United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 104th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 141 WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 22, 1995 No. 149

House of Representatives

The House was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Monday, September 25, 1995, at 12 noon.

Senate

FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 22, 1995

(Legislative day of Tuesday, September 5, 1995)

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the President pro tempore [Mr. THURMOND].

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Lloyd John Ogilvie, offered the following prayer:

O Gracious God, Sovereign of our land and source of courage, we thank You that You know our needs before we ask for Your help, but You have ordained that in the asking we would find release from the anxiety of carrying the burdens of leadership on our own shoulders. Help us to remember that You are the instigator of prayer. It begins with You, moves into our hearts, gives us the clarity of knowing how to pray, and then returns to You in petitions that You have refined and guided us to ask. We are astonished that You have chosen to do Your work through us and to use prayer to reorient our minds around Your guidance for the issues we will face today. We say with the psalmist, ''You are my rock and my fortress; therefore, for Your name's sake, lead me and guide me.''—Psalm 31:3. Suddenly, we see prayer in a whole new perspective. It is the method by which You brief us on Your plans and bless us with Your power. May this whole day be filled with magnificent moments of turning to You for Your purposes, Your glory, and honor in America. May we receive a dynamic vision to be that quality of leaders. In the all-powerful name of our Lord. Amen.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

SCHEDULE

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, for the information of all Senators this morning, the Senate will begin the consideration of the conference report accompanying the military construction bill under a 50-minute time limit. This is to advise Senators that the vote will come around 10:30 this morning. And then after that, we will go to the D.C. appropriations bill during today's session, so rollcall votes can be expected throughout the session in order to complete action on these items today.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996—CONFERENCE REPORT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will now proceed to the consideration of the conference report accompanying H.R. 1817, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The committee on conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 1817) making appropriations for military construction, family housing, and base realignment and closure for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, 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 conference report is printed in the House proceedings of the RECORD of September 14, 1995.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KYL). Under the previous order, there will be 20 minutes of debate equally divided between the Senator from Montana [Mr. BURNS], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID], or their designees. There will be 10 minutes under the control of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. BINGAMAN], and there will be 20 minutes under the control of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCCAIN].

Mr. BURNS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I am pleased to bring before the Senate the conference report on military construction appropriations for fiscal year 1996.

The conference report is within the 602(b) budget allocation for both budget authority and outlays. I would like to mention just briefly some of the provisions in this conference agreement.

First, the conferees agreed with the Senate and approved $3.9 billion for the implementation of the base realignment and closure decisions. This amount includes $785 million for the 1995 round. There is also $457 million for environmental cleanup of these facilities. It has been a difficult year for all of us in this area, and I am hopeful that these funds will relieve some of

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper containing 100% post consumer waste

the burden that has affected the communities and what they are experiencing with these base closings.

Mr. President, 38 percent of our bill is for family housing. We have included Secretary Perry's initiative for a new family housing program. We are hopeful that this will start to relieve some of the burden in keeping adequate housing for our service people.

With regard to the barracks and dormitories, we provided $675 million. We are hopeful that the Department will soon begin another program to provide alternative methods of housing our service members. We cannot afford to continue to build brandnew barracks when we still have people living in open bays.

The conferees did agree to earmark 430 million dollars' worth of funds for the National Guard and Reserve. The Department continues to ignore the needs of our citizen soldiers, and we will not ignore them, because we are keenly aware of the vital role they play in the defense of this country.

We did not fund any armories this year. This has been a difficult decision. However, we want the National Guard to take a hard look at where we are going with armories. There are about 3,000 armories in the United States, and we cannot keep adding new ones. In these austere times, the overhead has become too much of a burden.

This is the first year for me on this subcommittee, and I look forward to the process next year. We have just begun to change on how we build and maintain our facilities for the military.

Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Nevada, with whom I have worked closely on this bill, and the conferees in the House, because I think we have come through with a bill that is fair and balanced. We have kept everybody informed exactly on what we have been doing, and we have also taken a look at what the administration wants to do and some of the needs that might have been overlooked by the administration.

So I yield the floor to my friend, the ranking minority member, the Senator from Nevada.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, at this time, I ask Senator BINGAMAN to go ahead and use his 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I appreciate the chance to speak on this legislation. I wish to speak in opposition to the conference report on H.R. 1817, which is the fiscal year 1996 Military Construction Appropriations Act.

I opposed the bill when the Senate debated it in July, and now the conferees, in my view, have brought back an even worse bill with even more add-ons for Member interest projects.

We hear much these days about the need for deficit reduction. Critical domestic programs, such as education and health care and energy assistance for the poor and civilian research are being decimated by the Republican Congress on the grounds that we absolutely must fulfill the electorate's mandate to balance the budget by the year 2002.

Committees throughout the Congress are busily reporting their contributions to the reconciliation bill and including provisions that, in my view, will do major damage to our Nation's health and future prosperity.

We have already debated some appropriations bills that make major reductions in critical programs, such as Indian education and health. We will soon be debating others which decimate domestic programs in housing, education, and many other areas.

While these domestic programs are being cut to the bone, we have before us now a conference report that includes 129 Member interest projects not requested by the Pentagon.

The projects, totaling $795 million, are spread among 45 States—all except Connecticut, Maine, Delaware, Wisconsin, and Minnesota. Texas tops the list with nine add-on projects, totaling $47 million. Kansas has five projects worth $33.5 million and, accordingly, is another big winner.

Mr. President, this bill makes a mockery of all the protestations about deficit reduction coming from this Congress and leading Republican candidates. In my view, the President should veto this bill. The President was not stingy in his request for funding for military construction projects. His fiscal year 1996 military construction budget proposed a 22-percent increase; that is nearly a $2 billion increase above the 1995 level. He put particular emphasis on the needs for family housing and implementation of base closure and realignment recommendations.

What this Congress is now proposing to send to the President is a pork-laden bill with a net addition of $479 million above the President's budget request. Essentially, this so-called fiscally conservative Congress is saying that a 22-percent increase in military construction is not enough, that the increase needs to be 28 percent.

Mr. President, where else are we saying that this year? Outside of the defense budget, is there a single major discretionary or mandatory spending category that is growing 27 percent? I cannot think of a single one. I can think of a lot that are being cut at least 28 percent. In reality, the increase is even larger because many of the so-called cuts made in the bill are phony. They will just pay the bills in future years. A few large projects are stretched out so that we can defer paying the total bill until some future fiscal year. For example, $92 million is postponed from the third phase of a project in the Army Institute of Research in Maryland out of $119 million requested.

I could give other examples. Unfortunately, this bill has sailed through both Houses with bipartisan support. There is so much money available to spend in this area that there has been plenty to allocate to interest items on the Democratic as well as the Republican side. When Senators MCCAIN, KERREY, and I attempted on July 21 to trim $300 million out of the Senate version of the bill that had at the time about 100 unrequested projects, we were defeated 77 to 18. That vote occurred minutes after the Senate had given final approval to the $16 billion in rescissions in domestic programs for fiscal year 1995.

The President has not condoned business as usual on this bill in the Congress. Throughout the budget process, the administration has expressed strong objections to the hundreds of millions of dollars in unrequested military construction projects. OMB Director Alice Rivlin told Senate Appropriations Chairman HATFIELD on July 18 that ''with the Nation facing serious budget constraints, such a spending increase is not affordable.''

The American people are not clamoring for additional spending for the Pentagon. What little support there is for increased Pentagon spending, in my view, will dwindle further when the public realizes how the additional funds would be spent by the Congress.

Mr. President, I hope that President Clinton will not associate himself with this bill. He should use his bully pulpit to explain to the American people that there are better uses for this money, including deficit reduction and education and health.

The American people want a strong defense. They also want a brighter future for their children through investments in education and research. They want a society that does not turn its back on those least able to fend for themselves. Our defense is not strengthened by squandering money on projects that the Pentagon has not requested. If Congress insists on doing so, the American people should hold us accountable for these misplaced priorities.

Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to set aside the narrow parochial interests and to resist the temptation of the easy press release about how good this bill is for bases in their home State, and to cast a vote against this conference report in the national interest.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, how much time does the Senator from New Mexico have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. He has 3 minutes, 20 seconds.

Mr. REID. Will the Senator allow that time to be used by Senator GLENN?

Mr. BINGAMAN. I am pleased to yield that time to Senator GLENN.

Mr. GLENN. I appreciate that. Mr. President, I will be brief today.

Mr. President, I rise today to raise my concerns over the pending fiscal year 1996 military construction conference report.

The conference agreement provides a total of $11.2 billion in funding which is

$480 million more than the budget request; $775 million of that amount is for military construction projects for which the Pentagon made no request.

I have mixed feelings about this conference report, Mr. President. I strongly disagree with the practice Congress has developed over the years, with the tacit assent of the Pentagon, that results in $770 million in unrequested projects being included in the bill.

Members are expected to get military construction projects added to each year's bill in order to demonstrate that he or she can bring home the bacon. This, in part, results from the Pentagon's recurring failure to adequately fund Guard and Reserve construction requirements. The Pentagon does not request these projects but, instead, expects Congress to add these projects to the budget.

The result is a skewing of priorities, in my opinion, Mr. President. Rather than informing Congress of what is really needed, projects are funded based on a given member's ability to get the funding included in the authorization and appropriations bills. The Senator from Arizona and I contacted Secretary Perry earlier this year to express our concern over this practice and asked that the Guard and Reserve requirements be included in the budget request.

As I mentioned, I have mixed feelings about this year's conference report because, even though we are still engaging in the practice of adding close to a billion dollars in projects, on the Senate side, we have adopted a set of criteria by which to measure add-on requests. I have worked on those criteria over the years with the chairman of the Readiness Subcommittee, the Senator from Arizona. And, I am pleased that the appropriators followed those criteria this year as well.

I do not think it is too much to ask, Mr. President, that a military construction project meet certain minimum standards like being a valid military requirement, being in the service's 5-year program or having the project be sufficiently designed to be able to begin the project in the year in which it is authorized and appropriated. Quite frankly, if a project does not meet these criteria, we should not be including it as a military construction project.

Unfortunately, there are projects in this conference report that do not meet the standards we have set. I understand that these projects came over in conference from the House, but there are several that are not included in the 5-year plan and there is one that the Army simply does not want. I hope we can continue our efforts to clean up the add-on process so that we do not end up with these kinds of projects being funded in the future.

I will add that I think we are making enormous progress in this area. We used to have sheets and sheets of these things that came over. Almost every member on the committees over there, and also here, wanted something put in to sweeten the pot to show back home that they made a special effort. This year we are down to very few—practically none in the Senate, and about a dozen or so, or 15 or 20 from over in the House.

There are several important positive things about the conference report that are worthy of support. The BRAC accounts are fully funded—these projects are important so that we can get closed back into productive use. Secretary Perry's housing initiative is fully funded—we are hopeful that this new approach will work to leverage limited funds to get new housing for our troops and their families. And, there is a considerable number of barracks, family housing projects, health care centers, and child care centers that will add to service members' quality of life.

All in all, I can support this conference report, Mr. President, but I felt compelled to outline my concerns on the add-on issue. I would hope next year we can see, for the first time, no add-ons that do not meet the criteria.

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

Mr. McCAIN addressed the Chair.

Mr. BURNS. Will the Senator yield so I can propound a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. McCAIN. Yes.

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, first of all, I ask for the yeas and nays on the adoption of the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote occur at 10:20 this morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, I thank my friend from Ohio for all his efforts on behalf of bringing about a rational and reasonable process in allocating scarce taxpayer dollars for military construction projects. I also agree with my friend from Ohio that we have made significant progress. There has been a dramatic decrease in the numbers of MilCon properties that have been added—if I might say bluntly, pork barrel projects—over the years.

I say to my friend from Ohio, we have a long way to go. There are in this bill 21 projects that came from the House of Representatives that had no—no—relation to any national security requirement, was not on any person's list, was not any requirement by the Defense Department and simply was added on because it clearly related to members of the committee of oversight.

Let me also point out there is one here on the Senate side which jumps out to me. It is from the State of West Virginia.

Now, there is no rationale for that project. There is no rationale for the 21 that are from the House. There is also a distortion in the process which Senator GLENN and I are working on with the Secretary of Defense, and that is that when we take from the future years defense plan MilCon projects we are given a list of several thousand projects that would be proposed over the next 5 or 6 years.

What Senator GLENN and I are proposing to Secretary of Defense Perry is that now the Department of Defense prioritize their list 1 through 2,000 or 10,000 or whatever it is, so when we pick additional projects—and Mr. President, I deeply regret the reality there will be additional add-ons which I will talk about, whether we should be adding on money for military construction projects or other priorities as articulated by the Secretary of Defense, the President of the United States, and all of the Joint Chiefs—when we do have add-ons, at least there will be a priority list.

Now, some of these additions that meet the criteria that Senator GLENN and I were working on come from projects that were not planned by the Pentagon until the year 2001. That is not appropriate, either, I say to my dear friend from Ohio. We have to narrow this down and make it a lot better.

Again, I appreciate the fact that Senator GLENN and I have been able to work on this issue in a bipartisan fashion now for some 8 years. I do believe that we are making some progress.

I do not mean my remarks to be critical about the hard work of the chairman of the subcommittee, and the ranking member from Nevada. I believe that they have done a very dedicated job and I appreciate their efforts.

I point out that there are $706 million of add-ons in this bill, $480 million above the President's request and there are 110 new projects.

Mr. President, I wrote a letter on August 9 to the four military service chiefs and I asked them to comment on their priorities for add-ons. I want to talk about this because I hear from people who support these additional projects. ''Well, we are doing this for the good of the men and women of the military. We have to improve their lifestyle. We have to make sure that their living conditions are better,'' et cetera, et cetera. No one is more dedicated to that proposition than the service chiefs.

The service chief priorities, all four I wrote to, with the exception of the Chief of Staff of the Air Force, said their priorities are different than those of the members of the Military Constructions Appropriations Subcommittee.

Admiral Boorda said, ''* * * there is no issue more important to Navy than our long-term shipbuilding and TACAIR procurement requirements.''

General Krulak, ''My first program priority is for those initiatives, both ground and air, that will enable us to out-maneuver and out-shoot our opponents on tomorrow's battlefield.''

General Fogleman, ''At the top of the list are * * * F–22, * * * strategic airlift, * * * additional six F–15E's and six F–16 block 50 aircraft * * .''

On and on and on. I got the same response from the Secretary of Defense.

So, we should not be a little deceived at our zeal for the betterment of the men and women in the military. All of us share that commitment and desire. But the fact is that this is not in keeping with the priorities of the service chiefs and the Secretary of Defense.

Since 1990, we have had $5 billion—billion, Mr. President—add-ons which are not requested by the Secretary of Defense for military construction projects.

Now, we have done some good things. There is a new effort at better housing conditions for the men and women in the military, and military families.

In the Readiness Subcommittee and in the Personnel Subcommittee we worked very hard on seeing that initiative move forward. We took a step forward on improvement of barracks. That is the rational way to do it.

It is not rational, Mr. President, to add 21 projects which have no requirement whatever by the Department of Defense. Hypervelocity ballistic range facility at Redstone Arsenal, AL; a fire station at Grissom Air Force Reserve Base in Indiana; electrical system upgrade at Picatinny Arsenal, NJ; Stallion Range Center water development project at White Sands Missile Range; infantry platoon battle course and antiarmor tracking and live-fire range at Fort Drum, NY; Coscom health center and SOF barracks at Fort Bragg.

Notice, Mr. President, most of the 21 add-ons that came from the other body have nothing to do with quality of life. There are some, but most of them in my view are simply pork barrel projects.

A foundry renovation at Philadelphia Naval Shipyard; modified record-fire range at Tullahoma Training Site in Tennessee; dining facility at Fort Bliss; a highway overpass at Fort Sam Houston; a BEQ expansion in Corpus Christi; small craft berthing pier at Ingleside; dormitory at Fairchild Air Force Base, WA; family housing at several other places.

Mr. President, I think it is important to point out 37 States are represented on the Defense Committee or 74 percent of the total States. Mr. President, 34 of these States got add-ons in this bill, 84 projects totaling $537 million, representing 75 percent of the total adds that were awarded to those 34 States. Mr. President, I do not think it is coincidence.

Mr. President, General Shalikashvili, responding to questions from the Armed Services Committee was clear and unequivocal in his prioritization of additional funding, did not mention military construction. He said:

> Contingency funding is at the top of the list for any additional funding provided by Congress. . . priorities for additional 1996 funding would include the accelerate of warfighting enhancements identified in the Bottom-Up Review. . . other priorities would include funding critical modernization and procurement requirements that have slipped in the future year's defense plan.

None of the service chiefs or the Chairman cited any specific military construction projects as a high priority for additional funding.

Now when we stand up here and talk about how this bill is for the betterment of the men and women in the military, I repeat, the service chiefs and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Secretary of Defense have the same zeal and dedication to their betterment.

They also know that they have to have the weapons with which to fight and die. General Mundy, before my subcommittee, stated he wanted the wife of a marine officer or enlisted person to be living in a very decent house but he did not want that person to be living in a decent house when the chaplain came to tell her that her husband was killed because he did not have the proper war-fighting equipment with which to save his life.

I think that is as important a statement as I have ever heard and encapsulates my opposition to the $5 billion we have added since 1990 in unneeded and unwanted military construction add-ons.

Last year, the Congress added over $1 billion for specific unrequested military construction projects, and I believe this bill is too high, but it is only two-thirds of that amount, and I believe that is progress of a sort.

I want to talk a moment about two projects which demonstrate the illogic of the decisions of funding add-ons. One is an add-on of $6 million for renovating a foundry at the Philadelphia Naval Shipyard. The funds are used to bring the facility up to occupational standards to be utilized by the Navy at some point in the future.

This project was not requested by the Navy, nor was it included in the Navy's long-term funding plan. It does not meet the Senate's criteria, and not included in the Senate's version of the bill, but it survived in the conference agreement. I do not understand why this project was chosen as a high-priority military requirement by the conferees.

The other probability that I want to talk about is the addition of $10 million for the Barstow-Daggett Airport facility. This project was not requested. In fact, it was specifically rejected by the Army in a letter dated September 12 in which the Secretary of the Army stated that the project was not necessary because of better, cheaper and more readily available facilities at Edwards Air Force Base, yet the House added $10 million for the projects for the conferees and the conferees included in their agreement.

Let me note that I do not intend to include this project in the military construction authorization conference report and I believe Secretary Perry should include both of these projects in his list of rescissions of low-priority military construction projects.

Mr. President, I want to tell the chairman and the manager of the bill and the distinguished minority member, the Senator from Nevada, I intend to send a letter to the Secretary of Defense and the President seeking for him to submit to Congress a list of rescissions. I hope we will have passed that line-item veto legislation by then so that the President could simply line-item veto it.

Mr. President, I cannot point solely to the Appropriations Committee for continuing the egregious practice of adding funding for unrequested military construction projects.

With the addition of $7 billion to the overall defense budget request, I must admit that the Armed Services Committee was not able to resist the temptation to fund Members' special interest projects. One authorization conference report will likely authorize most of the added projects in this bill, even over my objection.

The American people sent a message to Congress last year that things in Washington had to change, but unfortunately this bill shows just how much they have not changed.

I mentioned already the amounts of money. Mr. President, 37 States are represented on either or both the Armed Services and Appropriations Committees, and 34 of those States got projects. Mr. President, 84 State projects totaling $503.7 million, or 75 percent of the total add-ons, are awarded to those 68 percent of the States which are represented on the committee. The list goes on and on. The bottom line is 86 percent of the States receiving add-ons in this bill are represented in the committee.

It seems to me there is a shift occurring, and I am glad to see some of it happening, though. The $700 million added for unrequested projects as well as more than $5 billion added over the past 5 years were added directly for high priority programs supported by the armed services.

As I noted before, the services need money for modernization, readiness, and other valid military requirements, not for military construction projects selected by Members of Congress. I recognize the futility of expecting Congress to stop adding money for military construction projects, but I think it is time to make those allocations based on the military services' priorities rather than location.

This year is the first year, as Senator GLENN pointed out, the Senate used, or was supposed to use, the evaluation criteria for Member add-ons which were adopted last year in the 1995 Defense Authorization Act. These criteria were set forth in a sense-of-the-Senate provision, and were designed to allow the Senate to evaluate Members' requests for additional military construction projects. Now that we have completed most of the review cycle, I

discovered an oversight in the criteria, which I mentioned before, and we need to correct that. I hope we can correct it soon.

I intend to add to the established criteria a requirement that requests for add-ons be screened for priority against the relevant services' unfunded military construction priorities. In this way, the highest priorities can be funded first.

Another serious concern I have about this bill concerns the inclusion of projects which do not meet the criteria of last year, and I have already discussed that.

We still have a long way to go in the fight to eliminate pork barrel spending from the military construction bill in both the authorizing and appropriating cycles. The good news is that the total amount of military construction add-ons this year will be only two-thirds of the $1 billion added last year. In just 1 year, that is progress.

The bad news is that when additional funds are available for Defense, it is difficult to argue successfully that none of these additional funds should be spent for military construction projects. My colleagues should also consider that it will be even more difficult next year to provide additional funding for Defense. Balancing the budget has become the most urgent priority facing the country.

Another consideration of which my colleagues should become aware is the potential of a veto of the 1996 Defense appropriations bill. The President has threatened a veto in large part because of the additional $7 billion added to Defense. If the Defense bill is vetoed, Congress may be forced to cut back on some of the added spending in that bill, spending which was allocated principally to the modernization program so important to our military service chiefs.

The question I put to my colleagues is: What share of any reduction in defense spending will be allocated to military construction? That may be a very important question.

The conference report in some ways represents a significant improvement, but I believe we have a long way to go. I am glad to see the conferees did not add funding for any projects which were not included in either the House or the Senate versions of the bill. Of that I am deeply appreciative. There are many other laudable provisions in the bill, particularly the new family housing initiative which will, I believe, begin to solve the daunting problem of undertaking a massive overhaul of military housing across the Nation.

I want to summarize by saying, in case some of my colleagues have not recognized it, defense spending overall has come under intense scrutiny and intense criticism throughout America. Many Americans do not understand why we are spending as much money as we are on defense in light of the fact that the cold war is over. They do not understand why we are purchasing post-cold-war relics such as the B–2 bomber and *Seawolf* submarine. They certainly do not understand why we add on military construction projects which have no relevance to national security requirements.

The problem that we are facing, all of us, is maintaining the confidence of the American people that their tax dollars which are earmarked for defense are being spent wisely. If we continue to fund unneeded and unwanted projects, we will see further cuts in defense, which in my view will endanger our ability to defend this Nation's vital national security interests.

I urge my colleagues to take that into consideration as they consider projects which are relevant only to their home State or district.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. INHOFE). The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, how much time does the Senator from Montana have left?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana has 5 minutes. The Senator from Nevada has 10 minutes. And the Senator from Arizona has 3 minutes left.

Mr. REID. How much time does the distinguished President pro tempore require?

Mr. THURMOND. About 4 minutes.

Mr. REID. I will yield him 2 minutes of my time and the Senator from Montana will yield 2 minutes of his time.

Mr. BURNS. That will be good.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I want to compliment Senator BURNS and Senator REID for their leadership in arriving at this conference. This military construction bill mirrors the construction priorities and criteria for projects established by the Armed Services Committee. I am particularly pleased by the emphasis placed on projects that will enhance the quality of life of the men and women in our military and on projects which will enhance the readiness of our Armed Forces. The bill also fully funds the base closure account request and provides the necessary funds to support environmental compliance projects. Both are areas which have historically been used as sources of funds for other projects.

Mr. President, I believe overall this is a good conference report, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Although I urge the adoption of this conference report, I do not favor every item in it. If I had my way, I would have eliminated some of the add-ons, and other parts of the report. But this Appropriations Committee—and I am not a member of that committee—has studied this matter well. They have come up with this report. It is not perfect. No report is perfect. No report pleases everybody. But as a whole, this report will provide for the needs of the Defense Department and the men and women of our Armed Forces. I think it is important to our Nation and to our defense.

I urge the Senate to adopt the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I am pleased to join with the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, Senator BURNS from Montana, in presenting this conference report on military construction for the next fiscal year. I also want to extend my appreciation to the distinguished Senator from South Carolina, the President pro tempore of the Senate, for his statement in support of this conference report.

There is no one in the Senate who has more authority, more experience, and more ability in speaking about military readiness of this country than the distinguished Senator from South Carolina. It means a lot to the two managers of this bill to have him on the floor supporting this conference report.

This conference report fulfills an obligation to fund downsizing of our extensive military overhead, extensive basing system, and fully funds the implementation of the Base Realignment and Closure Commission. That is a sizable chunk of this bill, almost $4 billion. More than a third of the dollars appropriated in this measure go to the Base Realignment and Closure Commission.

So the Senator from Montana and the Senator from Nevada really were in an uphill battle in arriving at the conference report we did, when we start out using approximately one-third of the dollars appropriated for base closing and realignment.

There are two other aspects of the bill which merit the Senate's attention. It goes a long way to getting our hands around the long-neglected problem of housing for our military families and for our single soldiers. Housing has always taken a back seat to more urgent near-term military requirements.

But it is the feeling of the Senator from Nevada and the Senator from Montana that housing is an important element of maintaining a safe, secure, and contented military.

This year, as the distinguished chairman has pointed out, some 38 percent of the bill is for housing. The new initiative by Secretary for private sector participation in new housing is included in the bill. Indeed, the committee has included about $179 million above the President's request for this housing. All of it, and more if we could afford it, is needed to bridge the gap that must be overcome in order to be able to maintain a high quality All-Volunteer Force in the years ahead. The request by the administration could have been higher, and I will give you an example. There were zero dollars in the request for whole barracks

renewal at one major western Army facility.

It is in Hawaii. The structures are some 50 years or more old. They have had it. The conference committee wisely included $30 million for this project, money which was in the 5-year defense program, but only in future years. When we asked the Army why the barracks had no funding at all in fiscal year 1996, there was no coherent answer. So the subcommittee took what I think was a prudent step in beginning this project. This is but one example of actions which we took that put our final bill above the budget request by about $480 million over the President's request.

Mr. President, a similar story can be told for the funding of the Reserve and Guard Forces of our country.

Mr. President, it is traditional that the Pentagon never asks for money for the Guard and Reserve. I repeat: It is traditional. When we have this bill before us, we have an obligation to our Guard and Reserve Forces to fund them. It really is unfair what this administration has done and past administrations have done in funding the Guard and Reserve.

