of public and private experts in the fields of finance, economics, accounting, and other related professions.

(C) The Commission should report to the President and the Congress by August 1, 1995, on its recommendations, and should include in its report a detailed plan for implementing such recommendations.

DOLE (AND SIMPSON) AMENDMENT NO. 1147

Mr. DOMENICI (for Mr. DOLE for himself and Mr. SIMPSON) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution Senate Concurrent Resolution 13, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place insert the following new section:

SEC. . CONSIDERATION OF THE INDEPENDENT BUDGET FOR VETERANS AFFAIRS, FISCAL YEAR 1996.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds as follows:

(1) Whereas over 26,000,000 veterans are eligible for veterans health care;

(2) Whereas the Veterans Heath Administration of the Department of Veterans Affairs operates the largest Federal medical care delivery system in the United States, providing for the medical care needs of our Nation's veterans'

(3) Whereas the veterans' service organizations have provided a plan, known as the Independent Budget for Veterans Affairs, to reform the veterans' health care delivery system to adapt it to the modern health care environment and improve its ability to meet the health the health care needs of veterans in a cost-effective manner;

(4) Whereas current budget proposals assume a change in the definition of service-connected veterans;

(5) Whereas proposals contained within the Independent Budget may provide improved service to veterans;

(6) Whereas budget proposals may not have fully considered the measures proposed by the veterans' service organizations in the Independent Budget.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the Sense of Congress: the reforms and proposals contained within the Independent Budget for Veterans Affairs, Fiscal Year 1996 should be given careful consideration in an effort to ensure the nation's commitment to its veterans.

McCONNELL (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 1148

Mr. McCONNELL (for himself, Mr. WARNER, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. HEFLIN, and Mr. COCHRAN) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution, Senate Concurrent Resolution 13, supra; as follows:

On page 29, line 10, increase the amount by $100,000,000.

On page 29, line 18, increase the amount by $200,000,000.

On page 30, line 2, increase the amount by $200,000,000.

On page 30, line 3, increase the amount by $100,000,000.

On page 30, line 10, increase the amount by $200,000,000.

On page 30, line 11, increase the amount by $100,000,000.

On page 30, line 18, increase the amount by $100,000,000.

On page 30, line 19, increase the amount by $100,000,000.

On page 31, line 2, increase the amount by $100,000,000.

On page 31, line 3, increase the amount by $100,000,000.

On page 20, line 7, decrease the amount by $100,000,000.

On page 20, line 15, decrease the amount by $200,000,000.

On page 20, line 23, decrease the amount by $200,000,000.

On page 20, line 24, decrease the amount by $100,000,000.

On page 21, line 7, decrease the amount by $200,000,000.

On page 21, line 8, decrease the amount by $100,000,000.

On page 21, line 15, decrease the amount by $100,000,000.

On page 21, line 16, decrease the amount by $100,000,000.

On page 21, line 23, decrease the amount by $100,000,000.

On page 21, line 24, decrease the amount by $100,000,000.

SARBANES (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 1149

Mr. SARBANES (for himself, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. WARNER, Mr. ROBB, and Mr. BINGAMAN) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution, Senate Concurrent Resolution 13, supra; as follows:

On page 3, line 10, increase the amount by $47,000,000.

On page 3, line 11, increase the amount by $144,000,000.

On page 3, line 12, increase the amount by $197,000,000.

On page 3, line 13, increase the amount by $257,000,000.

On page 3, line 14, increase the amount by $322,000,000.

On page 3, line 15, increase the amount by $392,000,000.

On page 3, line 16, increase the amount by $412,000,000.

On page 3, line 20, increase the amount by $47,000,000.

On page 3, line 21, increase the amount by $144,000,000.

On page 3, line 22, increase the amount by $197,000,000.

On page 3, line 23, increase the amount by $257,000,000.

On page 3, line 24, increase the amount by $322,000,000.

On page 3, line 25, increase the amount by $392,000,000.

On page 4, line 1, increase the amount by $412,000,000.

On page 4, line 18, increase the amount by $47,000,000.

On page 4, line 19, increase the amount by $144,000,000.

On page 4, line 20, increase the amount by $197,000,000.

On page 4, line 21, increase the amount by $257,000,000.

On page 4, line 22, increase the amount by $322,000,000.

On page 4, line 23, increase the amount by $392,000,000.

On page 4, line 24, increase the amount by $412,000,000.

On page 5, line 4, increase the amount by $47,000,000.

On page 5, line 5, increase the amount by $144,000,000.

On page 5, line 6, increase the amount by $197,000,000.

On page 5, line 7, increase the amount by $257,000,000.

On page 5, line 8, increase the amount by $322,000,000.

On page 5, line 9, increase the amount by $392,000,000.

On page 5, line 10, increase the amount by $412,000,000.

On page 5, line 17, increase the amount by $47,000,000.

On page 5, line 18, increase the amount by $144,000,000.

On page 5, line 19, increase the amount by $197,000,000.

On page 5, line 20, increase the amount by $257,000,000.

On page 5, line 21, increase the amount by $322,000,000.

On page 5, line 22, increase the amount by $392,000,000.

On page 5, line 23, increase the amount by $412,000,000.

On page 6, line 16, increase the amount by $47,000,000.

On page 6, line 17, increase the amount by $144,000,000.

On page 6, line 18, increase the amount by $197,000,000.

On page 6, line 19, increase the amount by $257,000,000.

On page 6, line 20, increase the amount by $322,000,000.

On page 6, line 21, increase the amount by $392,000,000.

On page 6, line 22, increase the amount by $412,000,000.

On page 39, line 24, increase the amount by $47,000,000.

On page 39, line 25, increase the amount by $47,000,000.

On page 40, line 6, increase the amount by $144,000,000.

On page 40, line 7, increase the amount by $144,000,000.

On page 40, line 13, increase the amount by $197,000,000.

On page 40, line 14, increase the amount by $197,000,000.

On page 40, line 20, increase the amount by $257,000,000.

On page 40, line 21, increase the amount by $257,000,000.

On page 41, line 2, increase the amount by $322,000,000.

On page 41, line 3, increase the amount by $322,000,000.

On page 41, line 9, increase the amount by $392,000,000.

On page 41, line 10, increase the amount by $392,000,000.

On page 41, line 16, increase the amount by $412,000,000.

On page 41, line 17, increase the amount by $412,000,000.

On page 63, line 19, decrease the amount by $47,000,000.

On page 63, line 20, decrease the amount by $967,000,000.

On page 63, line 21, decrease the amount by $1,771,000,000.

At the appropriate place in the resolution insert the following:

SEC. . FEDERAL RETIREMENT.

It is the sense of the Senate that—

(a) the assumptions underlying the revenue and functional totals in this resolution assume that the Federal Retirement programs will continue to calculate retirement benefits from the average of an employee's high 3 years of service; and

(b) the restoration of the Federal Retirement benefits will be restored by closing the tax loophole which allows billionaires to escape taxes by renouncing their citizenship.

ROTH AMENDMENT NO. 1150

Mr. ROTH proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution, Senate Concurrent Resolution 13, supra; as follows:

On page 3, line 10, increase the amount by $200,000,000.

On page 3, line 11, increase the amount by $200,000,000.

On page 3, line 12, increase the amount by $300,000,000.

On page 3, line 13, increase the amount by $300,000,000.

On page 3, line 14, increase the amount by $400,000,000.

On page 3, line 15, increase the amount by $400,000,000.

On page 3, line 16, increase the amount by $500,000,000.

On page 3, line 20, decrease the amount by $200,000,000.

On page 3, line 21, decrease the amount by $200,000,000.

On page 3, line 22, decrease the amount by $300,000,000.

On page 3, line 23, increase the amount by $300,000,000.

On page 3, line 24, increase the amount by $400,000,000.

On page 3, line 25, increase the amount by $400,000,000.

On page 4, line 1, increase the amount by $500,000,000.

On page 4, line 18, increase the amount by $200,000,000.

On page 4, line 19, increase the amount by $200,000,000.

On page 4, line 20, increase the amount by $300,000,000.

On page 4, line 21, increase the amount by $300,000,000.

On page 4, line 22, increase the amount by $400,000,000.

On page 4, line 23, increase the amount by $400,000,000.

On page 4, line 24, increase the amount by $500,000,000.

On page 5, line 4, decrease the amount by $200,000,000.

On page 5, line 5, decrease the amount by $200,000,000.

On page 5, line 6, decrease the amount by $300,000,000.

On page 5, line 7, increase the amount by $300,000,000.

On page 5, line 8, increase the amount by $400,000,000.

On page 5, line 9, increase the amount by $400,000,000.

On page 5, line 10, decrease the amount by $500,000,000.

On page 5, line 19, increase the amount by $1,400,000,000.

On page 5, line 22, increase the amount by $900,000,000.

On page 6, line 5, increase the amount by $1,400,000,000.

On page 6, line 8, increase the amount by $900,000,000.

On page 6, line 18, increase the amount by $1,400,000,000.

On page 6, line 21, increase the amount by $900,000,000.

On page 7, line 5, increase the amount by $1,400,000,000.

On page 7, line 8, increase the amount by $900,000,000.

On page 7, line 15, decrease the amount by $200,000,000.

On page 7, line 16, decrease the amount by $200,000,000.

On page 7, line 17, increase the amount by $1,100,000,000.

On page 7, line 18, decrease the amount by $300,000,000.

On page 7, line 19, decrease the amount by $400,000,000.

On page 7, line 20, increase the amount by $500,000,000.

On page 7, line 21, decrease the amount by $500,000,000.

On page 8, line 1, decrease the amount by $200,000,000.

On page 8, line 2, decrease the amount by $200,000,000.

On page 8, line 3, increase the amount by $1,100,000,000.

On page 8, line 4, decrease the amount by $300,000,000.

On page 8, line 5, decrease the amount by $400,000,000.

On page 8, line 6, increase the amount by $500,000,000.

On page 8, line 7, decrease the amount by $500,000,000.

On page 20, line 15, increase the amount by $1,400,000,000.

On page 20, line 16, increase the amount by $1,400,000,000.

On page 21, line 15, increase the amount by $900,000,000.

On page 21, line 16, increase the amount by $900,000,000.

On page 62, line 14, decrease the amount by $1,400,000,000.

On page 62, line 15, decrease the amount by $2,300,000,000.

EXON (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 1151

Mr. EXON (for himself, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. CONRAD and Mr. WELLSTONE) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution, Senate Concurrent Resolution 13, supra; as follows:

On page 74 strike lines 12 through 24 and insert the following: "budget, the revenue and spending aggregates may be revised and other appropriate budgetary aggregates and levels may be revised to reflect the additional deficit reduction achieved as calculated under subsection (c) for legislation that reduces revenues, and for legislation that will provide $15,000,000,000 in outlays to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry for the purpose of restoring outlay reductions required of that committee pursuant to section 6 of this Resolution.

(b) Revised Allocations and Aggregates—Upon the reporting of legislation pursuant to subsection (a), and again upon the submission of a conference report on such legislation (if a conference report is submitted), the Chair of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may submit to the Senate appropriately revised allocations under sections 302(a) and 602(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974; budgetary aggregates; and levels under this resolution, revised by an amount that does not exceed the additional deficit reduction specified under subsection (d)."

COVERDELL AMENDMENT NO. 1152

Mr. COVERDELL proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution, Senate Concurrent Resolution 13, supra; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING THE COSTS OF THE NATIONAL VOTER REGISTRATION ACT OF 1993.

It is the sense of the Senate that within the assumptions under budget function 800 funds will be spent for reimbursement to the States for the costs of implementing the National Voter Registration Act of 1993.

KERRY AMENDMENT NO. 1153

Mr. KERRY proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution, Senate Concurrent Resolution 13, supra; as follows:

On page 64, strike lines 17 through 19 and insert the following: "$2,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, $37,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1996 through 2000, and $72,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1996"

On page 66, line 6, decrease the amount by $70,000,000.

On page 66, line 13, decrease the amount by $70,000,000.

On page 66, line 14, decrease the amount by $28,000,000.

On page 66, line 20, decrease the amount by $70,000,000.

On page 66, line 21, decrease the amount by $215,000,000.

On page 67, line 2, decrease the amount by $70,000,000.

On page 67, line 3, decrease the amount by $4,000,000.

On page 67, line 9, decrease the amount by $70,000,000.

MCCONNELL AMENDMENT NO. 1154

Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment No. 1154 proposed by Mr. KERRY to the concurrent resolution Senate Concurrent Resolution 12, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE.

It is the sense of the Senate that the assumptions underlying function 800 include the following: that payments to presidential campaigns from the Presidential Election Campaign Fund, as authorized by the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1974, should not be used for or augment damage awards or settlements arising from a civil or criminal action, or the threat thereof, related to sexual harassment.

GLENN (AND SIMON) AMENDMENT NO. 155

Mr. EXON (for Mr. GLENN, for himself and Mr. SIMON) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution, Senate Concurrent Resolution 13, supra; as follows:

On page 79, strike lines 1 through 3.

DOMENICI (AND GRASSLEY) AMENDMENT NO. 1156

Mr. DOMENICI (for himself and Mr. GRASSLEY) proposed an amendment to

the concurrent resolution, Senate Congressional Resolution 13, supra; as follows:

In lieu of the language proposed to be stricken insert the following:

SEC. 209. REPEAL OF IRS ALLOWANCE.

(a) Section 25 of House Concurrent Resolution 218 (103d Congress, 2d Session) is repealed.

(b) It is the sense of the Senate that the revenue levels contained in the budget resolution should assume passage of the ''Taxpayers Bill of Rights 2'' and that the Senate should pass the Taxpayers Bill of Rights 2 this Congress.

(c) It is the sense of the Senate that funding for tax compliance efforts should be a top priority and that the assumptions underlying the functional totals in this resolution include the administration's full request for the Internal Revenue Service.

GLENN AMENDMENT NO. 1157

Mr. GLENN proposed an amendment to amendment No. 1156 proposed by Mr. DOMENICI to the concurrent resolution, Senate Congressional Resolution 13, supra; as follows:

In the pending amendment, strike lines 1–3.

BOXER (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 1158

Mr. EXON (for Mrs. BOXER, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. LAUTENBERG, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution, Senate Concurrent Resolution 13, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place add the following: ''It is the sense of Congress that no Member of Congress may use campaign funds to defend against sexual harassment lawsuits.''

DOLE AMENDMENT NO. 1159

Mr. DOLE proposed an amendment to amendment No. 1158 proposed by Mrs. BOXER to the concurrent resolution, Senate Concurrent Resolution 13, supra; as follows:

In the pending amendment, strike all after the words ''it is the Sense of the Congress'' and insert the following: ''that no Member of Congress or the Executive Branch may use campaign funds or privately donated funds to defend against sexual harassment lawsuits.''

EXON AMENDMENT NO. 1160

Mr. EXON proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution Senate Concurrent Resolution 13, supra; as follows:

On page 63, strike beginning with line 8, through page 65, line 5, and insert the following: ''The Senate Committee on Finance shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that increase the statutory limit on the public debt to the amount set forth for the public debt for fiscal year 1996 in section 2(5), of this resolution.

''(8) COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS.—The Senate Committee on Foreign Relations shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending to reduce outlays $0 in fiscal year 1996, $0 for the period of fiscal years 1996 through 2000, and $0 for the period of fiscal years 1996 through 2002.

''(9) COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS.—The Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending to reduce outlays $118,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, $3,023,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1996 through 2000, and $6,871,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1996 through 2002.

''(10) COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY.—The Senate Committee on the Judiciary shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending to reduce outlays $119,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, $923,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1996 through 2000, and $1,483,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1996 through 2002.

''(11) COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES.—The Senate Committee on the Labor and Human Resources shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending to reduce outlays $1,141,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, $9,165,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1996 through 2000, and $13,795,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1996 through 2002.

''(12) COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION.—The Senate Committee on Rules and Administration shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending to reduce outlays $2,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, $280,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1996 through 2000, and $319,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1996 through 2002.

''(13) COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS.—The Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending to reduce outlays $301,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, $5,760,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1996 through 2000, and $10,002,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1996 through 2002.

TITLE II—BUDGETARY RESTRAINTS AND RULEMAKING

SEC. 200. LIMITING INCREASES IN THE STATUTORY LIMIT ON THE PUBLIC DEBT.

(a) RECONCILIATION DIRECTIVES WITH RESPECT TO PUBLIC DEBT LIMIT.—

(1) BUDGET RESOLUTION.—Any concurrent resolution on the budget for a fiscal year that contains directives of the type described in paragraph (1) or (2) of section 310(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 for such fiscal year shall also include a directive of the type described in paragraph (3) of that subsection for that fiscal year.

(2) RECONCILIATION.—Any change in the statutory limit on the public debt that is recommended pursuant to a directive of the type described in paragraph (3) of section 310(a) shall be included in the reconciliation legislation reported pursuant to section 310 (b) for that fiscal year.

(b) POINT OF ORDER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—

(A) Notwithstanding any other rule of the Senate, except as provided in subparagraph (B), it shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill or joint resolution (or any amendment thereto or conference report thereon) that increases the statutory limit on the public debt during a fiscal year above the level set forth as appropriate for such fiscal year in the concurrent resolution on the budget for such fiscal year agreed to under section 301 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(B) Subparagraph (A) shall not apply to any reconciliation resolution reported pursuant to section 310(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 during any fiscal year (or any conference report thereon) that contains a provision that—

(i) increases the statutory limit on the public debt pursuant to a directive of the type described in section 310(a)(3) of such Act; and

(ii) becomes effective on or after the first day of the following fiscal year.

(2) PROHIBITION ON STRIKING PROPER DEBT LIMIT CHANGES.—Notwithstanding any other rule of the Senate, it shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any amendment to a reconciliation bill or resolution that would strike a provision reported pursuant to a directive of the type described in section 310(a)(3) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(3) WAIVERS.—This section may be waived or suspended in the Senate by a roll call vote of a majority of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(c) EXERCISE OF RULEMAKING POWERS.—The Senate adopts the provisions of this title—

(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate, and as such they shall be considered as part of the rules of the Senate, and such rules shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent therewith; and

(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of the Senate to change those rules (so far as they relate to the Senate) at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of the Senate.

MOYNIHAN AMENDMENT NO. 1161

Mr. EXON (for Mr. MOYNIHAN) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution, Senate Concurrent Resolution 13, supra; as follows:

On page 74, strike lines 12 through 24 and insert the following: ''budget, the appropriate budgetary allocations, aggregates, and levels shall be revised to reflect $55,000,000,000 in budget authority and outlays of the additional deficit reduction achieved as calculated under subsection (c) for legislation that retains AFDC as a Federal entitlement and restores budget authority and outlays for other income security programs.

''(b) REVISED ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.—Upon the reporting of legislation pursuant to subsection (a), and again upon the submission of a conference report on such legislation (if a conference report is submitted), the Chair of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may submit to the Senate appropriately revised allocations under sections 302(a) and 602(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, budgetary aggregates, and levels under this resolution, revised by an amount that does not exceed the additional deficit reduction specified under subsection (d).''.

BINGAMAN (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 1162

Mr. EXON (for Mr. BINGAMAN, for himself, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. BIDEN, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. BYRD, Mr. KERRY, Mr. DODD, Mr. PRYOR, and Mr. GLENN) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution, Senate Concurrent Resolution 13, supra; as follows:

At the end of the concurrent resolution, add the following:

SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE ON THE IMPORTANCE OF RESEARCH, TECHNOLOGY, AND TRADE PROMOTION AND TRADE LAW ENFORCEMENT PROGRAMS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) the public welfare, economy, and national security of the United States have benefited enormously from the investments the Federal Government has made over the past fifty years in research, technology, and trade promotion and trade law enforcement;

(2) these investments are even more important at the dawn of the twenty-first century

in order to ensure that future generations of Americans can remain at the forefront of exploring the endless scientific and technological frontier in the face of ever greater challenges from abroad and thereby maintain and improve their health, standard of living, and national security; and

(3) enforcement of United States trade laws and promotion of United States exports, especially programs in support of small and medium sized businesses, serve an invaluable function in creating jobs, promoting national economic growth, and allowing American workers and businesses to have the resources to compete in an ever more competitive global economy.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that, in the assumptions for the overall accounts, it is assumed that—

(1) in allocating discretionary spending in fiscal years 1996 through 2002 within the discretionary spending limits established in section 201, the Committee on Appropriations will make it a high priority to maintain the overall fiscal year 1995 investment level (without adjustment for inflation) in research, technology and trade promotion, and trade law enforcement programs; and

(2) the conferees on the concurrent budget resolution will not agree to any revenue reductions below current law unless the discretionary spending limit established in the conference report will permit the Committee on Appropriations to achieve the goal established in paragraph (1).

MURRAY AMENDMENT NO. 1163

Mr. EXON (for Mrs. MURRAY) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution, Senate Concurrent Resolution 13, supra; as follows:

On page 79, between lines 3 and 4, insert the following:

SEC. . PROHIBITION OF LEGISLATION THAT WOULD DEPRIVE CHILDREN OF THEIR HEALTH INSURANCE UNDER MEDICAID.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report that would cause children eligible to receive benefits under Medicaid (whether currently or in the future) to lose any of those benefits.

(b) WAIVER.—This section may be waived or suspended in the Senate by a majority vote of the Members voting, a quorum being present, or by the unanimous consent of the Senate.

(c) APPEALS.—Appeals in the Senate from the decisions of the Chair relating to this section shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided between and controlled by, the appellant and the manager of the bill or resolution, as the case may be. An affirmative vote of a majority of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required in the Senate to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this provision.

(d) CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE REPORTS.—Whenever the Director of the Congressional Budget Office prepares a report pursuant to section 308 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 in connection with a bill, resolution, or conference report that the Director believes would cause children eligible to receive benefits under Medicaid (whether currently or in the future) to lose any of those benefits, the Director shall so state in that report and, to the extent practicable, shall include an estimate of the number of children eligible to receive benefits under Medicaid (whether currently or in the future) who would lose any of those benefits as a result of that legislation.

(e) ESTIMATES.—Solely for the purposes of enforcement of this section in the Senate, the number of children eligible to receive benefits under Medicaid shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the Committee on the Budget of the Senate.

MURRAY (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 1164

Mr. EXON (for Mrs. MURRAY for herself, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. PRESSLER, Mr. AKAKA, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. PELL, Mr. DORGAN, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. KERREY, Mr. EXON, Mrs. KASSEBAUM, and Mr. KEMPTHORNE) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution, Senate Concurrent Resolution 13, supra; as follows:

At the end of title III, insert the following:

SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE.

(A) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds as follows:

(1) In order to fulfill its responsibility to communities that were adversely affected by Federal activities, the Congress established the Impact Aid program in 1950.

(2) The Impact Aid program is intended to ease the burden on local school districts for educating children who live on Federal property. Since Federal property is exempt from local property taxes, such districts are denied the primary source of revenue used to finance elementary and secondary education. Most Impact Aid payments are made for students whose parents are in the uniformed services, or for students who reside on Indian lands or in federally subsidized low-rent housing projects. Over 1,600 local educational agencies enrolling over 17,000,000 children are provided assistance under the Impact Aid program.

(3) The Impact Aid program is one of the few Federal education programs where funds are sent directly to the school district. Such funds go directly into the general fund and may be used as the local educational agency decides.

(4) The Impact Aid program covers less than half of what it costs to educate each federally connected student in some school districts, requiring local school districts or States to provide the remainder.

(5) Added to the burden described in paragraph (4) is the fact that some States do not rely upon an income tax for State funding of education. In these cases, the loss of property tax revenue makes State and local education funding even more difficult to obtain.

(6) Given the serious budget constraints facing State and local governments it is critical that the Federal Government continue to fulfill its responsibility to the federally impacted school districts in our Nation's States.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that in the assumptions for the overall accounts it is assumed that—the Federal Government has a financial responsibility to schools in our Nation's communities which are adversely affected by Federal activities and that funding for such responsibilities should not be reduced or eliminated.

PELL AMENDMENT NO. 1165

Mr. EXON (for Mr. PELL) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution, Senate Concurrent Resolution 13, supra; as follows:

At the end of title III, insert the following:

SEC. . STUDENT LOAN CUTS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) in the 20th century, educational increases in the workforce accounted for 30 percent of the growth in our Nation's wealth, and advances in knowledge accounted for 55 percent of such growth;

(2) the Federal Government provides 75 percent of all college financial aid;

(3) the Federal student loan program was created to make college accessible and affordable for the middle class;

(4) increased fees and interest costs discourage college participation by making higher education more expensive, and more of a risk, for students and their families;

(5) full-time students already work an average of 25 hours per week, taking time away from their studies; and

(6) student indebtedness is already increasing rapidly, and any reduction of the in-school interest subsidy will increase the indebtedness burden on students and families.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the assumptions underlying the functional totals in this resolution assume the Labor and Human Resources Committee, in seeking to achieve mandatory savings, should not increase the cost of borrowing for students participating in the Robert T. Stafford Federal Student Loan Program.