If we are going to continue to be ready to deploy and fight in the Persian Gulf, or Korea, or elsewhere, and reduce the size of our Active Forces, we must maintain robust Reserve and Guard Forces. Unfortunately, the administration followed past practice this year and seriously underfunded these accounts.

I cannot understand why this administration and past administrations ignore the Guard and Reserve. I do not understand. Well, I do. They do it because they know that we are going to take care of it. And I say this, Mr. President, we are going to continue, as long as I am part of this committee, to try to take care of our Guard and Reserve Forces regardless of how the administration ignores them, because it is an important and it is becoming a more important part of the national security of this country.

Consider these figures—in fiscal year 1995 the Congress appropriated $574 million for the Reserves and Guard, while for fiscal year 1996 the administration requested only $182 million.

They did not even ask for a third of what was given last year to the Guard and Reserve.

So the committee had little choice but to dramatically increase the funding for projects in these accounts not requested for fiscal year 1995, and appropriated some $430 million. So on the one hand we ended up some 25 percent below fiscal year 1995, we were still $248 million above the President's request. If we had just met the President's request, we would soon have a Reserve Force not ready to fight. That is clearly the case.

Mr. President, the administration wrote to me and the chairman, providing its views on the bills passed by each Chamber and before we went to conference.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of that letter be printed in the RECORD.

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

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT, OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET,
Washington, DC, September 14, 1995.

Hon. HARRY REID,
Subcommittee on Military Construction Appropriations, Committee on Appropriations, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR REID: The purpose of this letter is to provide the Administration's views on H.R. 1817, the Military Construction Appropriations Bill, FY 1996, as passed by the House and by the Senate. As you develop the conference version of the bill, your consideration of the Administration's views would be appreciated.

The Administration is committed to balancing the Federal budget by FY 2005. The President's budget proposes to reduce discretionary spending for FY 1996 by $5 billion in outlays below the FY 1995 enacted level. The Administration does not support the level of funding assumed by the House or Senate Committee 602(b) allocations. The Administration must evaluate each bill both in terms of funding levels provided and the share of total resources available for remaining priorities. Both the House and Senate versions of this bill exceed the President's request by over $450 million.

The Administration has recognized the need for significant funding increases for military construction programs by proposing an overall increase of 22 percent over the FY 1995 enacted level. However, the Administration believes that further increases, as provided by both the House and the Senate, are unwarranted, particularly when other legislation is drastically cutting programs that are vitally important to a higher standard of living for all Americans. Because the Administration has serious concerns about the overall priorities reflected in the appropriations process, we believe that it is essential to reduce the total funding level provided in this bill.

FUNDING PRIORITIES

The Administration appreciates the support of the House and Senate for funding the request for the base realignment and closure program, the family housing program, and requested construction projects. The Administration particularly appreciates the approval of funding for the family housing improvement program. The funding provided will enable the Department of Defense to improve the quality of life of our military members.

The Administration notes, however, that both the House and the Senate have provided approximately $650 million in funding for unrequested construction projects. Many of these projects are funded at the expense of high-priority requested projects, and a number of these unrequested projects are not included in the Defense Department's long-range plan. The Administration strongly urges the conferees to eliminate unrequested funding for low-priority programs.

OVERSEAS CONSTRUCTION

The House version of the bill provides $65 million, as requested, for high-priority prepositioning projects at classified locations overseas. The Senate has recommended eliminating funding for these projects. Failure to pursue these projects would increase military response time to areas of particular importance to the U.S. and discourage further cooperation by affected countries. Prepositioning on land is a cost-effective way to permit our armed forces to react to threats quickly and with the necessary military capability. The conferees are urged to adopt the House position and to provide the funding requested for these projects.

ENVIRONMENTAL CLEANUP

The Administration objects to the House and Senate language that would limit funding for environmental cleanup at base realignment and closure sites. The Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) accounts were created with a great deal of flexibility to permit DOD to allocate BRAC funds to the programs and locations with the greatest need at the moment. Constraining DOD's ability to apply BRAC funds to environmental cleanup could, if estimated requirements change, delay the transfer of base property to local redevelopment authorities, worsening the economic impact on the affected communities. The Administration urges the conferees to uphold the flexibility of the BRAC accounts and to support the affected communities by removing these artificial ceilings.

CHEMICAL DEMILITARIZATION

The House version of the bill provides $95 million, as requested, for continued construction of two chemical demilitarization facilities at Pine Bluff, Arkansas, and Umatilla, Oregon. The Senate has recommended eliminating funding for these two projects in the belief that unobligated appropriations for construction of a chemical demilitarization facility at Anniston, Alabama, would be available for the projects. Contract award for the Anniston facility, however, is scheduled during FY 1996. To help maintain the construction schedule and prevent cost increases in the chemical demilitarization program, the conferees are urged to adopt the House position and to provide the funding requested for these two facilities.

The Administration believes that the suggested changes discussed above would result in a fiscally responsible bill that funds programs of national significance. We look forward to working with the conferees to address our mutual concerns.

Sincerely,

ALICE M. RIVLIN,
Director.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the conference committee did make the serious effort to accommodate the administration on a number of items. We added some $65 million for an overseas construction item, in the Middle East, which the Senate had zeroed out in order to give the administration some incentive to secure matching funds of some kind from the recipient country.

We did not get those matching funds. But we acceded to the President's request, and the request of the House, and met that $65 million figure in conference. Such funds have not been secured, but we acceded to the administration's request in any event. Second, the administration asked to be relieved of a statutory ceiling on the amounts to be appropriated for environmental cleanup in the BRAC process. Here too we completely acceded to that request in the conference. Third, the administration wanted to reinstate funding for chemical demilitarization facilities which the Senate eliminated. In this case, the conference included planning and design funds for the projects. So I think it is fair to say we made a good faith effort to meet the administration's objections to the Senate bill.

I say to the administration that they are making a mistake even thinking about vetoing this bill. This bill passed the House 326 to 98. It does not take much math to understand that is not very good material for vetoing. I believe this bill will pass the Senate by the same large margins because it is a good bill. It meets the problems of this country.

Therefore, I think the administration should look hard and sympathetically at the committee's efforts to adequately fund the Guard and Reserve, and to adequately fund our housing needs in considering whether there was arguable justification for going above the President's request in its final appropriations recommendation. Nearly all the additional funds the committee added above the President's budget were dedicated to quality-of-life housing and Guard and Reserve projects. Therefore I strongly encourage the President to sign this bill and join with us in attacking the problems which the committee recognized as important to our Nation's national security.

Mr. President, every project in this bill is for the national security of this country. I believe if we look at the Guard and Reserve—and we had a caucus on the Guard and Reserve which was bipartisan and chaired by Senator BOND and cochaired by Senator FORD. They support this legislation.

Mr. President, this is a good bill. It is a bill that meets the demands of our national security interests.

I would like to say it has been a pleasure to work closely with the distinguished chairman on this measure. We have had an open, bipartisan approach to the problems of base closure, family housing, Reserve and Guard forces, and the other matters in this bill. It could have been a difficult conference. I think the work we did in preconferencing made it a relatively easy conference. We have not had any significant disagreements.

I thank the chairman for his support and for the chairman's staff director, Jim Morhard, and his assistant, Warren Johnson, as well as Dick D'Amato assigned to me by the full committee leadership. I also appreciate the work of B.G. Wright, a congressional fellow working on this bill, and also Peter Arapis of my staff.

Mr. President, this legislation could never have been accomplished without the leadership of the chairman, the distinguished Senator from Oregon, Mr. HATFIELD, and the ranking member, the distinguished Senator from West Virginia, Senator BYRD. I extend to them also my appreciation.

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, first of all, I want to thank the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the distinguished Senator from South Carolina, for his comments, because all of these issues were talked about in the Armed Services Committee and have been authorized by that committee.

Mr. President, the ranking member, the Senator from Nevada, is exactly right on target. We worked very hard on this because we took a look at the inventory of housing that we had for our armed services. We found that half of that housing was substandard. It would not even be qualified to be inhabited under today's standards.

We have taken a giant step toward this with this piece of legislation. So I appreciate his cooperation and enjoyed working with Senator REID on this.

I appreciate the work of Dick D'Amato and his staff, and also Jim Morhard and Julie Lapeyre, who worked hard to make this a very good bill and a balanced bill.

GULFPORT AIR NATIONAL GUARD

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, would the distinguished chairman and manager of the bill yield for a clarification?

Mr. BURNS. I would be pleased to yield to the assistant majority leader.

Mr. LOTT. I thank my friend from Montana. I note that the conference report includes funding for a road relocation project at the Gulfport Air National Guard base in Gulfport, MS. The funding level associated with this project in the conference report is half the amount required for the entire project.

The conference report, however, does not note that the funding provided for this important project is only half the total required. Is my understanding correct that the funds provided for this project in the conference report is specifically designated for phase 1 of this effort—and that next year phase 2 of this project will be addressed?

Mr. BURNS. I appreciate my friend from Mississippi raising this issue and I am pleased to clarify the scope of this project. The funds provided in this conference report for the road relocation project in Gulfport, MS, are intended to pay the first half of the cost for the total road relocation effort. This phase 1 effort is intended to begin the job of relocating the road. It is my hope that the second phase of this funding effort will be in the 1997 military construction appropriations request.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, if I could join my colleague, Senator LOTT, in this discussion, I would like to add that the full amount of the project was included in the Senate reported military construction appropriations bill. I know very well the difficult negotiations required to move this appropriation bill through the conference committee. I know that great effort was made to secure this funding for the road relocation project and I appreciate his diligence on this issue.

I would like to ask the chairman of the committee if this phase 1 funding will allow the Department of Defense to initiate actions, contractual or otherwise, to start this project in fiscal year 1996?

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, the conference committee's decision to include funding for phase 1 of this project was intended to initiate actions to execute this project in fiscal year 1996, including contract award and initial construction. I would note that the project is in the Senate defense authorization bill currently in conference, and under the authority which will be provided by the adoption of that conference bill, the Department should proceed in due course to execute all actions required to perform this work. We hope to pay for this work in two phases—not just one.

Mr. LOTT. I appreciate the attention of the chairman to this important project, as well as the invaluable assistance of my colleague from Mississippi, Senator COCHRAN.

Mr. COCHRAN. I join Senator LOTT in expressing appreciation to the chairman for his diligent efforts on this issue and many others in this important bill. I yield the floor.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, the Senate is now considering the conference agreement accompanying H.R. 1817, the fiscal year 1996 military construction appropriations bill.

The bill provides a total of $11.2 billion in budget authority and $3.1 billion in new outlays for the military construction and family housing programs of the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1996.

When outlays from prior year budget authority and other completed actions are taken into account, the bill totals $11.2 billion in budget authority and $9.6 billion in outlays for fiscal year 1996.

Mr. President, the bill provides for readiness and quality of life programs for our service men and women. The bill is at the subcommittee's 602(b) allocation in budget authority and the bill is below the subcommittee's 602(b) allocation in outlays.

I wish to convey my thanks to the committee for the support given to several priority projects in New Mexico, including a learning center at Hollomon Air Force Base.

I commend the distinguished subcommittee chairman, the Senator from Montana, for his efforts on this bill.

I urge the adoption of this bill.

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

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

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION SUBCOMMITTEE

[Spending totals—Conference report (fiscal year 1996, in million of dollars)]

Category	Budget authority	Outlays
Defense discretionary:		
Outlays from prior-year BA and other actions completed	.....	6,486
H.R. 1817, conference report	11,177	3,110
Scorekeeping adjustment	.....	.....
Adjusted bill total	11,177	9,597
Senate Subcommittee 602(b) allocation:		
Defense discretionary	11,178	9,693
Adjusted bill total compared to Senate Subcommittee 602(b) allocation:		
Defense discretionary	−1	−96

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

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in

the RECORD a communication to the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Construction, the Committee on Appropriations, the Honorable CONRAD BURNS, signed by the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, explaining the need for housing at Sugar Grove, WV.

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

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
Washington, DC, September 21, 1995.

HON. CONRAD BURNS,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Military Construction, Committee on Appropriations, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing in response to your inquiry regarding the requirement for family housing at NSGA Sugar Grove, WV.

As you are aware, adequate housing is the top quality of life issue the Navy faces today. We currently have a deficit of 44 housing units at NSGA Sugar Grove. The remote location of this base makes it extremely difficult for the private sector to accommodate the housing needs of Navy personnel. The project added to this year's military construction appropriations bill will meet approximately half of our need.

With a total family housing deficit of 14,700 we were unable to program this project within the resources available. While this does not diminish the need for these units, they were not included in the President's budget.

I trust this answers your question. As always, if I may be of further assistance, please let me know.

Sincerely,

ROBERT B. PIRIE, Jr.

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I know of no other debate on this piece of legislation. I urge passage of the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 86, nays 14, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 459 Leg.]

YEAS—86

Abraham	Dorgan	Lautenberg
Akaka	Exon	Leahy
Ashcroft	Feinstein	Levin
Bennett	Ford	Lieberman
Biden	Frist	Lott
Bond	Glenn	Lugar
Boxer	Gorton	Mack
Breaux	Graham	McConnell
Bryan	Gramm	Mikulski
Bumpers	Grams	Moynihan
Burns	Grassley	Murkowski
Byrd	Gregg	Murray
Campbell	Harkin	Nickles
Chafee	Hatch	Nunn
Coats	Hatfield	Packwood
Cochran	Heflin	Pell
Cohen	Helms	Pressler
Conrad	Hollings	Pryor
Coverdell	Hutchison	Reid
Craig	Inhofe	Robb
D'Amato	Inouye	Rockefeller
Daschle	Jeffords	Santorum
DeWine	Johnston	Sarbanes
Dodd	Kassebaum	Shelby
Dole	Kempthorne	Simon
Domenici	Kennedy	Simpson
Smith	Stevens	Thurmond
Snowe	Thomas	Warner
Specter	Thompson	

NAYS—14

Baucus	Feingold	McCain
Bingaman	Kerrey	Moseley-Braun
Bradley	Kerry	Roth
Brown	Kohl	Wellstone
Faircloth	Kyl	

So the conference report was agreed to.

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the conference report 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. BURNS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MACK. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on H.R. 1854 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The committee on conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 1854) having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses this report, signed by all 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 July 28, 1995.)

Mr. MACK. Mr. President, I am pleased to bring the legislative conference report to the floor of the Senate this morning. I want to begin by expressing my appreciation to Senator MURRAY. While we did not agree on every issue as we worked our way through this, we did agree to work together to bring a bill to the floor that the Senate could support and, in fact, could be proud of.

We began this process early in the year with a resolution being passed in conference indicating we wanted to make substantial reductions in funding of the legislative branch.

We have, under this bill, reduced spending for legislative operations by almost 9 percent. That is a reduction in real terms from last year's level. Again, not some projected increase and a reduction from that but from actual levels from last year.

We, in fact, did take on some controversial issues, and they were debated in full on the floor of the Senate with respect to the Office of Technology Assessment. In conference, there was further debate on that issue and the House, in fact, receded to the Senate's position and agreement was reached that the Office of Technology Assessment should be eliminated.

In addition to that, the bill called for—well, I should back up. The resolution passed earlier in the year by the Republican conference called for a 25-percent reduction in the General Accounting Office. We have, in essence, reached that objective, but we are going to do it in a 2-year period.

Under this bill, or with this conference report, we will reach the objective of a 15-percent reduction in the General Accounting Office in 1996, with the remainder of those reductions to take place in the next fiscal year.

Again, we worked with Chuck Bowsher on this issue, and our feeling was that rather than for us to micromanage how these reductions would be made over this 2-year period, we concluded it would be best to work with the GAO and, in essence, ask them to devise a plan about how they would reach those objectives.

They came back to us with a proposal. We felt, again, listening to what they had proposed and asking us to give them some flexibility, which we have done in this conference report, there was general agreement that we should go forward with the effort to reach that goal. In fact, we have done that now, and I think that both the House and the Senate can be proud of the approach that we took with respect to the General Accounting Office.

In addition to that, we suggested that the Sergeant at Arms and other support agencies of the Congress should make reductions. There is a 15-percent reduction in committee staffs. We asked the Sergeant at Arms, the Secretary of the Senate, and others, to meet a goal of a 12.5-percent cut. Some of those agencies—in fact, the Sergeant at Arms came up with cuts of greater than 12.5 percent.

So all in all, Mr. President, I will say that we have reached our objective. We have done it in a manner the Senate can be proud. Therefore, I encourage my colleagues to support this conference report.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a table relating to the conference agreement be printed in the RECORD.

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

CONFERENCE AGREEMENT

		FY 1995 enacted	FY 1996 estimates	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with			
							Enacted	Estimates	House	Senate
300	Title I—Congressional operations									
400	Senate									
800	Mileage and Expense Allowance									
1300	Mileage of the Vice President and Senators	60,000	60,000				−60,000	−60,000		
1400	Expense allowances:									
1800	Vice President	10,000	10,000		10,000	10,000			+10,000	
1900	President Pro Tempore of the Senate	10,000	10,000		10,000	10,000			+10,000	
2000	Majority Leader of the Senate	10,000	10,000		10,000	10,000			+10,000	
2100	Minority Leader of the Senate	10,000	10,000		10,000	10,000			+10,000	
2200	Majority Whip of the Senate	5,000	5,000		5,000	5,000			+5,000	
2300	Minority Whip of the Senate	5,000	5,000		5,000	5,000			+5,000	
2400	Chairman of the Majority Conference Committee	3,000	3,000		3,000	3,000			+3,000	
2500	Chairman of the Minority Conference Committee	3,000	3,000		3,000	3,000			+3,000	
2600	Subtotal, expense allowances	56,000	56,000		56,000	56,000			+56,000	
2700–2800	Representation allowances for the Majority and Minority Leaders	30,000	30,000		30,000	30,000			+30,000	
3100	Total, Mileage and expenses allowances	146,000	146,000		86,000	86,000	−60,000	−60,000	+86,000	
3200	Salaries, Officers and Employees									
3300	Office of the Vice President	1,513,000	1,549,000		1,513,000	1,513,000		−36,000	+1,513,000	
3400	Office of the President Pro Tempore	457,000	469,000		325,000	325,000	−132,000	−144,000	+325,000	
3500	Offices of the Majority and Minority Leaders	2,195,000	2,246,000		2,195,000	2,195,000		−51,000	+2,195,000	
3600	Offices of the Majority and Minority Whips	656,000	672,000		656,000	656,000		−16,000	+656,000	
3700	Conference committees	1,992,000	2,040,000		1,992,000	1,992,000		−48,000	+1,992,000	
3800–3900	Offices of the Secretaries of the Conference of the Majority and the Conference of the Minority	384,000	394,000		360,000	360,000	−24,000	−34,000	+360,000	
3920	Policy Committees				1,930,000	1,930,000	+1,930,000	+1,930,000	+1,930,000	
4000	Office of the Chaplain	192,000	201,000		192,000	192,000		−9,000	+192,000	
4100	Office of the Secretary	12,961,000	13,260,000		12,128,000	12,128,000	−833,000	−1,132,000	+12,128,000	
4400	Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper	32,739,000	35,399,000		31,879,000	31,889,000	−850,000	−3,510,000	+31,889,000	+10,000
4500–4600	Offices of the Secretaries for the Majority and Minority	1,197,000	1,225,000		1,047,000	1,047,000	−150,000	−178,000	+1,047,000	
4700	Agency contributions and related expenses	17,052,000	18,386,000		15,500,000	15,500,000	−1,552,000	−2,886,000	+15,500,000	
5100	Total, salaries, officers and employees	71,338,000	75,841,000		69,717,000	69,727,000	−1,611,000	−6,114,000	+69,727,000	+10,000
5200	Office of the Legislative Counsel of the Senate									
5300	Salaries and expenses	3,381,000	3,543,500		3,381,000	3,381,000		−162,500	+3,381,000	
5400	Office of Senate Legal Counsel									
5500	Salaries and expenses	936,000	985,000		936,000	936,000		−49,000	+936,000	
5600–5900	Expense Allowances of the Secretary of the Senate, Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate, and Secretaries for the Majority and Minority of the Senate: Expenses allowances	12,000	12,000		12,000	12,000			+12,000	
6000	Continent Expenses of the Senate									
6100	Senator policy committees	2,574,000	2,672,000				−2,574,000	−2,672,000		
6200	Inquiries and investigations	78,112,000	78,863,000		66,395,000	66,395,000	−11,717,000	−12,468,000	+66,395,000	
6300–6400	Expenses of United States Senate Caucus on International Narcotics Control	348,000	379,000		305,000	305,000	−43,000	−74,000	+305,000	
6500	Secretary of the Senate	1,966,500	1,966,500		1,266,000	1,266,000	−700,500	−700,500	+1,266,500	
6510	(By transfer)	(7,000,000)					(−7,000,000)			
6600	Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate	74,894,000	72,234,000		61,347,000	61,347,000	−13,547,000	−10,887,000	+61,347,000	
6800	Miscellanous items	7,429,000	7,429,000		6,644,000	6,644,000	−785,000	−785,000	+6,644,000	
6850–6860	Senators Official Personnel and Office Expense Account	206,542,000	222,663,000		204,029,000	204,029,000	−2,513,000	−18,634,000	+204,029,000	
6870	Office of Senate Fair Employment Practices	889,000	889,000		778,000	778,000	−111,000	−112,000	+778,000	
6875	Settlements and Awards Reserve	1,000,000	1,000,000		1,000,000	1,000,000			+1,000,000	
6900	Stationary (revolving fund)	13,000	13,000		13,000	13,000			+13,000	
6950	Official Mail Costs									
6975	Expenses	11,000,000	36,300,000		11,000,000	11,000,000		−25,300,000	+11,000,000	
7000	Total, contingent expenses of the Senate	384,767,500	424,409,500		352,777,000	352,777,000	−31,632,500	−71,900,500	+352,777,000	
7005	Total, Senate	460,580,500	504,937,000		426,909,000	426,919,000	−33,661,500	−78,018,000	+426,919,000	+10,000
7300	House of Representatives									
7400–7500	Payments to Widows and Heirs of Deceased Members of Congress									
7600	Gratuities, deceased Members	267,200				−267,200				
7650	Salaries and Expenses									
7700	House Leadership Offices									
7750	Office of the Speaker	1,444,000	1,600,000	1,478,000	1,478,000	1,478,000	+34,000	−122,000		
7800	Office of the Majority Floor Leader	1,220,764	1,114,000	1,470,000	1,470,000	1,470,000	+249,236	+356,000		
7850	Office of the Minority Floor Leader	1,445,413	1,525,000	1,480,000	1,480,000	1,480,000	+34,587	−45,000		
7900	Office of the Majority Whip	1,121,649	1,357,000	928,000	928,000	928,000	−193,649	−429,000		
7950	Office of the Minority Whip	897,000	946,000	918,000	918,000	918,000	918,000	+21,000	−28,000	
8100	Speaker's Office for Legislative Floor Activity	277,000	376,000	376,000	376,000	376,000	+99,000			
8200	House Republican Conference	1,506,587	1,628,000	1,083,000	1,004,000	1,004,000	−502,587	−624,000	−79,000	
8250	House Republican Steering Committee	200,000	205,000	664,000	743,000	743,000	+543,000	+538,000	+79,000	
8300	Nine minority employees	1,024,000	1,144,000	1,127,000	1,127,000	1,127,000	+103,000	−17,000		
8350	House Democratic Steering and Policy Committee	1,153,587	1,226,000	1,181,000	1,181,000	1,181,000	+27,413	−45,000		
8400	House Democratic Caucus	553,000	607,000	566,000	566,000	566,000	+13,000	−41,000		
8450	Subtotal, House Leadership Offices	10,843,000	11,728,000	11,271,000	11,271,000	11,271,000	+428,000	−457,000		
8460–8470	Enacted and request reflect current organization of House funding.									
8475	Members' Representational Allowances									
8500	Expenses	351,217,000	389,100,000	360,503,000	360,503,000	360,503,000	+9,286,000	−28,597,000		
8750	Committee Employees									
8800–8850	Standing Committees, Special and Select (except Appropriations)	112,805,000	125,749,000	78,629,000	78,629,000	78,629,000	−34,176,000	−47,120,000		
8940–8950	Committee on Appropriations (including studies and investigations)	22,531,000	23,044,000	16,945,000	16,945,000	16,945,000	−5,586,000	−6,099,000		
9050	Subtotal, Committee employees	135,336,000	148,793,000	95,574,000	95,574,000	95,574,000	−39,762,000	−53,219,000		
9150	Salaries, Officers and Employees									
9200	Office of the Clerk	15,270,000	16,811,000	13,807,000	13,807,000	13,807,000	−1,463,000	−3,004,000		
9250	Office of the Sergeant at Arms	2,736,000	3,049,000	3,410,000	3,410,000	3,410,000	+674,000	+361,000		
9300	Office of the Chief Administrative Office	69,725,000	65,132,000	53,556,000	53,556,000	53,556,000	−16,169,000	−11,576,000		
9800	Office of Inspector General	295,000	7,125,000	3,954,000	3,954,000	3,954,000	+3,659,000	−3,171,000		
9900	Office of Compliance		2,130,000	858,000	858,000	858,000	+858,000	−1,272,000		
9910	Transfer to Joint Items, Office of Compliance					(−500,000)	(−500,000)	(−500,000)	(−500,000)	(−500,000)

CONFERENCE AGREEMENT—Continued

		FY 1995 enacted	FY 1996 estimates	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with			
							Enacted	Estimates	House	Senate
9950	Office of the Chaplain	124,000	128,000	126,000	126,000	126,000	+2,000	−2,000		
10000	Office of the Parliamentarian	983,000	1,240,000	1,180,000	1,180,000	1,180,000	+197,000	−60,000		
10050	Office of the Parliamentarian	(669,000)	(835,000)	(775,000)	(775,000)	(775,000)	(+106,000)	−60,000)		
10100–10150	Compilation of precedents of the House of Representatives	(314,000)	(405,000)	(405,000)	(405,000)	(405,000)	(+91,000)			
10250	Office of the Law Revision Counsel of the House	1,630,000	1,870,000	1,700,000	1,700,000	1,700,000	+70,000	−170,000		
10300	Office of the Legislative Counsel of the House	4,400,000	4,592,000	4,524,000	4,524,000	4,524,000	+124,000	−68,000		
10450	Other authorized employees	504,000	675,000	618,000	618,000	618,000	+114,000	−57,000		
10500	Former Speakers' staff	(290,000)	(447,000)	(447,000)	(447,000)	(447,000)	(+157,000)			
10550–10600	Technical assistant, Officer of the Attending Physician	(161,00)	(171,000)	(171,000)	(171,000)	(171,000)	(+10,000)			
10700	Drivers	(53,000)	(57,000)				(−53,00)	(−57,000)		
10750	Subtotal, Salaries, Officers and Employees	95,667,000	102,752,000	83,733,000	83,733,000	83,733,000	−11,934,000	−19,019,000		
10800	Allowances and Expenses									
10850–10900	Supplies, materials, administrative costs and Federal tort claims	3,453,000	2,695,000	1,213,000	1,213,000	1,213,000	−2,240,000	−1,482,000		
10925–10930	Official mail (committees, leadership, administrative and legislative offices)			1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	+1,000,000	+1,000,000		
11150	Reemployed annuitants reimbursements	1,279,000	2,451,000	68,000	68,000	68,000	−1,211,000	−2,383,000		
11175	Government contributions	129,895,000	138,698,000	117,541,000	117,541,000	117,541,000	−12,354,000	−21,157,000		
11200	Miscellaneous items	778,000	778,000	658,000	658,000	658,000	−120,000	−120,000		
11250	Subtotal, Allowance and expenses	135,405,000	144,622,000	120,480,000	120,480,000	120,480,000	−14,925,000	−24,142,000		
11400	Total, salaries and expenses	728,468,000	796,995,000	671,561,000	671,561,000	671,561,000	−56,907,000	−125,434,000		
11450	Total, House of Representatives	728,735,200	796,995,000	671,561,000	671,561,000	671,561,000	−57,174,200	−125,434,000		
13900	JOINT ITEMS									
14100	Joint Economic Committee	4,090,000	4,265,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	−1,090,000	−1,265,000		
14100	Joint Committee on Printing	1,370,000	1,414,000		1,164,000	750,000	−620,000	−664,000	+750,000	−414,000
14300	Transfer to House Oversight Committee			375,000					−375,000	
14390–14400	Transfer to Senate Committee on Rules and Administration			375,000					−375,000	
14500	Join Committee on Taxation	6,019,000	6,460,000	6,019,000	5,116,000	5,116,000	−903,000	−1,344,000	−903,000	
14600	Office of the Attending Physician									
14700	Medical supplies, equipment, expenses, and allowances	1,335,000	1,260,000	1,260,000	1,260,000	1,260,000	−75,000			
14720	Capitol Police Board									
14800	Capitol Police									
14855	Salaries:									
14880	Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives	33,463,000	34,643,000	34,213,000	33,906,000	34,213,000	+750,000	−430,000		+307,000
14890	Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate	35,919,000	37,381,000	35,919,000	35,919,000	35,919,000		−1,462,000		
14895	Subtotal, salaries	69,382,000	72,024,000	70,132,000	69,825,000	70,132,000	+750,000	−1,892,000		+307,000
14900	General expenses	2,000,000	2,190,000	2,560,000	2,190,000	2,560,000	+560,000	+370,000		+370,000
14950	Subtotal, Capitol Police	71,382,000	74,214,000	72,692,000	72,015,000	72,692,000	+1,310,000	−1,522,000		+677,000
15300	Capitol Guide and Special Services Office			1,991,000					−1,991,000	
15310	Capitol Guide Service	1,628,000	1,730,000		1,628,000	1,628,000		−102,000	+1,628,000	
15320	Special Services Office	363,000	363,000		363,000	363,000			+363,000	
15330	Subtotal	1,991,000	2,093,000	1,991,000	1,991,000	1,991,000		−102,000		
15400	Statements of Appropriations			30,000	30,000	30,000	+30,000	+30,000		
15410	Office of Compliance				2,500,000	2,000,000	+2,000,000	+2,000,000	+2,000,000	−500,000
15420	Transfer from House of Rep. Office of Compliance					(500,000)	(+500,000)	(+500,000)	(+500,000)	(+500,000)
15600	Total, Joint items	86,187,000	89,706,000	85,742,000	87,076,000	86,839,000	+652,000	−2,867,000	+1,097,000	−237,000
15700	OFFICE OF TECHNOLOGY ASSESSMENT									
15800	Salaries and expenses	21,970,000	23,195,000		3,615,000	3,615,000	−18,355,000	−19,580,000	+3,615,000	
16100	CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE									
16200	Salaries and expenses	23,188,000	25,788,000	24,288,000	25,788,000	24,288,000	+1,100,000	−1,500,000		−1,500,000
16300	ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL									
16400	Office of the Architect of the Capitol									
16500	Salaries	9,103,000	9,823,000	8,569,000	8,876,000	8,569,000	−534,000	−1,254,000		−307,000
16550	Travel (limitation on official travel expenses)	(20,000)	(20,000)	(20,000)	(20,000)	(20,000)				
16600	Contingent expenses	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000				
16700	Subtotal, Office of the Architect of the Capitol	9,203,000	9,923,000	8,669,000	8,967,000	8,669,000	−534,000	−1,254,000		−307,000
16800	Capitol Buildings and Grounds									
16900	Capitol buildings	22,797,000	28,085,000	22,832,000	23,132,000	22,882,000	+85,000	−5,203,000	+50,000	−250,000
16960	Sec. 310 (purchasing x-ray & metal detectors)	(2,015,000)					(−2,015,000)			
17000	Capitol grounds	5,270,000	6,084,000	5,143,000	5,143,000	5,143,000	−127,000	−941,000		
17100	Senate office buildings	47,619,000	52,537,000		41,757,000	41,757,000	−5,862,000	−10,780,000	+41,757,000	
17200	House office buildings	41,364,000	46,054,000	33,001,000	33,001,000	33,001,000	−8,363,000	−13,053,000		
17300	Capitol Power Plant	36,637,000	41,062,000	36,578,000	35,518,000	35,518,000	−1,119,000	−5,544,000	−1,060,000	
17400	Offsetting collections	−3,200,000	−3,200,000	−4,000,000	−4,000,000	−4,000,000	−800,000	−800,000		
17600	Net subtotal, Capitol Power Plant	33,437,000	37,862,000	32,578,000	31,518,000	31,518,000	−1,919,000	−6,344,000	−1,060,000	
17700	Subtotal, Capitol buildings and grounds	150,487,000	170,622,000	93,554,000	134,551,000	134,301,000	−16,186,000	−36,321,000	+40,747,000	−250,000
17900	Total, Architect of the Capitol	159,690,000	180,545,000	102,223,000	143,527,000	142,970,000	−16,720,000	−37,575,000	+40,747,000	−557,000
18000	LIBRARY OF CONGRESS									
18100	Congressional Research Service									
18200	Salaries and expenses	60,084,000	65,913,000	75,083,000	60,084,000	60,084,000		−5,829,000	−14,999,000	
18300	GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE									
18400	Congressional printing and binding	89,724,000	91,624,000	88,281,000	85,500,000	83,770,000	−5,954,000	−7,854,000	−4,511,000	−1,730,000
18510	Total, title I, Congressional Operations	1,630,158,700	1,778,703,000	1,047,178,000	1,504,060,000	1,500,046,000	−130,112,700	−278,657,000	+452,868,000	−4,014,000
18600	TITLE II—OTHER AGENCIES									
18700	BOTANIC GARDEN									
18800	Salaries and expenses	3,230,000	10,370,000	3,053,000	3,053,000	3,053,000	−177,000	−7,317,000		
18810	Conservation renovation			7,000,000					−7,000,000	
18815	(By transfer)	(4,000,000)					(−4,000,000)			
18850	Subtotal	3,230,000	10,370,000	10,053,000	3,053,000	3,053,000	−177,000	−7,317,000	−7,000,000	

CONFERENCE AGREEMENT—Continued

		FY 1995 enacted	FY 1996 estimates	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with			
							Enacted	Estimates	House	Senate
18900	LIBRARY OF CONGRESS									
19000	Salaries and expenses	210,164,000	231,580,000	193,911,000	213,164,000	211,664,000	+1,500,000	−19,916,000	+17,753,000	−1,500,000
19100	Authority to spend receipts	−7,869,000	−7,869,000	−7,869,000	−7,869,000	−7,869,000				
19300	Net subtotal, Salaries and expenses	202,295,000	223,711,000	186,042,000	205,295,000	203,795,000	+1,500,000	−19,916,000	+17,753,000	−1,500,000
19400	Copyright Office, salaries and expenses	27,456,000	32,983,000	30,818,000	30,818,000	30,818,000	+3,362,000	−2,165,000		
19500	Authority to spend receipts	−17,411,000	−19,877,000	−19,830,000	−19,830,000	−19,830,000	−2,419,000	+47,000		
19700	Net subtotal, Copyright Office	10,045,000	13,106,000	10,988,000	10,988,000	10,988,000	+943,000	−2,118,000		
19800–19900	Books for the blind and physically handicapped, salaries and expenses	44,951,000	47,583,000	44,951,000	44,951,000	44,951,000		−2,632,000		
20700	Furniture and furnishings	5,825,000	5,825,000	4,882,000	4,882,000	4,882,000	−943,000	−943,000		
20900	Total, Library of Congress (except CRS)	263,116,000	290,225,000	246,863,000	266,116,000	264,616,000	+1,500,000	−25,609,000	+17,753,000	−1,500,000
21000	ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL									
21100	Library Buildings and Grounds									
21200	Structural and mechanical care	12,483,000	19,929,000	12,428,000	12,428,000	12,428,000	−55,000	−7,501,000		
21800	GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE									
22000	Office of Superintendment of Documents									
22100	Salaries and expenses	32,207,000	30,307.000	16,312,000	30,307,000	30,307,000	−1,900,000		+13,995,000	
22200	Revolving fund		15,420,000					−15,420,000		
22300	Subtotal, Office of Superintendent of Documents	32,207,000	45,727,000	16,312,000	30,307,000	30,307,000	−1,900,000	−15,420,000	+13,995,000	
22500	GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE									
22600	Salaries and expenses	450,360,000	481,060,000	401,264,000	382,806,000	382,806,000	−67,554,000	−98,254,000	−18,458,000	
22675	Offsetting collections	−7,000,000	−8,400,000	−8,400,000	−8,400,000	−8,400,000	−1,400,000			
22680	Subtotal	443,360,000	472,660,000	392,864,000	374,406,000	374,406,000	−68,954,000	−98,254,000	−18,458,000	
22690	GAO use of collections (formerly receipts)	6,000,000					−6,000,000			
22700	Total, General Accounting Office	449,360,000	472,660,000	392,864,000	374,406,000	374,406,000	−74,954,000	−98,254,000	−18,458,000	
22900	Total, title II, Other agencies	760,396,000	838,911,000	678,520,000	686,310,000	684,810,000	−75,586,000	−154,101,000	+6,290,000	−1,500,000
23100	Grand total	2,390,554,700	2,617,614,000	1,725,698,000	2,190,370,000	2,184,856,000	−205,698,700	−432,758,000	+459,158,000	−5,514,000
23500	TITLE I—CONGRESSIONAL OPERATIONS									
23600	Senate	460,580,500	504,937,000		426,909,000	426,919,000	−33,661,500	−78,018,000	+426,919,000	+10,000
23700	House of Representatives	728,735,200	796,995,000	671,561,000	671,561,000	671,561,000	−57,174,200	−125,434,000		
23800	Joint Items	86,187,000	89,706,000	85,742,000	87,076,000	86,839,000	+652,000	−2,867,000	+1,097,000	−237,000
23900	Office of Technology Assessment	21,970,000	23,195,000		3,615,000	3,615,000	−18,355,000	−19,580,000	+3,615,000	
24100	Congressional Budget Office	23,188,000	25,788,000	24,288,000	25,788,000	24,288,000	+1,100,000	−1,500,000		−1,500,000
24300	Architect of the Capitol	159,690,000	180,545,000	102,233,000	143,527,000	142,970,000	−16,720,000	−37,575,000	+40,747,000	−557,000
24400	Library of Congress: Congressional Research Service	60,084,000	65,913,000	75,083,000	60,084,000	60,084,000		−5,829,000	−14,999,000	
24500–24600	Congressional printing and binding, Government Printing Office	89,724,000	91,624,000	88,281,000	85,500,000	83,770,000	−5,954,000	−7,854,000	−4,511,000	−1,730,000
24700	Total, title I, Congressional operations	1,630,158,700	1,778,703,000	1,047,178,000	1,504,060,000	1,500,046,000	−130,112,700	−278,657,000	+452,868,000	−4,014,000
24800	TITLE II—OTHER AGENCIES									
24900	Botanic Garden	3,230,000	10,370,000	10,053,000	3,053,000	3,053,000	−177,000	−7,317,000	−7,000,000	
25100	Library of Congress (except CRS)	263,116,000	290,225,000	246,863,000	266,116,000	264,616,000	+1,500,000	−25,609,000	+17,753,000	−1,500,000
25200–25300	Architect of the Capitol (Library buildings and grounds)	12,483,000	19,929,000	12,428,000	12,428,000	12,428,000	−55,000	−7,501,000		
25500–25600	Government Printing Office (except congressional printing and binding)	32,207,000	45,727,000	16,312,000	30,307,000	30,307,000	−1,900,000	−15,420,000	+13,995,000	
25700	General Accounting Office	449,360,000	472,660,000	392,864,000	374,406,000	374,406,000	−74,954,000	−98,254,000	−18,458,000	
25900	Total, title II, Other agencies	760,396,000	838,911,000	678,520,000	686,310,000	684,810,000	−75,586,000	−154,101,000	+6,290,000	−1,500,000
26000	Grand total	2,390,554,700	2,617,614,000	1,725,698,000	2,190,370,000	2,184,856,000	−205,698,700	−432,758,000	+459,158,000	−5,514,000
26100	CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET RECAP									
26125	Scorekeeping adjustments:									
26150	Compensation of Members:									
26200	Senate	17,050,000	16,800,000		16,800,000	16,800,000	−250,000		+16,800,000	
26250	House (excluding Senate items)	74,900,000	75,500,000	75,500,000	75,500,000	75,500,000	+600,000			
26252	Rescission	−23,000,000			−63,544,723	−63,544,723	−40,544,723	−63,544,723	−63,544,723	
26255	Office of Technology Assessment (reappropriation).				2,500,000	2,500,000	+2,500,000	+2,500,000	+2,500,000	
26258	Settlements and awards (reappropriation)				1,000,000	1,000,000	+1,000,000	+1,000,000	+1,000,000	
26290	Effect on FY95 of rescission bill	+16,502,000					+16,502,000			
26410	Library of Congress (sec. 209)				1,000,000					−1,000,000
26420	Government Accounting Office (sec. 213)				1,000,000					−1,000,000
26430	Awards and settlements fund					500,000	+500,000	+500,000	+500,000	+500,000
26450	Total	52,448,000	92,300,000	75,500,000	34,255,277	32,755,277	−19,692,723	−59,544,723	−42,744,723	−1,500,000
26500	Total (including adjustments)	2,443,002,700	2,709,914,000	1,801,198,000	2,224,625,277	2,217,611,277	−225,391,423	−492,302,723	+416,413,277	−7,014,000
26600	Amounts in this bill	(2,390,554,700)	(2,617,614,000)	(1,725,698,000)	(2,190,370,000)	(2,184,856,000)	(−205,698,700)	(−432,758,000)	(+459,158,000)	(−5,514,000)
26700	Scorekeeping adjustments	(52,448,000)	(92,300,000)	(75,500,000)	(34,255,277)	(32,755,277)	(−19,692,723)	(−59,544,723)	(−42,744,723)	(−1,500,000)
27800	Total mandatory and discretionary	2,443,002,700	2,709,914,000	1,801,198,000	2,224,625,277	2,217,611,277	−225,391,423	−492,302,723	+416,413,277	−7,014,000
27810	Mandatory	92,217,200	92,300,000	75,500,000	92,300,000	92,300,000	+82,800		+16,800,000	
27950	Discretionary	2,350,785,500	2,617,614,000	1,725,698,000	2,132,325,277	2,125,311,277	−225,474,223	−492,302,723	+399,613,277	−7,014,000

Mrs. MURRAY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I rise today to support the conference agreement on H.R. 1854, the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act for fiscal year 1996. Compromises between the House and Senate version of this bill were necessary in order to reach this agreement, and I am pleased that we were able to work out our differences cooperatively.

The appropriations made in the conference report total $2,184,856,000. This is a $205,698,700 below the 1995 level, and roughly $5 million below the Senate-passed bill.

I want to at this time express my appreciation and respect for Senator MACK, the subcommittee chairman. He handled this bill in a very open, nonpartisan manner. He took his responsibility seriously and he did a very excellent job, and he was really good to work with. I thank him publicly for the hard work he has done on this bill.

We did not agree on every issue. I am particularly concerned about the elimination of the Office of Technology Assessment. However, Senator MACK made sure all views on this subject were fully aired in conference before we settled this issue.

In the end, we were able to get some protection for OTA workers to ensure that they are not thrown out on the street the moment this bill passes. I

want to thank our chairman for his help with that matter, as well.

I also want to take a moment to express a few personal thoughts about this bill. This bill cuts over $200 million out of the congressional budget. That is about a 10-percent cut. In this time of fiscal deficits, and the need to reduce spending, I believe we did it the way it should be done—line by line, program by program, bill by bill. We thought this through and made tough, but sensible, decisions. Most importantly, we are showing we can lead by example in the battle to reduce Federal spending by cutting Congress first.

I strongly urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the conference report. It makes sense, and it sets the right tone in the broader effort to reduce spending.

(Mr. CAMPBELL assumed the Chair.)

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I rise in support of H.R. 1854, the legislative branch appropriations bill for fiscal year 1996.

The bill, as reported provides $2.1 billion in new budget authority and $2 billion in outlays for the congress and other legislative branch agencies, including the Library of Congress, the General Accounting Office, and the Government Printing Office, among others.

When outlays from prior year appropriations and other adjustments are taken into account, the bill totals $2.2 billion in budget authority and $2.3 billion in outlays. The bill is under the subcommittee's 602(b) allocation by $35 million in budget authority and $2 million in outlays.

I want to commend the distinguished chairman and ranking member of the Legislative Branch Subcommittee for producing a bill that is substantially within their 602(b) allocation.

I am pleased that this bill incorporates most of the changes endorsed by the Republican Conference last December and achieves the goal of reducing legislative branch spending by $200 million from the 1995 level. It is important that the Congress set an example for the rest of the country by cutting its own spending first.

Another important feature of this bill is that it provides an increase of $1.1 million over the 1995 level for the Congressional Budget Office to enable that agency to meet the new requirements that were created in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act passed earlier this year.

I urge the Senate to adopt this conference report.

I ask unanimous consent that a Budget Committee table showing the final scoring of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH SUBCOMMITTEE

[Spending totals—conference report (fiscal year 1996, in millions of dollars)]

	Budget authority	Outlays
Nondefense discretionary:		
Outlays from prior-year BA and other actions completed	.....	202
H.R. 1854, conference report	2,125	1,977
Scorekeeping adjustment	.....	.....
Subtotal nondefense discretionary	2,125	2,180
Mandatory:		
Outlays from prior-year BA and other actions completed	92	92
H.R. 1854, conference report	.....	.....
Adjustment to conform mandatory programs with Budget Resolution assumptions	−2	−2
Subtotal mandatory	90	90
Adjusted bill total	2,215	2,270
Senate Subcommittee 602(b) allocation:		
Defense discretionary	.....	.....
Nondefense discretionary	2,167	2,188
Violent crime reduction trust fund	.....	.....
Mandatory	90	90
Total allocation	2,257	2,278
Adjusted bill total compared to Senate Subcommittee 602(b) allocation:		
Defense discretionary	.....	.....
Nondefense discretionary	−42	−8
Violent crime reduction trust fund	.....	.....
Mandatory	.....	.....
Total allocation	−42	−8

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

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

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time. And on behalf of Senator SIMON, I yield back his time as well.

Mr. MACK. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on adoption of the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MACK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote occur immediately following the first vote in connection with the D.C. appropriations bill.

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

Mr. MACK. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll. The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1996

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now proceed to the consideration of S. 1244.

The bill will be stated by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1244) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I am pleased to present the fiscal year 1996 District of Columbia appropriations bill to the Senate. The bill presented is within the subcommittee's allocation and contains a Federal payment of $660 million, which is the authorized amount and the same amount as last year.

I should make clear that the Federal payment is not a gift from the Federal Government to the local government, it is a payment in lieu of taxes. More than half of the District's property is untaxable to the local government. Of course all Federal property and buildings are exempt, but so are many other valuable properties in the city. In addition to foreign embassies and offices, also unavailable for tax purposes are facilities owned by entities with congressional charters. Properties such as the National Geographic Society, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the International Monetary Fund, the Inter-American Development Bank, and all of the hospitals and universities in the city are also exempt. The properties I just listed account for more than $1 billion in value that is not taxable to the District.

In addition, the Congress restricts the city's taxing power in other ways. The District is prohibited by law from taxing income earned in the city by those who live in the suburbs. This is no small amount. The Census Bureau estimates that of the $33 billion earned annually by individuals in the District, $19 billion is earned by nonresidents—over half—and therefore completely escapes District taxes.

This past year many of the District's financial problems came to a head. Fiscal year 1994 ended with a record deficit of $335 million. In an unusually cooperative endeavor Members of the House and Senate worked together, along with the Office of Management and Budget, to craft legislation which established a five-member unpaid financial control board for the District. The board, formally known as the Financial Responsibility and Management Assistance Authority, has been working since June 1, and has made a significant contribution to the bill we are recommending to the Senate today.

The bill before us represents the recommendations of the authority of the District's fiscal year 1996 budget. The authority is a powerful new player in the District's budget process. This authority must approve annual budgets and multiyear financial plans developed by the Mayor.

This authority is designed to provide the kind of day-to-day and month-to-month oversight as well as fiscal expertise that the Congress is neither designed nor inclined to exercise. The authority has the power to require the city to change its budget estimates of both revenues and expenditures. If the estimates are unrealistic and the city does not make the necessary changes,

the authority can implement those changes on its own.

Each year between now and fiscal year 1998, the District is permitted to submit and operate with an unbalanced budget, as long as it makes progress toward a balanced budget. This will give time to Congress and the local political leaders to address some of the issues concerning our relationship to the local government.

On July 15, the authority made recommendations to the city council for changes in the budget that the District had adopted in May. On August 1, the council responded by adopting an amendment in their budget. Finally, on August 15, the authority submitted to Congress the District's response to their recommendations. The committee's bill is based upon these recommendations.

The District has a long way to go to be a well-run, efficient, and financially stable city. With the control board in place, we have made important first steps.

On September 14, the chairman of the authority, Dr. Andrew Brimmer, testified before our subcommittee that the authority is developing a positive, working relationship with city officials based on cooperation. At a recent budget summit, where authority representing the city officials questioned various agencies about their budget, Dr. Brimmer testified that the discussion focused on improving the city's services, accountability, and getting the information necessary for managers and decisionmakers.

Those inquiries came from both the authority and the senior district officials. Of course, the proof will be in the doing, but the start is good. I am really pleased with the way they have been working.

While the control board will be charged with overseeing the restoration of the District's financial health and improving its management effectiveness, the Congress must review the complete relationship with the local government. Its fiscal problems are not caused by lack of revenue. The city elects and spends more than $3 billion of local revenue each year. That ought to be enough to operate this city.

In order for the city to maintain its long-term financial health, we, the Congress and the Federal Government, must reevaluate our relationship with the city in a dispassionate discussion with the District residents and their elected representatives. When we began drafting the control board legislation, we asked the General Accounting Office to talk to people in other cities that have had similar financial difficulties and established similar boards about their experiences.

One factor that everyone volunteered in our interviews was that the poor quality of public schools had exacerbated the middle-class flight from that city and was a major impediment in economic development. This is not just an economic development issue. Nationally, we are creating a generation of kids that cannot read or write properly.

This is not just bad educational policy; it is a devastating implication for unemployment, welfare, and crime policy in the near future, and especially in our cities like Washington. Each kid that we do not teach to read is a lost asset to this Nation, and we cannot afford to let our national assets decay. The District is no exception. We do not need to recite all the statistics.

Washington, DC, spends more per student than any other school district yet has the poorest student outcomes on standardized tests of any school district. We have old, high maintenance school buildings and too many of them. The problems of the District schools have been studied over and over and proposal after proposal has been made, but something happens between the commitment to reform and the implementation of a plan. It is time that we stop studying, analyzing, and strategizing, and start implementing and holding accountable those who are responsible for realizing set goals.

Mr. President, the committee is recommending establishment of a commission to hold consensus around public school reform in the District. I emphasize consensus. The seven-member commission will be made up entirely of local citizens charged with working with the school board and the superintendent to develop and implement a reform plan. I emphasize working with the school board and the superintendent to develop and implement a reform plan.

What we are providing is the structure for effecting reform, not dictating what the details of that reform should be. I want to emphasize that again. It is a structure for effecting reform, not dictating what the details of that reform should be.

Some District leaders have reacted to this proposal with charges that it thwarts home rule and circumvents the citizens of the District, charges which I might add were made before having access to the entire proposal. Mr. President, to make these charges is to completely ignore and cast scorn on what Congress has been all about this last 9 months. The District of Columbia is in trouble fiscally, managerially, and I think most important, educationally in public schools.

In difficult times, the city of Washington has no one to turn to but the Federal Government. We, the Congress, and the citizens of the District are partners in whatever happens to this city. We are partners in finding solutions to all these difficulties that Congress specifically and the Federal Government generally must be careful not to dictate or impose solutions on the citizens of the city. We need consensus.

Another important charge to the commission and the board is to develop a capital investment plan for the needed school buildings and a separate funding mechanism to ensure that the work is done.

Mr. President, on August 14, 1995, the superintendent received the report of the task force on education infrastructure for the 21st century. This report is an excellent description of the fiscal state of the public schools and needed steps to remedy the deficiencies. It sets out in plain terms the current condition of the public schools in this city.

Mr. President, 62 percent of the District's public schools are over 45 years old but only 8 of the 163 operating schools have ever had total renovations.

There is an inability to accommodate educational programs and initiatives and technology in these buildings. Continuing from the report: ''There is no school building able to support a comprehensive vocational or career focus to prepare students for work in the 21st century.''

That is totally intolerable and unacceptable. Based on the current number of schools and administrative buildings, the task force estimates that it will cost $1.2 billion to restore these buildings to a state of good repair and to modernize the schools and provide infrastructure to support for technology that is available and will be available.

This price tag is overstated because the first priority is to determine how many school buildings will be needed for the future student enrollment. Once the decision is made on how many and in what locations school buildings are needed, a final cost estimate can be made.

I am not just calling for the wholesale closure of school buildings. We must take into consideration the fiscal condition of the current inventory as well as answer questions as, What effect will the success of economic development programs have on enrollment? Or, What effect will the success of drop-out prevention programs have on the number of high schools needed?