LAUTENBERG (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 1166

Mr. EXON (for Mr. LAUTENBERG, for himself, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. WELLSTONE, Mr. REID, Mr. DASCHLE, and Ms. MIKULSKI) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution, Senate Concurrent Resolution 13, supra; as follows:

On page 3, line 10, increase the amount by $47,000,000.

On page 3, line 11, increase the amount by $144,000,000.

On page 3, line 12, increase the amount by $197,000,000.

On page 3, line 13, increase the amount by $257,000,000.

On page 3, line 14, increase the amount by $322,000,000.

On page 3, line 15, increase the amount by $392,000,000.

On page 3, line 16, increase the amount by $412,000,000.

On page 3, line 20, increase the amount by $47,000,000.

On page 3, line 21, increase the amount by $144,000,000.

On page 3, line 22, increase the amount by $197,000,000.

On page 3, line 23, increase the amount by $257,000,000.

On page 3, line 24, increase the amount by $322,000,000.

On page 3, line 25, increase the amount by $392,000,000.

On page 4, line 1, increase the amount by $412,000,000.

On page 4, line 18, increase the amount by $47,000,000.

On page 4, line 19, increase the amount by $144,000,000.

On page 4, line 20, increase the amount by $197,000,000.

On page 4, line 21, increase the amount by $257,000,000.

On page 4, line 22, increase the amount by $322,000,000.

On page 4, line 23, increase the amount by $392,000,000.

On page 4, line 24, increase the amount by $412,000,000.

On page 5, line 4, increase the amount by $47,000,000.

On page 5, line 5, increase the amount by $144,000,000.

On page 5, line 6, increase the amount by $197,000,000.

On page 5, line 7, increase the amount by $257,000,000.

On page 5, line 8, increase the amount by $322,000,000.

On page 5, line 9, increase the amount by $392,000,000.
On page 5, line 10, increase the amount by $412,000,000.
On page 5, line 17, increase the amount by $47,000,000.
On page 5, line 18, increase the amount by $144,000,000.
On page 5, line 19, increase the amount by $197,000,000.
On page 5, line 20, increase the amount by $257,000,000.
On page 5, line 21, increase the amount by $322,000,000.
On page 5, line 22, increase the amount by $392,000,000.
On page 5, line 23, increase the amount by $412,000,000.
On page 6, line 16, increase the amount by $47,000,000.
On page 6, line 17, increase the amount by $144,000,000.
On page 6, line 18, increase the amount by $197,000,000.
On page 6, line 19, increase the amount by $257,000,000.
On page 6, line 20, increase the amount by $322,000,000.
On page 6, line 21, increase the amount by $392,000,000.
On page 6, line 22, increase the amount by $412,000,000.
On page 43, line 24, increase the amount by $47,000,000.
On page 43, line 25, increase the amount by $47,000,000.
On page 44, line 7, increase the amount by $144,000,000.
On page 44, line 8, increase the amount by $144,000,000.
On page 44, line 15, increase the amount by $197,000,000.
On page 44, line 16, increase the amount by $197,000,000.
On page 44, line 23, increase the amount by $257,000,000.
On page 44, line 24, increase the amount by $257,000,000.
On page 45, line 7, increase the amount by $322,000,000.
On page 45, line 8, increase the amount by $322,000,000.
On page 45, line 15, increase the amount by $392,000,000.
On page 45, line 16, increase the amount by $392,000,000.
On page 45, line 23, increase the amount by $412,000,000.
On page 45, line 24, increase the amount by $412,000,000.
On page 64, line 24, decrease the amount by $47,000,000.
On page 64, line 25, decrease the amount by $967,000,000.
On page 65, line 2, decrease the amount by $1,771,000,000.

McCAIN (AND BROWN) AMENDMENT NO. 1167

Mr. DOMENICI (for McCAIN for himself and Mr. BROWN) proposed an amendment to amendment No. 1166 proposed by Mr. LAUTENBERG to the concurrent resolution, Senate Concurrent Resolution 13, supra; as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed, insert the following:
On page 3, line 10, increase the amount by $0.
On page 3, line 11, increase the amount by $0.
On page 3, line 12, increase the amount by $0.
On page 3, line 13, increase the amount by $0.
On page 3, line 14, increase the amount by $0.
On page 3, line 15, increase the amount by $0.
On page 3, line 16, increase the amount by $0.
On page 3, line 20, increase the amount by $0.
On page 3, line 21, increase the amount by $0.
On page 3, line 22, increase the amount by $0.
On page 3, line 23, increase the amount by $0.
On page 3, line 24, increase the amount by $0.
On page 3, line 25, increase the amount by $0.
On page 4, line 1, increase the amount by $0.
On page 4, line 18, increase the amount by $0.
On page 4, line 19, increase the amount by $0.
On page 4, line 20, increase the amount by $0.
On page 4, line 21, increase the amount by $0.
On page 4, line 22, increase the amount by $0.
On page 4, line 23, increase the amount by $0.
On page 4, line 24, increase the amount by $0.
On page 5, line 4, increase the amount by $0.
On page 5, line 5, increase the amount by $0.
On page 5, line 6, increase the amount by $0.
On page 5, line 7, increase the amount by $0.
On page 5, line 8, increase the amount by $0.
On page 5, line 9, increase the amount by $0.
On page 5, line 10, increase the amount by $0.
On page 5, line 17, increase the amount by $0.
On page 5, line 18, increase the amount by $0.
On page 5, line 19, increase the amount by $0.
On page 5, line 20, increase the amount by $0.
On page 5, line 21, increase the amount by $0.
On page 5, line 22, increase the amount by $0.
On page 5, line 23, increase the amount by $0.
On page 6, line 16, increase the amount by $0.
On page 6, line 17, increase the amount by $0.
On page 6, line 18, increase the amount by $0.
On page 6, line 19, increase the amount by $0.
On page 6, line 20, increase the amount by $0.
On page 6, line 21, increase the amount by $0.
On page 6, line 22, increase the amount by $0.
On page 43, line 24, increase the amount by $0.
On page 43, line 25, increase the amount by $0.
On page 44, line 7, increase the amount by $0.
On page 44, line 8, increase the amount by $0.
On page 44, line 15, increase the amount by $0.
On page 44, line 16, increase the amount by $0.
On page 44, line 23, increase the amount by $0.
On page 44, line 24, increase the amount by $0.
On page 45, line 7, increase the amount by $0.
On page 45, line 8, increase the amount by $0.
On page 45, line 15, increase the amount by $0.
On page 45, line 16, increase the amount by $0.
On page 45, line 23, increase the amount by $0.
On page 45, line 24, increase the amount by $0.
On page 64, line 24, decrease the amount by $0.
On page 64, line 25, decrease the amount by $0.
On page 65, line 2, decrease the amount by $0.

SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE.

It is the Sense of the Senate that the assumptions underlying the functional totals in this resolution include that the increased revenues resulting from the revision of the expatriate tax loophole should be used to eliminate the earnings penalty imposed on low and middle income senior citizens receiving social security.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 24, 1995, to conduct a hearing on the impact of the peso devaluation and the administration's aid package on the banking system and economy of Mexico.

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

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be allowed to meet during the Wednesday, May 24, 1995 session of the Senate for the purpose of conducting an oversight hearing on international aviation policy.

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

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be granted permission to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 24, 1995, for purposes of conducting a Full Committee business meeting which is scheduled to begin at 9:30 a.m. The purpose of this meeting is to consider pending calendar business.

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

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Finance Committee be permitted to meet Wednesday, May 24, 1995, in room 215 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, beginning at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a mark

up on H.R. 4, the Personal Responsibility Act of 1995.

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

COMMITTEE OF FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 24, 1995, at 10:30 a.m.

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

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 24, 1995 at 2:00 p.m. to hold a hearing on ''The Clinton Administration's Counter-Terrorism Intelligence Gathering Proposals.''

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

COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Labor and Human Resources be authorized to meet for an Executive Session, during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 24, 1995, at 9:30 a.m.

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

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 24, 1995, at 2:00 p.m. to hold a closed hearing on Intelligence matters.

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT OF GOVERNMENT AND THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Oversight of Government Management and the District of Columbia, Committee on Governmental Affairs, be permitted to meet during a session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 24, 1995, at 9:30 a.m., to hold a hearing on Aviation Safety: Do Unapproved Parts Pose a Safety Risk?

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON RESEARCH, NUTRITION AND GENERAL LEGISLATION

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry Subcommittee on Research, Nutrition, and General Legislation be allowed to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 24, at 10 a.m., in SR–332, to discuss research and the future of U.S. agriculture.

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

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

U.S. CONFERENCE OF MAYORS' COMMITMENT TO MAINTAINING GUN CONTROL LAWS

• Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, I would like to commend the U.S. Conference of Mayors for their May 16 letter restating their commitment to maintaining the Nation's gun control laws. I share their opposition to any efforts to weaken current laws, and I am particularly pleased with their restated commitment to the assault weapons ban.

Some people have called for the repeal of the assault weapons ban, even before it has an opportunity to demonstrate its effectiveness. These are the same people who argued that these weapons, which law enforcement officials have testified serve no purpose other than to kill as many human beings as quickly as possible, are legitimate products with a specially protected status in our society. I disagree with this conclusion.

In the aftermath of the tragic bombing in Oklahoma City, the push to repeal the ban has temporarily eased. When exposed to the scrutiny of the public eye, the absurdity of the effort to repeal the ban is exposed and the American public has had no trouble recognizing the inherent inconsistency of responding to terrorism by loosening common sense measures to stem the flow of weapons into our communities.

I am pleased that the Senate will not be considering a repeal of the assault weapons ban, or any other gun control initiatives, in the short run. However, the efforts to repeal these measures need to be permanently removed from Congresses' agenda.

Those who call for the repeal of gun control laws do not base their objections on substantive flaws with the measure, for when given an opportunity they have proven their worth. During its first year, the Brady law has made an impressive contribution to crime-fighting efforts. The International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP) reported on the 1-year anniversary of the Brady laws, implementation that in 27 of the States which did not previously meet Brady's requirements, 19,098 prohibited people were denied from purchasing a firearm. And although there is no national reporting requirement, the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms estimates that background checks in the past year have stopped 70,000 convicted felons and other prohibited persons from purchasing weapons.

In addition to fulfilling its primary aim: to stop felons from buying guns, the Brady law has assisted law enforcement officials in other ways. In Georgia, one sheriff reported that out of the 60 people denied weapons as a result of the Brady check in the first year, 15 had outstanding felony warrants and 15 arrests were made. Brady checks helped police in San Antonio, TX catch a suspected drug dealer, and it also led to the arrest of a man in South Carolina who was wanted for assaulting a police officer in Florida.

The assault weapons ban should also be given an opportunity to demonstrate its effectiveness.

The only way to resist the push to repeal these important laws is for the public to join this debate and make its views known. The U.S. conference of Mayors has once again joined the chorus of voices supporting our Nation's gun control laws, and I greatly appreciate their participation in this important debate.•

TRIBUTE TO MARGARET SWIEZYNSKI

• Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, today I rise to commend a distinguished citizen of New Hampshire, Margaret Swiezynski, for her many years of outstanding service to the Republican Party of New Hampshire and her community.

Margaret has dedicated her life to her family and in her spare time has selflessly given her time to the Republican Party. Her commitment and dedication to her community are to be commended and her involvement in the VFW, Lioness Club, and the local St. Patrick's Church has been instrumental in shaping her community.

Over the years, Margaret has seen many Presidential candidates come and go in New Hampshire, from President Nixon to President Bush. As always, Margaret played a key role in welcoming these candidates to our State and contributed to New Hampshire's reputation for being a key stop for everyone on the road to higher office. It is citizens like Margaret whose commitment and allegiance make New Hampshire such a special place to live and her many years of service should be applauded and certainly not go unnoticed.

Margaret is the proud mother and grandmother of three children and six grandchildren and her commitment is another example of her dedication to family and community. It is a characteristic that can be cherished by her family and Milford, NH, her home of over 40 years.

I, along with all the members of the New Hampshire Republican Party and the citizens of Milford, NH, whose lives Margaret has touched through her loyalty and devotion, would like to extend a heartfelt thanks and wish her all the best in her future endeavors.•

JAMES MADISON COMMEMORATIVE COIN ACT

Mr. ROBB. Mr. President, I rise today in support of the James Madison Commemorative Coin Act, which I joined my senior colleague from Virginia, Senator WARNER, in introducing on May 19, 1995.

This legislation requires the Secretary of the Treasury to issue a coin in the year 2001 commemorating the

250th birthday of James Madison and honoring his many accomplishments. The surcharges raised from the selling of the coins goes to the National Trust for Historic Preservation for the creation of a permanent fund for the preservation and renovation of Madison's home, Montpelier.

This is an important endeavor, Mr. President, because James Madison is one of our nation's most brilliant and significant founding fathers. A Virginian and a distinguished statesman, Madison was the principle drafter of the United States Constitution and the Bill of Rights. He served his country as the fourth President the United States.

His home, Montpelier, is located in Orange County, Virginia, not far from his friend Thomas Jefferson's Monticello.

It is extremely important, Mr. President, that we act today to both honor James Madison's 250th birthday and to create a permanent fund for the preservation of Montpelier. Doing so will ensure that Madison's legacy is sustained for future generations of the great nation he helped create.

I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

HONORING SOUTHEAST GUILFORD HIGH SCHOOL

• Mr. FAIRCLOTH. Mr. President, it is a pleasure and a privilege for me to rise today on the floor of the Senate to honor the accomplishments of Southeast Guilford High School. This group of young people and educator from Greensboro, NC, made it to the national finals in the recent 1995, ''We The People . . . The Citizen and the Constitution'' national competition held in Washington, DC, April 29–May 1. These outstanding young people competed against 49 other classes from throughout the Nation and demonstrated a remarkable understanding of the fundamental ideals and values of American constitutional government. The accomplishments of Christine Youmans, educator, and students Laurie Camp, Ivan Canada, Keith Cockerham, Kamyra Crawford, Joshua Curtiss, Crystal Delgado, Matthew Fulton, Terri Galinski, Kristin Gerner, Allison Gillus, Brent Gonet, Andrew Hamilton, Toby Kennedy, Jennifer Lee, Sara Manning, Brandon McGinnis, Jennifer Michael, Hope Moorman, Lanae Muse, Daniele Neese, Megan Randall, Aisha Rawlins, Christy Shaffer, Zachary Smith, and Mary Sullivan, are appreciated by myself and their home State of North Carolina.•

OKINAWAN KARATE-DO IN MASSACHUSETTS

• Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, Massachusetts is proud to be home to the North American Okinawan Karate-Do Association. Early in this century, Kanbum Uechi studied this ancient art on the mainland of China where it was first developed. Returning to his homeland of Okinawa, he introduced it there in 1910 and was the first master of the Okinawan Karate-Do system.

In 1956, for the first time, American servicemen were accepted as students in the Okinawan Karate-Do schools. One of them settled in the Boston area after his military discharge and began teaching this art form to people in the area. Walter Mattson of Framingham, MA, is the senior American instructor.

Over the years, there has been a continuing cultural exchange between the Masters on Okinawa and practitioners here in North America. Mr. Mattson is primarily responsible for this 35-year exchange program. This summer, Senior Instructor Peter McCrae from Plymouth, MA, will be studying on Okinawa with Master Shintoku Takara.

Many Americans have found in Okinawan Karate-Do a physical and mental discipline which promotes positive attitudes, good health, and self-mastery. Our young people have found in it an alternative to the streets and, in its instructors, positive role models. We are grateful for this Japanese import and we hope that this positive exchange between our two countries continues for many years.•

WILMER JONES-HAM RECEIVES MAHALIA JACKSON AWARD

• Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I would like to recognize the recent achievement of Wilmer Jones-Ham. On April 1, 1995 she received the Mahalia Jackson award for community service. Wilmer Jones-Ham is a dedicated woman who commits great energy to develop a sense of hope in youth, the under or unemployed, and homeless in the Saginaw community. She is the founder of the Saginaw Soul Children's Choir, the Saginaw Interdenominational Gospel Music Workshop, and the First Mayor's Scholarship Black and Gold Ball. She has been a teacher for more than 17 years and developed an after school program at her home to help students who need additional instruction in their subjects. It is my honor to congratulate and thank her for all her accomplishments.•

APPOINTMENTS BY MAJORITY AND MINORITY LEADERS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, on behalf of the Majority and Minority Leaders of the Senate and the Speaker and Minority Leader of the House of Representatives, pursuant to Public Law 104–1, announces the joint appointment of the following individuals as members of the Board of Directors of the Office of Compliance: Glen D. Nager, of Washington, D.C., for a term of 5 years and to serve as Chair; Virginia A. Seitz, of Washington, D.C., for a term of 5 years; Jerry M. Hunter, of Missouri, for a term of 4 years; James N. Adler, of California, for a term of 4 years; and Lawrence Z. Lorber, of Washington, D.C., for a term of 3 years.

A RETROSPECT OF V-E DAY

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, an issue of the journal entitled Uniformed Services Journal, May-June 1995, contains an article entitled, ''World War II Revisited: A Retrospect Of V-E Day and the Events Leading Up To It.''

The article includes recollections of some of the distinguished Members of the Congress who participated in World War II, among them Senator STROM THURMOND, Senator BOB DOLE, Senator DANIEL INOUYE, Congressmen TOM BEVILL, SAM GIBBONS, SONNY MONTGOMERY, and others.

It is an excellent reminiscence of their experiences and their views about the significance of V-E Day and their personal involvement in the events leading up to that occasion.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the article from the Uniformed Services Journal be printed in the RECORD.

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

WORLD WAR II REVISITED: A RETROSPECT OF V–E DAY AND THE EVENTS LEADING UP TO IT

(By Cathy Lumsden)

World War II (WW II) represents many things to many people. It represents sacrifice, freedom and hope for a better tomorrow. The road to freedom was paved with death and destruction. Many of you are familiar with Jim Pennington's stories of WW II at retiree recognition programs, chapter events and in the *USJ*, some more than once. But these stories and memories that follow are more than just stories. In today's climate of historical revisionism and political correctness, they remain as one of the few accurate eye-witness accounts of the making of American history in the Great War that literally saved the world. We cannot forget why we fought WWII, ''the war to end all wars'' or the men and women who fought the war. The thoughts and feelings that follow are real. Take the time to read and understand the contributions these Americans made in the fight for freedom.

SENATOR STROM THURMOND

Sen. Thurmond was serving as a Circuit Judge in his home state when war was declared on Germany. On that day, he called President Roosevelt and volunteered, even though he was exempted from service. Approximately a year later in 1943, LTC Thurmond, USA was a member of the 82nd Airborne Division assigned to First Army Headquarters in Europe. He is the only Senator still serving in Congress who participated in the Normandy Invasion on D–Day.

He was one of three men who volunteered to land in Normandy aboard a glider. The fire was so heavy that his glider was forced to go north to find a safer spot to land. Instead of it getting safer, it got worse. The glider landed in an apple orchard nearby. He was injured in the landing in the forehead, hand and knee. However, LTC Thurmond still joined the rest of the forces in the subsequent battles of the Invasion. LTC Thurmond would have preferred to have jumped but there wasn't sufficient time to train for the jump. After the invasion, he returned to Army Headquarters just as his unit got ready to go into St-Lo and into Paris.

On V–E Day, LTC Thurmond was in Leipzig, Germany when he learned of the end of

the war in Europe. He and his unit were disappointed that they were not allowed to take Berlin and had to let the Russians take it. LTC Thurmond was one of the men who uncovered and helped liberate Buchenwald Concentration Camp. He paints a grim picture of what he saw. ''I have never seen anything like it in my life. Bodies stacked up like cord wood, eight to ten feet high, those who had died and those who were still living . . . They killed them in one of three ways; by starving them to death with one bowl of thin pea soup per day . . . inducing them to climb a fence to get out, where they were shot . . . or they (the prisoners) were told to go into a big booth like a telephone booth and wait until the SS guards came in . . . they (prisoners) would go into the front of the booth and the SS Guards would go into the back of the booth and hit them with a mallet and smash their heads and kill them . . . The wife of the Commander was particularly cruel, she would take the skin from anyone who had tatoos to make lamp shades . . .'' Sen. Thurmond was selected to go on to the Pacific. He went to Fort Jackson, SC for a month, then by train to California and then on to the Philippines. LTC Thurmond was in the Philippines when the war ended. He captured a number of Japanese troops. He returned to Fort Bragg, NC and was called back to the Supreme Court of South Carolina. Sen. Thurmond was awarded five Battle Stars with the 82nd Airborne Division. For his military service, he earned 18 decorations, and awards, including the Legion of Merit with Oak Leaf Cluster, Purple Heart, Bronze Star for Valor, Belgian Order of the Crown and the French Croix de Guerre.

SENATOR BOB DOLE (R-KS)

Senator Dole shares his thoughts on WW II and V–E Day, we should take a moment to remember America's place in the world. When I witnessed the emotion of those gathered on the beaches of France last summer, memories came flooding back—memories of heroism, sacrifice and the pain men and women suffered. We must never be reluctant about our greatness as a country—nor ashamed of our national strength. There is one responsibility only the federal government has, and that is to protect our freedom. We must stop placing the agenda of the United Nations before the interest of the United States. Let us remember that America has been the greatest force for good the world has ever known. Before visiting France last year, I was in Northern Italy where I served in the Tenth Mountain Division 50 years before. While revisiting the battle sites, I thought about why we had been sent there, about the America we were risking our lives to protect and about the hopes for the generations to follow. As we open the door to another century, we can celebrate the fact that the world is a safer, freer place because of American leadership. We must continue to do what we have always done best—leading by example.

Senator Dole was a Platoon Leader with the legendary Tenth Mountain Division. Cpt. Dole was injured while serving in Northern Italy on April 14, 1945. He was awarded two Purple Hearts and one Bronze Star with Oak Leaf Cluster.

SENATOR DANIEL INOUYE (D-HI)

Sen Inouye was awarded a battlefield commission in Italy as a Second Lieutenant in the United States Army. This occurred just as his unit, the 442nd Regimental Combat Team left to rescue ''The Lost Battalion'' of the 141st Infantry. It had been surrounded and was desperately short of supplies and ammunition.Two days later he left to join his outfit. By the time he reached them, the bloody battle of The Lost Battalion was over. ''My platoon, numbering 20 men when I left, now had 11 capable of carrying a weapon—and that included me.'' Lt. Inouye considered himself lucky thanks to two silver dollars that he carried through every campaign. One was bent and the other cracked almost in two from the impact of a German bullet in France. (Sen. Inouye served in both France and Italy.) He carried them in his breast pocket but on the night of April 20, 1945, lost them. Despite his better judgment, he could not shake the fear that something was about to happen.

At first light (April 21, 1945), his unit (E Company) jumped. E Company's objective was Colle Musatello, a high and heavily defended ridge. Lt. Inouye's Company managed to make it within 40 yards of the German bunkers then almost at once three machine guns opened up at them. He took a hit in the stomach but still continued to fight. Finally he was close enough to pull the pin on the last grenade. ''As I drew my arm back, a German stood waist-high in the bunker. He was aiming a rifle grenade at me from a range of ten yards. And then as I cocked my arm to throw, he fired, and the grenade smashed into my right elbow. It exploded and all but tore my arm off . . . The German was reloading his rifle, but my grenade blew up in his face. I stumbled to my feet, closing on the bunker, firing my tommy gun lefthanded, the useless right arm slapping red and wet against my side . . . a bullet caught me in the right leg. The German resistance in our sector ended April 23. Nine days later, the war in Italy was over, and a week after that the enemy surrendered unconditionally.'' Senator Inouye was awarded the Distinguished Service Cross, the Purple Heart with Oak Leaf Cluster and the Bronze Star.

CONGRESSMAN TOM BEVILL (D-4TH-AL)

Last year, I participated in the commemoration of the 50th Anniversary of the D-Day Invasion on the coast of Normandy, France. The men who participated in that invasion will always be remembered for their heroism. It brought back many memories for me, although I was not part of the initial invasion. As a new Army Second Lieutenant, I was sent to England in late February of 1944, less than four months before D-Day. I was in a staging area with the 5th Armored Division, where I assisted in drilling the troops who were in the first wave to storm the coast of Normandy. At night we would load the troops on ships with their rifles and ammunition and send them out under cover of darkness. They did not know where they were going. They would land somewhere along the coast of Normandy. I remember how anxious the troops were. I realized it was no drill the day we issued emergency rations to the troops. Suddenly, they were provided kits with a several days' supply of chocolate bars, cigarettes and K-rations. We had never done that before. And, that's how we knew it was the real thing. I will never think of myself as a war hero. I am not. That honor goes to men like my colleague, Congressman Sam Gibbons of Florida, who parachuted behind the German lines on D-Day. That honor goes to men like the late Congressman Bill Nichols of Alabama who lost a leg in WW II. That honor goes to Travis Alvis, my childhood friend from Townley, who was killed in the D-Day Invasion. That honor goes to many, many others who stormed the beaches of Normandy in the name of freedom and democracy.

CONGRESSMAN SAM GIBBONS (D-11TH-FL)

Congressman Gibbons served in WWII as an Army Captain in the 501st Parachute Infantry of the 101st Airborne. Gibbons was a member of the initial assault force which invaded Normandy on D-Day. He is the only Member of the House of Representatives serving today who participated in the Invasion. He chose to remember V–E Day like this:

''V–E Day was a beautiful, sunny day. The weather was warm where I was in Paris and everyone was absolutely jubliant. I actually drove my jeep down the Champs-Elysees and weaved in and out of people dancing there. I saw V–E Day at the best time, from the best place.''

CONGRESSMAN ''SONNY'' MONTGOMERY (D-3RD-MS)

I served in the European Theatre during WW II. I was a Second Lieutenant with the 12th Armored Division which arrived in France in November, 1944. We were assigned to the Seventh Army part of the time and with the Third Army part of the time as we drove through France and Germany. We were in heavy combat during the fall and winter of 1944 and 1945. The toughest battle was against well-entrenched German forces at Herlisheim on January 9–10, 1945. We lost a number of tanks in the fighting there, but we held back a German counterattack and finally broke through enemy defenses. The German resistance began to break up after that and we then moved at a rapid pace toward the Rhine River. Another significant event occurred in April when elements of the Twelfth Armored Division captured the bridge over the Danube River at Dillingen before German demolition men could wreck it. Securing that bridge provided a vital artery for Allied troops to flood into southern Germany and helped speed up our efforts to end the war.

We helped liberate a number of concentration camps in Germany as the war neared its end. We drove past hundreds of freed Jewish prisoners walking and sometimes stumbling, along the road. The sight of these improverished people in their tattered clothes is something even the most hardened soldiers can never forget. I was in southern Germany when I heard the Armed Forces Radio broadcast that the war in Europe had ended, but I had little time to celebrate. I got orders a week later to go to the Pacific theater and prepare for the invasion of Japan. That invasion, of course, was averted when we dropped the atomic bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

RADM EUGENE B. FLUCKEY (USN-RET.)

Rear Admiral Fluckey, author of Thunder Below was Commanding Officer of the submarine USS Barb. He received the Medal of Honor and four Navy Crosses and is a veteran of eleven war patrols during WW II. RADM Fluckey is credited with the most tonnage sunk by a U.S. skipper in WW II, seventeen ships including a carrier, raider-carrier and a frigate. He is proudest of the fact that no one attached to the Barb received the Purple Heart and that the sub came back ready and eager to fight again. In the Atlantic, he chased German submarines but his biggest contributions were in the Pacific theatre. His contributions there will be highlighted in the upcoming V–J issue of the USI.

CORPORAL CHASE FIELDING (USA), FORMER POW

CPL Fielding arrived in Normandy on D+7 as part of the 29th Division going in to replace the 13th Airborne Division. They made it up to St-Lo which was later leveled by the Air Corps. Three days later, he was only one of three men remaining in his platoon, and was taken prisoner on June 30, 1944. Under American artillery fire, he along with two others were taken to Stalag XII A on the outskirts of Limsburg. ''We were fed bread and soup, bread and tea in the morning and water soup the next two meals. . . . Our meat consisted of worms which somehow got in the soup.'' We traveled by train for five days and five nights, forty to fifty men in a small boxcar. We were let out only twice to

perform our toilets. Ate, slept and excreted in the same place. It was suffocatingly hot during the day, and with little ventilation and sometimes without water for thirty-six hours, quite a few passed out.

Upon arrival in Limsburg, we had our first bath since the middle of July. We left Stalag XII A on August 24 and arrived at 4–B (Muhlburg) on August 26 and were put into barracks. ''The camp was like heaven compared to the others. . . . I met a member of Tito's band, age 15, and (who had been) wounded twice. There was a kid there, a machine-gunner, who was only eleven years old. . . . The Russians were treated horribly. In some Russian barracks cannibalism had occurred. They were like sticks, and when too weak to move were thrown in a lime pit. . . . One huge field there was fertilized with 10,000 bodies of Jews.'' On September 14th, CPL Fielding moved out as part of a working party. He passed through Dresden on the 15th and entered Sudatenland that night. On the 16th, the working party was housed at Falkensaw where it worked in coal mines. CPL Fielding went on his first sick call on October 6th due to boils. He was treated by a Serbian doctor in the Russian compound. A week and a half later, he developed an abscess and underwent surgery. A hole the size of an egg was left by a French surgeon purposely to keep him out of the mines for awhile. Mr. Fielding's health worsened in November because of another abscess, swollen tonsils and diphtheria.

Later an abscess was removed from the back of his head simply by cutting his head open without any painkiller. About a month later, he was returned to the commando and also to work in the mines. Rumors that Americans were coming closer began in April. Late in April, CPL Fielding and several other prisoners escaped and hid in a bomb shelter. He headed due west. The woods were full of Germans. Picking up information of SS troop movements, the group was able to avoid the SS. On April 27th (officially the 28th) they reached a Yank outpost. CPL Fielding later learned that those prisoners who stayed behind were the last to be liberated in Europe and when found were in such a state that many could hardly walk. A great many had died.

CAPT FRANK X. RILEY (USCG-RET.)

Captain Riley graduated from the Coast Guard Academy on June 19, 1942. He was assigned as Executive Officer on LCI 323 which was designated as Task Force Command Ship (TFCS) and was the first LCI to leave the States. He served aboard the LCI off the North African, Italian and Sicilian coasts; as Commanding Officer of the vessel, he participated in the Normandy Invasion. During the Invasion at Normandy. Captain Riley remembers that two hundred troops were loaded in the troop compartment. His ship, a salvage vessel saved the lives of 1500 Army personnel and salvaged 30 Landing Craft Personnel Vehicles (LCPV) and 50 larger vessels known as LCMs. Six New York City firefighters were put onboard the Landing Craft-Infantry (LCI) to control fires. General Omar Bradley rode the LCI twice, with his second ride being to Omaha Beach.

CAPT QUENTIN R. WALSH (USCG-RET.)

Captain Walsh graduated from the Coast Guard Academy in 1933. On December 7, 1941, his ship (APA) Joseph Dickman was part of a secret U.S. Navy convoy ''William Sail 12X'' approaching Cape Town South Africa. His ship returned to the United States on February 28, 1942 after having been diverted to India. His ship then became involved in the Battle of the Atlantic, surviving a torpedo attack May 15, 1942. Captain Walsh was assigned to the staff of Commander, U.S. Naval Forces, Europe in the Planning and Logistics Section. He was assigned to the planning for Operation Overlord and Phase Neptune and the logistics requirement for Cherbourg and LeHavre. He organized, trained and commanded U.S. Navy Task Unit 127.2.8 which landed over Beach Utah attached to the 7th Corps, U.S. Army. ''My Task Unit 127.2.8 (from June 26—June 29, 1944):

1. Cleaned out the last resistance in the Arsenal.
2. Plotted and delivered the mine fields in the harbor to the British mine sweepers off the port.
3. Established United States Navy Headquarters, Cherbourg.

We had to have Cherbourg to sustain the invasion (Normandy) and the Germans knew it.'' Task Unit 127.2.8 entered Cherbourg by going over the top of Fort duRoule with the 79th Division on June 26, 1944. Subsequently, he led a heavily-armed unit, equipped with submachine guns, hand grenades and bazookas the cleaned out the last resistance in the Cherbourg Arsenal, established U.S. Navy Headquarters in Cherbourg, and, by interrogating slave laborers, Free French and German prisoners, obtained and plotted the mine fields in Cherbourg harbor. Captain Walsh carried out the reconnaissance of ports in Brittany from St. Malo to Brest attached to Patton's Third Army, 8th Corps, until ordered to carry out the reconnaissance of LeHavre with the First Canadian Army on September 12, 1944. Captain Walsh considers his three most important contributions to the Invasion of Normandy as; U.S. Navy Task Unit 127.2.8, the capture of German mine fields, Cherbourg and the capture of Fort duHomet.

These are just of few of the brave men who along with women saved the world. Without them and others like them, democracy as we know it, would not exist. We thank them for their heroism and salute them one and all.

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, MAY 25, 1995

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in recess until the hour of 9 a.m. on Thursday, May 25, 1995; that following the prayer, the Journal of proceedings be deemed approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and the Senate then immediately proceed to a vote on the adoption of the conference report to accompany H.R. 1158, the rescissions bill.

I further ask unanimous consent that immediately following the vote on the conference report, the Senate resume consideration of S. Con. Res. 13, the concurrent budget resolution.

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

Mr. COCHRAN. I now ask unanimous consent that the first vote tomorrow morning at 9 a.m. be 20 minutes in length, and the remaining votes in the sequence be limited as under the terms of today's sequence of votes on the budget.

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

PROGRAM

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, for the information of all Senators, there will be a rollcall vote at 9 a.m. on the rescissions conference report. Immediately following that vote, the Senate will resume consideration of the budget resolution and will begin a series of rollcall votes on or in relation to remaining amendments to the budget.

RECESS UNTIL 9 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 8:42 p.m., recessed until Thursday, May 25, 1995, at 9 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 24, 1995:

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

LINDA LEE ROBERTSON, OF OKLAHOMA, TO BE A DEPUTY UNDER SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY, VICE MICHAEL B. LEVY, RESIGNED.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED AIR FORCE ACADEMY GRADUATES FOR PERMANENT APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE OF SECOND LIEUTENANT IN THE U.S. MARINE CORPS, PURSUANT TO TITLE 10, U.S. CODE, SECTION 541:

MARINE CORPS

To be second lieutenant

CHRISTIAN R. FITZPATRICK, 000–00–0000
DARREN M. HAMILTON, 000–00–0000
RUSSELL L. HICKS, 000–00–0000
NATHAN M. MILLER, 000–00–0000

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED U.S. MILITARY ACADEMY GRADUATE FOR PERMANENT APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE OF SECOND LIEUTENANT IN THE U.S. MARINE CORPS, PURSUANT TO TITLE 10, U.S. CODE, SECTION 541 AND 5585:

BRETT GREENE, 000–00–0000

THE JUDICIARY

JOSEPH H. MCKINLEY, JR., OF KENTUCKY, TO BE U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF KENTUCKY VICE RONALD E. MEREDITH, DECEASED.

ROBERT H. WHALEY, OF WASHINGTON, TO BE U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON VICE JUSTIN L. QUACKENBUSH, RETIRED.

B. LYNN WINMILL, OF IDAHO, TO BE U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF IDAHO VICE HAROLD L. RYAN, RETIRED.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

AN AMENDMENT TO PROVIDE A PERMANENT EXTENSION OF THE TRANSITION RULE FOR CERTAIN PUBLICLY TRADED PARTNERSHIPS

HON. AMO HOUGHTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1995

Mr. HOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I am joined today by several of my colleagues, including Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. CRANE, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. SHAW, Mr. HERGER, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. MCCRERY, and Mr. NEAL, in introducing legislation to permanently extend the 10-year grandfather for publicly traded partnerships [PTP's]. This provision applies to those PTP's that were in existence at the time the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1987 was passed.

Publicly traded partnerships, sometimes called master limited partnerships, were first created in the early 1980's. PTP's combined the traditional limited partnership form with the ability to have the partnership units freely traded on a stock exchange or over the counter.

In the 1987 act, Congress enacted section 7704 of the Internal Revenue Code. Section 7704 provides that PTP's generally will be taxed as corporations. Section 7704 does not apply, however, to PTP's where 90 percent or more of their income is qualifying income, such as from timber, oil and gas, and real estate. In addition, other PTP's in existence when section 7704 was enacted were grandfathered, but only for 10 years, through 1997. Our bill would extend this grandfather provision permanently.

APPROPRIATENESS OF THE 10-YEAR GRANDFATHER

We believe the 10-year limit on the grandfather for existing PTP's was inappropriate and unnecessary given the purpose for which section 7704 was enacted. According to the committee reports accompanying the 1987 act, section 7704 was intended to stop the ''long-term erosion of the corporate tax base.'' Generally, the concern was that much of corporate America would convert to PTP's, thereby causing corporate tax revenues to decline. There appears to have been no serious debate in 1987 over whether limiting the duration of the grandfather was necessary to address these concerns.

There is no question that our purpose in enacting section 7704 was fully achieved by prospective application of that section. The movement toward use of PTP's had barely begun by 1987; there were only approximately 120 in existence at that time. It was the snowball effect of future conversions that we sought to prevent. Prospective application of section 7704 stopped that snowball effect dead in its tracks. Permanently grandfathering all existing PTP's would have had no effect on this goal whatsoever. Conversely, limiting the duration of the grandfather to 10 years was unnecessary to achieve our purpose.

Since prospective application of section 7704 achieved our purpose, we believe Congress erred in 1987 by limiting the grandfather to 10 years. Unless we reverse that decision before it takes effect in 1998, those PTP's still in existence and their owners will face serious hardships with no corresponding benefit to the Government or the tax system. Our bill merely asks Congress to rethink its decision before any damage is done.

I can foresee that some people might view this proposal as special interest legislation. I strongly disagree. Had we chosen in 1987 to provide a permanent grandfather for existing PTP's, no one would have batted an eye. Instead, a permanent grandfather in 1987 would have been an appropriate decision for Congress to make based on the extent to which existing PTP's relied on the law that was in effect when they were created. The fact that the decision was initially made in 1987 should not stop us from revisiting the issue so long as the original decision has not yet taken effect.

We in Congress are called on to make decisions about appropriate transition relief in virtually every tax bill. Indeed, these types of decisions are ones that are particularly suited for the Members of Congress to make, since they generally involve the balancing of competing interests rather than technicalities of tax law.

Our proposal is different only because it is separate in time from the 1987 act. On the other hand, the proposal is generic in scope, applying to any PTP fitting the criteria. We believe that it is fair, before the 10-year grandfather expires, to determine whether that decision was the proper one or whether a permanent rule would be better.

Generally, Congress does not place time limits on grandfather provisions, other than what might be called project-specific provisions. The reasoning behind this policy is that if taxpayers were justified in relying on the law in effect at the time the taxpayer took action, then the taxpayers deserve relief from the change in the law, not just for a limited period but as long as the taxpayer's circumstances do not change.

REASONS FOR A PERMANENT GRANDFATHER

Some may wonder why these PTP's should be permanently grandfathered. After all, if they were taking advantage of so large a loophole that Congress had to shut it down, why should they benefit merely because they got in under the wire?

The truth is that these PTP's did not take advantage of an egregious loophole. PTP's are structured no differently from other types of limited partnerships. They merely combined that basic limited partnership structure with the ability for the units to be readily traded. The problem was thus not a loophole in the tax code that needed to be closed retroactively.

These PTP's relied on the law in effect before passage of the 1987 act, and that reliance was completely reasonable. The first proposal directed toward PTP's surfaced in 1984, but President Reagan chose not to forward it to Congress in his tax reform recommendations and we did not independently take up the idea in 1986. It was only when Treasury proposed section 7704 in mid-1987 as part of a list of acceptable revenue raisers that the proposal received any official endorsement. By that time, most of the affected PTP's were already in existence.

This raises what I believe is the most important issue in this debate: fairness to the PTP's and, more importantly, their owners. The process of converting from a corporation to a PTP is a costly and time-consuming one, easily taking over 1 year. The conversion process involved consultation with investment bankers, appraisals, planning by corporate finance, securities and tax lawyers, multiple filings with the SEC and State securities agencies, proxy statements and shareholder votes, etc. This process would not have been started or completed had there been any reasonable prospect that a change in the tax law would have applied retroactively or after a limited period of time.

To make matters worse, many of these same costs will be incurred once again if the 10-year grandfather is not made permanent. Grandfathered PTP's will be forced to convert to corporate form on January 1998. To do so, however, will require lengthy planning, and the same investment banking advice, appraisals, and attorney fees. The need for extensive, advance planning makes it essential that the matter be resolved this year.

More important is the effect that loss of the grandfather will have on PTP investors. It is a virtual certainty that the value of PTP units will be affected adversely if the grandfather expires. So it will be the investors that suffer most. And who are these investors? Most are average, middle-class taxpayers who have invested in PTP units because of their high yield, many before the 1987 act was passed.

We do not achieve any tax policy goal by retaining the 10-year grandfather. That goal was fully achieved by making section 7704 apply prospectively. Instead, all we would accomplish by retaining the 10-year grandfather would be harm to these PTP's and their investors. There is no doubt what our decision should be.

In conclusion I want to note the diversity of the PTP's that would benefit from permanent extension of the grandfather. The PTP's affected are involved in a wide variety of industries, from motels and restaurants to chemicals, financial advising, and macadamia nuts. Undoubtedly, these businesses operate in many of our districts. Of course, our districts are the homes to the individual investors in these PTP's. The most recent count indicates that there are well over 300,000 individual investors.

The 10-year grandfather hangs like a sword of Damocles over each one of these PTP's. We in Congress have the ability to remove that sword and there is no reason why we should not do so. We urge our colleagues to join with us to support this bill.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

● This ''bullet'' symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.
Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

VerDate 24-MAY-95 07:05 May 25, 1995 Jkt 099061 PO 00000 Frm 00001 Fmt 0626 Sfmt 9920 E:\CR\CRI\E24MY5.REC e24my1

ACADEMY NOMINATIONS FOR U.S. CITIZENS IN THE CNMI

HON. ROBERT A. UNDERWOOD

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1995

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation that will provide the U.S. citizens of the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands with the same opportunity to attend the U.S. military academies as is enjoyed by the people of Guam and other non-State areas of our country.

This bill authorizes the Northern Marianas Resident Representative, the official elected at large to represent the Commonwealth before the Federal Government, to nominate candidates to fill one vacancy at each of the three military academies.

Currently, the people of the Northern Marianas face restricted access to West Point, Annapolis, and Colorado Springs. As U.S. citizens, they are eligible for nomination to the military academies. The Northern Marianas, however, is without representation here in Congress. Therefore, the normal route to academy appointments—nomination by a Member—is barred to these Americans.

The proposal to rectify this situation has received considerable prior study. Extending the authority for nominations was recommended in 1985 by the Commission on Federal Laws that Congress established to determine what Federal statutes should apply to the Northern Marianas.

There is also precedent for this authority to be grated to elected officials who are not Members of Congress. Under present law, the Governor of Puerto Rico can make nominations, as could the Governor of the Canal Zone before that area was returned to Panama.

Passage of the bill that I am introducing today will help ensure that the youth of the Northern Marianas have equal access to the important opportunity our military academies provide for both higher education and service to our Nation.

THE PASSING OF MRS. AMY BULL CRIST

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1995

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret that I inform our colleagues of the passing of a remarkable woman Orange County's first lady, Mrs. Amy Bull Crist of Orange Count, NY, this past weekend, at the age of 89.

Amy Bull Crist born on March 9, 1906 in Brick Castle, her home in Stony Ford, NY, was a lifelong resident of Orange County. The building in which she was born was built by William Bull and Sarah Wells, her direct ancestors, who in 1718 became the first European couple married in what is now Orange County, NY.

As the daughter of Orange County's oldest and most illustrious family, Amy Bull Crist could have opted for a life of leisure. Instead, at an early age she determined to devote her life to the service of others.

When she was only 18—soon after her 1924 graduation from Middletown High School—she was invited to try her hand at teaching. Weary of farm work on the family estate, she eagerly grasped the opportunity to teach and within the next 15 years, as she taught in one-room schoolhouses, at Goosetown School in Hamptonburgh and at Cross Roads School in Montgomery, she became known county wide as one of the most outstanding educators in the region. Amy looked after her students like a doting parent, arranging dental and eyeglass appointments for those students who needed it, and in many ways making her mark upon the lives whose education was entrusted to her expertise and compassion. Subsequently she served as principal at Goodwill School. By the time of her retirement in the mid-1970's, Amy had risen to become our region's top education administrator, serving not only as district superintendent of schools for Orange and Ulster County, but also as district superintendent and executive officer for the Board of Cooperative Educational Services [BOCES].

Recognizing that our young people are our most valuable resource, Amy determined that education was the most worthwhile endeavor to which she could devote herself. Her lifelong career as an educator was a living testament to those who cherish this investment in our future. As a grade school teacher, a school superintendent, and as a trustee of our Orange County Community College which she was so instrumental in funding, Amy Bull Crist touched the lives of thousands of students. She served as founder and first superintended of Orange-Ulster BOCES for many years prior to her 1974 retirement, and the affection and respect in which the community held her is underscored by the fact that the BOCES complex is named in her honor.

As was typical of Amy's style, she never satisfied herself by resting on her laurels. She continued to teach evening and summer classes at New York University, the State University College at New Paltz, and at Orange County Community College in Middletown.

Amy was one of the last of her generation: a generation which saw Orange County progress from the farming area which her family helped to pioneer to the fastest-growing region of New York State. Throughout the many changes which Amy witnessed in her lifetime, she remained constant in her beliefs that those who are more fortunate have a moral responsibility to help neighbors enjoy more productive lives and live up to their potential.

Amy's philanthropic and civic endeavors in so many important activities, including Occupations, Inc., the Orange County Mental Health Association, the Goshen Historic Track, the proposed Youth Facility for the Town of Wallkill, the American Heart Association, and so many other worthwhile endeavors, helped make a better life for all of us.

Amy also remained active with the Arboretum Committee for Orange County Park; the Montgomery Grange; the Presbyterian Church in Hamptonburgh; and the Emeriti Association of Orange County Community College. She was an honorary member of the Order of the Eastern Star in Walden. She organized the Amy Bull Crist Reading Association, the Amy Bull Crist Youth-in-Government Association, and the Orange County Farmers Association and Museum.

Emanuel Axelrod, who succeeded Army as Orange-Ulster BOCES superintendent after her retirement in 1974, said upon her passing: ''She never wavered when she felt she was right. I will never forget her. She was one of the most outstanding people I've known.''

Amy was chairman of the Orange County museums—Hill Hold and Brick House—the original lands and buildings of her family. She was well known for presiding at the well-publicized Bull family summer reunions which brought together her many relatives from throughout the United States and the world and which on occasion I had the pleasure of attending.

Amy, the widow of the late Clarence H. Crist, is survived by a large family including her sister, Molly B. Bazemore of Augusta, GA; two nieces, including Mary Ann Cohen of Goshen, NY; four nephews, including Michael K. Brown of Campbell Hall, NY, and William Bull Brown of Middletown; 19 great-nieces and great-nephews; and 13 great-great nieces and great-great nephews.

I often relied upon Amy for advice and assistance in many of my responsibilities in the Congress. She always had a patient ear, a keen insight, and a helping hand.

Amy left us this past weekend; peacefully in her sleep at her home, Brick Castle—the same home in which she was born 89 years earlier!

Our county, our region, and our State will long miss Orange County's First Lady, Amy Bull Crist.

Mr. Speaker, I call upon all of my colleagues to join with me in paying tribute to a truly remarkable lady.

A TRIBUTE TO JAMES SMITH

HON. JERRY LEWIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1995

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to your attention the fine work and outstanding public service of Mr. James Smith of Ridgecrest, CA. Jim, a dedicated professional and longtime community activist, is retiring as the manager of Administration for North American Chemical Co. A tribute dinner will be held in his honor on June 2 to honor his more than 40 years of support to the chemical industry.

Jim Smith graduated from Loyola University in Los Angeles in 1954 and served 2 years in the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. Following graduation, Jim went to work for American Potash and Chemical Corp. where he served in supervisory and management positions at plants across the country. In 1967, Jim went to work for Kerr McGee Chemical Corp. of Trona where for 23 years he fulfilled critical functions relating to labor relations, environmental relations, and community relations. In 1990, Jim went to work at North American Chemical Co. where he has served as manager of Administration and Regulatory Affairs and most recently, as special assistant for public affairs.

To say the least, Jim has played an extraordinary and active role in our community. He is a board member of the Fire Mountain Foundation, the Ridgecrest Chamber of Commerce, the Chemical Industry Council of California,

the Desert Empire Fair, and the Maturango Museum. In addition, he has also served as an elected trustee of the Trona Joint Unified School District, and as a board member for the Council on Substance Abuse Awareness and the Searles Valley Community Service Council. Jim is also a past member of the San Bernardino County Air Pollution Control Advisory Council and a member of the Kern County Air Pollution Central District Hearing Board.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you join me, our colleagues, Jim's wife, Grace, and his family and many friends in recognizing his many fine achievements and selfless contributions. Over the years, Jim Smith has touched the lives of many people and it is only fitting that the House of Representatives recognize him today.

CONGRATULATIONS TO THE PATCHOGUE FIRE DEPARTMENT

HON. MICHAEL P. FORBES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1995

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Patchogue Fire Department on 115 years of excellent service to the residents of the village of Patchogue and the East Patchogue Fire Protection District. I would like to extend my applause to the Southern New York Volunteer Firemen's Association on celebrating the 100th anniversary of their convention.

The Patchogue Fire Department has established a tradition as one of the oldest and finest fire departments in New York. The firemen of Patchogue are among the best trained and bravest fire fighters in New York as well. These firemen regularly risk their lives to protect and serve the people of Patchogue. Upon examining their impeccable service record, it is no surprise that the Patchogue Fire Department has been protecting the village of Patchogue so well for 115 years.

On Friday, June 9, 1995, the men and women of the Patchogue Fire Department will celebrate at the 100th Annual Convention of the Southern New York Volunteer Firemen's Association. This association, which represents the volunteer and exempt firemen of the nine southern counties, stands as evidence that New York does in fact have among the best firemen in the Nation.