Currently, with the discussion on a number of needed school buildings, debate must begin on the funding mechanism. It is imperative that this mechanism be under the control of the District of Columbia financial responsibility authority and that any debt issue to outside the District's 14 percent of the local revenue cap on outstanding debt. We are right at that cap right now for all of the other infrastructure aspects of the city. There is no latitude in that, nor should it be used for the purposes of the school improvement program.

This latter point is necessary due to the extensive deferred maintenance that exists in the system because the school fiscal infrastructure has not been maintained routinely. The schools' normal capital program cannot be expected to handle the high annual expenditures that will be needed over the next 10 years.

In order for this new funding mechanism to be viable, it will require a separate revenue stream for debt service.

All potential sources will be considered, including a small dedicated short-term reciprocal income tax to provide a stable and reliable source for debt service funds. Another obvious source is the cash flow generated by the sale to the surplus school property.

These options should be explored by the control board, the board of education, District council, and the Mayor along with all other regional and District groups of interest. Local or Federal legislation should be developed that would facilitate creation of an appropriate funding mechanism and source of income.

The bill also contains language that establishes a charter schools initiative for District public schools to improve and encourage community involvement. The subcommittee developed this initiative in cooperation with Senator SPECTER, who is very interested in this subject and his help was important to its inclusion.

Charter schools offer great promise in reforming public education because they link the important factors of school-site autonomy, parental choice, regulatory flexibility, private sector initiative, accountability for student outcomes, and community participation. The committee believes that the autonomy of individual charter schools from external controls, such as those of the school district and union requirements, is essential for their success.

To ensure charter schools' autonomy, the committee has defined them as public schools that operate with independence from the District of Columbia public schools as local education agencies. This definition in no way removes charter schools from the oversight of the District of Columbia public schools or other charter granting authorities. Unlike traditional public schools, these schools must meet the terms of their charters, including specified student outcomes. If not, their charters can be revoked or not renewed.

I want to note the efforts of the current superintendent who has established schools-within-schools charters and enterprise schools within the public schools. These schools-within-schools share some of the same attributes of our proposed charter schools but are chosen by only one entity and are not as independent as they ought to be. It is our intention to build upon this good start, not reinvent the wheel.

In closing, Mr. President, I thank my other colleagues on the subcommittee, our able ranking member, Senator KOHL, and my colleague on our side of the aisle, Senator BENNETT, who have attended our hearings and taken a genuine interest in the work of the subcommittee. Finally, I thank the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the Senator from Oregon, Senator HATFIELD, and our distinguished ranking member, the Senator from West Virginia, Senator BYRD, for the leadership and guidance we have received in bringing this bill before the Senate today.

Mr. President, that concludes my formal presentation, I will be happy to answer any questions or consider any amendments that Senators may have. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

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

Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, I commend the distinguished subcommittee chairman, Mr. JEFFORDS, for his hard work and dedication in bringing this measure to the Senate floor.

The fiscal year 1996 District of Columbia appropriations bill is the result of a bipartisan effort. It cleared the Senate Appropriations Committee by a vote of 28 yeas to 0 nays.

The bill includes a Federal payment of $660 million, which is the same as the President's budget request and the previous year's level.

The bill also provides the overall budget for the District of Columbia. That budget has been developed and presented to the Congress by city officials and the Financial Responsibility and Management Assistance Authority for the District of Columbia, otherwise known as the Control Board. The Control Board was created earlier this year by the District of Columbia Financial Responsibility and Management Act of 1995.

The bill recommends a balanced budget for the District government. The funding levels recommended in the budget are the same as those recommended by the Control Board. The Board is expected to work with the Mayor and City Council to oversee and make further reforms in the District's budget, finances, and operation.

The bill would also establish a seven-member Commission on Consensus Public School Reform. The Commission, which is strongly supported by the subcommittee chairman, will seek to develop reform goals and approve and oversee annual reform implementation plans for the school system.

The bill would also establish procedures for public charter schools to open in the District, which would offer innovative educational approaches and opportunities to District students. In addition, the bill calls for city officials and the Control Board to develop options for consolidating and modernizing the public school infrastructure.

Mr. President, I again commend the distinguished subcommittee chairman and urge the adoption of the bill.

Mr. BYRD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is recognized.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, is the bill open to amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. The bill is open to amendment.

AMENDMENT NO. 2768

(Purpose: To improve order and discipline in District of Columbia Public Schools)

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] proposes an amendment numbered 2768.

Mr. BYRD. 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 53, between lines 5 and 6, insert the following:

(H) The Chief of the National Guard Bureau who shall be an ex officio member.

On page 66, strike line 15 and insert the following:

SEC. 211. IMPROVING ORDER AND DISCIPLINE.

(a) DRESS CODE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than the first day of the 1996–1997 school year, the Commission shall develop and implement, through the Board of Education and the Superintendent of Schools, a uniform dress code for the District of Columbia Public Schools.

(2) CONSIDERATIONS.—The dress code—

(A) shall include a prohibition of gang membership symbols;

(B) shall take into account the relative costs of any policy for each student; and

(C) may include a requirement that students wear uniforms.

(b) COMMUNITY SERVICE REQUIREMENT FOR SUSPENDED STUDENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Any student suspended from classes at a District of Columbia Public School who is required to serve the suspension outside the school shall perform community service for the period of suspension. The community service required by this subsection shall be subject to rules and regulations promulgated by the Mayor.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This subsection shall take effect beginning on the first day of the 1996–1997 school year.

SEC. 212. EXPIRATION DATE.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia is recognized.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, it is no secret that over the years the District of Columbia Public School System has suffered from a lack of discipline in the classroom. It appears that the situation is not improving and is probably deteriorating. The lack of discipline in a public school classroom by even one student can thwart the education process for the teacher and the students who want to learn. Mr. President, it is time to reclaim the classroom—for the teachers and for the serious students—from the disruption caused by problem students lacking in self-discipline and a desire to learn.

I commend the distinguished Subcommittee Chairman, Mr. JEFFORDS. His is a thankless task. He has done a good job. One of his initiatives has been to propose the establishment of a seven-member Commission on Consensus Public School Reform. I will have more to say about that in a moment.

Mr. President, the thrust of the amendment I am proposing builds upon the initiative of the Subcommittee Chairman. In the first place, it proposes that any student suspended from classes at a District of Columbia Public School, who is required to serve the suspension outside the school, shall

perform community service for the period of the suspension.

Mr. President, often the misbehavior detected in the public school system is punished by a suspension; however, this suspension is very often looked upon as a vacation by the individual suspended. The thrust of my amendment is to see that any student that finds himself or herself suspended shall use that time to perform a community service. A community service required by my amendment would be subject to rules and regulations promulgated by the Mayor. Thus, the individual under suspension would not be rewarded by a week off of idle time, but would be required to make some contribution to the community during that time.

Students who are expelled and then left to their own devices tend to become bored and then, as a result, may get into further trouble. Requiring them to perform service for the community benefits the community, provides supervision for the time the student is out of the classroom, and demonstrates to the student that job opportunities will likely be limited without the benefit of an education.

A second part of my amendment is related to a dress code. I am advised that in the year since Long Beach, California, made uniforms mandatory for all elementary and secondary school students, the Long Beach School district has seen a 36-percent drop in school crime and a 32-percent reduction in student suspensions. Many parents now spend a great deal of money on elaborate, fashion-conscious clothing ensembles, which cost far in excess of most uniforms. One reads newspaper articles about young people fighting and even murdering each other over articles of clothing, high-priced tennis shoes, and so forth. A dress code would keep obnoxious or inappropriate clothing out of the classroom, minimizing the differences between income levels among students, and removing the focus from clothes and gang symbols and placing it, instead, on scholarship and school activities.

The amendment I am proposing would implement through the Board of Education and the Superintendent of Schools a uniform dress code for the District of Columbia Public Schools. The dress code would include a prohibition of gang membership symbols; it should take into account the relative cost of any policy for each student; and, it may even include a requirement that students wear uniforms. It does not require that, but this would be up to the District authorities. This modest proposal has yielded improvements in discipline in some of the jurisdictions in which it has been employed, and it appears to be a worthwhile effort.

The third aspect of the amendment that I am proposing relates to the initiative of the Subcommittee Chairman to establish a Commission on Consensus Reform in the District of Columbia Public Schools, to create a consensus around reform goals and to oversee and monitor the implementation phase of the reforms. This Commission, according to the Subcommittee's legislative proposal, will consist of a member appointed by the Senate Majority Leader; a member appointed by the Speaker of the House; two members appointed by the President—one who should represent the local business community and one who is a teacher within the District of Columbia public schools. Also, the President of the District of Columbia Congress of Parents and Teachers and the President of the District of Columbia Board of Education, as well as the Superintendent of Public Schools of the District of Columbia would be members of the Commission. The Mayor and Council Chairman would each name one non-voting, ex-officio member. The amendment that I am proposing would add the Chief of the National Guard Bureau as an ex-officio member.

Mr. President, for the past two years, the National Guard has been directly involved in youth programs throughout the United States. During this time, the National Guard has had a direct and positive impact on ''at-risk'' youth in over thirty states and territories through its sponsorship of five separate youth programs. I am told that all of these programs have been a success. With this in mind, I am recommending that the Chief of the National Guard Bureau, Lieutenant General Edward D. Baca, be an ex-officio member. The purpose would be to increase National Guard participation in the District of Columbia Public Schools, so that a number of new and positive programs can be pursued, which will tend to promote discipline in the District's schools and which will assist ''at-risk'' youth. The National Guard is an organization comprised of the local interested citizenry. They have proven themselves to be dedicated professionals, who have displayed time and again their commitment not only to the national defense, but to the community as well.

In summary, Mr. President, I am proposing an amendment that would initiate a program of community service for suspended students. It would also propose a dress code and would strengthen the initiative of the Subcommittee Chairman, by making the Chief of the National Guard Bureau an ex-officio member of the Commission on consensus reform in the District of Columbia public schools.

Discipline is a problem in classrooms all across America. Students cannot learn and teachers cannot teach when the classroom is disrupted by disorder, and, in many cases, even by fear of violence.

Jurisdictions around the country are trying to craft new approaches to curb classroom violence and restore sanity to our institutions of learning. New approaches must be tried. I believe that the steps proposed in my amendment may enable the District's schools to get a handle on some of the violence and disruptive behavior which are all too common in our Nation's classrooms.

Mr. President, I urge the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 2769 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2768

(Purpose: To limit the amendment to 2 school years in order to evaluate the effectiveness of amendment)

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I send an amendment in the second degree to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] PROPOSES AN AMENDMENT NUMBERED 2769 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2768.

Mr. BYRD. 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 2, after line 25 insert the following:

(c) EXPIRATION DATE.—This section and the membership provided in section 202(a)(2)(H) shall expire on the last day of the 1997–1998 school year.

(d) REPORT.—The Commission shall study the effectiveness of the policies implemented pursuant to this section in improving order and discipline in schools and report its findings to the appropriate committees of Congress 60 days before the last day of the 1997–1998 school year.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the second-degree amendment makes this a pilot program. It very well may be instructive and helpful for the rest of the country to have a pilot program here in the District of Columbia. This would be a 2-year pilot program and would require a report to the Committee of Congress after a 2-year period on the effected school discipline resulting from the initiatives embodied in the amendment.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the second-degree amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I thank both managers. I have discussed this measure with both the majority and minority managers. They have been very careful in their study of the amendment. They will speak for themselves in regard to it. But I do appreciate their cooperation and courtesy, which are characteristic of both of them.

Mr. JEFFORDS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. JEFFORDS], is recognized.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I want to commend the senior Senator

from West Virginia for what I think is an excellent suggestion as to how we can help the District of Columbia find some of the answers that have been lacking in our educational system in this country.

I think the pilot program to take care of those who get turned out of the school system is an excellent one. One of the greatest problems we have in the city of Washington and the cities throughout the country is kids that are dropping out and those that leave involuntarily. At the same time nationally, we are cutting back on the number of young people that are being brought into the military, and often those young people who have that problem have found that the military has helped them greatly in their ability to straighten their lives out and to get back into the school systems and get an education.

I, therefore, am willing to accept both the second-degree amendment and the original amendment on this side of the aisle.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished manager of the bill for his comments in support of the amendment and for his willingness to accept the amendment.

Mr. KOHL addressed the Chair.

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

Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, I must reluctantly object to the amendment offered by my distinguished colleague from West Virginia. While I believe this amendment has many fine parts to it, and it certainly is well-intentioned, I believe that it would interfere with the development of a cooperative relationship between the Congress and the District.

I have consistently supported the principle of home rule, and I continue to feel that it is a very important objective.

I do not intend to debate my distinguished colleague. But I do feel it necessary to lodge my objection. I hope at some point that we will have a rollcall vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate on the amendment?

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I know there is a desire to stack votes so that Members will not be interrupted in their committee meetings. I suggest at this time that this amendment be set aside so that the leaders can meet and give us a suggestion as to how we can proceed. I believe there may be one other vote on an amendment. The other amendments, I believe, will be accepted.

So, at this time, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be set aside temporarily.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 2770

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Senate on tax cuts and Medicare)

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from North Dakota (Mr. DORGAN) proposes an amendment numbered 2770.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the suspension of the reading of the amendment?

Mr. JEFFORDS. I object to suspending the reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to read the amendment.

Mr. JEFFORDS. 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 new section:

SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE ON BUDGET PRIORITIES.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1996 (H.Con.Res. 67) calls for $245 billion in tax reductions and $270 billion in projected spending reductions from Medicare;

(2) reducing projected Medicare spending by $270 billion could substantially increase out-of-pocket health care costs for senior citizens, reduce the quality of care available to Medicare beneficiaries and threaten the financial health of some health care providers, especially in rural areas;

(3) seventy-five percent of Medicare beneficiaries have annual incomes of less than $25,000;

(4) most of the tax cuts in the tax bill passed by the House of Representatives (H.R. 1215) go to families making over $100,000 per year, according to the office of Tax Analysis of the United States Department of the Treasury.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the Committee on Finance and the Senate should approve no tax legislation which reduces taxes for those making over $101,000 per year; and

(2) the savings from limiting any tax reductions in this way should be used to reduce any cuts in projected Medicare spending.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JEFFORDS. 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. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be set aside for the sole purpose of considering the following amendments: An amendment by Senator INHOFE, an amendment by Senator DOLE and myself, an amendment by Senator BINGAMAN, and Senator BOXER.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. JEFFORDS. After those are taken care of, we would return to the status quo.

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

Mr. INHOFE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 2771

Mr. INHOFE. 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 Oklahoma [Mr. INHOFE] proposes an amendment numbered 2771:

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place insert the following: ''None of the funds provided in this Act may be used directly or indirectly for the renovation of the property located at 227 7th Street Southeast (commonly known as Eastern Market), except that funds provided in this Act may be used for the regular maintenance and upkeep of the current structure and grounds located at such property.''

Mr. INHOFE. I asked the clerk to go ahead and read it in its entirety so people could understand that this is simply a one-sentence, very simple, straightforward amendment, one that I have had before this body, successfully passed by the other body, on numerous occasions.

We have a very unique institution not far from the Capitol known as the Eastern Market. The Eastern Market has a unique type of a character of its own. And for a number of years, there have been notions trotting around that it should be renovated and contracted out to various people, against the wishes certainly of everyone I have ever talked to. The neighborhood associations want to keep it as it is and the same vendors who have been in there, not for years, but for decades.

So, this would preclude, and it would be clearly the intent—I want the RECORD to reflect this—that no funds directly or indirectly could be used for renovation or for construction or for changing the character of this institution; in other words, not using local funds to be replaced with Federal funds. I think it is something we have dealt with every year.

I will respond to any questions.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator from Oklahoma would yield to me for a question.

Mr. INHOFE. Yes. I would be happy to.

Mr. DORGAN. My understanding is that—I ask if it is correct—the Senator from Oklahoma is attempting to prevent the use of funds to essentially

come in and raze the Eastern Market and create a new gasoline station with 26 pumps and 1 person working there, or for that matter a motel or an office complex.

I very much support what the Senator is doing. I supported him when he did it in the House of Representatives. The Eastern Market, for those who have never seen it, is a very unique place. It is a market where individuals come and set up fruit stands and sell fruits and vegetables, and they sell fresh meats over there.

It is a wonderful neighborhood magnet, unique in character. It has been there for many, many years. And I know a lot of people think progress is knocking all those things down and paving it all over and building something bright and shiny. Boy, I will tell you, it would not be progress, in my judgment, to see the Eastern Market destroyed in this town. It is a wonderful, wonderful thing.

I think the Senator's amendment makes a great deal of sense, and I supported him previously on it. I compliment him on it.

Is it the case that the Senator is simply trying to prevent the razing of the Eastern Market in one form or another and trying to preserve it in this town?

Mr. INHOFE. Either razing it or transforming it. It would lose its character that it has had for the last 150 years. That is correct.

Mr. JEFFORDS. I am prepared to accept the amendment for this side.

Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, we are also prepared to accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 2771) was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2772

(Purpose: Making a technical correction to the bill)

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. JEFFORDS] proposes an amendment numbered 2772.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 2 at line 17: Strike ''$52,070,000'' and insert ''$52,000,000.''

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, this is a technical amendment to bring the printed bill into compliance with the committee's recommendations and the tables in the back of the committee report. The amendment eliminates $70,000 that was not part of the committee's recommended amount.

I believe this amendment has the support of the Democratic floor manager.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate on the amendment?

Mr. KOHL. We have no debate on the amendment. We are prepared to accept it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 2772) was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2773

(Purpose: To make a technical change to the membership provisions of the Commission on Consensus Reform in the District of Columbia Public Schools)

Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. KOHL], for himself and Mr. JEFFORDS, proposes an amendment numbered 2773.

Mr. KOHL. 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 52, strike lines 13 through 16 and insert the following:

''(A) 1 member to be appointed by the President chosen from a list of 3 proposed members submitted by the Majority Leader of the Senate;

''(B) 1 member to be appointed by the President chosen from a list of 3 proposed members submitted by the Speaker of the House of Representatives;''.

Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, this amendment is a technical amendment to remove a possible constitutional challenge to the Commission on Consensus Reform in the D.C. public schools. The amendment provides that the President shall appoint two of the commission members from a list provided by the majority leader of the Senate and the Speaker of the House.

There is a constitutional question whether these congressional leaders could directly appoint members of the commission. This amendment cures that potential problem.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate on the amendment?

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, we have no objection to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 2773) was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2774

(Purpose: To reduce the energy costs of Federal facilities for which funds are made available under this Act)

Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk on behalf of Senator BINGAMAN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. KOHL], for Mr. BINGAMAN, proposes an amendment numbered 2774.

Mr. KOHL. 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. . ENERGY SAVINGS AT DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FACILITIES.

(a) REDUCTION IN FACILITIES ENERGY COSTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The head of each agency of the District of Columbia for which funds are made available under this Act shall—

(A) take all actions necessary to achieve during fiscal year 1996 a 5 percent reduction, from fiscal year 1995 levels, in the energy costs of the facilities used by the agency; or

(B) enter into a sufficient number of energy savings performance contracts with private sector energy service companies under title VIII of the National Energy Conservation Policy Act (42 U.S.C. 8287 et seq.) to achieve during fiscal year 1996 at least a 5 percent reduction, from fiscal year 1995 levels, in the energy use of the facilities used by the agency.

(2) GOAL.—The activities described in paragraph (1) should be a key component of agency programs that will by the year 2000 result in a 20 percent reduction, from fiscal year 1985 levels, in the energy use of the facilities used by the agency, as required by section 543 of the National Energy Conservation Policy Act (42 U.S.C. 8253).

(b) USE OF COST SAVINGS.—An amount equal to the amount of cost savings realized by an agency under subsection (a) shall remain available for obligation through the end of fiscal year 2000, without further authorization or appropriation, as follows:

(1) CONSERVATION MEASURES.—Fifty percent of the amount shall remain available for the implementation of additional energy conservation measures and for water conservation measures at such facilities used by the agency as are designated by the head of the agency.

(2) OTHER PURPOSES.—Fifty percent of the amount shall remain available for use by the agency for such purposes as are designated by the head of the agency, consistent with applicable law.

(c) REPORTS.—

(1) BY AGENCY HEADS.—The head of each agency for which funds are made available under this Act shall include in each report of the agency to the Secretary of Energy under section 548(a) of the National Energy Conservation Policy Act (42 U.S.C. 8258(a)) a description of the results of the activities carried out under subsection (a) and recommendations concerning how to further reduce energy costs and energy consumption in the future.

(2) BY SECRETARY OF ENERGY.—The reports required under paragraph (1) shall be included in the annual reports required to be submitted to Congress by the Secretary of Energy under section 548(b) of the Act (42 U.S.C. 8258(b)).

(3) CONTENTS.—With respect to the period since the date of the preceding report, a report under paragraph (1) or (2) shall—

(A) specify the total energy costs of the facilities used by the agency;

(B) identify the reductions achieved;

(C) specify the actions that resulted in the reductions;

(D) with respect to the procurement procedures of the agency, specify what actions have been taken to—

(i) implement the procurement authorities provided by subsections (a) and (c) of section 546 of the National Energy Conservation Policy Act (42 U.S.C. 8256); and

(ii) incorporate directly, or by reference, the requirements of the regulations issued by the Secretary of Energy under title VIII of the Act (42 U.S.C. 8287 et seq.); and

(E) specify—

(i) the actions taken by the agency to achieve the goal specified in subsection (a)(2);

(ii) the procurement procedures and methods used by the agency under section 546(a)(2) of the Act (42 U.S.C. 8256(a)(2)); and

(iii) the number of energy savings performance contracts entered into by the agency under title VIII of the Act (42 U.S.C. 8257 et seq.).

ENERGY EFFICIENCY

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I rise today to commend the two floor managers of the bill, the distinguished Senator from Vermont, Senator JEFFORDS, and the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin, Senator KOHL, and their staff, for their excellent and efficient management of the Fiscal Year 1996 Appropriations Act for the District of Columbia.

I would like to take a few moments to discuss an amendment I am offering on this appropriations bill. My amendment encourages agencies funded under the bill to become more energy efficient and directs them to reduce facility energy costs by 5 percent. The agencies will report to the Congress at the end of the year on their efforts to conserve energy and will make recommendations for further conservation efforts. I have offered this amendment to every appropriations bill that has come before the Senate this year, and it has been accepted to each one.

I believe this is a commonsense amendment: the Federal Government spends nearly $4 billion annually to heat, cool, and power its 500,000 buildings. The office technology assistance and the alliance to save energy, a nonprofit group which I chair with Senator JEFFORDS, estimate that Federal agencies could save $1 billion annually if they would make an effort to become more energy efficient and conserve energy.

Mr. President, I hope this amendment will encourage agencies to use new energy savings technologies when making building improvements in insulation, building controls, lighting, heating, and air-conditioning. The Department of Energy has made available for Governmentwide agency use streamlined energy saving performance contracts procedures, modeled after private sector initiatives. Unfortunately, most agencies have made little progress in this area. This amendment is an attempt to get Federal agencies to devote more attention to energy efficiency, with the goal of lowering overall costs and conserving energy.

As I mentioned, Mr. President, this amendment has been accepted to every appropriations bill the Senate has passed this year. I ask that my colleagues support it.

Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, this amendment that I am offering on behalf of Senator BINGAMAN is intended to reduce the energy costs of the Federal facilities for which funds are made available under this act. This amendment has been attached to nearly all of the other appropriations bills and reemphasizes the energy conservation requirements mandated under the Energy Policy Act of 1992.

I understand that there is no objection on the other side of the aisle.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate?

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, we have no objection to the amendment. We believe it is a good amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 2774) was agreed to.

Mrs. BOXER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask the managers if they have any further business pending, or may I at this time offer my amendment?

Mr. JEFFORDS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, the unanimous-consent request that we have allows the Senator to offer her amendment at this time provided that she does not intend to require a vote.

Mrs. BOXER. That is correct.

AMENDMENT NO. 2775

(Purpose: To provide that Members of Congress and the President shall not be paid during Federal Government shutdowns)

Mrs. BOXER. I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration. I send it up on behalf of Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. DOLE, Mr. BUMPERS, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. FEINGOLD, and Mr. BRYAN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from California [Mrs. BOXER], for herself, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. DOLE, Mr. BUMPERS, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. FEINGOLD, and Mr. BRYAN, proposes an amendment numbered 2775.

Mrs. BOXER. 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 in the bill, insert the following new section:

SEC. . PAY OF MEMBERS OF CONGRESS AND THE PRESIDENT DURING GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWNS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Members of Congress and the President shall not receive basic pay for any period in which—

(1) there is more than a 24 hour lapse in appropriations for any Federal agency or department as a result of a failure to enact a regular appropriations bill or continuing resolution; or

(2) the Federal Government is unable to make payments or meet obligations because the public debt limit under section 3101 of title 31, United States Code has been reached.

(b) RETROACTIVE PAY PROHIBITED.—No pay forfeited in accordance with subsection (a) may be paid retroactively.

Mrs. BOXER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, the amendment I have just sent to the desk would stop the pay for Members of Congress and the President during any period in which the Government fails to meet its obligations because of our failure to enact a budget. President Clinton supports this amendment.

Americans are being warned every day that we may come to a train wreck over the budget. If we fail to enact appropriations bills by the end of the fiscal year or if the debt limit ceiling is reached, the Government will stop paying its bills and its debts. Small business people holding Government contracts, senior citizens with questions about their Medicare coverage, even major financial institutions holding Government securities would be severely impacted by that so-called train wreck.

Certainly there are major differences among Members of Congress and the President over what our national priorities should be. Yes, we have a Democratic President and a Republican Congress. But we were elected to work together, Mr. President. And I believe if we fail to do that, the most basic job we are sent here to do, then we should pay a price.

The way this amendment would work is simple. If any part of the Government shuts down because of a lapse in appropriations for any Federal department or agency, or there is a shutdown because the debt ceiling has been reached, Members of Congress and the President will not get paid.

Mr. President, some here have raised legitimate constitutional questions regarding this amendment. But I think the amendment is constitutional. I think it sends an important message to the people across the country that we understand that we are paid to do our jobs fully.

Today, the House Speaker threatened to take the Nation into default saying, and I quote him, ''I do not care what the price is.'' Mr. President, this is the greatest country on Earth. We must not default on our financial obligations. I truly believe my amendment will help prevent a Government shutdown. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I hope that we will do it right now very quickly without further debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield the floor?

Mrs. BOXER. I do yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate?

Mr. JEFFORDS. This amendment is acceptable to us on this side.

Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, this side also accepts the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate on the amendment? If not, the question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 2775) was agreed to.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JEFFORDS. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mrs. BOXER. Thank you very much, Mr. President, and I thank my colleagues.

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

Mr. DORGAN. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DORGAN. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the rules, a Senator cannot reserve the right to object in calling off the quorum call.

Mr. DORGAN. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. An objection is heard. The clerk will continue to call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk continued to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to speak as in morning business for 5 minutes, and further, that the Senator from North Dakota be allowed 5 minutes as in morning business for debate only.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator has 5 minutes and the Senator from North Dakota has 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMAS. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. THOMAS pertaining to the introduction of S. 1268 are located in today's RECORD under ''Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.'')

Mr. DORGAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCCAIN). The Senator from North Dakota is recognized for 5 minutes as in morning business.

EXPLANATION OF AMENDMENT NO. 2770

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I want to tell my colleagues who may be watching these proceedings where we are and why we are where we are.

I offered an amendment some while ago, about half hour ago. We intended to offer a second-degree amendment to it to slightly modify it. We intended to get a vote on it. At that point, the Senate was put into a quorum call. Since that time, two noncontroversial amendments have been adopted. Except for this morning business, the Senate has been in a quorum call.

I wanted to use this 5 minutes to explain what this amendment was and why I am offering it and why there is no intent at all to delay the proceedings of the Senate today. I understand we want to finish this appropriations bill. I think we can do that quickly. On my amendment I would agree to a very short time limit. I told the chairman of the committee I would agree to a half hour time limit, if necessary. So we can finish this bill quickly.

My amendment does something very simple. Because the Finance Committee in the Senate next week will deal with Medicare and Medicaid, and because we have proposals on the table for substantial cuts in Medicare, proposals that were included in the budget that call for a very substantial tax cut, my amended is an amended amendment to try to send the sense of the Senate to the Finance Committee about priorities. I suggest if there is a tax cut coming out of the Senate Finance Committee —and I do not think we ought to cut taxes at this point; we ought to keep our eye on the goal of reducing the Federal deficit. Cutting taxes may be popular but, in my judgment, it ought to be discussed after we have managed to balance the Federal budget. My sense-of-the-Senate amendment is that if there is a tax cut that comes out of the Finance Committee, it be limited to those making $100,000 a year or less. And by limiting the tax cut to those making under $100,000 a year, the savings could be used to reduce the cut that is anticipated in Medicare. It is a very simple amendment with respect to priorities.

I know people here will grit their teeth because of this amendment. But the reason there is the requirement to offer it is that the minority will have very little opportunity in the Senate Finance Committee; they are not involved in writing the bill. I am not complaining about that. That is the way the system works. The majority won, they control, they write the legislation.

But we have an opportunity, it seems to me, to try to express ourselves on priorities. The priority here is the juxtaposition between tax cuts and the cut in Medicare. I hope very much that if there is to be a tax cut, it be a tax cut that is focused on those who earn less than $100,000 a year. I was on a television program two mornings ago with a member of the majority party. The member of the majority party said, ''Look, our tax cut is a family tax cut. It is going to go to working families, modest-income families.'' I said, ''Then we will give you chance to vote on it. As a matter of priorities, let us decide that is what we are going to do.'' That is what my amendment does. When we tried to second-degree it, of course, there was an objection to the amendment being considered as read and, therefore, we were not able to offer the second degree, and the Senate was put into a quorum call.

I say to the chair that I have no intention of holding this bill up. But this amendment is not going to go away either. You can second-degree this amendment and do it three or four times, and I will offer it again as a second degree to something else, because I believe we ought to have the right to vote on this. So it is not going to go away. We can dispose of it very quickly. I will agree to a time limit. I have no intention of impeding the working of the Senate this afternoon. I hope very much that you will allow us the opportunity at an early time here to vote on an amendment of this type.

Again, as I said, I think we should finish this bill this afternoon. The timeliness of this amendment is—the Senate Finance Committee begins work on this next week. I have no choice, really, but to offer this at this point. It is not a breach of any agreement or a breach of understanding by anybody. It is not an attempt to stretch out the time. It is about priorities in this country, and these are important priorities which I will speak on at a point in time when the opportunity exists for debate on the amendment itself.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1996

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. JEFFORDS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 2770

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I understand the desires of the Senator from North Dakota, and this obviously is a very important amendment. However, we are dealing with the appropriations bill for the District of Columbia. It is my intention—after a brief period of time for the leader to debate—to move to table the Senator's amendment.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. DOLE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President we have already discussed the amendment. I wonder if we need anymore time. It has been explained two or three times by the Senator from North Dakota. If we can just have 1 minute on this side to explain our side, that would be sufficient. He has had 15 or 20 minutes. I do not see any reason for additional debate. A lot of colleagues on both sides of the aisle had hoped we might be finished with this bill and the other conference report by 12:30.

If the Senator from North Dakota could accommodate that, we will be prepared to table the amendment immediately.

Mr. DORGAN. I say to the majority leader that I have not had 10 or 15 minutes to debate this, but 5 minutes under morning business.

I have no intention of delaying. If the Senator wants to proceed and there will be a tabling motion, I accept that. I appreciate that.

I will ask for a couple more minutes, and if a colleague shows up who wants to speak, I hope we can accommodate a colleague, but I do not intend to string this out.

If your intention is to table this, we can move ahead quickly, but I want a couple of additional minutes to talk about the amendment.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from North Dakota be allowed to debate his amendment for an additional 4 minutes, and that the majority leader be given 1 minute, and after that I will move to table the amendment and ask for the yeas and nays on the motion.

Mr. DORGAN. Reserving the right to object, without a second-degree?

Mr. DOLE. No second-degree.

Mr. DORGAN. I have no objection.

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

The Senator from North Dakota is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, as I indicated to the majority leader, it is not my intention to delay this piece of legislation. It is my intention to try in whatever way I can before next week's markup begins in the Senate Finance Committee to have the Senate express itself on the issue of priorities.

Now, we will have, I am sure, a raucous debate around here for weeks on the issue of Medicare. I will not revisit that entire debate today.

The issue of Medicare is not unimportant. It is not just politics. It is about priorities. I imagine that those who will stand up on this amendment ultimately will say this is just politics, nothing but pure politics.

That is not what this is. It is about priorities and what is important. I happen to think that the Medicare Program is critically important. The $270 billion proposed to be cut from the baseline of Medicare is the $270 billion that is anticipated to be needed for the increasing cost of health care and for the number of new senior citizens becoming eligible in the 7-year period for the Medicare Program.

We have 200,000 new Americans becoming eligible for Medicare every month. A lot of people hear that and say that cannot be right. It is right. America is graying. Mr. President, 200,000 new people every single month become eligible for Medicare.

It does cost a lot. We ought to make changes. We ought to make sure it is fiscally solvent. We ought not under any condition in my judgment decide that we ought to cut Medicare so that we can accommodate a tax cut for the most affluent in this country.

People say, tax cut for the affluent? We are not proposing a tax cut for the affluent. Fifty percent of the tax cut, the one done in the House, goes to families making over $100,000 a year.

The priority side of this is to say we ought not do that. I am saying limit the tax cut, if there is one, to those with incomes of under $100,000, and to the extent that that limitation saves us some money, then use that money to reduce the needed cut in Medicare.

It is simple priorities. We have a series of charts, and a number of other people wanted to speak. I accept the notion it is not an easy job for the majority leader to run this place. I am not sure I would want that job. I guess I would want the majority title these days, as being in the minority is not easy.

It is one of the reasons we have to, from time to time, find a way on the floor of the Senate to make a point about priorities. We feel obligated to do that. The failure to do that means that we are not doing what the loyal opposition should and must do to represent their interests.

In the spirit of cooperation, I have no intention of holding up this bill. I appreciate the willingness of the majority leader to give us an opportunity to vote on this motion without a second degree.

I yield the floor.

Mr. DOLE. I thank the Senator from North Dakota. I do not have a quarrel with the Senator offering an amendment. That is how it works around here. I am certain we have done the same when we wanted to make a point when we were in the minority.

We have a provision in the budget that about 90 percent of any tax benefit would go to people making less than $100,000—in that range. I cannot remember the precise wording. So it seemed to me we pretty much are in compliance with what the Senator may suggest.

Having said that, we also have a real problem with Medicare. We are trying to address that problem. We have been working, members of the Finance Committee and others. Three of the President's Cabinet members who are trustees of the Medicare trust fund agree that it will go broke by the year 2002 if we do not fix it.

We are trying to preserve, strengthen, and protect Medicare. We believe we can do it without any serious impact on any beneficiary or any of the providers in the program.

We believe we have a good program. We have just left a press conference where the chairman of the Finance Committee, Senator ROTH, and others outlined precisely what the Republican Senate plan did with Medicare. We have not yet come to the tax cut portion.

That tax cut will go to families with children. They do not make over $100,000. Many in my State are making $20,000, $25,000, or $30,000. They will get the benefit.

For all the reasons I can think of—it does not belong to this bill, it is subject to a point of order, 60 votes if the tabling motion fails—I am pleased that the chairman of the committee will now move to table the amendment.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I move to table the Dorgan amendment No. 2770, 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 have been ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LOTT. I announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. GRAMM], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SANTORUM] are necessarily absent.

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. PRYOR] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COVERDELL). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 54, nays 43, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 460 Leg.]

YEAS—54

Abraham	Frist	McCain
Ashcroft	Gorton	McConnell
Bennett	Grams	Moynihan
Bond	Grassley	Murkowski
Brown	Gregg	Nickles
Burns	Hatch	Packwood
Campbell	Hatfield	Pressler
Chafee	Helms	Roth
Coats	Hutchison	Shelby
Cochran	Inhofe	Simpson
Cohen	Jeffords	Smith
Coverdell	Kassebaum	Snowe
Craig	Kempthorne	Specter
D'Amato	Kyl	Stevens
DeWine	Lieberman	Thomas
Dole	Lott	Thompson
Domenici	Lugar	Thurmond
Faircloth	Mack	Warner

NAYS—43

Akaka	Feingold	Leahy
Baucus	Feinstein	Levin
Biden	Ford	Mikulski
Bingaman	Glenn	Moseley-Braun
Boxer	Graham	Murray
Bradley	Harkin	Nunn
Breaux	Heflin	Pell
Bryan	Hollings	Reid
Bumpers	Inouye	Robb
Byrd	Johnston	Rockefeller
Conrad	Kennedy	Sarbanes
Daschle	Kerrey	Simon
Dodd	Kerry	Wellstone
Dorgan	Kohl	
Exon	Lautenberg	

NOT VOTING—3

Gramm	Pryor	Santorum

So the motion to lay on the table the amendment (No. 2770) was agreed to.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the motion was agreed to.

Mr. FORD. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2769

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the yeas and nays be vitiated on amendment No. 2769.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I urge adoption of amendment No. 2769.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The amendment (No. 2769) was agreed to.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, immediately following the vote on the legislative branch appropriations conference report, there be 4 minutes of debate

equally divided in the usual form, to be followed by a vote on the Byrd amendment No. 2768, as amended.

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

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate continued with the consideration of the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the role.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. LOTT. I announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. GRAMM] is necessarily absent.

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. PRYOR] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRAMS). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber who desire to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 94, nays 4, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 461 Leg.]

YEAS—94

Abraham	Feinstein	McCain
Akaka	Ford	McConnell
Ashcroft	Frist	Mikulski
Bennett	Glenn	Moseley-Braun
Biden	Gorton	Moynihan
Bingaman	Graham	Murkowski
Bond	Grams	Murray
Boxer	Grassley	Nickles
Bradley	Gregg	Nunn
Breaux	Harkin	Packwood
Bryan	Hatch	Pell
Bumpers	Hatfield	Pressler
Burns	Helms	Reid
Byrd	Hutchison	Robb
Campbell	Inhofe	Rockefeller
Chafee	Inouye	Roth
Coats	Jeffords	Santorum
Cochran	Johnston	Sarbanes
Cohen	Kassebaum	Shelby
Conrad	Kempthorne	Simon
Coverdell	Kennedy	Simpson
Craig	Kerrey	Smith
D'Amato	Kerry	Snowe
Daschle	Kohl	Specter
DeWine	Kyl	Stevens
Dodd	Lautenberg	Thomas
Dole	Leahy	Thompson
Domenici	Levin	Thurmond
Dorgan	Lieberman	Warner
Exon	Lott	Wellstone
Faircloth	Lugar	
Feingold	Mack	

NAYS—4

Baucus	Heflin
Brown	Hollings

NOT VOTING—2

Gramm	Pryor

So, the conference report was agreed to.

Mr. EXON. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. COVERDELL. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1996

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

AMENDMENT NO. 2768, AS AMENDED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia has 2 minutes.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, my amendment, as amended, specifies that any student suspended from classes at a DC public school must serve the suspension by performing community service for the period of suspension under regulations promulgated by the mayor.

It would require the Commission on Consensus Reform in the DC Public Schools to develop and implement a uniform dress code for the public schools.

It would become effective at the beginning of the 1996–1997 school year.

It would add the Chief of the National Guard Bureau as an ex officio member to the Commission on Consensus Reform in the DC Public Schools to facilitate the establishment of programs to assist at-risk youth.

It would require a report to Congress within 60 days at the end of the 1997–1998 school year on the improvements and discipline resulting from dress code policy and community service requirements.

It would limit the provisions to a 2-year pilot program which would expire at the end of the 1997–1998 school year.

Mr. President, this might help to point the way to other school districts throughout the country and enable them, on the basis of the results, to initiate such programs within their own districts.

I hope that the Members of the Senate will support the amendment.

Mr. JEFFORDS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I rise to speak in support of the amendment. It is an effort to try to end some of the problems we have with young people who get in trouble in school and need some guidance and support. It helps, I think, to maintain discipline. I think it is worth a demonstration project, as the amendment provides, to see if in the city we can demonstrate alternatives to kids just being put out of school for disciplinary reasons and then just walking the streets and getting into trouble.

So I think it is a good amendment.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator.

Mr. JEFFORDS. I see no other speakers, so I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question occurs on agreeing to amendment No. 2678, as amended. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will 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.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I know Members are anxious to leave, and I know there will not be a vote on final passage. This will be the last vote of the day. There will be voice votes but no more rollcall votes.

On Monday, there will be no rollcall votes, but we do expect to take up VA–HUD. The managers will be here at 3 p.m. Senator BUMPERS will be here, I think, about 4 o'clock to offer an amendment on the space station, to add money to the space program. But probably not.

[Laughter.]

We will be in space here at 4 o'clock.

What we would like to do is accommodate everybody. We know it is a holiday for some. There will not be any votes until, let us say, after the policy luncheon on Tuesday, but we want to get some work done. Still, we will be down to three appropriations bills. If we can do those next week, we are out of here for 8 days. That ought to be an incentive for less talk, fewer amendments. If we can do it on each side, we can finish by late Thursday or Friday.

So I just hope, in accommodating everybody who wants to be accommodated, that they will accommodate us. So there are no further votes today, no votes on Monday, and any votes that are ordered will occur on Tuesday after the policy luncheons.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 2768, AS AMENDED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question occurs on agreeing to amendment No. 2768, as amended. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LOTT. I announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. GRAMM] is necessarily absent.

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. PRYOR] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 88, nays 10, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 462 Leg.]

YEAS—88

Abraham	Dodd	Kennedy
Akaka	Dole	Kerrey
Ashcroft	Domenici	Kerry
Baucus	Dorgan	Kyl
Bennett	Exon	Lautenberg
Biden	Faircloth	Levin
Bond	Feinstein	Lieberman
Boxer	Ford	Lott
Bradley	Frist	Lugar
Brown	Gorton	Mack
Bryan	Grams	McCain
Bumpers	Grassley	McConnell
Burns	Gregg	Mikulski
Byrd	Harkin	Moseley-Braun
Campbell	Hatch	Moynihan
Chafee	Hatfield	Murkowski
Coats	Helms	Nickles
Cochran	Hollings	Nunn
Cohen	Hutchison	Packwood
Conrad	Inhofe	Pell
Coverdell	Inouye	Pressler
Craig	Jeffords	Reid
D'Amato	Johnston	Rockefeller
Daschle	Kassebaum	Roth
DeWine	Kempthorne	Santorum

Sarbanes	Snowe	Thurmond
Shelby	Specter	Warner
Simon	Stevens	Wellstone
Simpson	Thomas	
Smith	Thompson	

NAYS—10

Bingaman	Graham	Murray
Breaux	Heflin	Robb
Feingold	Kohl	
Glenn	Leahy	

NOT VOTING—2

Gramm	Pryor

So the amendment (No. 2768), as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. JEFFORDS. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. BYRD. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I rise in support of S. 1244, the fiscal year 1966 District of Columbia appropriations bill, as reported by the Senate Appropriations Committee.

The pending bill provides Federal payments to the District of Columbia totaling $712 million. The Senate bill provides $660 million for the Federal payment and $52 million as the Federal contribution to certain retirement funds.

The Senate bill is funded at the President's requested level.

It is at the subcommittee's 602(B) allocation for both BA and outlays.

I hope the Congress will work with the District of Columbia as it addresses its serious financial situation.

I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

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

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

D.C. SUBCOMMITTEE—SPENDING TOTALS—SENATE-REPORTED BILL

[Fiscal Year 1996, in millions of dollars]

Category	Budget authority	Outlays
Non-Defense discretionary:		
Outlays from prior-year BA and other actions completed	.....	.....
S. 1244, as reported to the Senate	712	712
Scorekeeping adjustment	.....	.....
Adjusted bill total	712	712
Senate subcommittee 602(b) allocation: Non-Defense discretionary	712	712
Adjusted bill total compared to Senate subcommittee 602(b) allocation: Non-Defense discretionary	0	0

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

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I noted with interest a provision of the D.C. appropriations bill which earmarks money for police details in Georgetown, Adams Morgan, Capitol Hill, and East of the River. Georgetown is to receive the highest amount—$250,000.

Every day the Washington Post and the Washington Times remind us that the District of Columbia is wracked by crime. The citizens of this city, in every quarter, deserve the best possible police protection.

I hope my colleagues would agree, police resources should be allocated to the areas of highest and most serious crime. Those decisions, I would submit, are best made by police authorities, not Congress.

I know that Georgetown has a serious crime problem, but I'm not sure that the areas targeted for earmarks are the areas with the highest need. I'm troubled that Congress seems to be taking it upon themselves to make that determination and micromanage the allocation of law enforcement resources. I hope that the conferees will examine this issue and assess whether such earmarks are necessary or fair to all the residents of the District of Columbia and visitors to our Capital City.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there are no further amendments to the bill, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

So the bill (S. 1244), as amended, passed, as follows:

[The text of the bill will appear in a future edition of the RECORD.]

Mr. JEFFORDS. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. KOHL. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes action on S. 1244 that it be held at the desk, and that when the Senate receives the House bill making appropriations for the District of Columbia for the fiscal year 1996, that all after the enacting clause be stricken and the text of S. 1244 as passed by the Senate be inserted in lieu thereof; I further ask consent that the House bill as thus amended be immediately passed without any further debate, amendment, motion, or action of any kind, and the motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill is passed be laid upon the table; I further ask consent that the Senate insist on its amendment and request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair be authorized to appoint the managers on that on the part of the Senate; finally, I ask unanimous consent that S. 1244 be indefinitely postponed.

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

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there now be a period for the transaction of morning business with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, not to extend beyond the hour of 2:20 p.m. today.

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

THE BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, as of the close of business yesterday, September 21, the Federal debt stood at $4,948,376,970,884.70. On a per capita basis, every man, woman, and child in America owes $18,784.12 as his or her share of that debt.

FOREIGN OPERATIONS APPROPRIATIONS—AMENDMENT NO. 2748

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, on September 20, I voted against an amendment offered by Senator BROWN to cap economic assistance to Turkey, because I believe the United States should strongly support economic development in that country.

Turkey is a NATO member and a close ally of the United States. Turkey has been instrumental in enabling the humanitarian program in Northern Iraq to proceed. Turkey is also struggling to become more closely tied to the European economic community, and to reform its constitution to strengthen democracy. I believe we should support that.

I also believe, however, that we have a responsibility to speak out about the mistreatment of the Kurdish minority in Turkey, which is primarily located in several southeastern provinces.

The undeniable fact is that the Kurds are second-class citizens in Turkey, where they are discriminated against in law and practice. In the southeast, where the PKK are waging a terrorist campaign against the Turkish Government, virtually any Kurd is branded with the ''terrorist'' label and considered by the Turkish military to be the enemy.

Thousands of Kurds, including innocent civilians, have been caught up in this struggle, and there are persistent reports of the excessive use of force by Turkish soldiers. There is also no denying that the PKK has used abominable tactics, resulting in many innocent deaths.

But according to a report requested by the Appropriations Committee last year and released by the State Department several months ago, and other reports by Turkish and international human rights organizations, United States military equipment, particularly fighter aircraft and helicopters, have been routinely used to strafe and destroy Kurdish villages.

The villages are targets because the Turkish Army regards them as havens for the PKK, which in some instances they may be. But the attacks have been indiscriminate, resulting in many civilian casualties. There has been a pattern of human rights violations against the Kurdish people, who have been dehumanized by Turkish society.

It recently came to my attention that the Turkish Government does not permit the International Committee of the Red Cross into Turkey. Frankly, it is inconceivable to me that a democracy, an important member of NATO,

and a country that seeks closer ties to Europe, would deny the ICRC access when there is clearly a need for it. Any armed conflict involves abuses of human rights against civilians, and in Turkey the evidence of such abuses by both sides is overwhelming. In addition, the State Department has reported on the mistreatment and torture of prisoners in Turkish jails for many years.

The ICRC operates confidentially. It does not seek to embarrass governments. It does not discuss its findings with the press, or with the Congress, or anyone else. Its goal is to monitor human rights and provide objective advice to whoever is deemed to be violating them on how to improve respect for human rights.

I am told by administration officials that they have raised this issue with Turkish officials in the past, to no avail. That is discouraging, and it is for that reason that my amendment calls on the President of the United States to raise this himself with the Turkish Prime Minister. I believe this issue is that important. I also believe that Turkey's willingness to do this would be an important sign of its commitment to improve human rights.

It is for this reason that yesterday I offered an amendment, which was adopted, which aims to encourage the Turkish Government to permit unimpeded access to the ICRC, especially in the southeast where its presence is so urgently needed. I think this is the least that a civilized, democratic country should do.

I hope the administration understands the importance of this amendment, and will give it the urgency and serious attention that it deserves.

I also joined Senator PELL in an amendment, which was also adopted, which provides $5 million for nongovernmental organizations to carry out humanitarian and other activities on behalf of Kurds in southeastern Turkey. I think this is very important. It is consistent with United States policy of promoting economic development, cultural and ethnic tolerance, and human rights, and it makes clear that we want to see a portion of our assistance to Turkey used to directly further these goals. I trust the administration will make every effort to encourage the Turkish Government to permit the use of these funds as intended.

FOREIGN OPERATIONS APPROPRIATIONS—AMENDMENT NO. 2743

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, an amendment that was adopted yesterday which I cosponsored with Senator DODD and which was also cosponsored by Senators KERRY and MURRAY, aims to address the travesty that has been going on in Guatemala for as long as most of us can remember.

Guatemala is now the only country in Central America still plagued by civil war. It is winding down, but it continues to claim innocent lives, and it is an excuse for continuing human rights atrocities by the Guatemalan Armed Forces, as well as the URNG guerrillas.

But it is the Guatemalan Armed Forces, and their armed supporters, that are guilty of the majority of these crimes. Their victims are students, nuns, journalists, human rights lawyers, union organizers—anyone who dares speak out about Government corruption or Government-sponsored violence.

The estimate of the number of killed and disappeared ranges from 40–70,000, over the past three decades. In any given week, the toll is staggering. Death threats, disappearances, and extrajudicial executions are routine in human rights reports on Guatemala.

Let me describe some recent incidents. In May of this year, nearly 100 bodies were found with signs of torture—an increase in extrajudicial executions by 40 percent, with 195 violent deaths reported.

In June, a teacher was abducted, 21 judges were threatened with death, a 17-year-old street youth was shot to death by a member of the National Police, several bodies of disappeared persons were found, a union leader was abducted, beaten, and raped, a former judge was attacked for the third time with a bomb, high school student leaders were harassed by armed men—who reportedly tried to abduct them, a Congressman was attacked, and the remains of hundreds of people in mass graves were exhumed.

On June 14, several religious organizations and human rights advocates signed a letter to President Clinton, asking that an independent human rights expert be appointed to undertake a full investigation into human rights violations in Guatemala. On Father's Day, a march was organized for children of disappeared parents. ''The father who took care of us was taken away,'' said one of the children at a press conference. ''He did not come back and we never heard from him again.''

For years, the Congress has passed resolutions, written letters, cut off aid. We have tried to get the Guatemalan Army's attention, to no avail. There has been virtually no progress in bringing to justice those responsible for any of the thousands of human rights abuses.

Jennifer Harbury, a U.S. lawyer, lost her husband 3 years ago and has been searching for him ever since. His name is Efrain Bamaca Velasquez. He was murdered after being tortured. There is evidence that a Guatemalan colonel, paid by the CIA, may have been involved in Bamaca's torture and death, as well as the death of American Michael DeVine.

A Guatemalan officer who was convicted in the DeVine case mysteriously escaped from prison the next day, and has not been seen since. Efrain Bamaca's fate remains unknown, and the Guatemalan army has obstructed justice every step of the way. Despite a court order, they have refused to permit a special prosecutor to excavate where Bamaca's body, and the bodies of many others, are believed to be buried.

Mr. President, I am not going to take the time to repeat the details. I have spoken before about the Harbury case, the DeVine case, about numerous other human rights cases in Guatemala over the years.

Guatemala's President de Leon Carpio is doing his best, and he deserves credit for keeping the peace negotiations moving forward, enabling U.N. human rights monitors to take up residence in Guatemala, supporting democratic elections, and taking some steps to improve human rights. But impunity among the army and civil patrols remains the central problem. There is no justice when a member of the armed forces is involved.

This amendment makes it clear who is the problem. It praises President de Leon Carpio, who deserves our support. But it prohibits any assistance to the armed forces and the URNG, any sales of military equipment, and cuts off visas for any member of the armed forces and URNG who are suspected of involvement in human rights violations, or of covering up such crimes.

These restrictions will end when the President certifies that the Guatemalan armed forces are fully cooperating in solving these crimes, and in carrying out the recommendations of the U.N. monitors.