REMEMBERING A HERO, HUMBLE SERVANT

HON. HAROLD ROGERS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1995

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, the Army Corps of Engineers, our southern region and the nation lost a humble servant, war hero and good friend when Mitchell ''Stoney'' Merriman died last week from complications of an inoperable brain tumor.

Originally from White County, Tennessee, Stoney wrote the book on public relations—literally. A published author, newsman and writer, Stoney had such a creative and innovative style that he wrote a how-to book for the Corps that is used nationwide today.

Since 1987, he managed the Army Corps Nashville District's public information, media relations and community relations program in a 7-State area. I cannot think of anyone who knew how to promote an event better.

In Corps events and groundbreakings in my district, Stoney always amazed us with something new, creative and exciting. His style blazed a trail for all to follow and his legacy will be long remembered.

Stoney was more than just a top-notch public relations man. He was a veteran newsman, and even more importantly, a war hero.

During his 23 years of service in the U.S. Marine Corps, he served two combat tours in Vietnam, where he served as a combat journalist. Among his awards were two Purple Hearts, Legion of Merit Medal, Meritorious Service Medal, the Bronze Star with Combat ''V'' Medal and several other awards.

As a newsman, Stoney started in the military, but carried on his tradition of excellence at the ''The Smithville Review'' and then as publisher and editor of the ''Carthage, TN Courier.''

I am proud of Stoney Merriman. He was committed, honest and hard working in everything he did—whether it was a Corps event placing his life in harm's way to protect and defend his country. He was a joy to be with, and his service must always be remembered.

TRIBUTE TO JIM HENRY

HON. JAMES M. TALENT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1995

Mr. TALENT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer my congratulations to Jim Henry, a constituent of mine who was recently awarded the Small Business Administration's ''1995 Small Business Person of the Year'' award for the State of Missouri.

Ten years ago Mr. Henry left his job with Emerson Electric and bought R.C. Wilson Co., a small collection agency in St. Louis, MO. At the time Mr. Henry bought R.C. Wilson he had no small business experience or background, but he did have a can-do philosophy, which has helped him build one of the most successful collection companies in our city. Over the past 10 years, sales, employment, and clientele at R.C. Wilson have grown significantly. Sales have increased by 200 percent, while employment at R.C. Wilson have grown from 25 to 118. At the same time, his company's collection success rate is over 30 percent—higher than the 22 percent average for the industry.

Mr. Henry explains his success this way: ''The way a business owner treats employees makes or breaks a business. The key to long-term success is to treat your employees with dignity and always maintain the highest level of integrity and honesty in all dealings.'' This attitude is reflected in the companies employee benefit policies. R.C. Wilson Co. has a generous tuition reimbursement program which enables many employees to continue their education through post-graduate levels. The company also provides an annual scholarship for Missouri Business Week to the child of one employee. The company also shares profits with its employees.

Mr. Speaker, I want to close by again offering Mr. Henry my congratulations on being named the 1995 Missouri Small Business Person of the Year, and to wish him and the employees of R.C. Wilson Co. continued success.

HONORING VICE ADM. THOMAS J. KILCLINE, USN RETIRED

HON. JAMES P. MORAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1995

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to pay tribute to Vice Adm. Thomas J. Kilcline, USN [Retired] on the eve of his retirement from his position as president of The Retired Officers Association. Because of his many accomplishments, I consider it appropriate to formally recognize him for his more than 50 years of service to this Nation.

Admiral Kilcline was born in Detroit, MI, on December 9, 1925. He enlisted in the U.S. Navy in 1943, graduated from the U.S. Naval Academy in 1949, and was designated a naval aviator in November 1950 after which he flew with VR–5 until 1953. Admiral Kilcline attended the Naval Postgraduate School and later Massachusetts Institute of Technology, where he earned a masters degree in aeronautical engineering in 1956.

He then joined Heavy Attack Squadron Nine, serving on the *Saratoga* and *Ranger.* In 1959, he was assigned to the staff of the commander Sixth Fleet. He completed the command and staff course at the Naval War College and in 1962 completed test pilot school. He was later assigned as coordinator of test programs for all attack aircraft at the Naval Air Test Center. In January 1965, Kilcline reported to Heavy Attack Squadron Eleven [VAH–11] aboard the *Forestall.* He commanded an RA5C squadron deployed to the Vietnam theater. He returned to the staff of the commander Naval Air Force, U.S. Atlantic Fleet in August 1967, and a year later was assigned as operations officer and later executive officer aboard the U.S.S. *Ticonderoga* [CVA–14] during operations off Vietnam. He then became program manager for acquisition and support of the RA–5C aircraft, Naval Air Systems Command. In October 1970, he was named director of liaison with the House of Representatives under the Navy Office of Legislative Affairs.

From August 1972 until May 1974, Kilcline was commanding officer, Naval Air Station, Patuxent River, MD. He was then assigned as director of aviation officer distribution, aviation captain detailer and later, assistant chief of Naval Personnel, Officer Distribution and Education. In August 1975, he assumed command of Naval Base Subic Bay with duties as commander in chief Pacific representative in the Philippines and commander U.S. Naval Forces, Philippines. He became chief, Legislative Affairs in February 1978 and in July 1981, was assigned as commander Naval Air Forces, U.S. Atlantic Fleet, He retired from the Navy in 1983.

His awards include the Distinguished Service Medal; the Legion of Merit with three gold stars; the Bronze Star; the Air Medal; and awards from the governments of the Philippines and the Republic of Vietnam.

Following retirement, Admiral Kilcline formed a military and congressional consulting firm

which he disestablished when he became TROA president in December 1986. Through his stewardship, The Retired Officers Association played a pivotal role in convincing Congress to enact several legislative initiatives to maintain readiness and improve the quality of life for all members of the military community—active, reserve and retired, plus their families and survivors. I won't describe all of his accomplishments, but will briefly focus on a few to illustrate the breadth of his concern for military people.

Under his direction, TROA supported strengthening the underpinning of the Montgomery GI Bill and thus provided a solid foundation for our Nation's future leaders by placing the wherewithal for a college education on the horizons of more than 1 million young men and women who otherwise might have been denied that opportunity. He was ever mindful of the adverse effects on morale and retention caused by broken commitments and inadequate compensation and forcefully championed the causes of fairness and equity. His leadership efforts to preserve the long-standing commitment to lifetime care in military health care facilities, to fight perennial threats to retiree cost of living adjustments and to provide adequate military pay raises are some of his other significant contributions. Most recently, he fought and won the battle for a transition plan that provides a comprehensive benefits package for those personnel and their families who are forced out of active service as a result of the force structure drawdown that, hopefully, is in its final stages.

One of Tom's added strengths has been his lovely wife of 44 years, the former Dornell Thompson of Pensacola, FL. Dornell has stood steadfastly at his side, championing the cause of military people, particularly their families and survivors, everywhere. For these contributions, we owe her a debt of gratitude, as well.

Tom and Dornell live in McLean, VA. They have had four children: Captain Tom, Jr., an F–14 pilot now in the Navy Chair at the National War College; Lieutenant Patrick, lost in an F–14 accident off the U.S.S. *Constellation,* Lieutenant Kathleen, a navy doctor killed in an auto accident; and Mary, wife of Commander Bob Novak, a P–3 pilot assigned as a program manager in the Naval Air Systems Command in Washington, DC.

I wish to extend my heartfelt appreciation for his numerous contributions to military people everywhere and my best wishes for continued success in all of his endeavors.

IN RECOGNITION OF THREE BAILEY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL RETIREES

HON. KEN BENTSEN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1995

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize the longstanding service and dedication of three employees of the William F. Bailey Elementary School of Pasadena, TX, who will retire at the end of this month.

Bailey Elementary has provided an excellent education to the thousands of students that have passed through its doors in its 37-year history. Bailey was the first school to establish the Right Choice Program, which teaches children that with everything there is a right and a wrong choice. It is the only elementary school with a choir, orchestra, and band in the Pasadena Independent School District. The entire staff at Bailey Elementary School works together with one goal in mind: To make every child a winner.

These three individuals, Patricia Ann Autrey Hawkins, Rebecca Faye Dorsett Buck, and Pauline Sophie Trojanowski Braden, have demonstrated their commitment to this goal and to the students of Bailey Elementary.

Mrs. Hawkins was born on July 22, 1938. Her parents devoted their lives to public education, spending over 75 years in the classroom or administration, so it was no surprise when Patricia attended Sam Houston State Teachers College and the University of Houston. She received her bachelor degree in education from Sam Houston in 1959. Her first teaching experience began with the Houston Independent School District, but she moved to Pasadena Independent School District after only one semester. She taught at Red Bluff Elementary for 5 years, before she and her family moved to Austin for her husband to complete his graduate studies. Mrs. Hawkins returned to Pasadena in 1969 and began her career again at Bailey Elementary School as a fourth grade teacher. She never left.

Mrs. Hawkins' dedication to education was not limited to the classroom, however. She remained active in the Texas State Teachers Association, the Pasadena Junior Forum, Delta Kappa Gamma, and First United Methodist Church. She served as a grade-level chairman and on numerous faculty committees at Bailey, and she was also honored with a Texas lifetime membership to the PTA. Mrs. Hawkins also found time to complete her own education, and she received her masters degree from Southwest Texas State Teachers College in 1965.

Mrs. Hawkins and her husband Sam have remained in the Pasadena area for over 30 years. Their children, Malcolm and Melissa, continue to live in Texas. Mrs. Hawkins will retire from Pasadena Independent School District and Bailey Elementary on May 29, 1995, after 31 years in public education.

Rebecca Faye Dorsett Buck was born on September 4, 1938, and moved to Houston at the age of 6. He graduated from Galena Park High School in 1956 and married her husband, Ronald Buck, in December 1957. Mrs. Buck waited until her three children, Ronald, Teresa, and Terrie, were in high school before she started to work in the Pasadena School District. She began in the visual handicap program in 1975, and after taking 1 year off, she returned to complete 19 years working at Bailey Elementary School, her latest position as a member of the office staff.

Mrs. Buck has also dedicated herself to activities outside the school, including the Central Baptist Church. She has a great talent for decorating and is very creative with arts, crafts, and floral arrangements. Mrs. Buck also spends a great deal of time entertaining her six grandchildren.

According to her coworkers and friends, Mrs. Buck goes out of her way to help anyone and treats everyone equally. She has maintained the respect and admiration of the faculty, administration, and students during her 19 years at Bailey.

Pauline Sophie Trojanowski Braden was born on February 6, 1931, in Sealy, TX. She married Anton Otto Braden, Jr. in October 1948, and has 5 children, 10 grandchildren, and 1 great-grandchild. Mrs. Braden began working with Pasadena Independent School District in 1971, and will be retiring from the cafeteria staff of Bailey this year.

Mrs. Braden has lived in Pasadena since 1960. Currently three of her children and one grandchild live with her. Her daughter Cynthia said, in a tribute to her mother, that:

> She would not hesitate to give anything she has to anyone of her family with no thought of asking for repayment. She comes from a large family and does not consider this living arrangement as cramped as some might think. I might even go as far to say she is happy because this is her family. Little does mother know she is giving up something which is totally unknown to her, and as of now it may never be known to her. That is total peace mind. And even if she was aware of what she might be missing, she would choose to give it up for her family anyway.

Mrs. Braden will be sorely missed for her warmth, dedication, and friendship to Bailey Elementary, its staff, and its students.

I congratulate Mrs. Hawkins, Mrs. Buck, and Mrs. Braden on their combined 73 years of service to the Pasadena School District and to the Pasadena community. I wish them the very best as they enjoy their retirement, and I am certain they all will be missed at Bailey Elementary.

ON THE OCCASION OF THE ALLIANCE FOR JUSTICE HONORING TOM STODDARD

HON. HENRY A. WAXMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1995

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, on May 23, the Alliance for Justice—a coalition of organizations with a history of working for equal justice—honored Tom Stoddard for his long career. I want to take the opportunity to do so as well.

Now is precisely the right time to honor Tom Stoddard.

This Congress is dominated by politicians who would have us march backward and have us repeal the progress of the last 25 years, especially the ideals of equal justice.

But Tom embodies a different philosophy, one first said by Frederick Douglass: ''Those who profess to favor freedom, and yet deprecate agitation, are men who want crops without plowing up the ground. If there is no struggle, there is no progress.''

In that spirit, Tom has worked and struggled. For years after the Nation decided that race discrimination, sex discrimination, religious discrimination, and finally disability discrimination were all wrong—discrimination against gay men and lesbians is not just allowed, it is encouraged, it is joked about, it is expected.

Tom has worked against that, working for what the opposition calls ''the special rights for gay people.'' He has worked for the ''special right'' to work if you are qualified; the ''special right'' to live in the privacy of your home with those you love; the ''special right'' to have families; the ''special right'' to speak your mind; the ''special right'' to serve your country;

and the ''special right'' to have photographs on your desk, to have picnics in public places, and to care for your friends who are sick. He has worked for the ''special right'' to be free and equal and unafraid in America.

Tom has done all this by speaking, teaching, advocating, organizing, and writing. He has been a model for young people who care about progress, and he has been a reminder for older people that not all justice has yet been done. Tom is the kind of American who has made the Nation make the quantum leap from thinking about gay civil rights as a fringe issue to gay civil rights as a fundamental issue.

The Alliance for Justice has made these leaps before, leading the Nation closer to liberty and justice for all. I am pleased to join with the Alliance in honoring Tom Stoddard as a pioneer in that fight, and as a man whose work has changed politics for the better and forever.

TRIBUTE TO 2D LT. WAYLAND E. BENNETT, USMC

HON. STEVE LARGENT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1995

Mr. LARGENT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to 2d Lt. Wayland E. Bennett, a Marine Corps pilot who perished on a training mission during World War II, but was only recently brought back to this country for burial. The story of his return is a remarkable tale of friendship and dedication and deserving of special recognition.

Mr. Bennett was a young man of 18 when he left home to join the war effort in the South Pacific. In 1943 he was commissioned a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps and was sent to a small island 1,200 miles northeast of Australia to complete his training and join the elite Black Sheep Squadron of fighter pilots. On October 22, 1943 his Corsair crashed into a jungle area of the island too dense and too dangerous to risk a patrol. The wreckage and Mr. Bennett's remains were considered by the military to be unrecoverable.

But the story doesn't end there, thanks in large measure to the devotion of Mr. Robert Bowden of Texarkana, TX. He refused to let his memories of his childhood friend end with a plane crash in the jungle. In 1988, he began a friendship with Dr. Dan Bookout, and together the two men decided to search for the wreckage. Enlisting family, friends, and strangers alike, Mr. Bowden and Dr. Bookout began to raise money and to organize an expedition to the South Pacific to scour the jungle for the plane.

Dr. Bookout led his teams of volunteer searchers on four trips to Vanuatu, the first in 1988. He made friends with and enlisted natives to aid in the searches. The team endured many hardships and dangers in the jungles, each trip bringing them nearer to their objective as they eliminated improbable sites. Then in March and April of 1994, local villagers assisting in excavating a crash site told the CILHI team that they knew of another crash site and led the CILHI team to this site. From April 2 to 5, 1994, the CILHI team conducted an excavation of this newly revealed crash site and recovered the remains tentatively identified as being those of 2d Lt. Wayland E. Bennett. The board appointed to review the matter after all tests were completed acted with characteristic military thoroughness and on August 23, 1994, confirmed positive identification of the remains as being those of 2d Lt. Wayland E. Bennett, USMC. Lt. Bennett's nearest survivors were so informed, and on September 16, 1994, 2d Lt. Wayland E. Bennett's remains were interred in the family plot in Texarkana, TX. Dr. Bookout continued to act as the Bennett family representative until the interment.

I know I speak for all Members of Congress when I say the selflessness and dedication of Mr. Bowden and Dr. Bookout deserves recognition. I hope you will join me in extending best wishes to them, as well as to the families of Lieutenant Bennett. I am proud that their efforts led to his return.

CATHOLICS UNDER ATTACK IN BANJA LUKA

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1995

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, today I want to bring to the attention of my colleagues the deteriorating conditions in the region of Banja Luka in northern Bosnia. It seems the latest atrocities committed by Bosnian Serb militants, who control the area, are directed at Catholic Church leaders and Catholic believers, who are primarily Croats. These attacks come on the heels of Croatia's efforts to regain control over some of its territory occupied by the Croatian Serb militants since 1991. Around 40,000 Croats still live in northern Bosnia despite significant ethnic cleansing by the Serbs. An estimated 50,000 Croats and hundreds of thousands of Moslems have been expelled from this region alone during the past 3 years.

In one recent incident in Banja Luka, a priest and nun were reportedly doused with gasoline and set on fire in the parish rectory as militants blew up the parish church building next door. This tragic act of barbarity is part of a larger campaign directed against the Catholic community in the diocese of Banja Luka. On May 4, militants forcibly expelled nuns from two convents in the region. Since that time, a total of five churches and one monastery have been destroyed. In all, since the beginning of the war, 40 churches in the diocese have been completely destroyed and another 25 have sustained heavy damage.

The bishop of Banja Luka, Franjo Komarcia, has repeatedly called upon the Bosnian Serb leadership to stop the attacks. These pleas have fallen on deaf ears. Bishop Komarica, in an open appeal, described the current situation in his diocese: ''Fear and panic, for their lives, has overcome the Catholics remaining in the area because they are totally unprotected from the local and newly arrived Serbian extremists. They are virtually [sic] hostages and are faced with the real threat of immediate catastrophe or widespread banishment.'' Bishop Komarica began a hunger strike recently to draw attention to the gravity of the situation faced by the Catholic community in Banja Luka. Late last week, an urgent appeal was sent to the head of the Serbian Orthodox Church urging his intervention to ensure the protection of Catholics in the Serb stronghold. The senseless attacks in Banja Luka have been roundly condemned by Pope John Paul II.

Mr. Speaker, these tragic developments are but the latest examples of the campaign of death and destruction directed against innocent civilians by the Bosnian Serb militants in Banja Luka and elsewhere in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

TRIBUTE TO WILLIAM K. WATERS

HON. JACK REED

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1995

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a gentleman who has dedicated his life to one of our Nation's most honorable and arduous professions: teaching. Mr. William K. Waters has been a social studies teacher at Park View Junior High School in Cranston, RI, for his entire 31 year tenure with the Cranston public school system. At the end of this school year, Mr. Waters will retire after his many years of teaching.

Mr. Waters first went to Park View as a student teacher while studying at Rhode Island College in 1963. The following year, he returned to Park View as a full-time social studies teacher. He quickly became immersed in this dynamic school, and soon his duties extended far beyond the classroom.

Mr. Waters has worked tirelessly with students on Park View's award winning yearbook for over 20 years. As the ninth grade class advisor for 28 years, Mr. Waters' encouragement and guidance instilled qualities of responsibility and leadership. However, Mr. Waters' legacy to Park View will be most remembered as advisor to the student council, a position he has held for 29 years.

Park View's student council has long been the envy of junior high schools throughout Rhode Island. The council's many longstanding traditions and services have benefited students, teachers, and the community. Students chosen by their peers to represent their class on the student council have managed school stores, a student handbook, all-school dances, the ninth grade dance, and fundraisers. Overseen by the always attentive and dedicated Mr. Waters, these were not merely student activities, they fostered a cooperative and active student body within the Park View community.

And for the students fortunate enough to serve on the council, it served as a life-long lesson. Someone believed that at their age they could be trusted with money, to carry out responsibilities, and to deliver results. Leadership and commitment are not easily learned, but Mr. Waters not only encouraged these, he expected them.

The student council's organizational skills and resources also benefited the local community. The Meeting Street Center, the Heart Association, the R.I. Lung Association, and Rhode Island's senior citizens have all come to recognize that Park View is not just another junior high school. At the same time, students were able to learn about life beyond the confines of classes, teachers, and friends.

Of course, none of this would have been possible had someone not taken on the enormous responsibility of going beyond the afternoon school bell. Junior high school teachers

are a rate commodity. They face challenges in the classroom that go far beyond textbooks, homework, and grades, Mr. Waters is a dedicated professional who went beyond the call of duty and always bestowed any credit to his students.

Mr. Waters has gotten to know many generations of young adults growing up in eastern Cranston. His guidance and devotion is demonstrated by the caliber of students who have graduated. Prepared academically when they graduated to high school, these young adults were also prepared to be role models and leaders for other students. Mr. Waters is an institution, and will always be fondly recalled by his students, their parents, and his colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in saluting Mr. Waters' service to Park View Junior High School and commend him as a teacher, an advisor, and a person. Mr. Waters is truly a role model for future teachers and students, and I would like to wish him continued success in retirement.

A TRIBUTE TO MARFA ON THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE MOVIE ''GIANT''

HON. HENRY BONILLA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1995

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Speaker, 40 years ago the town of Marfa, TX, joined with Hollywood to bring to life ''Giant,'' the classic movie etched in the minds of so many Americans as a tale of trial and tribulation. This May 27, Marfa will have the pleasure of hosting a return engagement of this memorable classic with some of the original cast and crew joining in the celebration.

Many of us recall the family saga which features Hollywood greats Rock Hudson and Elizabeth Taylor. We especially remember James Dean, a young actor who was relatively unknown back in the summer of 1955 and had just finished filming another movie ''Rebel Without a Cause.''

Five years ago, Presidio County Judge Jake Brisbin came up with the idea to host a ''Giant'' reunion. Marfa Chamber of Commerce manager, Sheila Lujan and many others in the community have been very busy planning this exciting event. A few months ago, however, a fire swept through the Marfa City Hall, damaging the theater and dampening hopes that the reunion would take place. However, the people of Marfa didn't stop for a minute and now, their dream will become a reality.

The reunion will include a barbecue and look-alike contest at the Riata Ranch, a screening of ''Giant'' and a roundtable discussion on the famous movie. Robert Hinkle, who taught James Dean and actress Fran Bennett how to rope for the movie, will serve as a panelist.

Sponsored by the Marfa Chamber of Commerce, the Big Bend Quarterly, and the Cibolo Creek Ranch, the 40th anniversary ''Giant'' reunion will truly be unforgettable.

''Giant'' brought the spotlight to west Texas and showed America the culture and history of this unique area. The movie's plot helped define what Americans today perceive as the modern-day oilman. Many Marfans, too, still remember that long, hot summer 40 years ago when Marfa took center stage and dozens of people from Hollywood descended upon the town.

This reunion will be another historic moment for Marfa. The citizens of Marfa have shown faith and resolve in putting together what is sure to be a grand event. Congratulations and good luck to the community of Marfa.

A TRIBUTE TO JOHN BUDD

HON. VIC FAZIO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1995

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my sincere condolences to the family of John Budd, the Regional Liaison for the Bureau of Reclamation's Mid-Pacific Regional Office in Sacramento, CA. John passed away on April 18. His loss is a tremendous blow to the Bureau and to the Federal service.

In many ways, John Budd was the Bureau of Reclamation in Sacramento. He was responsible for communicating the Bureau's policies, programs, and activities to congressional, State and local decisionmakers. He was the face that went with the Bureau.

John was always very helpful to me and my staff. John had a tremendous instinct when it came to seeing issues developing on the horizon. John was almost always the first person to give me a ''heads up'' on problems so we could deal with them before they reached the crisis stage.

John was a long-time Bureau employee. He joined the Bureau in 1965 as part of the construction crew for the San Luis Unit. Prior to his appointment as Regional Liaison, John was a repayment specialist responsible for negotiating and administering water service and repayment contracts for water deliveries from the Central Valley Project. John's fellow employees honored him many times during his years of service, perhaps most notably with the Department of Interior's prestigious Superior Service Award.

The formal accolades are important because they are the official markers of John's distinguished career. The real touchstone of John's career is the lasting impression he made on the lives of the people who surrounded him.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad to have had the opportunity to work with John Budd. We will all miss his professionalism, but more importantly, we will miss his friendship.

JOE PETERSON: TEACHER, SCHOLAR, VOLUNTEER

HON. JAMES L. OBERSTAR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1995

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, in these days when we hear too many voices ask ''What's in it for me?'' It is always refreshing to hear of those who freely donate their time and efforts for the good of their fellow citizens—in other words, volunteers.

Volunteers can be found in every community. They are both male and female, of all races and faiths. They come from all walks of life and from all economic strata, and they range in age from elementary students to senior citizens. However, these volunteers all have one attribute in common: they ask for no compensation other than the good feeling they got from helping their fellow citizens.

One such volunteer is Joseph Peterson, of Carlton, MN in my congressional district. Mr. Peterson is an amateur scholar in American history, particularly in the history of the Presidency. He is an amateur in the root sense of the word: he is a true lover of his chosen field of study.

Like all volunteers, Mr. Peterson does not hide his light under a bushel. He happily shares his knowledge of our Government and our Presidents with schools, churches, social groups, and libraries in Carlton County and throughout Minnesota. A democratic society relies on an educated electorate, and Joseph Peterson is one man in one American community who is doing what he can to inform, educate, and stimulate interest in our democratic process.

Mr. Speaker, I would like at this time to share with you and my colleagues a newspaper article about Mr. Peterson from the Cloquet Journal and a sampling of the letters I have received recognizing his activities in the community. I'm sure you will join me in recognizing the importance of this volunteer's contribution to our society.