I am not among those who believes that everyone in the Guatemalan army is corrupt, or guilty of crimes. Far from it. I know some honorable, honest Guatemalan officers who are disgusted by what some of their fellow officers do. I also know that there are honorable members of the URNG who are fighting because for years they were excluded from the political process, but that is changing. This amendment is aimed at the bad apples. It is time for all Guatemalans who believe in respecting human rights, in justice, to stand up for it, and to end the impunity once and for all.

A TRIBUTE TO DOUGLASS CATER

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I rise today to mourn the death of a great friend and great American, S. Douglass Cater, Jr.

A native of Montgomery, AL, Douglass Cater traveled north to school at Exeter and Harvard, interrupting his education to serve as a Russian specialist in the Office of Strategic Services in World War II. After the war ended, he remained in Washington, writing eminent prose on Washington and national affairs for The Reporter. His articles, along with his first-rate books ''The Fourth Branch of Government'' and ''Power in Washington'' brought him to the attention of Lyndon Johnson. In 1964, he joined the Johnson

White House as the President's education specialist, assisting in the development of programs that established Federal aid to education as the national policy. He also oversaw much of the work that went in to the creation of the Public Broadcasting System.

Always a dedicated educator, Douglass Cater became the President of Washington College after stints at the Aspen Institute and The Observer, the great English newspaper. As president of Washington College, Douglass moved to a new plateau above that of Chester Dana, the title character of his masterful 1970 fiction book, ''Dana: The Irrelevant Man.'' I reviewed that book back when it was first published and wrote the foreword to an upcoming edition. That brilliant novel remains as true today as ever, even though the climate and culture of this city and government have drastically changed.

Douglass Cater gave new meaning to the terms ''gentleman'' and ''scholar.'' He brought a thoughtfulness and intelligence to all his work, and continually preached the value of civilized discourse over political bickering. His faith in reason was much appreciated by all those who came to know him.

Douglass Cater was, in the words of Edwin Yoder, ''one of the best of a fine generation.'' And so we will remember him, even as we offer our condolences to his beloved wife Libby, and all his children and grandchildren.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the articles from the New York Times and the Washington Post 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, Sept. 16, 1995]

DOUGLASS CATER IS DEAD AT 72; EDUCATOR AND PRESIDENTIAL AIDE

(By Robert McG. Thomas, Jr.)

Douglass Cater, a soft-spoken student and practitioner of government power who began his working life as a journalist and ended it as a college president—after a heady detour through Lyndon B. Johnson's White House—died yesterday at the guest house at Washington College in Chestertown, Md.

He was 72 and had lived in Montgomery, Ala., since his retirement as the president of the college in 1990.

His wife, Libby, said that her husband, who was stricken during a visit to the college six weeks ago, died of pulmonary fibrosis.

By the time he went to the White House in 1964 at age 40, Mr. Cater was already an old Washington hand. An original editor of The Reporter magazine, he had spent 14 years covering Washington and national affairs, with occasional time off to write books or serve as a Government consultant.

Indeed, he began his stint as a special assistant to President Johnson two months after the publication of his third book, ''Power in Washington.''

It was a measure of Mr. Cater's evenhandedness that five years before his journalist's examination of Government power, he had given his own profession the same treatment in ''The Fourth Branch of Government.''

Mr. Cater, who had written admiringly of Johnson's use of power as Senate majority leader, had been asked to join his Vice Presidential staff in 1963, but had demurred.

At the time, Mr. Cater was on a leave from his magazine working as associate director of the Center of Advanced Studies at Wesleyan University in Connecticut and wanted to finish his book.

The second call—this time from the White House—''got his attention,'' Mrs. Cater recalled yesterday.

Mr. Cater, who was given a vague mandate to ''think ahead'' and had been told by other Presidential assistants that they ''made it up'' as they went along, took a while to find his niche.

The breakthrough, his wife said, came when he noticed that Johnson's face lit up whenever he read a memorandum on education. Taking the Presidential visage as his guide, Mr. Cater became the resident education specialist, with far-reaching results, among them the first legislation establishing Federal aid to education as a national norm.

''It was one of his proudest achievements,'' his wife said, recalling that another was the spadework her husband did in creating the Public Broadcasting System.

Mr. Cater, who left the White House in 1968 to join Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey's Presidential campaign staff, later worked as an executive of The Observer and joined the Aspen Institute, which became his base as a freelance writer and political gadfly before taking the Washington College post in 1982.

A native of Montgomery, Mr. Cater, whose full name was Silas Douglass Cater Jr., came by his interest in government naturally. His father, Silas Cater, was a politically attuned lawyer who served in the Alabama Legislature and later became Montgomery City Clerk.

After attending Exeter, Mr. Cater went on to Harvard, interrupting his education during World War II to serve as a Russian specialist with the Office of Strategic Services in Washington, an experience he found so dull, his wife said, that he vowed never again to work as a specialist but to operate as a generalist.

By most accounts he did that brilliantly, earning a reputation as a civilizing influence who brought thoughtfulness to both his extensive writings and his other work.

Resorting to reason when others might rail, Mr. Cater was forever preaching the value of civilized discourse.

In 1984, for example, he persuaded two former Presidents and six former Secretaries of State to endorse a bipartisan statement urging Presidential candidates to moderate their comments on foreign affairs.

Mr. Cater, who wrote widely, including a number of Op-Ed articles for The New York Times, had less success a campaign to persuade the news media, particularly television, to moderate their voices in reporting on Government.

Although his published works on Government were widely praised, perhaps his greatest achievement as a writer was his lone and daring venture into fiction, his 1970 novel ''Dana: The Irrelevant Man.''

There have been many excellent factual accounts of Washington, of course, but in his review in The Times, Christopher Lehmann-Haupt suggested that Mr. Cater had pulled off something of a miracle in a well-abused genre, proving ''That wise reporters can write fiction after all.''

In addition to his wife, Mr. Cater is survived by two sons, Silas 3d, of San Rafael, Calif., and Ben, of Baltimore; two daughters, Sage, of Montgomery and Morrow Scheer, of San Rafael; a brother, William, of Millburn, N.J., and four grandchildren.

[From the Washington Post, September 16, 1995]

S. DOUGLASS CATER DIES AT 72; LBJ AIDE, WRITER, EDUCATOR

(By Bart Barnes)

S. Douglass Cater, 72, a top aide to President Lyndon B. Johnson, a Washington journalist and author and the former president of Washington College in Chestertown, Md., died Sept. 15 at his quarters on the college campus. He had pulmonary fibrosis.

Mr. Cater served as special assistant to Johnson from 1964 to 1968. In that period, he was a principal draftsman for much of the Great Society legislation, including programs on education, health and medical care, labor and welfare. He also wrote speeches for Johnson and was instrumental in the formation of the Public Broadcasting Corp. and the Teacher Corps.

As a journalist, he was Washington editor and national affairs editor for the Reporter magazine in the 1950s and early 1960s, then in the late 1979s was vice chairman of The Observer in London. He wrote occasional political commentary on the op-ed pages of The Washington Post.

From 1982 until 1990, Mr. Cater was president of Washington College, a small liberal arts institution on Maryland's Eastern Shore. He was said by friends to have had a deep and abiding belief in the value of education, and a conviction that an educated citizenry could be sensible and responsible in matters of public policy. He also was a senior fellow, funding member and trustee of the Aspen Institute for Humanistic Studies.

He was the author of ''Power in Washington,'' a 1964 book that he described as an attempt ''to define what was happening to the political process as America moved toward its bicentennial.'' In a 1958 book, ''The Fourth Branch of Government,'' Mr. Cater criticized the media, observing that the presence of television cameras at White House press conferences ''make unpaid actors of the entire Washington press corps.''

He also wrote a political novel, ''Dana, the Irrelevant Man,'' which was published in 1970.

After stepping down as president of Washington College, Mr. Cater returned to his native Montgomery, Ala. He died while on a visit back to the college.

During World War II, Mr. Cater served in the Office of Strategic Services. He graduated from Harvard University and came to Washington in 1950 as Washington editor for the Reporter.

Not until he retired from Washington College did Mr. Cater return to live in the South, but he retained his Southern identity all his life and sometimes came across as the epitome of the cultivated Southerner.

He was inventive—with a seemingly endless stream of ideas—humorous, warm and sometimes crotchety.

''He had an acute sense of history, a gift for clear prose and excellent contacts in the universities, medical schools, foundations and education associations. He helped to draw up and put through most of Johnson's programs for aid to education and better medical care,'' said Harry C. McPherson Jr., who also served in the Johnson White House, in his book, ''A Political Education.''

For 13 years, Mr. Cater was Washington editor of the Reporter. He then served two years as national affairs editor before joining the Johnson White House in the spring of 1964. On Election Day 1964, Mr. Cater wrote a one-page memorandum to the president suggesting that Johnson seize the opportunity in what was beginning to look like a major electoral victory to become the ''education president.'' Among the measures stemming from this suggestion were the Elementary

and Secondary Education Act, the Higher Education Act and the International Education Act.

Mr. Cater left the Johnson administration in October 1968 to work as a domestic adviser on the unsuccessful presidential campaign of Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey.

Later, he did writing and consulting and in 1970 became a founding fellow of the Aspen Institute for Humanistic Studies. He was a principal planner in designing the Institute's Center for Governance at Wye Plantation on the Eastern Shore.

In the late 1970s, he became vice chairman of the Observer, England's oldest weekly newspaper.

He took the job as president of Washington College in 1982, he said, ''because I wanted to do something to make my own mark. In the White House, one could feel many heady things, but you were just part of a process. It didn't really matter if it was you or someone else. Although I was a high level staff man, I had never been in a job where the buck stopped with me.''

During his years at the college, Mr. Cater raised more than $43 million to revitalize the academic program and add major new facilities. He also became a national champion of independent liberal arts colleges, waging a running verbal battle on the op ed pages of The Post and the New York Times with then-Education Secretary William J. Bennett, who had accused private colleges of being too greedy.

Mr. Cater's books also included ''Ethics in a Business Society'' (1953); ''Politics of Health'' (1972); and ''TV Violence and the Child'' (1975).

Survivors include his wife, Libby Anderson Cater of Montgomery; four children, S. Douglas Cater III and Libby Morrow Cater Sheer, both of San Francisco, Rebecca Sage Cater of Montgomery, and Benjamin Winston Cater of Baltimore; a brother, William B. Cater of Milburn, N.J.; and four grandchildren.

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 20, 1995]

DOUGLASS CATER'S RULES OF JOURNALISM

(By Edwin M. Yoder, Jr.)

Even perceptive newspaper obituaries rarely capture the flavor of a man. The notices of Douglass Cater's death at 72 conveyed only a hint of what made him an original.

I knew of Cater, and had read a good bit of his writing (mainly in the old Reporter magazine), long before our paths crossed in the mid-1980s. By then, he was assailed by excruciating physical debilities, including chronic back pain that he managed by a curious regimen of flexing exercises, rhythmically twisting his torso in a way vaguely suggestive of an exotic dance. But far from complaining, he observed his frailties as a journalist and wrote about them—interestingly.

Meeting him one could see how he had by then accumulated a larger stock of interesting firsthand institutional memory than just about anyone you ever met, beginning with World War II service in the legendary Office of Strategic Services. That was just the beginning. When communists took control of the world student movement, he and others organized the U.S. National Student Association. Later, he was a Washington magazine correspondent and editor, a White House aide to Lyndon Johnson, the editor of a venerable English newspaper (the Observer of London, which with the help of Robert Anderson's philanthropy, he rescued from the brink of oblivion), a writer, philosopher of higher education, godfather to public broadcasting and president of an old liberal arts college on Maryland's eastern shore (Washington, in Chestertown), which he also helped rescue and was visiting when he died.

Cater's old friends knew him as a man of dramatic loyalties, reinforced by a sharp tongue.

After we had seen Cater take someone's hide off at a forum one summer night, an old friend told me a story. It happened when Cater was working for Lyndon Johnson in the White House, at the height of the national quarrel over Vietnam.

His friend had flown to Washington on business and planned to stay with the Caters. Cater picked him up at National Airport. As they drove south on the GW Parkway, Cater asked, in his Alabama drawl: ''John, are you one of those goddam academics who're always carping at the president about the war?'' His friend admitted that he was. ''I'm sorry,'' Cater announced, ''but we will have to stop speaking.'' Cater withdrew to this study, skipping dinner, and it was years before friendly relations were restored. He took his loyalties seriously.

Douglass Cater's monument, however, apart from many inventive good works, is a small book he wrote in the late 1950s called ''The Fourth Branch of Government,'' one of those seminal books that say all that needs saying about a subject. Cater wrote the book when many journalists were uncomfortably reviewing the press's dubious performance in the rise and fall of the 20th century's most disruptive American demagogue, Sen. Joe McCarthy of Wisconsin.

McCarthy's dark ascendancy was in part an expression of the anxiety generated by the Cold War. Cater's analysis focused, however, on one of its proximate sustaining causes: the cult of reportorial ''objectivity.'' By the rules of objectivity, if an official of note made a sensational charge, even one that seemed patently bizarre, the press's duty was to report it straight, put it out unspun for public consumption. If it proved to be a lie, it would presumably be answered; and the answer would be duly reported.

Cater demonstrated that this rosy theory took inadequate account of McCarthy's unscrupulousness, or of the speed with which a resounding lie tends to outrun humdrum truth. Whether as an original perception or as the articulation of a consensus, Cater's book helped kill the cult of journalistic ''objectivity''; and it was good riddance. If, today, a U.S. senator asserts that the sky was blue on Labor Day, a diligent reporter will check the back weather reports. And if it was actually gray, you can bet that fact will be reported early in the story, under the convention that Stephen Hess of the Brookings Institution calls ''corrective journalism.'' And even the excesses of corrective journalism are a vast improvement over the abuses of the rules of ''objectivity.''

In short, it was Douglass Cater, more than anyone else, who changed the rules of American journalism, and very much for the better. And that was only one of perhaps a dozen distinctions that made him one of the best of a fine generation.

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 Committee on Foreign Relations.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, which were referred as indicated:

EC–1461. A communication from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report on the expenditure and need for worker adjustment assistance training funds for the period July 1 to September 30, 1995; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–1462. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, notice of the intention of the President to provide economic support funds to El Salvador; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1463. A communication from the Senior Deputy Assistant Administrator (Bureau for Legislative and Public Affairs), U.S. Agency for International Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Turkey Economic Report for calendar year 1994; the Committee on Foreign Relations.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petitions and memorials were laid before the Senate and were referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM–301. A resolution adopted by the Council of the City of North Wildwood, New Jersey relative to the Flood Rate Map; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

POM–302. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

''SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 12

''Whereas, section 8 housing assistance is made available from the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) through California local government housing agencies to assist in rental payments for persons of lower income; and

''Whereas, section 8 housing assistance has heretofore been made available to assist lower income families and individuals, including senior citizens and the disabled, in helping them pay part of manufactured home and mobilehome park space rent; and

''Whereas, HUD has proposed rule changes to the Section 8 housing assistance payments program for fiscal year 1995 for manufactured home spaces to be established at 30 percent of the applicable Section 8 Rental Certificate program two-bedroom fair market rent; and

''Whereas, the proposed HUD rule changes would establish a formula that would permit space rent in many counties to be not more than $207 in order for lower income persons to be eligible for the Section 8 assistance; and

''Whereas, in San Diego County alone, the current average mobilehome space rent of mobilehome applicants awaiting Section 8 assistance is more than $325; and

''Whereas, under the proposed rule changes many lower income senior citizens, families, and disabled persons living in mobilehome parks in a number of California counties will no longer qualify for assistance: Now, therefore, be it

''*Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California, jointly,* That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully

memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States to support modification of the proposed rule changes to the proposed Section 8 formula relating to manufactured home and mobilehome space rent, or to enact urgency legislation to clarify that persons receiving Section 8 assistance for manufactured home and mobilehome space rent be treated no differently under the HUD rules than recipients of Section 8 assistance living in other types of rental housing, or to at least provide a more realistic formula in recognition of higher manufactured housing space rents in more populous California counties; and be it further

''*Resolved,* That the Secretary of the Senate transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, and to the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.''

POM–303. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

''ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 7

''Whereas, manufactured homes constructed pursuant to the National Manufactured Housing Construction and Safety Standards Act provide an important source of nonsubsidized affordable housing to Californians; and

''Whereas, the State of California is a national leader in efforts to encourage and expand the use of manufactured housing by eliminating unnecessary regulatory barriers and by developing and encouraging innovative land use and financing policies; and

''Whereas, the State of California has deemed manufactured homes a permitted use in all residential zoning districts, subject to the same development standards applicable to other dwellings in that zoning district; and

''Whereas, construction and safety standards for manufactured homes are established in federal law and regulation and all such standards preempt local and state codes; and

''Whereas, the federal Manufactured Home Construction and Safety Standards have been determined by the State of California to meet or exceed performance standards established for other dwellings; and

''Whereas, Federal law requires every federally certified manufactured home to be constructed on a chassis which must remain a permanent feature of the home's substructure; and

''Whereas, the chassis is not necessary for the home's structural integrity if the home is sited on a permanent foundation and the home's floor system is designed to accommodate appropriate design loads; and

''Whereas, this mandatory feature represents an unnecessary regulatory barrier to greater design flexibility for manufactured homes; and

''Whereas, this regulatory barrier prevents innovative uses of manufactured homes to meet the demand for affordable housing in California; and

''Whereas, this regulatory barrier prevents manufactured home producers from developing a recycling program for chassis systems which could save consumers between $1,000 and $2,000 per home; now, therefore, be it

''*Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California, jointly,* That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States to amend the definition of ''manufactured home'' in federal law to allow such homes to be designed to accommodate a removable chassis, so long as the home is intended to be permanently sited on a foundation and so long as the floor system is designed to accommodate appropriate design loads; and be it further

''*Resolved,* That the Chief Clerk of the Assembly transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, and to each member of the House Committee on Banking, Housing, and Financial Services, the Senate Committee on Banking and Urban Affairs, and the House and Senate appropriations subcommittees on HUD/VA and independent agencies.''

POM–304. A resolution adopted by the Senate of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

SENATE RESOLUTION

''Whereas, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts has produced the paper from which United States currency, including the one dollar bill, is made from over one hundred years and takes great pride in this product; and

''Whereas, the elimination of the one dollar bill would have a severe negative impact on the local economies of the western region of the Commonwealth, including job cutbacks and the state's economy in general; and

''Whereas, the economies of the western region have suffered greatly in past years due to manufacturing job reductions and attendant economic impacts; and

''Whereas, the benefits, so-called, claimed by proponents of the dollar coin are highly suspect and would come at the overall expense of the people of the Commonwealth; and

''Whereas, the paper for which currency is made is produced from renewable resources and recycled industrial products, while the metals to produce coins are obtained from environmentally damaging hardrock mining; and

''Whereas, the prices of coin operated machines will likely rise with the replacement of the dollar bill with a dollar coin, thereby negatively impacting those least able to afford such price increases; and

''Whereas, the overwhelming majority of Americans have consistently opposed replacing the dollar bill with the dollar coin; Now therefore be it

''*Resolved,* That the Commonwealth of Massachusetts is opposed to the replacement of the one dollar bill by a one dollar coin as contrary to its economic, historical, social and environmental interest and traditions; and be it further

''*Resolved,* That a copy of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the clerk of the Senate to the Members of the Congress from the Commonwealth.''

REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following reports of committee were submitted:

By Mr. HATFIELD, from the Committee on Appropriations:

Special Report entitled ''Revised Allocation to Subcommittees of Budget Totals from the Concurrent Resolution for Fiscal Year 1996'' (Rept. No. 104–146).

By Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. ROTH), from the Committee on Governmental Affairs, without amendment:

S. 1267. An original bill to amend the Congressional Award Act to revise and extend authorities for the Congressional Award Board (Rept. No. 104–147).

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. MACK (for himself, Mr. DOLE, Mr. LOTT, Mr. D'AMATO, Mr. KYL, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. GRAMM, Mr. NICKLES, Mr. ROTH, Mr. FRIST, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. BOND, Mr. FAIRCLOTH, and Mr. COCHRAN):

S. 1266. A bill to require the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System to focus on price stability in establishing monetary policy to ensure the stable, long-term purchasing power of the currency, to repeal the Full Employment and Balanced Growth Act of 1978, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. ROTH):

S. 1267. An original bill to amend the Congressional Award Act to revise and extend authorities for the Congressional Award Board; from the Committee on Governmental Affairs; placed on the calendar.

By Mr. THOMAS (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. FRIST, Mr. SIMPSON, and Mr. BURNS):

S. 1268. A bill to provide assistance for the establishment of community rural health networks in chronically underserved areas, to provide incentives for providers of health care services to furnish services in such areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. ROBB:

S. 1269. A bill to amend the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 to provide for the establishment of Internet, dial-in network, and telephone access to information on traffic conditions as part of the intelligent vehicle-highway systems program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. MACK (for himself, Mr. DOLE, Mr. LOTT, Mr. D'AMATO, Mr. KYL, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. GRAMM, Mr. NICKLES, Mr. ROTH, Mr. FRIST, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. BOND, Mr. FAIRCLOTH, and Mr. COCHRAN):

S. 1266. A bill to require the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System to focus on price stability in establishing monetary policy to ensure the stable, long-term purchasing power of the currency, to repeal the Full Employment and Balanced Growth Act of 1978, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

THE ECONOMIC GROWTH AND PRICE STABILITY ACT OF 1995

● Mr. MACK. Mr. President, today I am introducing the Economic Growth and Price Stability Act of 1995. This legislation aims to accomplish two major goals. First, it focuses the Federal Reserve on achieving price stability. Second, it repeals the Full Employment and Balanced Growth Act of 1978—the

Humphrey-Hawkins Act—which codified the Keynesian principles that advocate government fine-tuning of the economy.

Based on the fundamentally flawed premise that government can manage the economy, the Humphrey-Hawkins Act set targets for the economy to reach an unemployment rate of 3 percent for individuals over 20 and 4 percent for individuals over 16 and an inflation rate of 3 percent eventually moving to zero. Almost 20 years later, we know that this law has never achieved any of its intentions. This law proves that government cannot legislate prosperity—the reality is that individuals create jobs and free markets lead to prosperity.

By codifying unrealistic goals, the Humphrey-Hawkins Act gives the Fed an unachievable mission to artificially boost growth and employment while keeping inflation and interest rates low. This promotes fine-tuning of monetary policy by the Fed in response to current economic trends. While this may lead to short-term economic boosts, over the long term such intervention by the Fed leads to higher inflation, higher interest rates, and more frequent recessions. The Economic Growth and Price Stability Act corrects this problem by focusing the Fed on the only goal it can effectively achieve: price stability. Focusing the Fed on price stability will lead to a sounder dollar, more stable financial markets, increased employment, and greater long-term economic growth.

The Economic Growth and Price Stability Act gives the Fed the responsibilities of defining price stability, charting its own course toward achieving and maintaining it, and setting its own timeframe for accomplishing the price stability goal. By allowing the Fed to create its own timetable, we can rest assured that transitional effects on employment and output will not occur.

Under my legislation, the Fed will still be required to report to Congress on a semiannual basis, but it will additionally be required to explain, in verbal and numerical terms, its definition of and its methods for attaining price stability. By not mandating inflation targets, this legislation places the burden on the Fed to appropriately define price stability. As we all know, the market is a harsh task master, and I believe it will be the best judge of the Fed's progress.

The Fed will have a strong incentive to make correct decisions about its definition of price stability and its method for achieving it, because the markets will be quick to express their views. The Fed will pursue price stability honestly and openly, because if it does not, long term interest rates will rise.

Instead of countercyclical, command and control, government interventionist economics, the Economic Growth and Price Stability Act sets in place a free market paradigm. Under the Economic Growth and Price Stability Act the principal economic responsibilities of government are to establish and ensure an environment conducive to long-term economic growth and increases in living standards by maintaining free markets, low taxes, respect for private property, and the stable long-term purchasing power of the U.S. currency.

If the elections in November 1994 taught us anything, they taught us that the American people want less government, not more. The Economic Growth and Price Stability Act recognizes that the American people know what is best for them and directly responds to their demands. I hope you will join me in this vital effort to free our economy from government mishandling.●

● Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, I am proud to cosponsor with Senator MACK, the Economic Growth and Stability Act. As chairman of the Joint Economic Committee and a member of the Banking Committee, Senator MACK has studied economic issues studiously. I commend him for this initiative.

This bill would repeal the Humphrey-Hawkins Act, which sets the current guidelines for the Federal Reserve's conduct of monetary policy. The multiple goals of Humphrey-Hawkins, however laudable, are conflicting and unattainable. In the long term the Fed can only address inflation. Unemployment and other such matters are the responsibility of the administration and Congress—which we control through our spending and tax decisions. Under this bill, we could no longer lay the blame of failed fiscal policy at the foot of the Federal Reserve.

Senator MACK'S bill would recognize that the appropriate goal for the Federal Reserve is maintaining price stability in the long term. The Economic Growth and Price Stability Act recognizes that a key factor in encouraging growth is a stable environment in which to make decisions about the future. In an atmosphere of assured price stability, American families and corporations would be better able to budget and plan for the future. Assuring this steady level of capital investment and growth will create the jobs necessary to keep Americans' working.

The policies and school of thought behind this legislation are sound. Federal Reserve Board Chairman Alan Greenspan has testified that ''a key ingredient in achieving the highest possible levels of productivity, real income, and living standards is the achievement of price stability.'' The Economic Growth and Stability Act is a critical step in this direction.

Working together, the Federal Reserve can tackle inflation while the Congress, with the right fiscal policy, can stimulate long-term growth. We must return to a period of strong growth for our country to prosper and remain globally competitive. We owe it to ourselves and our children.●

By Mr. THOMAS (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. FRIST, Mr. SIMPSON, and Mr. BURNS):

S. 1268. A bill to provide assistance for the establishment of community rural health networks in chronically undeserved areas, to provide incentives for providers of health care services to furnish services in such areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

THE RURAL HEALTH DEVELOPMENT ACT

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Rural Health Development Act, an act that I have worked on for some time, to help rural communities design a delivery system that fits their unique health care needs. It has been a project, in fact, that I have worked on since the day I arrived in the House, more than 5 years ago. This issue and these items continue to be a top priority for me here in the Senate. I am pleased that my colleagues, Senators GRASSLEY, JEFFORDS, SIMPSON, BURNS and FRIST, have joined me in this effort. They, too, have worked feverishly on behalf of the rural communities in their States.

Rural health care, Mr. President, as you know from your State, is at a crossroads. My bill provides for an infrastructure needed to create a system of quality health care for rural families. There are a number of problems that are unique to rural areas—the lack of physicians, nurses, health care extenders, nurse practitioners, and physician assistants. We are troubled by the closure of small hospitals where the utilization has been relatively low, and leaves a community without some kind of emergency medical service.