[From the Cloquet Minnesota Journal]

PRESIDENTIAL BUFF CONTINUES HOBBY

(By Wendy Rockvam)

February is the month the nation traditionally honors its presidents. For one Cloquet resident, however, Presidents' Day is a year-round observance.

Joe Peterson, a presidential history buff whose pursuits have taken him to President Bush's State of the Union Address and President Clinton's Inauguration, has been interested in the lives of the presidents since he was in second grade. During that year, President Kennedy was assassinated, and Peterson put together a detailed report on it for his class at school. His teacher gave his efforts high praise, and thus began a lifetime interest in the presidential office and those who have held it.

Peterson's hobby has involved an extensive amount of reading and study as well as a vast amount of correspondence. He has received Christmas cards, birthday cards, and autographed photos of several presidents, and he is constantly on the lookout for presidential memorabilia of all sorts.

Peterson said he tries to view presidents as people rather than political figures and finds them all fascinating in their own respect. His personal favorites are Pierce (''He kept the same cabinet for all four years of his presidency'') and Polk (''He was the only Speaker of the House to go on to become President'').

He is also a collector of presidential trivia.

''For example,'' he asked ''did you know that there are only three states—Ohio, Nebraska, and Hawaii—that actually recognize all the presidents on President's Day? All the others honor only Washington and Lincoln.''

''Another thing I've uncovered that most people don't know,'' he said, ''is the fact that no left-handed president has ever been reelected to office. President Clinton, by the way, is left handed. . . .''

BILLY GRAHAM
EVANGELISTIC ASSOCIATION,
Minneapolis, MN.

For many years Joe has researched and studied about our United States Presidents

and collected memorabilia which he has displayed at various functions. He prepared a small display here for our employees one President's Day as well as another on the July 4 Independence Day.

He is an unusual man who has done a service to others by reminding us of our government, our freedom and our history in this special way.

I hope you will be able to give him an opportunity to again show his collection.

Sincerely,

DORIS A. HORTON,
Director, Human Resources.

WASHINGTON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL,
Cloquet, MN.

I have known Joe Peterson for over ten years and during that time he has worked on a history of Washington Elementary School, talked in our Grade 4 classrooms on state symbols for Minnesota Day, and visited various classrooms discussing our presidents. His drive and enthusiasm are self evident in his thorough presentations.

Respectfully,

T.M. WALSH,
Principal, Washington Elementary School.

OUR SAVIOR'S LUTHERAN CHURCH,
Cloquet, MN.

Joe has done extensive work in researching the lives and accomplishments of our presidents. He deserves recognition.

Joe Peterson has also done much valuable work with the history of our congregation. He has articulate knowledge about each of the pastors, significant congregational members, and specific dates. He has also helped considerably in this work in the history of other congregations. He has put much time and effort into all of the above.

Sincerely,

DENNIS C. MORREIM,
Senior Pastor.

CLOQUET CO-OP CREDIT UNION,
Cloquet MN.

In our community, Joe has become quite a historian and was recognized just one week ago in our local newspaper for the historical work that he has done. Joe does outstanding work and is highly committed to the endeavor of becoming an expert on our past presidents. I write this letter to you on behalf of Joe Peterson and should you have any questions as to his reputation or work ethic, please by all means feel free to be in touch with me.

Sincerely,

DEL D. PREVOST,
President.

CARLTON COUNTY HISTORICAL SOCIETY,
Cloquet, MN.

Joe has been a member of our Society for a long time. He has done research on the presidents and other sources.

We have all gotten along very well with Joe and he is always willing to pass on help when he can.

Sincerely,

FERN M. OLSON.
KATHLEEN MONSON.

I have known Joe Peterson for about five years. He is a very nice young fellow, ambitious and always willing to give a helping hand.

He gave several programs at the senior center about the presidents. It was very moving to hear him talk about them. He knows where and when they were born, about their history and backgrounds. Then, a couple of months later, he put on one about their wives, which was very interesting also.

He's put on programs at several other places, too.

He is a very smart young fellow and well liked by everyone.

VIOLET I. LOMPREY.
Duluth, Minnesota.

FAMILY DAY IN TENNESSEE

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1995

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, recently the Tennessee General Assembly sent me a resolution declaring the last Sunday in August as Family Day in Tennessee. They asked for my support to make this a National day.

The parent/child relationship is one of the most important in our society. Children learn lessons at home which shape and guide their future. No one would dispute that a loving, supportive homelife would benefit any child.

As the family deteriorates, so does American society. We can readily see that many of the problems our Country now faces have coincided with the breakdown of the family. As a father of four, I appreciate the importance this legislation places on the worth of the family.

Unfortunately, Congress no longer considers legislation for commemorative days. While this rule will save hundreds of thousands of dollars in operating and staff time, it does not allow for the recognition of National days of importance, such as Tennessee's proposed National Family Day.

Therefore, I ask that the Tennessee General Assembly's resolution be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that my colleagues may benefit from such an eloquent and worthwhile memorial.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 97

A Resolution Memorializing the United States Congress to establish a day of national observance in honor of the American family.

Whereas, One of the most trustworthy indicators of the health, strength and progress of a nation is the esteem in which the family is held; and

Whereas, Family strength, unity and respect cannot be purchased or fabricated, but comes to us instead when families are together and realize that through interaction they know love, trust and hope; and

Whereas, Life is special when we realize the worth of the family and its importance in all relationships; and

Whereas, The family is the center of our affections and the foundation of our American society; and

Whereas, No institution can take the family's place in giving meaning to human life and stability in our society; and

Whereas, It is fitting that official recognition be given to the importance of strengthening family life; now, therefore,

Be it resolved by the Senate of the ninety-ninth general assembly of the State of Tennessee, the House of Representatives concurring, That this General Assembly hereby memorializes the U.S. Congress to enact legislation establishing the last Sunday of August of each year as a day of national observance to be known as ''Family Day'' in order to focus attention and to confer honor upon the importance of the American family as the cornerstone of our society.

Be it further resolved, That the Chief Clerk of the Senate is directed to transmit enrolled copies of this resolution to the Honorable Bill Clinton, President of the United States, the Honorable Al Gore, Vice President of the United States, and to each member of the Tennessee delegation to the U.S. Congress.

''CENTRAL PENNSYLVANIA BLASTS CLINTON''

HON. BUD SHUSTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1995

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, last week, spokesmen from the Clinton administration took aim at the supposed pork in highway projects. But, as with other matters, they had a hard time with the truth. First, they confused the House rescissions bill with the historic 1991 Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 [ISTEA], a stunning error made by the former Budget Committee Chairman, Leon Panetta.

Then, they criticized 10 projects in my district as wasteful, claiming that the money would be better spent on building schools and training teachers. Wrong again. These projects are extremely worthwhile. Moreover, they are funded with transportation trust fund dollars, which by law cannot be spent on anything but highway construction and improvements.

The largest newspaper from my Ninth District of Pennsylvania, the Altoona Mirror, instantly and eloquently spoke up on this matter, with the following superb editorial:

ROUTE 220 IS NOT PORK

President Clinton is off-base in attacking highway projects in central Pennsylvania and especially in trying to label the completion of new route 220 as a pork project.

Few projects are as important to the economic health of central Pennsylvania and the safety of motorists than completing the limited-access highway link between Bald Eagle and interstate 80. Our region has already seen some benefits from the new highway between Bedford and Tyrone. Now we need the rest of the link to the State college/I–80 area.

Companies are locating in the Bedford, Blair, and Centre counties region because they know that new route 220 will give them easy access to the Pennsylvania turnpike and points south and to interstate 80 and the northern tier of States, including the metropolitan New York market.

It is unbelievable that our president could perceive such a vital link as a pork project. He accused Republicans in Congress of ''caring more about pork than people.''

Well, Mr. President, the northern leg of route 220 and the other road projects you attacked are being planned because they are about people, their safety, and their jobs. The other projects criticized by Clinton were the route 22 bypass of Hollidaysburg, the relocation of route 22 north of Lewistown and a new turning lane on route 36 in Roaring Spring.

We believe a legitimate need exists for all of these projects in terms of public safety, and we are glad that Representative Bud Shuster is working to bring these road improvements to fruition.

While we have seen disputes on the exact routing, we believe area residents generally agree that route 22 traffic creates hazards in the Hollidaysburg and Lewistown areas. And anyone who ever has been caught in traffic on route 36 doesn't think that a turning lane in Roaring Spring is pork.

Clinton said Thursday, ''Special interest road projects—nine in one congressional district—are not as important as giving our

teachers the training they need to make sure our students reach world-class standards in education.''

Wasn't this the president who came into office preaching about the need to repair America's infrastructure?

He apparently has forgotten about his promise. He also missed the boat on accuracy.

Money for the roads that Clinton attacked will come from a trust fund that can only be used for highway construction projects. The trust fund has about $18 billion from special taxes on fuel, tires, and certain weights of trucks.

The money cannot be used to train teachers or build safe schools, as the administration alleges. If it isn't spent building and repairing highways and bridges, it just sits there doing nothing.

We urge area residents to tell Clinton that he is wrong in attacking the highway projects in central Pennsylvania and especially route 220, which will have a major impact on our economic future.

We need the highway link to I–80, and we should challenge anyone, including the president, who claims the road is just an unneeded and unwarranted ''pork'' project.

ANNIVERSARY CONGRATULATIONS

HON. ROBERT G. TORRICELLI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1995

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate a special couple from my district who will celebrate a milestone wedding anniversary on June 19, 1995.

In these turbulent times, it is so wonderful to recognize Kay and Frank Purritano, a couple who have honored their vows to each other for 40 years. Family and friends will gather on June 3 in Albany, NY to wish them well.

Frank worked for over 30 years at Alleghany-Ludlum Steel before he retired. Kay has been a wonderful wife, mother and grandmother. She is extremely creative, is a gourmet cook and enjoys sewing and baby-sitting for her grandchildren.

The couple raised their five children, Debra, Francis, Jr., Joseph, Marie and Michael in New York but, after Frank retired, they moved to my district in New Jersey to be closer to their children and grandchildren. They are devoted parents and are the proud grandparents of seven, Laura, David, Scott, Anthony, Anastasia, Joseph and Nicholas.

It is an honor to commend this couple for their life together and to offer my best wishes for the years to come.

HONORING MICHAEL SCHENKLER

HON. GARY L. ACKERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1995

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join with my constituents of the Fifth Congressional District and many other citizens of New York as the Queens Council on the Arts celebrates its 29th anniversary by honoring the long-time Publisher of The Queens Tribune, Michael Schenkler.

Mr. Speaker, Mike Schenkler epitomizes a success story that stands as a shinning example of dedication and achievement for the citizens of Queens County and its many communities. A product of the New York City schools, Mike first became involved in community affairs as a student at Queens College. Upon graduation, he began his professional career in the New York City school system, and quickly rose to the rank of principal.

In 1978, when I needed someone to take over the day-to-day operations of the community newspaper I had published, I was fortunate enough to lure Michael away from a career in education and introduce him to the world of journalism and small business. This was a move that would have a major impact not only on Mike's own career, but on the borough of Queens as well.

Mike departed from the school system and became totally immersed in the operation of The Queens Tribune, which quickly became the county's dominant weekly newspaper. In 1989, the Tribune merged with News Communications, Inc., and Michael rapidly rose to the rank of president and CEO of the newly formed company.

From his start in the private sector in a small storefront operation in Flushing, Mike Schenkler now runs a publishing empire that employs more than 300 people and publishes 23 different newspapers and magazines throughout the New York metropolitan area and in Washington, DC.

As the Queens Tribune grew, so did Michael's love for community, politics, the arts, economics, local sports and the many areas that join together to represent the dynamics of the borough of Queens.

Testimony for this dedication can be found every week on the pages of his newspapers, which cover all aspects of the Queens community. The annual Guide to Queens and the historical anniversary editions have highlighted the paper's ability to cover all the news.

The Queens Tribune is a living tribute to Michael Schenkler, his borough and the dynamic communities that thrive in Queens. The paper has received numerous journalism awards, including the New York Press Association Award for Mike's column, QUIPS. In 1994, Michael was named Businessman of the Year by the Queens Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. Speaker, Michael Schenkler is a true American success story: a successful businessman, a warm and caring individual, a person dedicated to his family. I am truly honored to consider him my friend.

I ask all my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join with me and the Queens Council on the Arts in extending our best wishes to Mike, his lovely wife, Lillian, and their two children, Lee and Allison, and in saluting Michael Schenkler for his energy, vision and tireless efforts on behalf of the people and the arts of the Borough of Queens.

HIGHLANDS TRAIL DEDICATION

HON. MARGE ROUKEMA

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1995

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to call attention to the dedication of the Highlands Trail, which took place May 20 at Echo Lake in West Milford, NJ.

The Highlands are part of an ancient chain of mountains formed of Pre-Cambrian rock. This area has been widely recognized for its natural resources, especially water, wildlife and recreation, which are of great benefit to the dense populations of New Jersey and the New York metropolitan area.

The Highlands Trail is a result of a project initiated in 1993 by the New York-New Jersey Trail Conference, with technical assistance from the National Park Service's Rivers, Trails and Conservation Assistance Program. Assisting in the development of this exceptional trail were more than three dozen organizations, including the State of New Jersey and the counties of Passaic and Warren. All of these organizations are to be commended by the Congress for creation of this trail and their work to make more accessible to the people of our region a landscape of exceptional beauty and wilderness.

The Highlands area is a landscape of national significance but has been described as a hidden jewel in the emerald necklace of the Appalachian mountain chain.

The Highlands Trail is intended as the first of many trails in the Highlands region that will eventually be interconnected. When finished, the overall trail will stretch 150 miles, from the Hudson River at Storm King Mountain, NY, to the Delaware River at Phillipsburg, NJ. Marked by rugged slopes, narrow valleys and scenic ridge lines, the trail will link more than two dozen county, State and Federal parks, forests, historic sites and public open spaces. While the National Park Service will provide technical assistance, volunteer trail clubs and other community groups will conduct management and maintenance.

The New Jersey section being opened this weekend is 20 miles long. It offers breathtaking views of the Wanaque and Monksville reservoirs toward the Manhattan skyline 30 miles away. The route extends to the 35,000-acre Pequannock watershed wilderness, the source of Newark's water supply and home to numerous black bear.

I congratulate everyone involved in the creation of this magnificent trail. I am certain it will play a major role in helping preserve New Jersey's scenic outdoor culture for generations to come.

TRIBUTE TO CATHOLIC CHARITIES

HON. BRUCE F. VENTO

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1995

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the success of a volunteer organization that has served the Twin Cities community since 1869. This year the Catholic Charities of the Archdiocese of St. Paul and Minneapolis is celebrating its 125th year providing social services to Twin Cities area residents in need.

Catholic Charities began with a commitment and desire to help the most vulnerable residents of the community, the children. In the late 1800's, events such as the Civil War and epidemics added to the already harsh pioneer life leaving many children without parents. Trying to do what they could to help, a group from Assumption parish in St. Paul organized a small orphanage to care for six Germanic

children who met this fate. Soon after its establishment, the facility was moved to accommodate more children, and it grew into what is now St. Joseph's Home for Children.

Catholic Charities has retained its focus on children throughout the years, yet at the same time, it has expanded to include other residents of the community in need of assistance. The organization runs emergency shelters and temporary housing facilities for homeless individuals and families. They operate job training programs to help people gain skills, find work, and become self-sufficient. They also help educate the broad community by distributing information and providing counseling on health issues such as AIDS, mental illness, and substance abuse. Catholic Charities acknowledges the diversity of the Twin Cities area by including programs to help immigrants and their families become and remain self-supporting. These and other programs help citizens in the Twin Cities community get back on their feet and enjoy a better quality of life.

Today, however, the fate of Catholic Charities and other similar organizations is uncertain. In a time when budgets are being cut and many social programs are on the chopping block, volunteer organizations like Catholic Charities will become an even more vital part of the Twin Cities community. Limiting both government and charitable organizations from helping the citizens of our community that are in need is a disastrous formula for both the Twin Cities and the nation.

For 125 years, the Catholic Charities of the Archdiocese of St. Paul and Minneapolis has supported the Twin Cities community, lending a helping hand to those in need. They not only give shelter, educational information, and training to the people they help, they give something even more powerful and important; they give them hope. Hope that they can build a better life and a secure future for themselves and their families. I am proud of the work that all of Catholic Charities' staff and volunteers do on a daily basis to make a difference in the lives of so many people. They have made our Twin Cities, St. Paul-Minneapolis, a strong foundation for families and especially people in need.

SKEPTICISM AND TERRORISM

HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1995

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, this past weekend Pennsylvania Avenue was closed-off to protect the White House from terrorist bombs. Soon this body will deliberate legislation designed to restrict domestic terrorism in the wake of the Oklahoma City bombing. In the aftermath of such historic and tragic events there have been some sensational proposals about how we might prevent future acts of domestic terrorism. Mr. Speaker. I am concerned that some of the recommendations for deterring terrorism threaten to trample civil liberties. I believe it would be a serious mistake to jeopardize the rights and freedoms of all citizens in the name of preventing potential acts of madness. Our freedom is our greatest strength. I encourage my colleagues to remember this and commend you to consider the points raised in this St. Louis Post Dispatch editorial.

[From St. Louis Dispatch, April 25, 1995]

MAKING IT EASY TO HATE

Skepticism toward government—even a measure of cynicism—is a healthy thing in a democracy. It means people are on guard against an overreaching government. But something has been at work in recent years that goes beyond skepticism or mistrust. It comes down to hate, and in Oklahoma City, the nation has seen first hand what hate can do.

The various paramilitary groups that can be found in so many states, including Missouri, are cauldrons of distrust and suspicion in which hate is easily brewed. Some groups call themselves survivalists, others say they are militias, and all are proud to proclaim themselves patriots. Their credo is that the government is the enemy, and they must arm themselves against it. Under this paranoid scenario, everything the government does is intended to enslave people—income taxes, Social Security numbers and, above all, gun control.

If men want to dress up in battle fatigues and play soldier in the woods, that is harmless enough in itself. But things don't always stop there. For the drilling and the target practice to retain their allure, a threat must loom. It is, of course, the government, that large, impersonal force out there. However, until the attack comes, more immediate threats must be found so as to keep everyone alert and ready to hate. Jews or blacks, or both, usually suffice.

Self-appointed paramilitary groups that soon turn themselves into vigilantes are not new in American history. This surge, though, may owe its growth to that relatively new phenomenon known as hate radio, which unrelievedly preaches contempt of government and ridicule of those in power. President Bill Clinton took note of this disturbing development in Minneapolis Monday, reminding Americans that hate radio hosts' ''bitter words can have bitter consequences.''

This is not to say there is a cause-and-effect relationship between the anti-government propaganda of hate radio and what happened in Oklahoma City. Rather, hate radio provides the background music for extremists. Tell people often enough and long enough that their government can do no right and that the people in it are incompetent or dishonest or sinister, and eventually some of them will conclude that the government is a force for evil. Moreover, it is not difficult to find government excesses to cite as supporting evidence. In this way, a small group of unstable people, susceptible to the message of hate, decides to launch a pre-emptive strike, or take retaliatory action, against a government facility.

The risk now is that the country will overreact. The first impulse is to see all paramilitary groups that cavort in the woods as terrorists in training. The second is to think that constitutional rights must be jettisoned to combat the threat they pose. No one wants to make it easy for another Oklahoma City atrocity, but Congress should not give federal law-enforcement authorities the added powers Mr. Clinton has requested without careful thought.

Since the end of World War II, political dissenters, civil rights organizations, anti-war groups and even Earth Day organizers have been the target of government spying and disruption, always in the name of protecting society. Mr. Clinton wants to give law-enforcement agencies greater authority to place people and groups under surveillance on the basis of less evidence. If the tools the FBI and other agencies have now are inadequate, they should be strengthened, of course, but the bombing in Oklahoma City does not automatically mean they are.

The last thing Congress and the administration need to do is prove that the kooks are right.

THE SOUTHERN ILLINOIS CHILDREN'S CHOIR

HON. GLENN POSHARD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1995

Mr. POSHARD. Mr. Speaker, it is a distinct pleasure for me to take this opportunity to welcome the Southern Illinois Children's Choir to Washington, DC. In a time when children are experiencing especially tumultuous times in an all too violent world, the magnificent efforts which have produced this wonderful choral group are very much appreciated.

The 85 boys and girls from grades 4 through 8 who have auditioned and been accepted as part of the choir represent the southern Illinois communities of Alto Pass, Anna, Carbondale, Carterville, Cobden, DuQuoin, Elkville, Gorham, Harrisburg, Herrin, Jonesboro, Makanda, Marion, Murphysboro, and Sparta. I am proud that many of these young people are residents of the 19th Congressional District which I represent.

The choir was organized only 5 years ago under the Southern Illinois University at Carbondale Youth Music Program. Its purpose is twofold. First, and foremost, it has been assembled for the musical enrichment of our children, and then for the enhancement of the musical life for all southern Illinoisans. In the short span of time of its existence, the choir has remarkably amassed a very impressive portfolio of performances, including the Southern Illinois University Opera Theatre, the Symphony Orchestra and Choral Union, as well as various conferences, education programs and concerts throughout the southern Illinois area. In addition, the Choir has sung in the State Capitol at Springfield, and appeared at the 1992 Illinois Music Educators All-State Conference. In 1993, the choir toured the southeast, performing at the Piccolo Spoleto Festival in Charleston, SC, and in 1994, they appeared on the Shepley Music and Art Series at Christ Church Cathedral in St Louis where they presented the premiere performance of Gregg Smith's ''Four Sandburg Songs.''

The choir continues to impress audiences everywhere it performs. I am especially delighted and pleased that the 1995 tour of Southern Illinois Children's Choir includes a one week visit to the Nation's Capital June 9 through 16. The children's performances while in Washington will include singing a prelude to the morning worship service at the National Cathedral, and performances on the west steps of the Capitol as well as at the Lincoln Memorial. The tour will also include an excursion to historic, Colonial Williamsburg, VA, with a performance at the Bruton Parrish Church.

I heartily commend the choir and all who have contributed to its success—parents, directors and assistants. It is indeed gratifying that these children and their extraordinary musical talents exemplify what is best in the youth of today. They are certainly beacons of light for their families, friends and communities.

EATING DISORDERS INFORMATION AND EDUCATION ACT

HON. PATRICIA SCHROEDER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1995

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Eating Disorders Information and Education Act, which provides outreach and education for the increasing number of people—primarily women and young girls—with eating disorders.

Eating disorders and self-induced vomiting, compulsive dieting, binge-eating and self-starvation regimes afflicting 7 million women and 1 million men, according to the National Association of Anorexia Nervosa and Associated Disorders [ANAD]. Their cause is complex, but studies have looked at genetics, environments, biochemistry and personalities. Certainly, there is a strong link between these disorders and the pressure to be thin in our society.

It is estimated that about 6 percent of those with serious cases die, and only 50 percent report being cured. While 86 percent report onset of the disorder by age 20, even those 10 years and younger are known to suffer from it.

Eating disorders typically last one to 15 years. Treatment is often expensive and longter—$30,000 or more a month for inpatient treatment and $100,000 or more for outpatient care. Many find their insurance doesn't cover treatment.

Even though eating disorders are widespread, no State has an adequate program to combat them, and few schools have programs to educate youth about them, according to ANAD.

My bill helps address this lack of public knowledge. It amends the Public Health Service Act to establish a program providing information and education to the public on the prevention and treatment of eating disorders. That program would be carried out by the Center for Mental Health Services, which would also provide a toll-free public hotline offering information and referrals for prevention and treatment. The bill authorizes $2 million for fiscal year 1996 and such sums as are necessary for fiscal years 1997 through 1998.

I was particularly moved by the story of Ellen Hart Pena, wife of our Transportation Secretary Federico Pena, in the April 10 issue of People magazine. She told of her more than 10-year struggle to break free of anorexia and bulimia. Only after long-term therapy did she end the cycle of starvation diets and bingeing and purging. I would like to include her story for the RECORD.

[Taken from People Magazine, April 10, 1995]

HITTING HER STRIDE

(By Ellen Hart Peña)

I remembered exactly the moment it began. It was January 1980, during my senior year at Harvard where I ran on the track team. My coach had suggested that I lose some weight over Christmas break to help me run faster, and I had worked out every day and gone from 132 to 123 pounds. But when I came back from vacation I had a really crummy workout, and the coach said it looked as if I were gaining back the weight.

That was the click. If he'd made the same comment to me a year earlier it probably wouldn't have hand any effect. But I was just four months from graduation and at a point where I was scared about being an adult, about being a woman and going out into the world. Until then, my life had been scripted and safe. Now there were changes happening I couldn't control. I was really hurt by the coach's remark and said to myself, ''I'm never, ever going to be fat again.''

Almost immediately, I began eating very little and spent all my free time running. But then I'd have this uncontrollable, demonic urge to eat ice cream, cookies, doughnuts—anything high-calorie. And I'd eat until I couldn't eat anymore. Afterward, I couldn't bear the thought that it would stay in me and turn into fat, so I'd have to purge. During the worst periods, I'd binge and purge four or five times a day, from the moment I woke up until I went to sleep. By April, I was down to 110, and I looked like a cadaver.

The purging was really painful, and it made me feel horrible, disgusting and wretched. I shared a campus dormitory suite with four other women, and when I went into the bathroom I'd lock the door and turn the water on to over the sound. But my roommates knew. One of them brought me library books on anorexia and persuaded my coach to make me see a counselor. It didn't help. I just sat there until the session was over. My mom found out that spring, and when I visited her in Albuquerque in April she arranged for me to see a family friend who was a psychiatrist. But in my family, people are private. No one was going to hear of my problem and say, ''Enough is enough,'' and plunk me in treatment. Nobody in my family had ever seen a therapist, and when I stopped going after one visit, my mom and one of my sisters, who were the only ones who knew of my problem, didn't push me further. And I was still in denial and didn't think I needed a psychiatrist.

When I graduated in June I was very depressed, and it was difficult to be with people. I took a job teaching English and coaching soccer at a private boarding school in Colorado Springs but quit a year later when Nike offered to sponsor me as a runner. For the next four years, I tried to make a go as an amateur athlete, first in Boston, then back in Colorado. My eating improved a bit when I was training because I was happy. But whenever I got injured and couldn't run, I'd fall back into the bingeing and purging several times a day for weeks and months at a time. I was dehydrated, I was cold all the time, my hands would shake, and I would get headaches. And I had horrible nightmares that I would just eat and get bigger like this huge blimp.

Most people didn't know I had a problem. In relationships, I would pick men who wouldn't try to get too close to me. And I did a good job of hiding things. No one noticed when I didn't eat—I'd take just a couple of bites of what was on my plate and then mound it up all together so it didn't look like much. The bingeing and purging I'd do behind closed doors. But I was trying everything to control my problem. I learned to meditate, I prayed, I went to group and individual therapy and Overeaters Anonymous meetings. Either the techniques weren't right for me or I wasn't ready for them.

Sometimes I was actually sorry that the eating disorder wouldn't kill me, and I'd think, ''Please, just let me out of this.''

In February 1984, I met Federico at a race in Denver. I placed first among the women and, as mayor, he presented me with the award. I thought he was very down-to-earth and genuine, and we seemed to hit it off. But I couldn't imagine that anyone could like me if they knew about this horrible part of my life. When we started dating, I told him I had an eating problem and was working on it, but I made sure he didn't find out how bad it was. Hiding it was actually pretty easy. Federico was working at least 15 hours a day, and after I started law school at the University of Colorado at Boulder in the fall of 1985 we couldn't spend that much time together.

Several months later I found a therapist who specialized in eating disorders, but I didn't begin to make progress until I started with yet another therapist in 1987. She helped me see how my eating was connected to my perfectionism and my need for control. I remember in grade school going into the bathroom and crying whenever my team lost because I felt *I* hadn't done enough to make us win. As the second oldest of eight children, I had been a caretaker growing up so I also didn't know how to ask for help. I felt like a failure acknowledging that I wasn't all that strong or capable, and I had been trying to escape those negative feelings by bingeing and purging. But as I began to deal with my fears, my confidence grew. I really believed I could get better, so when Federico proposed in 1987, I said yes.

We married in May 1988. I graduated law school the same month and took a job with a prestigious firm in Denver. Then the following October I learned I was pregnant. I never told Federico the full extent of my eating disorder, and now I didn't tell my obstetrician. For a while I was good about my eating, but before long I was bingeing and purging. Then, six months into my pregnancy, I began to have really significant contractions. That was the moment when I said, ''Stop. You have to take care of your body, and your body is now carrying a baby.'' I'm absolutely convinced that if I hadn't been in therapy for a long time, I wouldn't have been able to turn the corner.

It wasn't easy. I would eat and feel so bloated, and then the old feelings would kick in—eating equals fat equals bad. Keeping in touch with my therapist in Boulder, I just had to take a leap of faith that it was really going to turn out okay. Amazingly I'm still okay. Through Nellia's birth that July and Cristina's birth 19 months later and all the stress of moving to Washington in 1993, my eating problem has not resurfaced. Even when I suffered a miscarriage that July, I knew I was strong enough to withstand the pain. I don't think the lost pregnancy was as real to Federico as it was to me, but when he asked me if I wanted to go back into therapy to help work through my sadness, I told him I had the tools now to deal with pain myself.

Although Federico had attended a few therapy sessions with me, we never had the 3-hour, tearful kind of talk about my illness you might expect because I was too afraid to reveal the depths of my disease. In fact, I don't think he truly understood how bad it was until last fall when I showed him an article I'd written for the ''Road Runners Club of America'' newsletter. I think he felt bad that he hadn't understood. My response was that he had done all I had allowed him to do, which was basically to stand by me.

I'm running and even competing again, for the first time I can run just for the enjoyment of it. I've also learned to manage my weight, which is now 125, without getting totally compulsive and weird. A couple of months ago I gained four or five pounds, but I just said, ''Oh well, I'll have to be more thoughtful about food choices.'' That felt great. There are still times when I'm tempted to binge and purge, and I think, ''Maybe just today . . .'' But I'm strong enough to resist it. I'm not walking near that cliff again because going over the edge was my private hell. I can't go back.

MEDICARE BENEFICIARY PROTECTION AMENDMENTS OF 1995

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 1995

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce the Medicare Beneficiary Protection Amendments of 1995. I am joined by Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. COYNE, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. OLVER, Mr. PALONE, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. RANGEL, and Ms. WOOLSEY.

This legislation is designed to achieve what its title implies—to improve the protections provided to Medicare beneficiaries. This legislation is urgently and increasingly needed, for two chief reasons.

First, proposals are appearing that have as their focus the movement of more and more Medicare beneficiaries into managed care insurance products. Some proposals would push beneficiaries into health maintenance organizations. I support a less coercive approach, one that allows beneficiaries to determine the pace at which they move into HMO's. But either way, HMO's will continue to play a growing role in Medicare.

Second, an extensive survey of Medicare HMO enrollees and former enrollees, recently completed by the inspector general of the Department of Health and Human Services, documents several problem areas with Medicare HMO's. The inspector general's findings substantiate numerous complaints I have received from individual beneficiaries over the past few years.

It is clear that before Congress flings the Medicare doors wide open to managed care plans, we ought to act to prohibit managed care practices that are known to jeopardize beneficiary care. And we ought to act swiftly, because this is an area where an ounce of prevention is worth more than a pound of the cure.

The summary finding of the inspector general's report, I believe, captures very well the overall experience we are having with the service delivery of Medicare HMO's:

> Generally, beneficiary responses indicated Medicare risk HMOs provide adequate service access for most beneficiaries who have joined. However, our survey results also indicated some problem areas: beneficiaries' knowledge of appeal rights, access and service to [end stage renal disease]/disabled beneficiaries, and inappropriate screening of beneficiaries health status at application.

Overall, Medicare beneficiaries are receiving adequate services, but serious problems exist with a significant number of enrollees, particularly among those enrollees who have the greatest health care needs. Some of the specific findings of the inspector general are:

> [C]ompliance with Federal enrollment standards for health screening and informing beneficiaries of their rights appeared to be problematic.
>
> Most beneficiaries reported timely doctor appointments for primary and specialty care, but some enrollees and disenrollees experienced noteworthy delays.
>
> Perceived, unmet service needs and lock-in problems led 22% of disenrollees and 7% of enrollees to seek out-of-plan care.
>
> Disabled/ESRD [end stage renal disease] disenrollees . . . reported access problems in several crucial areas of their HMO care.

In addition, the inspector general's survey found that:

> 16% [of enrollees] either planned to leave or wanted to leave [their HMO], but felt they could not, primarily for reasons of affordability.

The most troubling of the inspector general's findings is that:

> 66% of disabled/ESRD enrollees wanted to leave their HMOs.

I have no illusions that the ''Medicare Beneficiary Protection Amendments of 1995'' will completely alleviate all of these problems. In fact, I am hopeful that consumers, providers, and others will continue to offer suggestions as to how we can continue to improve the quality of care received by Medicare beneficiaries. Nonetheless, the remedies I am proposing today will take us a long way toward that goal.

In addition to providing specific responses to managed care practices that have created beneficiary access problems, this legislation provides a framework through which Medicare beneficiaries can make informed choices about their Medicare coverage options.

Too often today, while a beneficiary has the legal right to exit an HMO and return to traditional Medicare coverage, the inability to secure an affordable Medicare supplemental policy—a medigap plan—makes this a hollow option. As proposed in this legislation, the institution of a coordinated open enrollment process for Medicare beneficiaries will guarantee that the options we claim to provide to beneficiaries are actually open to them.

Central to the functioning of the coordinated open enrollment process—and to guaranteeing true choice for beneficiaries—is the beginning of attained-age pricing of medigap premiums. Attained-age pricing is the policy of raising medigap premiums as an enrollee gets older. In their report on medigap plans, Consumer Reports magazine described attained-age priced plans as hazardous to policyholders. I agree.

A comparison of the least expensive attained-age rated medigap plan versus the only community-rated medigap plan in California—using plan E for the comparison—showed that a typical Medicare beneficiary will pay $3,360 more for the attained-age plan than the community-rated plan over his or her life. On top of being more expensive, this attained-age rated plan restricted access to a limited number of health care providers. The reason for the higher lifetime premium is that while the attained-age plan starts with a lower premium, the premium quickly rises as the beneficiary ages to well above the non-age-adjusted community rate.

The premium comparison follows:

MEDICARE SUPPLEMENTAL PLAN E

(Premiums as of May, 1994 for the California counties of San Diego, Orange, Los Angeles, San Bernardino, Imperial, and Riverside)

COMPARISON OF PREMIUMS OF ATTAINED-AGE MEDIGAP PLAN VERSUS STANDARD MEDIGAP COMMUNITY-RATED PLAN

Insurer and type of plan	Age of beneficiaries—			
	65–69 yrs. old	70–74 yrs. old	75–79 yrs. old	80+ yrs. old
Community-Rated Plan	$957	$957	$957	$957
AARP/Prudential plan Standard ''Medigap'' No restrictions on accessing beneficiaries' providers of choice				
Attained-Age Plan	780	1,080	1,260	1,380

COMPARISON OF PREMIUMS OF ATTAINED-AGE MEDIGAP PLAN VERSUS STANDARD MEDIGAP COMMUNITY-RATED PLAN—Continued

Insurer and type of plan	Age of beneficiaries—			
	65–69 yrs. old	70–74 yrs. old	75–79 yrs. old	80+ yrs. old
Blue Cross plan Medicare Select type Limited network of providers and restricted access to the limited network				
Cumulative difference in premiums of attained-age supplemental plan to community rated plan	−$177 X 5 yrs	+$123 X 5 yrs	+$303 X 5 yrs	+423 X 5 yrs
	−885	+615	+1,515	+2,115
Additional cost for a person living to the age of 85 who enrolls in an attained-age plan	.....	.....	.....	+3,360

Source: Senior World Newsmagazine, San Diego Edition, May, 1994, analysis conducted by the Office of Congressman Stark.

Because this legislation would accomplish the central goal of providing greater protections to Medicare beneficiaries, it has the endorsement of consumer and senior organizations. Two of the largest senior and consumer organizations made the following comments:

> Congressman Stark's proposed Medicare Beneficiary Protection Amendments of 1995 will institute needed protections in the Medicare Select program * * * it also strengthens protections for Medicare beneficiaries in other managed care options.—Testimony of the National Committee to Preserve Social Security and Medicare before the Committee on Ways and Means Subcommittee on Health, February 10, 1995.
>
> Consumers Union strongly supports the Medicare Beneficiary Protections Amendments of 1995. This Act would provide important protections for the Medicare beneficiaries who enroll in managed care plans, purchase Medicare Select policies, or purchase a medigap policy * * * [T]he protections will benefit tens of millions of senior citizens.—Consumers Union, May 8, 1995

I would like to complement my colleagues who are joining me today in introducing this bill. They have responded to the needs of their senior and disabled constituents—those who rely upon Medicare for their health insurance coverage. They have responded to the challenge to balance the goals of providing a broad range of coverage choices for Medicare beneficiaries while at the same time making sure that these choices do not place Medicare beneficiaries at risk.

I look forward to working with all my colleagues to move the Medicare Beneficiary Protection Amendments of 1995 forward. Due to the urgency of this issue, I hope we will not delay in taking up consideration of this legislation.

A summary of the bill follows.

MEDICARE BENEFICIARY PROTECTION AMENDMENTS OF 1995—SUMMARY (5/19/95)

I. MEDICARE MANAGED CARE BENEFICIARY PROTECTION PROVISIONS

A. Marketing standards

1. Plans could not market to beneficiaries on a door-to-door basis.

2. Plans could not require beneficiaries to attend an enrollment seminar and would be required to permit enrollment through the mail.

3. Commissions may not constitute the predominant source of compensation for agents.

4. To the extent an agent is compensated based upon a commission, the plan would be required to recover the commission if the

beneficiary disenrolled within 90 days after initial enrollment.

B. Due process requirements for providers in networks

1. Public notice would be required as to when applications by participating providers are to be accepted.

2. Descriptive information regarding the plan standards for contracting with participating providers would be required to be disclosed.

3. Notification of a participating provider of a decision to terminate or not renew a contract would be required not later than 45 days before the decision would take effect, unless the failure to terminate the contract would adversely affect the health or safety of a patient.

4. Notices would be required to include reasons for termination or non-renewal. Carriers would be required to offer providers receiving notification of termination or non-renewal an opportunity for review of the reasons, with a majority of those conducting the review to be peers of the provider that have contracts with the managed care plan.

5. The findings of such a review would be advisory and non-binding. Federal or State laws pertaining to the right of involved parties to appeal or seek recourse would not be superseded.

C. Standards for utilization review would be established by the Secretary

1. Individuals performing utilization review could not receive financial compensation based upon the number of certification denials made;

2. Negative determinations about the medical necessity or appropriateness of services or the site of services would be required to be made by clinically-qualified personnel;

3. Utilization review procedures would be required to be based on reasonable, current medical evidence and applied consistently across reviewers and developed in consultation with participating providers;

4. Plans would be required to provide to enrollees a written description of the utilization review requirements of the plan.

D. Centers of excellence: Plans would be required to demonstrate that enrollees have access to designated centers of excellence

1. According to standards developed by the Secretary, plans would demonstrate that enrollees with chronic diseases or who otherwise require specialized services would have access to designated centers;

2. The Secretary would designate centers that provide specialty care, deliver care for individuals with chronic diseases or other complex cases requiring specialized treatment. Such centers must meet standards established by the Secretary pertaining to specialized education and training, participation in peer-reviewed research, and treatment of patients from outside the facility's geographic area.

3. Recognition of trauma centers: The existing requirements that plans provide for reimbursement of services outside the plan's provider network where medically necessary and immediately required because of an unforeseen illness, injury, or condition would be clarified to include services provided by designated trauma centers.

4. Ob-Gyn Referral: Plans would be prohibited from requiring enrollees to obtain a physician referral for obstetric and gynecologic services.

E. Access to emergency medical care

1. Plans could not require pre-authorization for emergency medical care.

2. A definition of emergency medical condition based upon a prudent layperson definition would be established to protect beneficiaries from retrospective denials of legitimate claims for payment for out-of-plan services.

3. Plans could not deny any claim for a beneficiary using the ''911'' system to summon emergency care.

4. Plans would be required to provide timely authorization for coverage of emergency services.

5. Plans would be required to reimburse fully emergency physicians for any services provided to beneficiaries in order to fulfill the requirements of the anti-dumping statute.

F. Deadline for responding to requests for coverage of services

1. Plans would be required to make a final determination within 24 hours;

2. Secretary would be required to establish an expedited process to review appeals of plan denials.

G. Nondiscriminatory service area requirements

1. In general the service area of a plan serving an urban area would be an entire Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA). The Secretary could waive this requirement if the plan demonstrated that it could not develop capacity to expand to the entire MSA and that the plan's proposed service area boundaries to not result in favorable risk selection. The Secretary could not waive the requirement that the plan serve the central county of an MSA.

2. The Secretary could require a plan to contract with Federally-qualified health centers (FQHCs), rural health clinics, migrant health centers, or other essential community providers located in the service area if the Secretary determined that such contracts are needed in order to provide reasonable access to enrollees throughout the service area.

H. Contractors would be required to disclose information about physician payment

1. Information would be provided under the terms of the contract with the Health Care Financing Administration (HCFA).

2. Information would be made available to plan enrollees, or potential enrollees, upon request.

I. Intermediate sanctions on HMOs

1. Civil money penalties of up to $25,000 for each violation that directly or indirectly adversely affects an individual enrolled in the plan.

2. Civil money penalties of up to $10,000 for each week after the Secretary begins proceeding to terminate a contract.

3. A new formal process would be adopted through which HMOs could submit a corrective action plan for violations of the requirements. More severe penalties could be imposed on HMOs with previous deficiencies.

4. HMOs which fail to cooperate with PRO quality review and which fail to meet standards for appeals would be subject to existing intermediate sanctions and civil money penalties.

J. Amendments to Health Care Prepayment Plan under section 1833 (HCPPs)

1. The HCPP option would be restricted to organizations that could not qualify under section 1876 as an HMO such as the UMW and other union plans.

2. New requirements would be imposed on HCPPs: Solvency and marketing standards would be imposed; HCPPs would be required to meet the section 1876 standards for grievance procedures and physician incentive plan requirements, and would be subject to the section 1876 intermediate sanctions and civil money penalties.

3. The provision of the Social Security Amendments of 1994 which subjects HCPPs to the MediGap standards effective January 1, 1996 would be repealed.

4. A transition rule would be provided for beneficiaries enrolled in HCPPs which would not continue as a result of this provision.

K. Other beneficiary protections

1. An enrollee of an HMO receiving unauthorized out-of-plan treatment could not be charged more than what Medicare would have paid under fee-for-service rules.

2. Plans would be required to make arrangements for dialysis services for beneficiaries traveling outside the plan's service area.

L. Benefit package for section 1876 HMO plans

1. In addition to regular Medicare benefits, plans would be required to provide hospitalization and SNF coverage without the three-day stay requirement.

2. For Medicare covered services, plans may not impose cost-sharing other than nominal co-payments.

3. Limits on additional benefits (if any) must be fully explained and enrollees given reasonable notice that benefits are expiring.

4. Requirements to provide additional benefits to the extent that the plan's adjusted community rate is exceeded by the AAPCC payment would not change.

M. Plans would be required to provide information on provider credentials to enrollees and patient enrollees

N. A demonstration project on competitive rate-setting for Medicare risk contractors would be conducted

O. HMO outlier pool

An outlier pool would be created for HMOs with risk contracts to provide reinsurance for high-cost cases. The pool would be created by withholding a percentage of current payments.

P. PRO review

All section 1876 and section 1833 plans would be subject to PRO review.

II. MEDICARE SELECT PROVISIONS

The Medicare Select demonstration program would be amended:

A. Establish Federal oversight of Medicare Select

1. Secretary would establish standards for Medicare Select in regulation.

To the extent practicable the standards would be the same as the standards developed by the NAIC for Medicare Select plans. Any additional standards would be developed in consultation with the NAIC.

2. Medicare Select plans would generally be required to meet the same requirements in effect for Medicare risk contractors under section 1876: Community rating; prior approval of marketing materials; intermediate sanctions and civil money penalties; additional requirements added by this bill as described below.

3. If the Secretary has determined that a State has an effective program to enforce the standards for Medicare Select plans established by the Secretary, the State would certify Medicare Select plans. If the Secretary does not make such a finding with respect to a State, the Secretary would certify Medicare Select plans in that State.

4. Existing requirements for State-based standards and fifteen-State restriction would be repealed.

B. Benefit Requirements

1. Fee-for-service Medicare Select plans would offer either the MediGap ''E'' plan with payment for extra billing added or the MediGap ''J'' plan. Both have preventive benefits and adding extra billing benefits to ''E'' should not add cost given that network doctors should all accept assignment.

2. If an HMO or competitive medical plan (CMP) as defined under section 1876 offers Medicare Select, then the benefits would be

required to be offered under the same rules as set forth in Title III below. Such plans would therefore have different benefits than traditional MediGap plans.

III. MEDIGAP PROVISIONS

A. All MediGap policies would be required to be community rated.

B. MediGap plans would be required to participate in coordinated open enrollment.

C. The loss ratio requirement for all plans would be increased to 85 percent.

IV. COORDINATED OPEN ENROLLMENT

A. The Secretary would conduct an annual open enrollment period during which Medicare beneficiaries could enroll in any MediGap plan, Medicare Select, or an HMO contracting with Medicare.

1. Each Medigap plan, Medicare Select plan, and HMO contractor would be required to participate in the open enrollment system.

2. The Secretary would make available to beneficiaries information on Medigap and Medicare-contracting HMO plans.

B. Generally, except for cause, an enrollee could enroll, disenroll, or switch plans only during the annual open enrollment period, with the following exceptions:

During the first year of enrollment with a limited access plan (including HMOs and Medicare Select) the beneficiary could disenroll at the end of any calendar quarter and return to fee-for-service. During the second year, disenrollment could only occur mid-year at the end of the second calendar quarter. After the first two years, disenrollment could only occur during the open enrollment period;

There would be an exception for HMOs which the Secretary determines has reached capacity;

There would be an exception to individuals newly eligible for Medicare or who are new residents of the service area of a plan who could enroll on an open enrollment basis during the sixty-day period that begins thirty days before they become eligible or before they become a resident of the service area.

COMPREHENSIVE FETAL ALCOHOL SYNDROME PREVENTION ACT

HON. BILL RICHARDSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 1995

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce the Comprehensive Fetal Alcohol Syndrome Prevention Act. Fetal Alcohol Syndrome [FAS] is the leading cause of mental retardation in the United States and is one of the most common birth defects to occur in our country. Diagnosis is rare prior to birth and there is no cure for FAS or Fetal Alcohol Effects [FAE], its less severe counterpart.

This disease is completely preventable, by simply avoiding alcohol during pregnancy, but the number of affected children is rising sharply. Recent studies indicate that the percentage of babies stricken by FAS has increased sixfold in the last 15 years.

The statistics are appalling: the disease affects 1 in 250 live births; 5,000 infants are born each year with the recognizable facial, physical and mental abnormalities caused by FAS; 50,000 babies are born annually with FAE, and suffer from learning disabilities, central nervous system damage, and physical disorders.

Not only are the emotional impacts of these diseases devastating, the costs associated with treatment are very high: health care costs for one child stricken with FAS total $44,000.

FAS and FAE strike without regard to race or economic status, but the rate of incidence is higher among certain groups; for instance, the rate is 30 times higher among Native Americans. This disease threatens to destroy whole generations on some reservations if stronger federal action is not initiated.

Surprisingly, much of the public is still unaware of the dangers of drinking during pregnancy. The medical community does not uniformly caution against alcohol consumption for pregnant women, and most medical schools do not provide curriculum on FAS prevention and detection.

This bill seeks to address each of these issues comprehensively. It requires the Department of Health and Human Services to close the gaps in our current efforts to prevent FAS and FAE by establishing a coordinating committee to streamline program development and eliminate duplicative research programs. The committee will develop professional practice standards and curriculum for health care providers, and will initiate a national public awareness program to outline the dangers of alcohol consumption during pregnancy. Finally, additional research will be conducted to aid detection and a cure for FAS so that future generations will not suffer from this debilitating disease.

This bill, as evidence by our bipartisan list of cosponsors, deserves the support of all Members, and I look forward to working toward its passage.

VIRGINIA R. SAUNDERS, 50 YEARS OF FEDERAL SERVICE

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 1995

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Ms. Virginia Saunders, congressional document specialist at the Government Printing Office, for reaching 50 years of dedicated and enthusiastic Federal service on Friday, May 26, 1995.

Ms. Saunders was born Virginia R. Frisbie in Darlington, MD, on October 11, 1926. After working briefly at the Federal Bureau of Investigation, she came to the Government Printing Office on February 4, 1946, as a war service junior clerk typist in the division of public documents, stock section. Two years later, she was promoted to the division of public documents reference section. In February 1951, Ms. Saunders was promoted to indexing clerk and earned subsequent promotions in the same classification. In July 1958, she was promoted to library technician. Becoming a congressional documents specialist in April 1970, she was then promoted to supervisor of the congressional documents section in July 1974. In October 1983, Ms. Saunders assumed her current position of congressional documents specialist in the congressional printing management division, customer services.

Although one may not yet recognize the name of this outstanding GPO employee, the end product of her dedicated efforts is certainly familiar. Ms. Saunders has primary responsibility for the Congressional Serial Set, which is a compilation of all the House and Senate documents and reports issued for each session of Congress. Dummy volumes establishing the format for each edition are prepared and assigned a serial number following each session of Congress. The actual books are produced by GPO's binding division, often as many as 100 volumes per set for each session of Congress. As a chronicle of events of the U.S. Congress over the years, the Congressional Serial Set is rivaled only by the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. While the Serial Set records behind-the-scenes legislative activities for the United States, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD reflects the ''in session'' proceedings. Distributed to the House and Senate libraries, the Archives, the Library of Congress, and depository libraries, the Congressional Serial Set joins the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in offering students and historians a rich insight into the American system of government.