Inadequate and unequal Medicare reimbursement is a problem today. So we have what we think is a solution. It helps communities develop their own health care delivery system. It assists in recruiting and retaining physicians. It improves educational opportunities for nurses, physicians, physician extenders, and other kinds of health professionals. It allows hospitals to downsize without losing their emergency room capacity. In short, it is a long-term solution tailored to the needs of rural areas.

Specifically, it provides technical assistance. Small grant funds are provided to help communities to design their own network, not one designed by outside consultants who are only familiar with the characteristics of larger places. Second, these funds can be used for two purposes—to build telemedicine systems to assist rural areas, and coordinate arrangements between primary care clinics, emergency medical centers, and tertiary care facilities.

Finally, the result to rural individuals, families and employers is the ability to take advantage of cost savings that occur elsewhere, which has not been able to occur in rural America.

We equalize the Medicare reimbursement rates. Rural counties receive significantly less reimbursement from

Medicare managed care programs. For example, Fall River County in South Dakota, receives $177 per month, per beneficiary versus $678 for Bronx County in New York—a 367 percent difference.

My bill reduces this variation and reimburses rural providers relative to their metropolitan counterparts. The result, of course, is that Medicare beneficiaries in rural areas will have the opportunity to participate in managed care plans.

Third, it improves the educational opportunities for nurses. Nurses are a critical component to rural health care. My bill guarantees that 20 percent of all scholarships offered through the National Health Service Corps go to nurses in rural areas. Since 1972, over 70 health care providers have served in Wyoming through the services of the National Health Service Corps Program. So we put greater emphasis there.

Regarding recruiting and retaining physicians, Medicare currently provides a 10 percent bonus in rural areas. Ten percent is not much of an incentive. So it is increased to 20. To compensate for the increase, the bonus is restricted to primary care physicians in rural areas.

In addition, the bill guarantees 24-hour emergency care. Medicare currently restricts States from establishing limited-service hospitals. As a result, many facilities either have to operate as full-service hospitals, with very low utilization, or close. We are suggesting they be recategorized as a rural emergency access care hospital so that indeed they can be reimbursed from HCFA for these emergency services.

In conclusion, Mr. President, as we search for solutions to deliver health care throughout the country, the Rural Development Health Care Act is one proposal that should be added to the list. Many of the provisions have received a favorable response—so much so that they are likely to be folded into the reconciliation package.

More important, the Rural Development Health Care Act provides the answer to rural communities that are looking to keep up with the rapidly changing health care environment.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 216

At the request of Mr. INOUYE, the name of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CRAIG] was added as a cosponsor of S. 216, a bill to repeal the reduction in the deductible portion of expenses for business meals and entertainment.

S. 304

At the request of Mr. SANTORUM, the name of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. GRAMS] was added as a cosponsor of S. 304, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the transportation fuels tax applicable to commercial aviation.

S. 910

At the request of Mr. CHAFEE, the name of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BREAUX] was added as a cosponsor of S. 910, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an election to exclude from the gross estate of a decedent the value of certain land subject to a qualified conservation easement, and to make technical changes to alternative valuation rules.

S. 1137

At the request of Mr. THOMAS, the name of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HELMS] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1137, a bill to amend title 17, United States Code, with respect to the licensing of music, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2711

At the request of Mr. REID the names of the Senator from Illinois [Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. WELLSTONE], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SIMON], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 2711 proposed to H.R. 1868, a bill making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED

THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1996

BYRD AMENDMENT NO. 2768

Mr. BYRD proposed an amendment to the bill (S. 1244) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 53, between lines 5 and 6, insert the following:

(H) The Chief of the National Guard Bureau who shall be an ex officio member.

On page 66, strike line 15 and insert the following:

SEC. 211. IMPROVING ORDER AND DISCIPLINE.

(a) DRESS CODE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than the first day of the 1996–1997 school year, the Commission shall develop and implement, through the Board of Education and the Superintendent of Schools, a uniform dress code for the District of Columbia Public Schools.

(2) CONSIDERATIONS.—The dress code—

(A) shall include a prohibition of gang membership symbols;

(B) shall take into account the relative costs of any policy for each student; and

(C) may include a requirement that students wear uniforms.

(B) COMMUNITY SERVICE REQUIREMENT FOR SUSPENDED STUDENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Any student suspended from classes at a District of Columbia Public School who is required to serve the suspension outside the school shall perform community service for the period of suspension. The community service required by this subsection shall be subject to rules and regulations promulgated by the Mayor.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This subsection shall take effect beginning on the first day of the 1996–1997 school year.

SEC. 212. EXPIRATION DATE.

BYRD AMENDMENT NO. 2769

Mr. BYRD proposed an amendment to amendment No. 2768 proposed by him to the bill S. 1244, supra; as follows:

On page 2, after line 25 insert the following:

(c) EXPIRATION DATE.—This section and the membership provided in section 202(a)(2)(H) shall expire on the last day of the 1997–1998 school year.

(d) REPORT.—The Commission shall study the effectiveness of the policies implemented pursuant to this section in improving order and discipline in schools and report its findings to the appropriate committees of Congress 60 days before the last day of the 1997–1998 school year.

DORGAN AMENDMENT NO. 2770

Mr. DORGAN proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1244, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place, add the following new section:

SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE ON BUDGET PRIORITIES.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1996 (H. Con. Res. 67) calls for $245 billion in tax reductions and $270 billion in projected spending reductions from Medicare;

(2) reducing projected Medicare spending by $270 billion could substantially increase out-of-pocket health care costs for senior citizens, reduce the quality of care available to Medicare beneficiaries and threaten the financial health of some health care providers, especially in rural areas;

(3) seventy-five percent of Medicare beneficiaries have annual incomes of less than $25,000;

(4) most of the tax cuts in the tax bill passed by the House of Representatives (H.R. 1215) go to families making over $100,000 per year, according to the Office of Tax Analysis of the United States Department of the Treasury.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the Committee on Finance and the Senate should approve no tax legislation which reduces taxes for those making over $101,000 per year; and

(2) the savings from limiting any tax reductions in this way should be used to reduce any cuts in projected Medicare spending.

INHOFE AMENDMENT NO. 2771

Mr. INHOFE proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1244, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place insert the following: ''None of the funds provided in this Act may be used directly or indirectly for the renovation of the property located at 227 7th Street Southeast (commonly known as Eastern Market), except that funds provided in this Act may be used for the regular maintenance and upkeep of the current structure and grounds located at such property.''

JEFFORDS AMENDMENT NO. 2772

Mr. JEFFORDS proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1244, supra; as follows:

On page 2 at line 17: Strike ''$52,070,000'' and insert ''$52,000,000.''

KOHL (AND JEFFORDS) AMENDMENT NO. 2773

Mr. KOHL (for himself and Mr. JEFFORDS) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1244, supra; as follows:

On page 52, strike lines 13 through 16 and insert the following:

''(A) 1 member to be appointed by the President chosen from a list of 3 proposed members submitted by the Majority Leader of the Senate;

''(B) 1 member to be appointed by the President chosen from a list of 3 proposed members submitted by the Speaker of the House of Representatives''.

BINGAMAN AMENDMENT NO. 2774

Mr. KOHL (for Mr. BINGAMAN) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1244, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. . ENERGY SAVINGS AT DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FACILITIES.

(a) REDUCTION IN FACILITIES ENERGY COSTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The head of each agency of the District of Columbia for which funds are made available under this Act shall—

(A) take all actions necessary to achieve during fiscal year 1996 a 5 percent reduction, from fiscal year 1995 levels, in the energy costs of the facilities used by the agency; or

(B) enter into a sufficient number of energy savings performance contracts with private sector energy service companies under title VIII of the National Energy Conservation Policy Act (42 U.S.C. 8287 et seq.) to achieve during fiscal year 1996 at least a 5 percent reduction, from fiscal year 1995 levels, in the energy use of the facilities used by the agency.

(2) GOAL.—The activities described in paragraph (1) should be a key component of agency programs that will by the year 2000 result in a 20 percent reduction, from fiscal year 1985 levels, in the energy use of the facilities used by the agency, as required by section 543 of the National Energy Conservation Policy Act (42 U.S.C. 8253).

(b) USE OF COST SAVINGS.—An amount equal to the amount of cost savings realized by an agency under subsection (a) shall remain available for obligation through the end of fiscal year 2000, without further authorization or appropriation, as follows:

(1) CONSERVATION MEASURES.—Fifty percent of the amount shall remain available for the implementation of additional energy conservation measures and for water conservation measures at such facilities used by the agency as are designated by the head of the agency.

(2) OTHER PURPOSES.—Fifty percent of the amount shall remain available for use by the agency for such purposes as are designated by the head of the agency, consistent with applicable law.

(c) REPORTS.—

(1) BY AGENCY HEADS.—The head of each agency for which funds are made available under this Act shall include in each report of the agency to the Secretary of Energy under section 548(a) of the National Energy Conservation Policy Act (42 U.S.C. 8258(a)) a description of the result of the activities carried out under subsection (a) and recommendations concerning how to further reduce energy costs and energy consumption in the future.

(2) BY SECRETARY OF ENERGY.—The reports required under paragraph (1) shall be included in the annual reports required to be submitted to Congress by the Secretary of Energy under section 548(b) of the Act (42 U.S.C. 8258(b)).

(3) CONTENTS.—With respect to the period since the date of the preceding report, a report under paragraph (1) or (2) shall—

(A) specify the total energy costs of the facilities used by the agency;

(B) identify the reductions achieved;

(C) specify the actions that resulted in the reductions;

(D) with respect to the procurement procedures of the agency, specify what actions have been taken to—

(i) implement the procurement authorities provided by subsections (a) and (c) of section 546 of the National Energy Conservation Policy Act (42 U.S.C. 8256); and

(ii) incorporate directly, or by reference, the requirements of the regulations issued by the Secretary of Energy under title VIII of the Act (42 U.S.C. 8287 et seq.); and

(E) specify—

(i) the actions taken by the agency to achieve the goal specified in subsection (a)(2);

(ii) the procurement procedures and methods used by the agency under section 546(a)(2) of the Act (42 U.S.C. 8256(a)(2)); and

(iii) the number of energy savings performance contracts entered into by the agency under title VIII of the Act (42 U.S.C. 8287 et seq.).

BOXER (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 2775

Mrs. BOXER (for herself, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. DOLE, Mr. BUMPERS, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. FEINGOLD, and Mr. BRYAN) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1244, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following new section:

SEC. . PAY OF MEMBERS OF CONGRESS AND THE PRESIDENT DURING GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWNS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Members of Congress and the President shall not receive basic pay for any period in which—

(1) there is more than a 24-hour lapse in appropriations for any Federal agency or department as a result of a failure to enact a regular appropriations bill or continuing resolution; or

(2) the Federal Government is unable to make payments or meet obligations because the public debt limit under section 3101 of title 31, United States Code has been reached.

(b) RETROACTIVE PAY PROHIBITED.—No pay forfeited in accordance with subsection (a) may be paid retroactively.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. JEFFORDS. 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 Friday, September 22, 1995, to conduct a hearing on the Federal Reserve's semiannual report on monetary policy.

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

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent on behalf of the Governmental Affairs Committee to meet on Friday, September 22 at 10 a.m. for a markup on reconciliation.

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

COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Labor and Human Resources be authorized to meet for an executive session, until the close of business during the session of the Senate on Friday, September 22, 1995.

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE CONSTITUTION, FEDERALISM, AND PROPERTY RIGHTS

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on the Constitution, Federalism, and Property Rights of the Committee on the Judiciary, be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Friday, September 22, 1995 at 10 a.m., in the Senate Dirksen Building, room 226 to hold a hearing on ''Adarand versus Pena: a Review of Affirmative Action in Contracting.''

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON TERRORISM, TECHNOLOGY, AND GOVERNMENT INFORMATION

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Terrorism, Technology, and Government Information of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, be authorized to meet during a session of the Senate on Friday, September 22, at 10 a.m., in Senate Hart Building, room 216, on the Ruby Ridge incident.

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

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

RECONCILIATION SUBMISSIONS

● Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, pursuant to section 105(a) of the 1996 budget resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 67, Senate committees are to submit their reconciliation recommendations to the Senate Budget Committee no later than September 22. While the Budget Committee has the discretion to report the reconciliation bill at any time after that date, the Budget Committee's obligation to report the bill to the Senate arises upon receipt of all of the committee's submissions. In addition, under the reconciliation procedures applicable this year it is particularly important that as many submissions be included in the reconciliation package as possible.

It has come to my attention that the Senate Finance Committee cannot submit its recommendations to the Budget Committee prior to September 29. Because the Finance Committee's submission will carry a great portion of the outlays reductions necessary to achieve balance and to obtain certification by CBO, the Senate Budget Committee will exercise its discretion and wait to receive Finance's submissions on September 29 before initiating

the certification process. Any submission under section 105(a) made after that date, however, may be received too late to be included.●

THE 21ST ANNUAL UKRAINIAN HERITAGE FESTIVAL

● Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. President, our country is a remarkable mosaic—a mixture of races, languages, ethnicities, and religions—that grows increasingly diverse with each passing year. Nowhere is this incredible diversity more evident than in the State of New Jersey. In New Jersey, schoolchildren come from families that speak 120 different languages at home. These different languages are used in over 1.4 million homes in my State. I have always believed that one of the United States greatest strengths is the diversity of the people that make up its citizenry and I am proud to call the attention of my colleagues to an event in New Jersey that celebrates the importance of the diversity that is a part of America's collective heritage.

On Saturday, September 23, 1995, the Garden State Arts Center in Holmdel, NJ, will celebrate the next in its series of 1995 Fall Heritage Festivals. The Heritage Festival Program salutes some of the different ethnic communities that contribute so greatly to New Jersey's diverse makeup. Highlighting old country customs and culture, the festival programs are an opportunity to express pride in the ethnic backgrounds that are a part of our collective heritage. Additionally, the Fall Heritage Festivals contribute proceeds from their programs to the Garden State Arts Center's Cultural Center Fund which presents theater productions free-of-charge to New Jersey's schoolchildren, seniors, and other deserving residents. The Heritage Festival thus not only pays tribute to the cultural influences from our past, it also makes a significant contribution to our present day cultural activities.

On Saturday, September 23, 1995, the Heritage Festival Series will celebrate the 21st Annual Ukrainian Heritage Festival. Chaired by Oksana Korduba, this year's event focuses on the road to democracy and economic reform for the Ukraine. It is fitting that the Ukrainian Heritage Festival follows so closely on the heels of the fourth anniversary of Ukrainian independence. Upon gaining independence, Ukraine has worked diligently for both economic reform and democracy. In particular, Ukraine has taken significant steps to reform its economy by working to stabilize inflation, liberalize prices, and privatize industries. Further, through the creation and continued improvement of a constitutional framework, Ukraine is developing its own strong democratic tradition.

I am delighted to have this opportunity to pay tribute to the Ukrainian-American community. During the long years when Ukraine suffered under foreign control, Ukrainian-Americans helped keep alive Ukraine's culture and traditions. The Garden State Arts Center's Ukrainian Heritage Festival, with its celebration of food, crafts, music, sports, and traditional folk dancing, preserves Ukrainian culture for all generations.

On behalf of all New Jerseyans of Ukrainian descent I offer my congratulations on the occasion of the 21st Ukrainian Heritage Festival.●

GRATITUDE TO ELLEN SHAFFER

● Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the RECORD the text of a letter to Ellen Shaffer expressing my gratitude for her service as a member of my staff since 1992.

The letter follows:

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, DC, September 20, 1995.

MS. ELLEN R. SHAFFER
807 Arrington Drive, Silver Spring, MD.

DEAR ELLEN: I want to express to you my deep gratitude and appreciation for your contributions to my overall efforts to improve health care for people, and in particular to national health care reform legislation, during your tenure with my office. As my principal legislative assistant for national health policy since January 1992, you have worked tirelessly on this subject with great knowledge and skill.

Because of your long experience in this area, you were able to craft the American Health Security Act, my legislative proposal for a national single payer health care system. You worked diligently with the organizations supporting the bill, and, as a result, they became important participants in advancing our proposal. As a result of your expertise and writing skills, we were able to propose and have published in the New England Journal of Medicine an outstanding piece on the merits of a single payer approach to national health care reform

I, along with Senator Domenici, was able to lead effectively the Senate's Working Group on Mental Health as a direct result of your strategic skills and your ability to establish a coalition among those parties having diverse views. Similarly, you were instrumental in working with the American Medical Association to develop the legislation known as the Patient Protection Act, a measure which enabled me to fulfill my role as an advocate for health care consumers.

I greatly valued your skills at financial analysis and your ability to expand quickly those skills, which were so critical to our work on health care legislation, and your successful efforts to communicate the merits of our legislative work through the media to the public at large.

Ellen, I have often said in public that your brilliance and dedication led people to believe that I had a health care staff of ten. I consider myself enormously fortunate that you have been my health care staff of one—supplemented, certainly, by the excellent contributions of talented fellows with whom you collaborated in our office. I wish you well in your future endeavors, and I look forward to continuing to see the positive results of the work we have done together.

Sincerely,

PAUL WELLSTONE●

INTERNATIONAL CHILDREN'S WISH WEEK

● Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, I rise in recognition of the week of November 26–December 2 as International Children's Wish Week.

Children's Wish Foundation International, a nonprofit organization headquartered in Atlanta, GA, has expressed as its mission to provide seriously ill children of every origin, race, creed, religion, or economic status the experience of a lifetime by fulfilling his or her favorite wish; and

Children's Wish Foundation International includes the immediate family in the wish experience in order to provide them with special memories to help counter the last images of doctors, hospitals, and suffering; and

Children's Wish Foundation International has provided invaluable wish experiences for seriously ill children of the State of Michigan; and

International Children's Wish Week will provide a forum to publicly acknowledge the courage of these children and their families while giving others the opportunity to become involved with this important cause. I cannot think of a more meritorious undertaking; this organization is focused on bringing the wonders of life to those whose daily living is in question. The efforts of the Children's Wish Foundation have well earned this special recognition.

Therefore, I hope the people of Michigan will join me in recognizing November 26–December 2, 1995 as International Children's Wish Week in our State.●

THE 20TH ANNUAL SLOVAK HERITAGE FESTIVAL

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. President, our country is a remarkable mosaic—a mixture of races, languages, ethnicities and religions—that grows increasingly diverse with each passing year. Nowhere is this incredible diversity more evident than in the State of New Jersey. In New Jersey, schoolchildren come from families that speak 120 different languages at home. These different languages are used in over 1.4 million homes in my State. I have always believed that one of the United States greatest strengths is the diversity of the people that make up its citizenry and I am proud to call the attention of my colleagues to an event in New Jersey that celebrates the importance of the diversity that is a part of America's collective heritage.

On September 24, 1995, the Garden State Arts Center in Holmdel, NJ will celebrate its 20th Annual Slovak Heritage Festival. The heritage festival program will salute one of the many different ethnic communities that contributes so greatly to New Jersey's diverse makeup. Highlighting old country customs and culture, the festival programs are an opportunity to express pride in the ethnic backgrounds that are a part of our collective heritage. The Slovak Heritage Festival will highlight many aspects of the Slovak culture ranging from business to religion. Additionally, the 20th Annual

Slovak Heritage Festival will contribute proceeds from their programs to the Garden State Arts Center's cultural center fund which presents theater productions free-of-charge to New Jersey's school children, seniors, and other deserving residents. The Heritage Festival thus not only pays tribute to the cultural influences from our past, it also makes a significant contribution to our present day cultural activities.

The Slovak Heritage Festival will open with a business trade show with a number of different exhibits. Chaired by Joseph J. Talafous, this year's event will focus on free trade and economic development. At noon the festival will honor his excellency, the Most Reverend Michael J. Dudick, D.D., Bishop of Passaic, NJ, for his 15th anniversary of dedicated service to the Byzantine Catholic community. A mass will be performed by Bishop Frantisek Tondra, of Spis Kapitula, Slovakia. Following the Mass, the opening ceremony which includes the Slovak fashion show, will take place on the mall. The festival will also feature food, crafts, music, a soccer tournament, and traditional Slovak dancing.

Congratulations once again on the occasion of the 20th Annual Slovak Heritage Festival. I offer my best wishes to all who are celebrating a day of pride in their ethnicity by attending the festival.●

TRIBUTE TO MR. THOMAS L. AYRES ON HIS RETIREMENT FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

● Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, I would like for the Senate to recognize the retirement of Thomas L. Ayres from the Department of Veterans Affairs after more than 41 years of exemplary service in providing health care to the armed service members and veterans of our Nation. On September 30, 1995, Mr. Ayres will retire from his position as the Director of the Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center in Augusta, GA.

Tom began providing health care during his service with the United States Army from 1995 until 1959 at the 279th Station Hospital in Berlin. After his service in the Army, he started his career with the Veterans' Administration by becoming a nursing assistant at the Veterans Administration Hospital in Marion, IN. From 1962 until 1969, Tom worked as a supervisory recreation specialist at the Veterans Hospital in Brecksville, OH. From 1969 until 1972, he served as a voluntary services officer at Veterans Administration Hospitals in both Madison, WI and Gainesville, FL. In 1972, Tom Ayres became a medical administration assistant at the Veterans Hospital in Madison, WI.

Since 1972, Tom Ayres has earned appointments to positions of increased responsibility within the Department of Veterans Affairs. In 1976, he became a hospital administration specialist and soon thereafter was transferred to the Veterans Affairs central office and served as the executive assistant to the Associate Chief Medical Director for Operations.

Tom Ayres received an appointment to the position of Medical Center Director of the Veterans Administration Hospital in Salisbury, NC in 1981. Nine years later, he became the director of the two-division Veterans Administration Medical Center in Augusta, GA. He also serves as the associate administrator for Veterans Affairs at the Medical College of Georgia and as a member of the Medical College of Georgia's Clinical Enterprise Executive Committee.

Throughout his long and distinguished career in providing health services for U.S. veterans throughout our great Nation, Tom has received numerous awards based on the exemplary performance of his duties. His awards include the National Daughters of American Veterans Commander Award, the Award for Valor from the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, three Superior Performance Awards, and five consecutive Executive Performance awards. In 1990, he received the Presidential Rank Award from the President of the United States.

It is important to note that his compassion and sense of civic responsibility does not start and end with his job. Tom is an active participant with the local United Way, Kiwanis Club, American Legion, Senior Executive Association, and the American College of Hospital Administrators. In addition, he serves on the Administrative Board of Trinity on the Hill Church and is a life member of the Disabled American Veterans and the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Mr. President, I ask my colleagues to join me in thanking Thomas L. Ayres for his outstanding career spent in service to our Nation's veterans. He is a model citizen in every sense of the term. We wish him, his wife Christa, and their children and grandchildren Godspeed and every success for the future.●

IN HONOR OF JOSEPH E. BUDD, GRAND MARSHALL OF THE MIDDLESEX COUNTY PULASKI DAY PARADE

● Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. President, on September 23, 1995, a distinguished New Jerseyan, Joseph E. Budd, will be appointed the grand marshall of the Middlesex County Pulaski Day Parade Committee. This appointment is based on Joseph Budd's lifelong commitment to his community and country.

Joseph Budd, born in Sayreville, NJ, has lived a life of exemplary citizenship. As a youth, he graduated from South River High School, where he was an all-State baseball player. He than went on to play semiprofessional baseball with Holy Trinity and Saint Mary's of South River, N.J.

After completing his education, Joseph joined the U.S. 77th Infantry Division in the Pacific theater. Joseph distinguished himself as a Sergeant of reconnaissance, receiving five battle stars and a Bronze Star in the Battle of Guam, for his outstanding bravery and superior leadership abilities.

After leaving the military, Joseph continued to play an active role in the veteran community by serving as the past commander of Veterans of Foreign War Post 8025 in Somerset, NJ, and as a member of the American Legion Post 478. In addition, Joseph is also a member of the Catholic War Veterans Post 405 in New Brunswick, NJ.

Employed by the Public Service and Gas Co. for 36 years, Joe retired as an office manager in the customer service center in 1987. Joseph Budd's strong work ethic carried over into his commitment to community service. Throughout his life, Joseph has been a committed member of a number of organizations. Joseph is the past president of the Kiwanis Club of New Brunswick, a member of the Bound Book chapter of Deborah Heart and Lung Hospital Foundation, past chairman of the Franklin Township Industrial Commission, noteworthy member of the Franklin Park Senior Citizen's Club and Retired Senior Volunteer Program of Somerset County, NJ.

Congratulations once again to Joseph Budd on his selection as the grand marshall of the Middlesex County Pulaski Day parade.●

ORDER OF BUSINESS

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

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

MEDICARE, TAX CUTS, PRIORITIES

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, next week the Senate Finance Committee will begin to mark up a piece of legislation dealing with Medicare and Medicaid, essentially comporting to the budget that was enacted by the U.S. Senate. The issue, as anyone who has been watching television or reading the newspaper recently knows, is Medicare, tax cuts, priorities. I would like to talk about that a little bit today.

This morning I was watching a bit of the morning shows on television and I saw the Speaker of the House and a number of others engaging in a debate about what these issues mean. There are a substantial amount of charges and countercharges going back and forth on the issue of Medicare and the tax cuts. These are important issues, there is no question about that. I do not think anyone denies the consequences of what we do will have a

substantial impact on people in this country. What I want to do today is discuss a little about the kinds of debate that we have heard in recent days on the effect or impact of both the Medicare Program and tax cuts. I thought I would do it by beginning with some comments, not from a Democrat, but from a Republican.

This is from Kevin Phillips, a Republican conservative political analyst. I want to go through some of the things he says, and the reason I do this is because the Speaker and others say this is all being distorted; it is a bunch of Democrats who want to distort what the Republicans are doing on Medicare and tax cuts. Here is what Kevin Phillips says. He says, speaking of the Republican approach, the budget, and so on:

> It is senior citizens, the poor, students, and ordinary Americans who will see programs they depend on gutted, while business, finance, and the richest 1 or 2 percent, far from making sacrifices, actually get new benefits and tax reductions.

That is an analysis by a Republican of the Republican plan.

Further, from Kevin Phillips, he says:

> If the U.S. budget deficit problem does represent the fiscal equivalent of war—and maybe it does—then what we are really looking at is one of the most flagrant examples of war profiteering this century has seen.

Again, talking about the budget initiative.

Further, Kevin Phillips, a Republican, says:

> . . . if the deficit is substantially reduced under a program like this, there'll be a second stage of further upward income redistribution from upper bracket profits in the stock and bond markets.