In late 1989, Ms. Saunders drew upon her indepth knowledge of depository library program responsibilities in informing the Nation, and her then-43 years of GPO experience, to submit an employee suggestion regarding the appendix to the Iran Contra Report to Congress. She suggested that this 40-volume publication, which was printed as both a Senate and House report, be bound only once for the serial set volumes of House and Senate reports that are sent to depository libraries. She further suggested that the Schedule of Volumes, which is a listing of the bound volumes, contain a notation explaining the mission serial number voluments. The implementation of this suggestion resulted in a reduction of 13,740 book volumes to be bound, saving the Federal Government over $600,000. In recognition of these efforts, she received GPO's top monetary Suggestion Award for that year. In ceremonies held on January 9, 1991, Ms. Saunders was awarded a Presidential letter of commendation under the Presidential Quality and Management Improvement Award Program. In his letter to Ms. Saunders, President Bush noted, ''You have demonstrated to an exceptional degree my belief that Federal employees have the knowledge, ability, and desire to make a difference.''

I know my colleagues and Ms. Saunders' family, friends, and coworkers join me in congratulating her on 50 years of exemplary Federal service.

CONGRATULATIONS TO THE SHELTER ISLAND HEIGHTS POST OFFICE

HON. MICHAEL P. FORBES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 1995

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to praise the exceptional service provided by the Shelter Island Heights Post Office. For the past 115 years, the Shelter Island Heights Post Office has served the community with extreme dedication. I would also like to commend the Shelter Island ferry service which has provided the vital link between the mainland and Shelter Island. This ferry service has been at the heart of the Postal Service for the Shelter Island Heights community. With the help of this ferry service, the Shelter Island Post Office has been able to deliver over 1.5

million pieces of mail in 1989 alone. Excellence at the Shelter Island Heights Post Office has become the norm, not the exception.

If one looks at the leadership of the Shelter Island Heights Post Office it comes as no surprise that they have been able to maintain such high standards of service. The Shelter Island Heights Post Office is led by its Postmaster Heather L. Reylek, who has helped keep her post office unsurpassed by any other in the Nation. She exemplifies all of the qualities that one would hope and expect for in a community's postmaster which include her excellent understanding of community issues and how they affect her employees. Mr. Speaker, I ask that you join me in congratulating Postmaster Reylek on the excellent job she has done as postmaster of the Shelter Island Heights Post Office. With her as postmaster, the Shelter Island Heights community can no doubt expect its high standards of service to be continued.

On Saturday, June 3, 1995, the accomplishments of the Shelter Island Heights Post Office will be celebrated at the special pictorial cancellation ceremony. At this ceremony, a commemorative stamp of the ferry boat used in the Shelter Island Heights community since 1904 will be revealed to help illustrate the history of this community. I can think of no better way to celebrate these accomplishments than with the issuance of this ferry boat stamp. I ask the entire House of Representatives to join with me in congratulating the Shelter Island Heights Post Office for a job well done.

TRIBUTE TO JOE SLABBINCK

HON. DAVID E. BONIOR

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 1995

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to my good friend Joe Slabbinck who is being honored this evening by the Clinton Township Goodfellows. Joe is being named as a Goodfellow of the Year at a recognition dinner at the Fern Hill Country Club in Clinton Township, MI.

Joe is currently a Board member and has served in the past as president, vice-president, and secretary of the Clinton Township Goodfellows. He is also currently the president of the Tenth Congressional Democratic Committee. I have known Joe for many years and have had the fortunate opportunity to work with him on numerous occasions. Joe is a nuts and bolts kind of guy who always makes sure that projects stay on track. This is true in his role as a Goodfellow and as a Democrat.

After 30 years at Chrysler, his success at helping build world class quality cars is only surpassed by his success in building organizations dedicated to meeting people's needs. In addition to the Goodfellows, Joe has devoted time and energy to the Interfaith Center for Racial Justice as well as the Volunteer Services Committee of the United Community Service. His helpful attitude and relentless drive ensure that organizational goals are always achieved.

Taking an active role in one's community is a responsibility we all share, but few fulfill. Joe and his wife, Brenda, have dedicated much of their lives to this endeavor. I deeply admire their strong values and outstanding example of civic involvement. Their time, talents, and energy are appreciated by all of us. I thank Joe and Brenda for their efforts and commend them for their good work.

I applaud the Clinton Township Goodfellows for recognizing Joe. He has provided outstanding leadership to the group and I know he is proud to be honored by the members.

The devotion the Goodfellows and Joe have displayed to their community is an inspiration. Their contributions are many and they deserve our gratitude for their compassion and work.

On behalf of the Clinton Township Goodfellows, I urge my colleagues to join me in saluting Joe Slabbinck.

INTRODUCTION OF THE FEDERAL MORTGAGE INSURANCE CORPORATION ACT OF 1995

HON. JERRY WELLER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 1995

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, I stand here today to introduce legislation that will allow many Americans—the low and middle income, first-time homebuyers and minorities—to embark on a venture that is inherently part of the American dream. The bill I am introducing—the Federal Mortgage Insurance Corporation Act of 1995—will give a helping hand to those who want to buy a home and make a better life for themselves and their families. Owning a home instills a sense of pride and responsibility and this bill will ensure that anyone in our society—not just the wealthy—can afford to buy a home here in the United States of America.

The purpose of this legislation is to establish a Government corporation to administer the highly successful single-family mortgage insurance program currently under the management of the Federal Housing Administration at the Department of Housing and Urban Development. Under a corporate structure, the single family program will be better equipped to respond more efficiently to the needs of Americans in pursuit of the dream of home ownership.

The Corporation will be run by a Board of Directors made up of experts in housing finance and leaders in community action whose neighborhoods have been well served by FHA over many years. The board will appoint a President who will run the day to day operations like any other president. The act relieves the Corporation of burdensome civil service restrictions and procurement requirements and provides paperwork reductions that can hamper the productivity and progress of the noblest of objectives that we undertake.

Also, like other corporations, the FMIC must carry on the FHA single family program tradition of being a self-sufficient enterprise. Congress can only appropriate funds for the FMIC to the extent that the Corporation has net income. Moreover, the Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight will oversee the capitalization of the FMIC funds as well as the safety and soundness of its products.

The FMIC will also continue the successful mission of the FHA only more efficiently. The act will expand homeownership opportunities for those segments of the market that need it most: first time homebuyers, lower income families, and minorities. The FMIC's greater flexibility will allow an even greater portion of this market to gain sorely needed access to capital and credit.

The Federal Mortgage Insurance Corporation act of 1995 will continue the successful public-private partnership of FHA. More families will be able to share in American dream of homeownership and it does not involve a subsidy from the government. This is exactly the kind of effective governance that the American people expect and deserve.

My legislation carries forward the message of the November 8 election: calling on us all to streamline and reduce bureaucracy and to do a better more efficient job, in this case promoting the basic American dream of homeownership.

CREDIT OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS ACT OF 1995

HON. BILL McCOLLUM

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 1995

Mr. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to fundamentally reform the Community Reinvestment Act of 1977 and to strengthen and clarify the enforcement of fair lending laws. CRA is one of the worst examples of runaway federal regulation on the books today. It is the number one regulatory burden for our depository institutions and compliance costs exceed one billion dollars a year.

When originally adopted, CRA was designed to stop redlining. Redlining is the practice of lenders refusing to make loans because of the racial composition of the neighborhood surrounding the property securing the loan. The enforcement of CRA quickly left its original purpose and turned toward credit allocation.

I strongly support efforts to eliminate redlining. The legislation I am introducing today includes redlining in the list of prohibited activities under the Equal Credit Opportunity Act and the Fair Housing Act. This makes it clear that we will not tolerate illegal discrimination in lending.

In adopting CRA in 1977, Congress did not anticipate there would be any additional burden on the banking industry. The Senate report accompanying CRA indicates that Congress believed that all the data needed to assure compliance was available and no new reporting or other paperwork would be required.

The enforcement of CRA by the federal banking regulators grew in complexity and burden throughout the years. In 1989, CRA was amended to add provisions requiring written evaluations and specific grades for institutions. This added further burdens for the industry and set us on the precipice of credit allocation.

Recently, the Clinton Administration completed a two year effort to rewrite CRA regulations. The new rules vastly expand the paperwork burdens for most banks. In addition, they complete the transition of CRA from prohibiting redlining to credit allocation. The new rules require regulators to measure bank performance on the basis of the total dollar amount and number of loans made to certain areas or groups. This is credit allocation, pure and simple.

Another concern with CRA is the enforcement mechanism. Under current law, performance under CRA is taken into account when a bank regulator is considering an application from an institution for a merger or other transaction. Consumer groups have used protests to pending applications to force institutions to commit credit to certain borrowers or areas. In some cases the institutions have been forced to make grants to the protesting groups.

Recently, the Clinton Administration has linked the enforcement of CRA with other fair lending statutes. This has placed the Justice Department in the position as an additional bank regulator. It also has further confused the question of what is required to comply with CRA and the fair lending laws. In addition, the Justice Department has begun using disparate impact analysis to attempt to prove lending discrimination. Disparate impact analysis is imported from employment law and relies solely on statistical data to prove discrimination. Importing this analysis into lending discrimination is inappropriate. First, we should not find discrimination without some element of intent. In addition, the statistics available present an incomplete picture of the lending decision.

The bill I am introducing today addresses these problems. It amends CRA to eliminate the current enforcement provisions and the requirements for written evaluations. It replaces these sections with a new requirement that institutions disclose their activities undertaken to meet the needs of the communities they serve and to make these disclosures available to the public.

The legislation amends the Equal Credit Opportunity Act and the Fair Housing Act to prohibit redlining. In addition, it limits the Attorney General's authority under the Acts to bring cases only on referral from the primary regulator. Finally, it limits the use of statistical data to prove discrimination to those cases where there is evidence of intentional discrimination.

Mr. Speaker, this bill will eliminate credit allocation by the federal bank regulators. It is tough on lenders that redline neighborhoods. Yet, it is fair by removing costly and unnecessary burdens from financial institutions. These burdens currently result in limiting the amount of credit available to our citizens and businesses.

HONORING VICE ADMIRAL THOMAS J. KILCLINE, USN RET.

HON. JAMES P. MORAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 1995

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to pay tribute to Vice Admiral Thomas J. Kilcline, USN (Retired) on the eve of his retirement from his position as President of the Retired Officers Association. Because of his many accomplishments, I consider it appropriate to formally recognize him for his more than 50 years of service to this Nation.

Admiral Kilcline was born in Detroit, MI, on December 9, 1925. He enlisted in the United States Navy in 1943, graduated from the U.S. Naval Academy in 1949, and was designated a naval aviator in November 1950 after which he flew with VR–5 until 1953. Admiral Kilcline attended the Naval Postgraduate School and later Massachusetts Institute of Technology, where he earned a masters degree in aeronautical engineering in 1956.

He then joined Heavy Attack Squadron Nine, serving on the *Saratoga* and *Ranger.* In 1959, he was assigned to the staff of the Commander Sixth Fleet. He completed the Command and Staff Course at the Navel War College and in 1962 completed test pilot school. He was later assigned as coordinator of test programs for all attack aircraft at the Naval Air Test Center. In January 1965, Kilcline reported to Heavy Attack Squadron Eleven (VAH–11) aboard the *Forestall.* He commanded an RA5C squadron deployed to the Vietnam theater. He returned to the staff of the Commander Naval Air Force, U.S. Atlantic Fleet in August 1967, and a year later was assigned as operations officer and later executive officer aboard the *USS Ticonderoga* (CVA–14) during operations off Vietnam. He then became program manager for acquisition and support of the RA–5C aircraft, Naval Air Systems Command. In October 1970, he was named Director of Liaison with the House of Representatives under the Navy Office of Legislative Affairs.

From August 1972 until May 1974, Kilcline was commanding officer, Naval Air Station, Patuxent River, Maryland. He was then assigned as director of aviation officer distribution, aviation captain detailer and later, Assistant Chief of Naval Personnel, Officer Distribution and Education. In August 1975, he assumed command of Naval Base Subic Bay with duties as Commander In Chief Pacific Representative in the Philippines and Commander U.S. Naval Forces, Philippines. He became Chief, Legislative Affairs in February 1978 and in July 1981, was assigned as Commander Naval Air Forces, U.S. Atlantic Fleet. He retired from the Navy in 1983.

His awards include the Distinguished Service Medal; the Legion of Merit with three gold stars; the Bronze Star; the Air Medal; and awards from the governments of the Philippines and the Republic of Vietnam.

Following retirement, Admiral Kilcline formed a military and congressional consulting firm which he disestablished when he became TROA president in December 1986. Through his stewardship, The Retired Officers Association played a pivotal role in convincing Congress to enact several legislative initiatives to maintain readiness and improve the quality of life for all members of the military community—active, reserve and retired, plus their families and survivors. I won't describe all of his accomplishments, but will briefly focus on a few to illustrate the breadth of his concern for military people.

Under his direction, TROA supported strengthening the underpinning of the Montgomery GI. Bill and thus provided a solid foundation for our Nation's future leaders by placing the wherewithal for a college education on the horizons of more than 1,000,000 young men and women who otherwise might have been denied that opportunity. He was ever mindful of the adverse effects on morale and retention caused by broken commitments and inadequate compensation and forcefully championed the causes of fairness and equity. His leadership efforts to preserve the long-standing commitment to lifetime care in military health care facilities, to fight perennial threats to retiree Cost of Living Adjustments and to provide adequate military pay raises are some of his other significant contributions. Most recently, he fought and won the battle for a transition plan that provides a comprehensive benefits package for those personnel and their families who are forced out of active service as a result of the force structure drawdown that, hopefully, is in its final stages.

One of Tom's added strengths has been his lovely wife of 44 years, the former Dornell Thompson of Pensacola, Florida. Dornell has stood steadfastly at his side, championing the cause of military people, particularly their families and survivors, everywhere. For these contributions, we owe her a debt of gratitude, as well.

Tom and Dornell live in McLean, Virginia. They have had four children: Captain Tom Jr., an F–14 pilot now in the Navy Chair at the National War College; Lieutenant Patrick, lost in an F–14 accident off the USS Constellation; Lieutenant Kathleen, a navy doctor killed in an auto accident; and Mary, wife of Commander bob Novak, a P–3 pilot assigned as a program manager in the Naval Air Systems Command in Washington, D.C.

I wish to extend my heartfelt appreciation for his numerous contributions to military people everywhere and my best wishes for continued success in all of his endeavors.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place, and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled, and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, May 25, 1995, may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

MAY 26

9:00 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
Business meeting, to consider the nomination of Henry W. Foster Jr., of Tennessee, to be Medical Director in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law and regulations, and to be Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, Department of Health and Human Services; and the proposed Child Care and Development Block Grant Amendments.
SD–430

9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
Legislative Branch Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the General Accounting Office, and the Office of Technology Assessment.
SD–116

10:00 a.m.
Finance
Taxation and IRS Oversight Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine S-Corporation reform and the home office deduction.
SD–215

JUNE 6

9:30 a.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
Forestry, Conservation, and Rural Revitalization Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed legislation to strengthen and improve United States agricultural programs, focusing on resource conservation.
SR–328A

Appropriations
Defense Subcommittee
To hold closed hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the Department of Defense, focusing on intelligence programs.
S–407, Capitol

Appropriations
Interior Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the Department of the Interior.
SD–138

Energy and Natural Resources
Energy Production and Regulation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 708, to repeal section 210 of the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978.
SD–366

Finance
To hold hearings on the overstatement of the Consumer Price Index.
SD–215

2:00 p.m.
Foreign Relations
East Asian and Pacific Affairs Subcommittee
To hold hearings on democracy and the rule of law in Hong Kong.
SD–419

Joint Printing
To hold oversight hearings on the activities of the Government Printing Office (GPO).
1310 Longworth Building

JUNE 7

9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the National Service and the Selective Service System.
SD–192

10:00 a.m.
Foreign Relations
Western Hemisphere and Peace Corps Affairs Subcommittee
To resume hearings on S. 381, to strengthen international sanctions against the Castro government in Cuba, and to develop a plan to support a transition government leading to a democratically elected government in Cuba.
SD–419

Judiciary
Youth Violence Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine issues relating to welfare, illegitimacy and juvenile violence.
SD–226

JUNE 8

9:30 a.m.
Indian Affairs
To hold hearings on S. 436, to improve the economic conditions and supply of housing in Native American communities by creating the Native American Financial Services Organization.
SR–485

2:00 p.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Forests and Public Land Management Subcommittee
To hold hearings to review the Forest Service reinvention proposal and the proposed National Forest planning regulations.
SD–366

JUNE 13

9:30 a.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
Production and Price Competitiveness Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed legislation to strengthen and improve United States agricultural programs, focusing on commodity policy.
SR–328A

Appropriations
Defense Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the Department of Defense, focusing on health programs.
SD–192

JUNE 15

9:30 a.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
Production and Price Competitiveness Subcommittee
To resume hearings on proposed legislation to strengthen and improve United States agricultural programs, focusing on commodity policy.
SR–328A

JUNE 19

2:00 p.m.
Governmental Affairs
Post Office and Civil Service Subcommittee
To resume hearings on proposals to reform the Federal pension system.
SD–342

JUNE 20

9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
Defense Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the Department of Defense, focusing on counternarcotic programs.
SD–192

JUNE 22

9:30 a.m.
Indian Affairs
To hold joint hearings with the House Committee on Resources Subcommittee on Native American and Insular Affairs on S. 487, to amend the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act.
SR–485

JUNE 27

9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
Defense Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the Department of Defense.
SD–192

JUNE 28

9:30 a.m.
Indian Affairs
To hold hearings on S. 814, to provide for the reorganization of the Bureau of Indian Affairs.
SR–485

POSTPONEMENTS

MAY 25

10:00 a.m.
Finance
Social Security and Family Policy Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine the financial and business practices of the American Association of Retired Persons (AARP).
SD–215

Wednesday, May 24, 1995

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

House Committees ordered reported 9 sundry measures.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S7281–S7403

Measures Introduced: Three bills were introduced, as follows: S. 848–850. **Page S7388**

Congressional Budget: Senate continued consideration of S. Con. Res. 13, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for the fiscal years 1996, 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002, taking action on amendments proposed thereto, as follows: **Pages S7281–S7371**

Adopted:

(1) By 85 yeas to 14 nays (Vote No. 186), Hatfield Amendment No. 1133, to restore funds cut from the National Institutes of Health. **Pages S7293–S7304, S7307**

(2) Domenici Amendment No. 1145, to make certain technical corrections. **Page S7331**

(3) Domenici (for Bingaman) Amendment No. 1146, to express the sense of the Senate regarding the establishment of a nonpartisan advisory commission on budgeting and accounting. **Pages S7331–32**

(4) Domenici (for Dole) Amendment No. 1147, to express the sense of the Senate that the reforms and proposals contained within the Independent Budget for Veterans Affairs, fiscal year 1996, should be given careful consideration in an effort to ensure the Nation's commitment to its veterans. **Page S7333**

(5) By 51 yeas to 49 nays (Vote No. 188), McConnell Amendment No. 1148, to provide for continued funding for economic development in Appalachian Region. **Pages S7336–39**

(6) By 51 yeas to 49 nays (Vote No. 192), Coverdell Amendment No. 1152, to express the sense of the Senate regarding reimbursement to the States for the costs of implementing the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 under budget function 800. **Pages S7345–46**

(7) By 56 yeas to 44 nays (Vote No. 194), Exon (for Kerry) Amendment No. 1153, to maintain public funding for Presidential campaigns. **Pages S7346–50**

(8) By a unanimous vote of 100 yeas (Vote No. 193), McConnell Amendment No. 1154 (to Amendment No. 1153), to express the sense of the Senate on use of the Presidential Election Campaign Fund in regard to sexual harassment. **Pages S7347–49**

(9) Domenici/Grassley Amendment No. 1156, to retain the prohibition against off-budget funding for the Internal Revenue Service and to express the sense of the Senate that funding for tax compliance efforts should be a top priority and that the assumptions underlying the functional totals in this resolution include the administration's full request for the I.R.S. **Pages S7350–51**

(10) Exon (for Boxer) Amendment No. 1158, to express the sense of the Congress that no member of Congress may use campaign funds to defend against sexual harassment lawsuits. (By 1 yea to 99 nays (Vote No. 196), Senate earlier failed to table the amendment.) **Pages S7351–52**

(11) By 55 yeas to 45 nays (Vote No. 197), Dole Amendment No. 1159 (to Amendment No. 1158), to express the sense of the Congress that no member of Congress or the Executive Branch may use campaign funds or privately donated funds to defend against sexual harassment lawsuits. **Page S7351**

(12) Exon (for Murray) Amendment No. 1164, to express the sense of the Senate that the Federal Government has a financial responsibility to schools in our Nation's communities which are adversely affected by Federal activities and that funding for such responsibilities should not be reduced or eliminated. **Page S7361**

(13) Exon (for Pell) Modified Amendment No. 1165, to express the sense of the Senate regarding student loan cuts. **Pages S7361–62, S7364**

(14) Exon (for Lautenberg) Amendment No. 1166, to repeal the ex-patriot tax loophole and put the money into veterans programs. **Pages S7362–64**

VerDate 24-MAY-95 07:01 May 25, 1995 Jkt 099061 PO 00000 Frm 00001 Fmt 0627 Sfmt 0627 E:\CR\CRI\D24MY5.REC d24my1

(15) By 97 yeas to 3 nays (Vote No. 202), Domenici (for McCain) Amendment No. 1167 (to Amendment No. 1166), to repeal the ex-patriot tax loophole and use the money to eliminate the social security earnings penalty. **Pages S7363–64**

Rejected:

(1) By 28 yeas to 71 nays (Vote No. 181), Harkin/Bumpers Amendment No. 1126, to reduce unnecessary military spending, holding military spending to a freeze in overall spending over 7 years protecting readiness and modernization activities, and shifting the savings to education and job training, restoring a portion of the reductions proposed for those programs in the resolution. **Pages S7305–06**

(2) By 44 yeas to 55 nays (Vote No. 182), Feingold/Hollings Amendment No. 1127, to strike the budget surplus allowance provision (Section 204) from the resolution to eliminate the use of the fiscal dividend for further tax cuts. **Page S7306**

(3) Bumpers Amendment No. 1130, to strike the proposed change in the budget process rules which would permit the scoring of revenue derived from the sale of federal assets. (By 52 yeas to 47 nays (Vote No. 183), Senate tabled the amendment.) **Pages S7304–06**

(4) Dodd Amendment No. 1131 (to Amendment No. 1128), to restore $28,000,000,000 in outlays over seven years to reduce by $16,000,000,000 the discretionary cuts proposed in education and reduce the reconciliation instruction to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources by $12,000,000,000 by closing corporate tax loopholes. (By 51 yeas to 48 nays (Vote No. 184), Senate tabled the amendment.) **Pages S7290–93, S7306**

(5) By 39 yeas to 60 nays (Vote No. 185), Snowe Amendment No. 1128, to increase funding for mandatory spending in function 500 (Education). **Pages S7281–93, S7307**

(6) By 50 yeas to 50 nays (Vote No. 189), Sarbanes Amendment No. 1149, to restore the cuts to Federal retirement programs by providing that the Federal retirement programs will continue to calculate retirement benefits from the average of an employee's high 3 years of service. **Pages S7339–40**

(7) Roth Amendment No. 1150, to prohibit including revenues in the budget resolution based on oil and gas leasing within the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. (By 56 yeas to 44 nays (Vote No. 190), Senate tabled the amendment.) **Pages S7340–43**

(8) Glenn Amendment No. 1157 (to Amendment No. 1156), to strike provisions providing for a repeal of the IRS allowance. (By 58 yeas to 42 nays (Vote No. 195), Senate tabled the amendment.) **Pages S7350–51**

(9) Exon (for Bingaman) Amendment No. 1162, to express the sense of the Senate on the importance of research, technology, and trade promotion and trade law enforcement programs. (By 53 yeas to 47 nays (Vote No. 200), Senate tabled the amendment.) **Pages S7353–60**

Withdrawn:

Hatfield/Jeffords Amendment No. 1132, to restore funds cut from the National Institutes of Health. **Page S7293**

During consideration of this measure today, the Senate took the following action:

By 46 yeas to 54 nays (Vote No. 187), three-fifths of those Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, Senate rejected a motion to waive section 904 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 with respect to consideration of Boxer Amendment No. 1134, to establish a prohibition of legislation that would include a tax cut unless 90 percent of the benefits go to the middle class. Subsequently, a point of order that the amendment was in violation of Section 305(b)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act was sustained, and the amendment was ruled out of order. **Pages S7307–08, S7316–17, S7334–35**

By 31 yeas to 69 nays (Vote No. 191), three-fifths of those Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, Senate rejected a motion to waive section 904 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 with respect to consideration of Exon Amendment No. 1151, to restore funding for agriculture and nutrition programs. Subsequently, a point of order that the amendment was in violation of Section 305(b)(2) was sustained, and the amendment was ruled out of order. **Pages S7344–45**

Exon (for Glenn) Amendment No. 1155, to restore the IRS compliance initiative, became moot upon adoption of Domenici/Grassley Amendment No. 1156, listed above. **Pages S7350–51**

By 40 yeas to 60 nays (Vote No. 198), three-fifths of those Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, Senate rejected a motion to waive section 904 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 with respect to consideration of Exon Amendment No. 1160, to limit increases in the public debt. Subsequently, a point of order that the amendment was in violation of Section 305(b)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act was sustained, and the amendment was ruled out of order. **Pages S7352–53**

By 41 yeas to 59 nays (Vote No. 199), three-fifths of those Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, Senate rejected a motion to waive section 904 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 with respect to consideration of Exon (for Moynihan) Amendment No. 1161, to restore funding to the AFDC and JOBS programs by using amounts set aside for a tax cut. Subsequently, a point of order that the amendment was in violation

of Section 305(b)(2) was sustained, and the amendment was ruled out of order. **Page S7353**

By 45 yeas to 55 nays (Vote No. 201), three-fifths of those Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, Senate rejected a motion to waive section 904 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 with respect to consideration of Exon (for Murray) Amendment No. 1163, to protect children receiving health care insurance under Medicaid. Subsequently, a point of order that the amendment was in violation of Section 305(b)(2) was sustained, and the amendment was ruled out of order.

Pages S7360–61

Senate will resume consideration of the resolution on Thursday, May 25, 1995, with further votes to occur thereon.

Supplemental Rescissions Conference Report: Senate began consideration of the conference report on H.R. 1158, making emergency supplemental appropriations for additional disaster assistance and making rescissions for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1995. **Pages S7371–85**

Senate will resume consideration of the conference report on Thursday, May 25, 1995, with a vote to occur thereon.

Appointments:

Office of Compliance: The Chair, on behalf of the Majority and Minority Leaders of the Senate and the Speaker and Minority Leader of the House of Representatives, pursuant to Public Law 104–1, announced the joint appointment of the following individuals as members of the Board of Directors of the Office of Compliance: Glen D. Nager, of Washington, D.C., for a term of 5 years and to serve as Chair; Virginia A. Seitz, of Washington, D.C., for a term of 5 years; Jerry M. Hunter, of Missouri, for a term of 4 years; James N. Adler, of California, for a term of 4 years; and Lawrence Z. Lorber, of Washington, D.C., for a term of 3 years. **Page S7401**

Messages From the President: Senate received the following messages from the President of the United States:

Transmitting the report on aeronautics and space for fiscal year 1994; referred to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation. (PM–52).

Page S7388

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

Linda Lee Robertson, of Oklahoma, to be a Deputy Under Secretary of the Treasury.

Joseph H. McKinley, Jr., of Kentucky, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Kentucky.

Robert H. Whaley, of Washington, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Washington.

B. Lynn Winmill, of Idaho, to be United States District Judge for the District of Idaho.

A routine list in the Marine Corps. **Page S7403**

Messages From the President: **Pages S7387–88**

Messages From the House: **Page S7388**

Statements on Introduced Bills: **Pages S7389–90**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S7390–91**

Amendments Submitted: **Pages S7391–99**

Authority for Committees: **Pages S7399–S7400**

Additional Statements: **Pages S7400–01**

Record Votes: Twenty-two record votes were taken today. (Total—202) **Pages S7305–07, S7334–35, S7339–40, S7343, S7345–46, S7349–51, S7353, S7360–61, S7363–64**

Recess: Senate convened at 8 a.m., and recessed at 8:42 p.m., until 9 a.m., on Thursday, May 25, 1995. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's RECORD on page S7403.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

1995 FARM BILL

Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry: Subcommittee on Research, Nutrition, and General Legislation concluded hearings on proposed legislation to strengthen and improve United States agricultural programs, focusing on research and the future of American agriculture, after receiving testimony from Karl Stauber, Under Secretary Designate of Agriculture for Research, Education and Economics; Susan E. Offutt, Executive Director of the Board on Agriculture, National Research Council; John Owens, New Mexico State University, Las Cruces, on behalf of the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges; Victor L. Lechtenberg, Purdue University, West Lafayette, Indiana, on behalf of the Research and Education Working Group of the National Center for Food and Agricultural Policy; Frank F. Busta, University of Minnesota, St. Paul, on behalf of the Institute of Food Technologists; William R. Sprague, Kentucky Farm Bureau, Louisville, on behalf of the American Farm Bureau Federation; Michael Wehler, Plain, Wisconsin, on behalf of the Animal Agriculture Coalition; Robert F. Barnes, American Society of Agronomy, Madison, Wisconsin, on behalf of the Crop Science Society of America and the Soil Science

Society of America; Alan Goldhammer, Biotechnology Industry Organization, Washington, D.C.; Larry Jefferies, New Castle, Kentucky, on behalf of the Campaign for Sustainable Agriculture; and David Morris, Institute for Local Self-Reliance, Minneapolis, Minnesota.

APPROPRIATIONS—FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on the Interior and Related Agencies held hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the Fish and Wildlife Service, receiving testimony from George T. Frampton, Jr., Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Mollie H. Beattie, Director, United States Fish and Wildlife Service, and Mary Ann Lawler, Director of Budget, all of the Department of the Interior

Subcommittee will meet again on Tuesday, June 6.

MEXICAN BANKING SYSTEM

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Committee concluded hearings to examine the impact of the peso devaluation and the Administration aid package on the banking system and economy of Mexico, after receiving testimony from Jerome I. Levinson, Economic Policy Institute, and Christopher Whalen, Legal Research International, Inc., both of Washington, D.C.; Bernard L. Weinstein, University of North Texas, Denton; Alberto Sanchez, Deutsche Bank Securities Corp., New York, New York; Juan Auping, Iberian American University, Raymundo Artiz, National Association of Manufacturers, and Javier Livas, all of Mexico City, Mexico; Sra. Liliana Flores, Monterrey, Mexico; and Gabriel Hinojosa, Puebla, Mexico.

INTERNATIONAL AVIATION POLICY

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Subcommittee on Aviation concluded hearings to examine issues relating to international aviation policy, after receiving testimony from Federico Pena, Secretary, and Stephen H. Kaplan, General Counsel, both of the Department of Transportation; Kenneth M. Mead, Director, Transportation Issues, Resources, Community, and Economic Development Division, General Accounting Office; Ronald Allen, Delta Airlines, and Thomas H. Weidemeyer, United Parcel Service Airlines, both of Atlanta, Georgia; Gerald Greenwald, United Airlines, Chicago, Illinois; Jeffrey Erickson, Trans World Airlines, Inc., St. Louis, Missouri; Robert L. Crandall, AMR Corporation, Dallas, Texas; and George F. Doughty, Lehigh Northampton Airport Authority, Allentown, Pennsylvania.

WELFARE REFORM

Committee on Finance: Committee began markup of H.R. 4, to control welfare spending and reduce welfare dependence by requiring States to encourage job placement measures, to provide for a job voucher program through the use of private profit and nonprofit organizations, to eliminate certain Federal requirements to give States additional flexibility in operating their Job Opportunities and Basic Skill Training Program (JOBS), and to establish a temporary family assistance grant under which States can provide assistance to needy families with minor children, but did not complete action thereon, and will continue tomorrow.

AVIATION SAFETY

Committee on Governmental Affairs: Subcommittee on Oversight of Government Management and the District of Columbia held hearings to examine the safety implications of unapproved aviation parts used in the rebuilding of aircraft, receiving testimony from David R. Hinson, Administrator, Federal Aviation Administration, A. Mary Schiavo, Inspector General, and Harry Schaefer, Assistant Special Agent-in-Charge, Office of the Inspector General, all of the Department of Transportation; Thomas T. Kubic, Chief, Financial Crimes Section, Federal Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice; Chester Paul Beach, Jr., United Technologies Corporation, East Hartford, Connecticut, on behalf of the Aerospace Industries Association; Michael F. Rioux, Air Transport Association of America, Walter S. Coleman, Regional Airline Association, and Edward J. Glueckler, Airline Suppliers Association, all of Washington, D.C.; Gabor Kish, New York, New York; and James M. Frisbee, Apple Valley, Minnesota.

Hearings were recessed subject to call.

COUNTER-TERRORISM

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee held hearings on the Administration's counter-terrorism intelligence gathering proposals, focusing on whether there is a need for increased wiretap and infiltration authority for Federal law enforcement, receiving written testimony from Jamie S. Gorelick, Deputy Attorney General, Department of Justice; James E. Moody, Acting Deputy Assistant Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation; and James X. Dempsey, Center for National Security Studies, and Donald M. Haines, American Civil Liberties Union, both of Washington, D.C.

Hearings were recessed subject to call.

INTELLIGENCE

Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee held closed hearings on intelligence matters, receiving testimony from officials of the intelligence community.

Committee recessed subject to call.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Bills Introduced: Nineteen public bills, H.R. 1690–1708; and one resolution, H.J. Res. 92, were introduced. **Pages H5570–71**

Committees To Sit: The following committees and their subcommittees were authorized to sit today during proceedings of the House under the 5-minute rule: Committees on Agriculture, Banking and Financial Services, Commerce, Economic and Educational Opportunities, Government Reform and Oversight, Judiciary, National Security, Resources, and Select Intelligence. **Page H5490**

Agreed To:

The Smith of New Jersey amendment that prohibits the availability of funds authorized for population assistance to any private, nongovernmental, or multilateral organization that directly or indirectly performs abortions in a foreign country, except in instances of rape, incest, or when the life of the mother is in danger (agreed to by a recorded vote of 240 ayes to 181 noes, Roll No. 350); **Pages H5490–92, H5502**

The Bereuter amendment, as amended by the Brownback amendment, that increases the authorization for the Food for Peace program by $25 million by reducing authorizations in other categories; and **Pages H5528–30**

The Bereuter amendment, as amended by the Smith of New Jersey amendment (agreed to by a recorded vote of 266 ayes to 156 noes, Roll No. 353), that strikes the earmark for the resettlement of South Asian boat people. **Pages H5533–44**

Rejected:

The Morella amendment to the Smith of New Jersey amendment that sought to provide that the abortion prohibitions contained in the amendment would not be applicable to the medical treatment of injuries or illnesses caused by unsafe abortions (rejected by a recorded vote of 198 ayes to 227 noes, Roll No. 349); **Pages H5492–H5501**

The McKinney amendment that sought to prohibit military assistance or arms transfers to a foreign government unless the President certified that the foreign government adheres to a national code of conduct (rejected by a recorded vote of 157 ayes to 262 noes, Roll No. 351); **Pages H5502–28**

The Wynn amendment that sought to authorize $12 million in fiscal years 1996 and 1997 for debt relief for Latin America and the Caribbean (rejected by a recorded vote of 125 ayes to 297 noes, Roll No. 352); and **Pages H5530–32**

The Hastings amendment that sought to increase the authorization for the Development Fund for Africa by $173 million (rejected by a recorded vote of 141 ayes to 278 noes with 1 voting ''present'', Roll No. 354). **Pages H5544–52**

Presidential Message—Aeronautics and Space: Message wherein he transmits a report on the Nation's achievements in aeronautics and space during fiscal year 1994—referred to the Committee on Science. **Page H5553**

Office of Compliance: The Speaker and Minority Leader of the House and the Majority and Minority Leaders of the Senate jointly appointed the following persons from private life to the Board of Directors of the Office of Compliance: Mr. Glen D. Nager of Washington, D.C., Chairman, to a 5-year term; Ms. Virginia A. Seitz of Washington, D.C. to a 5-year term; Mr. Jerry M. Hunter of Missouri, to a 4-year term; Mr. James N. Adler of California, to a 4-year term; and Mr. Lawrence Z. Lorber of Washington, D.C. to a 3-year term. **Page H5553**

Amendments Ordered Printed: Amendments ordered printed pursuant to the rule appear on pages H5572–75.

Quorum Calls—Votes: Six recorded votes developed during the proceedings of the House today and appear on pages H5501, H5502, H5527–28, H5521–32, H5544, and H5551–52. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: Met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 8:51 p.m.

Committee Meetings

FARM BILL—CONSERVATION ISSUES

Committee on Agriculture: Subcommittee on Resource Conservation, Research, and Forestry held a hearing on Conservation issues in the 1995 Farm bill. Testimony was heard from Representatives Bereuter, Furse and Pete Geren of Texas; the following officials of the USDA: Jim Lyons, Under Secretary, Natural Resources and the Environment; and Paul Johnson, Chief, Natural Resource Conservation Service; and public witnesses.

FARM BILL—SUGAR

Committee on Agriculture: Subcommittee on Risk Management and Specialty Crops held a hearing on 1995 Farm Bill—Sugar Title. Testimony was heard from Representatives Crapo, Miller of Florida, Schumer, Mink, and English; Gene Moos, Under Secretary,

Farm and Foreign Agriculture Service, USDA; William Slyne, Chief, Import Operations, U.S. Customs Service, Department of the Treasury; and public witnesses.

COMMERCE, JUSTICE, STATE, AND JUDICIARY APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary continued appropriations hearings. Testimony was heard from Members of Congress.

The Subcommittee also held a hearing on the Legal Services Corporation. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Legal Services Corporation: Douglas S. Eakeley, Chairman; Alexander D. Forger, President; and Thomas F. Smegal, Jr., member of the Board.

VA, HUD, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies concluded hearings on the EPA. Testimony was heard from Carol M. Browner, Administrator, EPA.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS REGULATORY RELIEF ACT

Committee on Banking and Financial Services: Subcommittee on Financial Institutions and Consumer Credit continued hearings on the broad issue of regulatory burden relief as well as those matters addressed in H.R. 1362, Financial Institutions Regulatory Relief Act of 1995. Testimony was heard from Representative Waters; and public witnesses.

Hearings continue June 8.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Commerce: Ordered reported the following bills: H.R. 558, Texas Low-Level Radioactive Waste Disposal Compact Consent Act; and H.R. 1323, amended, Pipeline Safety Act of 1995.

The Committee also began markup of H.R. 1555, Communications Act of 1995.

Will continue tomorrow.

CONSOLIDATED AND REFORMED EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND REHABILITATION SYSTEMS

Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities: Ordered reported amended H.R. 1617, Consolidated and Reformed Education, Employment and Rehabilitation Systems.

RAMSPECK: REFORM, REPEAL, OR RETENTION

Committee on Government Reform and Oversight: Subcommittee on Civil Service held a hearing on Ramspeck: Reform, Repeal, or Retention. Testimony was heard from Representative Goss; Timothy Bowling, Associate Director, Federal Human Resource Management Issues, GAO; James B. King, Director, OPM; Theresa Trujeque, Deputy Assistant Secretary, House Resources, Department of the Interior; W. Scott Gould, Deputy Assistant Secretary, Finance and Management, Department of the Treasury; Eugene Kinlow, Deputy Assistant Secretary, Personnel, Department of Health and Human Services; and a public witness.

FLAG DESECRATION

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on the Constitution held a hearing on H.J. Res. 79, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States authorizing the Congress and the States to prohibit the physical desecration of the flag of the United States. Testimony was heard from Representatives Solomon and Montgomery; and public witnesses.

IMMIGRATION ISSUES

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Immigration and Claims held a hearing on immigration issues. Testimony was heard from Representatives Packard, Lofgren, Bilbray, Rohrabacher, Martini, Foley, Goss, Kim, Pickett, Underwood, Molinari, Mink, Beilenson, Seastrand, Torres, Filner, Hutchinson, and Coleman.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on National Security: Ordered reported amended the following bills: H.R. 1141, Sikes Act Improvement Amendments of 1994; H.R. 1347, Maritime Administration Authorization Act for fiscal year 1996; H.R. 1350, Maritime Security Act of 1995.

The Committee also began markup of H.R. 1530, National Defense Authorization for fiscal year 1996.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Resources: Ordered reported the following bills: H.R. 1332, amended, Rongelap Recovery and Community Self-Reliance Act; S. 523, to amend the Colorado River Basin Salinity Control Act to authorize additional measures to carry out the control of salinity upstream of Imperial Dam in a cost-effective manner; and H.R. 1070, to designate the reservoir created by Trinity Dam in Central Valley project, CA as ''Trinity Lake.''

COMMITTEE BUSINESS

Committee on Standards of Official Conduct: Met in executive session to consider pending business.

EXPLORE INCREASING AND IMPROVING OPTIONS FOR MEDICARE BENEFICIARIES

Committee on Ways and Means: Subcommittee on Health continued hearings to explore increasing and improving options for Medicare Beneficiaries, with emphasis on Medicare HMO Enrollment Growth and Payment Policies. Testimony was heard from Gail Wilensky. Chair, Physician Payment Review Commission; Stuart H. Altman, Chairman, Prospective Payment Assessment Commission; Jonathan Ratner, Associate Director, Health Financing Issues, GAO; and public witnesses.

Hearings continue tomorrow.

SOCIAL SECURITY DISABILITY INSURANCE PROGRAM

Committee on Ways and Means: Subcommittee on Social Security concluded hearings on the Social Security Disability Insurance Program. Testimony was heard from Representatives McCrery, Gekas, Kanjorski, Costello, and Bass.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR THURSDAY, MAY 25, 1995

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry, Subcommittee on Marketing, Inspection, and Product Promotion, to hold hearings on proposed legislation to strengthen and improve United States agricultural programs, focusing on Federal farm export programs, 10 a.m., S–116, Capitol.

Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Military Construction, to hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for military construction programs of the Department of Defense, focusing on Army and certain Defense agencies, 10 a.m., SD–192.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, business meeting, to mark up proposed securities litigation reform legislation, and to consider the nominations of Bruce A. Morrison, of Connecticut, and J. Thimothy O'Neill, of Virginia, each to be a Director of the Federal Housing Finance Board, 10 a.m., S–207, Capitol.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, to hold hearings on S. 638, to authorize funds for United States insular areas, 9:30 a.m., SD–366.

Subcommittee on Forests and Public Land Management, to hold hearings on property line disputes within the Nez Perce Indian Reservation in Idaho, 2 p.m., SD–366.

Committee on Finance, business meeting, to resume markup of H.R. 4, to restore the American family, reduce illegitimacy, control welfare spending and reduce welfare dependence, 9:30 a.m., SD–215.

Committee on Foreign Relations, to hold hearings on various treaties on Conventions and Protocols on Avoidance of Double Taxation and the Prevention of Fiscal Evasion with Respect to Taxes on Income and Capital, 10 a.m., SD–419.

Full Committee, business meeting, to continue to mark up proposed legislation authorizing funds for foreign assistance programs, 2 p.m., SD–419.

Full Committee, to hold hearings on the nominations of Timothy Michael Carney, of Washington, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Sudan, Donald K. Steinberg, of California, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Angola, Mosina H. Jordan, of New York, to be Ambassador to the Central African Republic, and Lannon Walker, of Maryland, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Cote D'Ivoire, 3 p.m., S–116, Capitol.

Committee on Governmental Affairs, business meeting, to consider pending nominations, 10 a.m., SD–342.

Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Terrorism, Technology, and Government Information, to hold hearings to examine the impact of the militia movement in the United States, 9:30 a.m., SD–226.

Committee on Labor and Human Resources, Subcommittee on Education, Arts and Humanities, to hold hearings to examine the business role in vocational education, 9:30 a.m., SD–430.

Subcommittee on Children and Families, to hold hearings to examine child protection issues, 2:30 p.m., SD–430.

Committee on Rules and Administration, to hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for the Federal Election Commission, 9:30 a.m., SR–301.

NOTICE

For a listing of Senate Committee Meetings scheduled ahead, see page E1118 in today's RECORD.

House

Committee on Agriculture, Subcommittee on General Farm Commodities, hearing on the 1995 Farm Bill—Cotton and Feed Grains Titles, 10 a.m., 1302 Longworth.

Subcommittee on Livestock, Dairy, and Poultry, hearing on the classified pricing for milk, the appropriate number of classes within the pricing system, replacement of the Minnesota-Wisconsin ("M–W") series, formulae to determine future prices for manufacturing and Class I milk, the continuation of state make allowances, the continuation or elimination of Class III–A pricing, and multiple component pricing, 9 a.m., 1300 Longworth.

Committee on Banking and Financial Services, Subcommittee on Domestic and International Monetary Policy, to markup legislation authorizing appropriations for the International Financial Institutions, 9:30 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Housing and Community Opportunity, hearing on innovative approaches to homeownership opportunities, focusing on the efforts of Habitat for Humanity International; to be followed by a markup of the Homesteading and Neighborhood Restoration Act, 9:30 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on Commerce, to continue markup of H.R. 1555, Communications Act of 1995, time to be announced, 2123 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearing on A Consumer's Perspective on Drugs and Biologics, 9 a.m., 2322 Rayburn.

Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities, Subcommittee on Workforce Protections, hearing on Adams Fruit, 1 p.m., 2175 Rayburn.

Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, and the Committee on National Security, joint hearing on H.R. 1670, The Federal Acquisition Reform Act of 1995, 10 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on the Constitution, to mark up H.J. Res. 79, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States authorizing the Congress and the States to prohibit the physical desecration of the flag of the United States, 10:30 a.m., 2237 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on the Constitution, hearing on the authorization and oversight of the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice, 1 p.m., 2237 Rayburn.

Committee on Resources, Subcommittee on Fisheries, Wildlife and Oceans, hearing on H.R. 1675, National Wildlife Refuge Improvement Act of 1995, 10 a.m., 1334 Longworth.

Endangered Species Act Task Force, to continue oversight hearings on the Endangered Species Act, 12 p.m., 1324 Rayburn.

Committee on Small Business, Subcommittee on Government Programs, hearing on the SBA's Disaster Assistance Loan Program, 2 p.m., 2359 Rayburn.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Subcommittee on Railroads, to mark up AMTRAK reauthorization, 10 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Committee on Ways and Means, Subcommittee on Health, to continue hearings to explore increasing and improving options for Medicare Beneficiaries, 10 a.m., 1100 Longworth.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

9 a.m., Thursday, May 25

Senate Chamber

Program for Thursday: Senate will resume consideration of the conference report on H.R. 1158, Supplemental Rescissions, with a vote to occur thereon, following which Senate will resume consideration of S. Con. Res. 13, Congressional Budget, with further votes to occur thereon.

Senate is also expected to consider S. 735, Comprehensive Terrorism Prevention Act.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

10 a.m., Thursday, May 25

House Chamber

Program for Thursday: Continue consideration of H.R. 1561, American Overseas Interests Act.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Ackerman, Gary L., N.Y., E1110
Bentsen, Ken, Tex., E1106
Bonilla, Henry, Tex., E1108
Bonior, David E., Mich., E1116
Clay, William (Bill), Mo., E1111
Duncan, John J., Jr., Tenn., E1109
Fazio, Vic, Calif., E1108
Forbes, Michael P., N.Y., E1105, E1115
Gilman, Benjamin A., N.Y., E1104
Houghton, Amo, N.Y., E1103
Hoyer, Steny H., Md., E1115
Largent, Steve, Okla., E1107
Lewis, Jerry, Calif., E1104
McCollum, Bill, Fla., E1116
Moran, James P., Va., E1105, E1117
Oberstar, James L., Minn., E1108
Poshard, Glenn, Ill., E1111
Reed, Jack, R.I., E1107
Richardson, Bill, N. Mex., E1115
Rogers, Harold, Ky., E1105
Roukema, Marge, N.J., E1110
Schroeder, Patricia, Colo., E1112
Shuster, Bud, Pa., E1109
Smith, Christopher H., N.J., E1107
Stark, Fortney Pete, Calif., E1113
Talent, James M., Mo., E1105
Torricelli, Robert G., N.J., E1110
Underwood, Robert A., Guam, E1104
Vento, Bruce F., Minn., E1110
Waxman, Henry A., Calif., E1106
Weller, Jerry, Ill., E1116

Congressional Record The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed at one time. ¶The Congressional Record is available as an online database through *GPO Access*, a service of the U.S. Government Printing Office. The online database is updated each day the Congressional Record is published. The database includes both text and graphics from the beginning of the 103d Congress, 2d Session (January 1994) forward. It is available on a Wide Area Information Server (WAIS) through the Internet and via asynchronous dial-in. The annual subscription fee for a single workstation is $375. Six month subscriptions are available for $200 and one month of access can be purchased for $35. Discounts are available for multiple-workstation subscriptions. To subscribe, Internet users should telnet swais.access.gpo.gov and login as newuser (all lower case); no password is required. Dial in users should use communications software and modem to call (202) 512–1661 and login as swais (all lower case); no password is required; at the second login prompt, login as newuser (all lower case); no password is required. Follow the instructions on the screen to register for a subscription for the Congressional Record Online via *GPO Access*. For assistance, contact the *GPO Access* User Support Team by sending Internet e-mail to help@eids05.eids.gpo.gov, or a fax to (202) 512–1262, or by calling (202) 512–1530 between 7 a.m. and 5 p.m. Eastern time, Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays. ¶The Congressional Record paper and 24x microfiche will be furnished by mail to subscribers, free of postage, at the following prices: paper edition, $112.50 for six months, $225 per year, or purchased for $1.50 per issue, payable in advance; microfiche edition, $118 per year, or purchased for $1.50 per issue payable in advance. The semimonthly Congressional Record Index may be purchased for the same per issue prices. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, directly to the Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily Congressional Record is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the Congressional Record.