Two additional comments from, again, a Republican political analyst about this approach:

> Spending on Government programs from Medicare and education to home heating oil assistance is to be reduced in ways that principally burden the poor and the middle class while simultaneously taxes are to be cut in ways that predominantly benefit the top 1 or 2 percent of Americans.

This is not some wild-eyed radical liberal saying this. This is an observation from Kevin Phillips, a conservative Republican political analyst.

Finally, from Mr. Kevin Phillips, ''In short,'' he says, again speaking of the Republican budget which is now in place:

> In short, aid to dependent grandmothers, children, college students, and city dwellers is to be slashed while aid to dependent corporations, stock brokers, generals, and assorted James Bond imitators survives or even grows worse.

Those are the comments, not from someone who is partisan on this side of the aisle. Those are comments I have read from a political analyst who is a Republican.

What of this debate about Medicare? The proposal in the budget to cut the Medicare Program $270 billion below what is needed to finance the Medicare Program is a proposal to cut $270 billion. The analysis is that $89 billion is needed for the trust fund. So the question is, if you are going to cut $181 billion more than is necessary in Medicare to make it solvent, where does that money go? How is that money used?

The answer to that is, of course, the extra money being cut in Medicare is to finance a tax cut. From the Department of Treasury, Office of Tax Analysis, this pie chart shows what Kevin Phillips said in the earlier comments.

Who is going to get the benefits of the tax cut? This says that the top 12 percent of the income earners in this country will get over 50 percent of the tax benefits. Families with over $100,000 of income will receive 51.5 percent of the tax benefits.

We just had a vote on an amendment I offered, a-sense-of-the Senate resolution saying let us limit the tax cut to those who earn less than $100,000 a year. To the extent we save money by limiting the tax cut to those who have $100,000 or less, let us then be able to use that savings to reduce the cut in Medicare.

The vote was, predictably I think, 43 to 54. The amendment was defeated.

The point is that over half the tax cut is going to go to families with over $100,000 in income. This at a time when we are up to our necks in debt, when we are told the deficit is such a serious problem that we have to take a big hunk out of Medicare, $270 billion.

It turns out we have to take a big hunk out of Medicare, according to some, in order to finance this half of the tax cut, and that is the dilemma and that is the political debate.

Is it just pure partisan politics? No. It is a debate about priorities. We only have the tax bill that the House of Representatives passed to go on, but if you take a look at what was passed by the House of Representatives, what you will see is that if you are a household between 0 and $30,000, or in other words a household with less than $30,000 in income, you will get a tax cut for the year of $124. If your income is $200,000 or more, you will get a tax cut of $11,200.

Whenever one points this out—this comes from the Department of Treasury information—whenever someone points this out someone else jumps up and says, ''Class warfare. Class warfare. You are trying to divide people.''

I am not trying to divide anybody. I am just trying to figure out who gets what from these proposals. This is a classic cake and crumbs approach to a legislative profile. You give the cake to the big shots—if you have a lot of money you get to eat a big piece of this cake—and if you do not have much, they will wipe a few crumbs off the table for you and say, ''By the way, everybody gets something here. This is a wonderful deal for everybody.''

Well, this graph shows it is not a wonderful deal for everybody. The fact is the bulk of the tax cut is going to inure to the benefit of the wealthiest Americans.

The interesting discussion about Medicare is this: Medicare was a very controversial program when first conceived. When first proposed in the U.S. Senate, 95 percent of the Republicans voted against the Medicare Program. ''Socialism,'' they said. ''We do not like it. We do not want anything to do with it. It is bad public policy.'' I understand that. The old definition of a conservative is someone who never wants to do anything for the first time. I understand all of that.

The fact is, despite the fact that most all in their party opposed it 30 years ago, I would guess, if you had a vote on the very simple proposition, ''Is Medicare good and should we keep Medicare?'' I would guess now 95 percent in the Republican Party would probably vote yes. They have changed their mind. I think most of them would say that they were wrong to oppose Medicare initially because Medicare has proven to be an enormously important program.

Over half of the senior citizens in this country had no health care coverage before we adopted Medicare. Then in the fifties, the forties, and in the thirties, back in the days when we had no Medicare coverage for senior citizens, when getting sick when you were a senior citizen was a circumstance where you feared that you would be held hostage by virtue of being unable to pay for a medical bill or get medical help when you were critically ill. Half of the senior citizens in this country had no health care coverage.

We passed Medicare, and I am proud that I am part of a group whose heritage is to fight for things that are progressive. Ninety-nine percent of the senior citizens in this country now no longer have to live in fear that they may not be able to get treatment for health care needs because they now have the Medicare Program.

Is it a perfect program? Gosh, no. We have lots of problems with it. We have had hearings about fraud. We have had hearings about waste. But the fact is that most senior citizens and others who have used Medicare would tell us that the Medicare Program has been a wonderful boon to them.

It has cost us a lot more than we expected, for a couple of reasons. Senior citizens are living a lot longer. Senior citizens are living an enormous amount of time. Prior to the 1960's they did not have that kind of lifespan. Now they do.

What happened in addition to the fact that people are living longer is that medical technology has made breathtaking breakthroughs. Now when someone's knee gives out, they can get a new knee. When their hip gives out and they need a new hip, or when they eat food that plugs up the heart muscle, somebody can open up their chest, give them an operation, unplug the heart muscle and the arteries, and they are back out.

So it is not unusual to run into a senior citizen that just had open heart surgery, or has a new knee, or has a new hip, or cataract surgery, is 75 years old, and feels like a million dollars. It is all very expensive, but it is wonderful. It is a condition of success in many respects. But it has been an expensive program, there is no question about that.

The question before the Congress is, What kind of adjustments are necessary to make it solvent? It is interesting that the trustees of the Medicare commission say, well, the Medicare Program is going to be insolvent by the year 2002 unless some adjustments are made.

The majority party wants to get some money out of Medicare. They called all of the trustees up to the Capitol Building and made a big show. And they said, ''Medicare is going broke.'' In 23 of the last 25 years when the trustees made their report, they said, ''Here is the date by which Medicare will be insolvent.'' This was not the first time that happened. This happens every year. But it is the first time that anybody has called the trustees up to make a big show out of it. In every year, 23 out of 25 years, what has happened is the trustees say, ''Here is the date by which Medicare will be insolvent.'' Every year the Congress has made adjustments to make it solvent. This year we are going to do that. We are going to make an adjustment that deals with about $89 billion over a long period of time to make the Medicare system solvent.

But we are not going, on this side of the aisle at least, to agree with those who believe you ought to cut $270 billion rather than the $89 billion and take the extra $170 billion or so and use it to provide a tax cut, half of which will go to people or families with incomes over $100,000 a year. That is how this boils down.

When you finally condense all of the crowd noise and all of the bellicose debates, when you finally condense it down to the simple point, the point is this: We believe that adjustments to Medicare ought to be made to make the Medicare system solvent. That takes about $89 billion to do. We do not believe, we do not support, and we will not accept notions that we ought to cut the Medicare Program an extra $170 billion below what is necessary to serve the senior citizens who will be eligible in the next 7 years in order to provide a tax cut, the bulk of which will go to upper-income people.

There is ample room for disagreement on priorities and policies. The debate about priorities ought to be thoughtful, not thoughtless. It ought not be a circumstance whenever someone stands up to talk about this difference in priorities that someone says, ''Well, this is just raw politics. It is all nonsense.'' It is not raw politics, and it is not nonsense. It is about priorities, what we believe in, what we fight for, and what we think is important for the future of this country. That is what this is all about.

I see the Senator from West Virginia just came to the floor. He has served in this Chamber for a good long while and in a very distinguished way. He has seen these policies and programs come and go. He, perhaps more than any other, understands that some programs are good and they make this country better. They make this a better place in which to live. Some were not so good and did not work out, and we have changed programs. We have repealed programs. But the Medicare Program, I think, has been an enormously beneficial program for this country. And those who had the courage to stand up when so many others said no, those who had the courage to do that and help develop this program for this country, have my unending gratitude.

There was an old saying around here a long time ago that, ''Any jackass can kick a barn door down, but it takes a carpenter to build one.'' It may be even an old West Virginia saying. I do not know. But I understand what that difference is. The talent to build is a substantially different talent than the talent to destroy.

Someone asked a foreman of a crew that was putting up a building, ''What kind of people do you have to hire to put up a building?'' Well, ''You have to hire skilled workers.'' ''What kind of people would you hire if you were tearing down a building?'' He said, ''Oh, that is not a problem to get those kind of workers. That does not require any skill.''

It is the builders, in my judgment, of this country, who have done the things to make this a better place in which to live that we must pay tribute to. One way to pay tribute to them is to take a look at a program like Medicare and say, ''This is an enormous contribution to this country.'' Let us fix it. Let us make sure it works. But let us not do anything in any way that pulls out the foundation or the structure that supports this wonderful program.

That is what this debate is about. It is going to be a tough one. There are going to be a lot of charges flying back and forth. But when you condense it all down to its rudimentary elements, it is very simple: We support the $89 billion adjustment necessary to make this Medicare Program solvent for the long term. We do not support taking extra money out of Medicare to provide a very substantial tax cut, most of which will go to the affluent of this country. That is bad public policy, and it is a wrong priority for the future of this country.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. BYRD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia is recognized to speak for up to 10 minutes.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I thank the Chair. I thank the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN]. I thank him also for the consistency with which he is fighting this battle, for his support of the programs that are needed to help the elderly and, in helping the elderly, they help the young as well.

My thoughts go back to a time when the elderly did not have any safety net, nor did anyone else. There were no welfare checks, no Social Security checks, no Federal aid to education, no student loans. And when people became too old to work, they had nowhere else to go except over the hill to the poorhouse or stand at the gates of their children with their hats in their hands and hope to be taken in by their children.

Mr. President, the Senator is doing a great service to the country and for the Senate in calling attention to the arguments that are being made here and the threats that are directed toward the Medicare Program. And for what reason? To pay for a tax cut. It is folly, f-o-l-l-y, pure folly to talk about giving a tax cut, with the kind of deficits we now have in this country, and it is going to be a tax cut for the wealthy. I am opposed to that. I am opposed to any tax cut at this time for anybody—wealthy, middle class, or anybody else. That money ought to be applied against the deficit or applied against the cost of the Medicare Program.

It is easy to tear down, as the Senator very aptly said, easy to tear down. Anybody can tear down. It is hard to build. What he said brought to mind a bit of verse:

I saw them tearing a building down,
A group of men in a busy town;
With a ho-heave-ho and a lusty yell,
They swung a beam and a sidewall fell.

I asked the foreman, ''Are these men skilled,
The type you would hire if you had to build?''
He laughed, and then he said, ''No, indeed;
Just common labor is all you need.
I can easily wreck in a day or two,
That which takes builders years to do.''

I thought to myself as I walked away,
Which of these roles am I trying to play?
Am I a builder who works with care,
Building my life by the rule and square?

Am I shaping my deeds by a well-laid plan,
Patiently building the best I can?
Or am I a wrecker who walks the town,
Content with the labor of tearing down?

I am afraid that is what we see at play here. The wreckers are busy.

It is late September and the Senate is entering the season of fiscal ''sound and fury.'' Political leaders in Washington will have to come to grips with all of the rhetorical promises made to reduce the deficit to zero in 7 years, and actually legislate the details which will achieve that end. In this fiscal year, that means substantial savings will have to be made in many important domestic programs, but clearly the most sensitive of these are the third-rail issues of American politics—Social Security and Medicare.

Substantial savings must be found in Medicare in order to meet the deficit reduction targets called for in the budget resolution. The majority party has attempted to justify a very large cut in the medicare program—some

$270 billion dollars, I believe—by claiming that the medicare trust fund is in danger of collapse.

In the first place, $270 billion is more than triple what is actually needed to stabilize the fund. In the second place, the savings will not be applied to the ''trust fund'' part of Medicare. The savings proposed to allegedly salvage the trust fund are actually going to be given away in the form of tax cuts—some $245 billion dollars worth of them—that mainly will benefit the well-to-do in our society.

It is true that steps will need to be taken to make sure that Medicare remains solvent for future generations. Both political parties need to explain that to the people. There is no getting around it. Medicare must undergo changes if it is to continue to be a viable public health care program. But, we poison the water for acceptance by the public of the changes that must come to make the Medicare system healthy if we obfuscate, hype, and over-simplify this issue. On the one hand, if we leave the impression with senior citizens that no changes are necessary, we close off the avenue for large-scale acceptance of reasonable change. In fact, the status quo cannot prevail. The program is growing too fast, and with the baby boomers headed for eligibility in the next decade, the Medicare Program has to be altered to accommodate larger numbers of recipients. We must not leave the impression that the status quo can be protected by any political party or any President. A reality check has to come.

On the other hand, to falsely claim that huge savings are needed right now, and then to further claim, falsely, that those savings will go toward the salvation of Medicare, when, in fact, those savings will only be used to hand out tax cuts to special interests and the most comfortable in our society is an outrage, a breaking of faith with the elderly, and a sure way to lay the groundwork for the utter failure of any reasonable and real fix of Medicare when it has to be enacted.

The $270 billion worth of cuts mandated by the writers of the budget resolution is a bogus number. It was picked for no other reason, I believe, than the convenience of allowing room for the promised tax cuts while making the budget arithmetic come out balanced.

That number is a fabrication by the ''powers that be'' in the current Congress. It reflects nothing more than a policy decision here in Washington to raise monthly premiums on seniors for Part B Medicare benefits so that there will be dollars enough to hand around in tax cuts. I deplore the hype and the scare tactics about collapsing funds and vanishing Medicare programs and the absolute necessity of making $270 billion dollars worth of cuts in Medicare. While it is true we will have to eventually make some savings in the fund, nothing but a political decision to make room for tax cuts, in my judgment, is driving cuts in the Medicare Program of this magnitude.

To make matters worse, the details of the plan to cut Medicare will be wrapped in a reconciliation bill, under a 20-hour time limit, with little opportunity to debate or amend the proposal. After weeks of misinformation, claims, counter claims, hype, scare tactics, media manipulation, general confusion, and false premises, this extremely sensitive and crucial program important to millions of our elderly population will be dispatched on the Senate floor under the tightest of time limits in a massive deficit reduction package.

Now, I turned down the President of the United States when he urged me to go along with putting health care reform into the reconciliation bill. I also turned down that request on the part of the then majority leader, Mr. Mitchell. I am opposed to putting huge Medicare cuts and tax cuts into the reconciliation bill for the same reason that I opposed including health care reform on that occasion. I said it was a matter so complex, so costly it ought to be debated fully by the Senate. That is why we are here—to debate such matters. To put massive bills of that nature into a reconciliation bill is to deny the American people the information and to deny Senators the information to which they are entitled if they are to make sound judgments. But apparently that is what is going to be done.

The details will be obscured by the smoke of the rhetoric and, in short the American people will never know what hit them until it is too late, as usual.

As if there has not already been enough confusion and misrepresentation over reforming medicare, now we hear reports of further chicanery in the budget wars over the issue.

Apparently some in the other body have gotten ''cold feet'' over trading cuts in medicare for cuts in taxes and have opted to play the ''magic asterisk'' game in the reconciliation process. The Congressional Budget Office apparently has told the Republican leadership that, even with a substantial rise in medicare payments by beneficiaries, the $270 billion in medicare budget savings the Republicans need to get from medicare in order to pay for their tax cut, has still not materialized. So, the Republicans are reviving an old canard called a ''look-back'' sequester in the House—the ''look-back'' sequester—in order to achieve the additional cuts needed.

Beware, America's seniors! Beware! A ''look-back'' sequester is the gimmick of all gimmicks in the arcane language of Federal Budgetese.

The ''look-back'' says in plain English—we need more of that these days, plain English. I am for making English the national language.

I realize I may be politically incorrect in making such a statement, but I studied Muzzey when I was in grade school. Muzzey's ''History of the American People.'' And the very first sentence in Muzzey's history book said, ''America is the child of Europe.''

Mr. President, that is true. Muzzey did not care much about being politically correct. He would have been hooted out of town these days. But he believed in giving the historical facts. So do I. I do not give a hoot about political correctness. I will take my stand with Muzzey! America was the child of Europe. And I will take my stand with making English the national language.

The ''look-back'' says in plain English, if our savings plan does not achieve $270 billion in medicare savings, the Secretary of Health and Human Services is instructed to identify the shortfall each year and then to arbitrarily make sufficient cuts in the succeeding year to eliminate the previous year's shortfall. That is legislative and political ''kick the can'' at its worst.

Members of Congress were elected to make these choices and to make them in ways that are understandable and acceptable to the public they represent. Gimmicks like ''look-back'' sequesters deny the American public the opportunity to hear a reasoned debate and to weigh in on decisions they elected us to make. It is a totally spineless way to make cuts in vital programs and it is painless only for the shaky-kneed legislators who employ it.

I urge the Majority Party in the Senate to reject this return to budget gimmickry, David Stockman type magic asterisks, process fixes, and responsibility-shirking convolutions, and engage instead in an honest debate, utilizing plain English language, with the American people about what needs to be done to balance the budget and also assure the solvency of medicare for future users.

I further urge the Senate Finance Committee not to unduly tax Medicare recipients in order to parcel out generous tax breaks for those who do not have to worry about how to pay their doctor bills and afford their medications.

We will never keep deficit reduction on track if we begin the effort by failing to come clean with the people about how hard it will be to carry out the plan. It really comes down, Mr. President, to a matter of trust. If we trust the intelligence and reasonableness of the American people by telling them the truth, they just may—they just may—begin to trust us and give us their support in crafting the hard solutions to our budget and deficit problems.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and 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. BYRD. 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. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

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

Mr. BYRD. My friend, who is presiding in the chair, the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. SMITH], was interested in the remarks I made a few minutes earlier, and he asked me about Muzzey, whether or not he was the author of the book on American history. He was. He was the author. As I recall, the book was copyrighted, I believe, around 1927, 1928, 1929, or 1930.

I used to memorize the chapters in that history book at night by the light of a kerosene lamp. I told my fellow classmates in the early grades about Nathaniel Greene, Francis Marion the ''Swamp Fox,'' Daniel Morgan, and about Nathan Hale.

I often carry on conversations with the young pages here. And as each new page group comes to the Senate, I generally ask them several questions. And I will stop to tell them stories. When I walk into that Cloakroam, they will gang up around me like a bunch of little birds with their mouths open wanting to be fed, and they ask, ''Can you tell us a story today?''

Well, generally my first question of these new young pages is ''Have you ever heard of Nathan Hale?'' And normally they have never heard of Nathan Hale. I was pleased that this year—I believe there were as many as three in the group who had heard of Nathan Hale.

Mr. DODD. Would my friend and colleague yield?

Mr. BYRD. Of course. With great pleasure.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I walked on the floor here. Coincidentally, the distinguished former leader and senior Senator from West Virginia mentions Nathan Hale. I live in the town in the State of Connecticut where Nathan Hale taught in East Haddam, CT.

Coincidentally, in approximately 30 minutes the high school choral group from the Nathan Hale High School of East Haddam, CT, will be meeting with me on the steps of the Capitol here and later will be performing at the Kennedy Center.

I chose them as a choral group from my State. Each State gets to name a choral group. So it is serendipity that as I walked onto the floor, my wonderful friend of so many years mentions Nathan Hale.

In fact, I say to my colleague, I live in a renovated schoolhouse on the banks of the Connecticut River. It was the successor school to the one-room schoolhouse in which Nathan Hale taught in East Haddam, CT.

So I appreciate immensely my colleague's reference to a Connecticut son of whom we are deeply proud for his steadfastness, his loyalty, his patriotism, and his regret that he had but only one life to give to his country. I thank my colleague for referencing him.

Mr. BYRD. I thank my friend, Senator DODD. Plato thanked the gods for having been born a man, he thanked the gods for having been born a Greek, and he thanked the gods for having been born in the age of Sophocles.

Mr. President, I thank the benign hand of destiny for allowing me to live in an age in which the distinguished Senator from Connecticut, CHRISTOPHER DODD, is a Member of this body. I am glad that he chanced to come by the floor just as I was talking about the patriot Nathan Hale.

Nathan Hale was a young schoolteacher, 21 years of age, and when George Washington called for a volunteer to go behind the British lines to draw pictures of the British fortifications, Nathan Hale volunteered to go on this dangerous mission. He disguised himself as a Dutch schoolmaster.

He went behind the British lines. He was successful in drawing pictures of the fortifications and accumulating information that would be of benefit to General George Washington. But upon the evening before Hale was to return, he was discovered carrying the documents, and was arrested. The next morning, he was brought up before the scaffold. His request for a Bible was denied.

There he stood in full view of the stark, wooden coffin in which his body was soon to be placed. The British officer, whose name was Cunningham, said, ''Have you anything to say?''

Hale, whose hands were tied behind him, said, ''I only regret that I have but one life to lose for my country.''

The British commander said, ''String the rebel up.''

I do not find that great story in history books anymore. What I used to call history is, I think, probably today more aptly designated ''social studies.'' There is nothing wrong with social studies, of course, but we also need history. Young people need heroes to emulate, and we used to have such heroes in American history.

Well, I just tell that story for the benefit of those who may be a little startled at my looking askance at so-called ''political correctness.'' Take it away. Give me history. Give me Muzzey!

I thank the Chair.

Mr. DODD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH). The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, first of all, let me commend our colleague from West Virginia, not only because he made reference to our favorite son of East Haddam, CT, a schoolteacher. In fact, the distinguished senior Senator from West Virginia has, over the years, enjoyed my Christmas greetings card which, on numerous occasions, has the schoolhouse in East Haddam as the cover.

I appreciate his reference to Nathan Hale, of whom we are very proud in Connecticut and the Nation. I also appreciate, once again, his reminding the Members of this body and the Nation at large of the importance of history and social studies and people who have sacrificed great things, who have given us the opportunity to enjoy this Nation today.

Too often, those stories are minimized or scorned or treated lightly. It is the lives of heroes, the lives of great individuals which have made the difference. Events do not happen without great individuals, and we do not pay enough attention to them.

MEDICARE

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I want to take a few minutes today if I can, and talk about our upcoming proposal on Medicare, which is a subject of great interest, and ought to be, in the country. I think it is important to place into context this debate.

Regardless of where one stands on the specifics of these issues as they come out, it is important that we all understand that we are talking about the single largest transfer of wealth in the history of our country with this proposal, some $270 billion that will have to be moved from the Medicare Program. We are talking simultaneously about a $245 billion tax cut. There is nothing quite like this in the annals of this country's history.

I say that, not to in any way suggest that in and of itself one ought to oppose this, but rather to raise what I hope will be the interests of the American public as we engage in this discussion, because they are the ones who will be affected. Not the Members of this body because, frankly, most of us have health care programs and have income levels which will basically make us immune from the kind of potential tragedies and difficulties that most Americans will face if they lose a safety net of health care.

It is in their interest, and it is certainly a program that has been tremendously successful in assisting millions of people over the last 30 years to avoid the catastrophic problems associated with the predictable health problems that people face.

What disturbs me is the fact that we are going to have almost no hearings on this at all. In fact, only 1 day of hearings have been scheduled in the entire Congress on an issue that I think is certainly as important as any that this body will debate or discuss this year, only 1 day of hearings on the single largest transfer of wealth in the history of the United States.

Mr. President, the world looks on this body, and we often refer to it ourselves, as the greatest deliberative body in the world. Yet, I say with all due respect to those in the majority that to hold only 1 day of discussions on legislation that will affect today 37 million direct beneficiaries of Medicare, not to mention the families of these Medicare recipients and, frankly,

those who will move into the age categories that would allow them to receive some Medicare assistance, I find hard to justify, to put it mildly.

We are not talking about an Intelligence Committee issue here. We are not even talking about a defense issue in which the secrecy of our proceedings has legitimacy. But to come forward with an idea that only has 1 day of hearings and will affect many millions of people I find very, very disturbing.

I can only conclude, Mr. President, that some people are deeply worried that more people may find out about what we are likely to do. And so some think, do it fast, do it quickly, get it over with. Hopefully, they will not notice, and we can achieve the kind of results that some are seeking to adopt when it comes to this program.

Mr. President, this plan, as I mentioned at the outset of these remarks, will cut Medicare by $270 billion. Let me quickly point out that that number is three times what the Health Care Finance Administration says is necessary to extend the solvency of Medicare until the year 2006—three times, Mr. President.

I am not sure that the Health Care Finance Administration is absolutely correct. They are saying about $89 billion. There are those who would tell you that you could do this with $45 billion if you can deal with some of the waste and fraud, which CBO and others will not score. A GAO study that was done said you could basically achieve the savings if we would just make this program run more efficiently. Whether you believe the $45 billion or $60 billion or $89 billion, no one will tell you—no one—that $270 billion in cuts in the Medicare Program is necessary. Yet, that is exactly the plan being put together as we sit here. It is not a plan done in the light of day, but done with one day of hearings, with a bunch of people writing this gathered in rooms where you cannot find them. They are leaking this out bit by bit with vagaries and never getting into the details.

I do not think people ought to stand for that. Whether you agree or disagree, it is fundamental that we have a full-blown discussion of what we are likely to do here with a plan that is going to affect that many millions of people—people who are not in a great position to defend themselves.

Let me share with my colleagues what we are talking about here and who these beneficiaries are. The vast majority of our beneficiaries are not well-off people. I, for instance, have long supported the idea of means testing Medicare. I do not find that to be any great revolutionary idea. I am talking about incomes of $75,000 or $150,000.

I quickly point out, Mr. President, that the savings there are relatively modest when you look at the overall amount of cuts that are being talked about. Lest anyone thinks that the money could be saved by excluding the wealthy, let us take a quick look at the numbers. Ninety-seven percent of Medicare expenditures go to individuals with incomes of $50,000 or less; 97 percent go to people with $50,000 or less. Seventy-eight percent of Medicare beneficiaries have an income of less than $25,000 a year. The median income for a woman of 65 years of age or over is $8,500 a year. In fact, the median income is $17,000. And almost 9 million of the 37 million of Medicare recipients have incomes of less than $10,000 a year.

So when we start talking about $270 billion in cuts and premium increases, and the like, remember who we are talking about here. We are not talking about affluent Americans. We are talking about people who, in some cases, are in the most difficult positions, financially, in the country. If not just them, we are talking about their families, who will have to bear the burden of handling these costs.

It has been a very successful program. Yes, it has problems and you have to treat and work on some of the costs associated with it. But it has been a tremendously successful program. If you look here on the chart, Mr. President, in 1959, only 46 percent of our seniors have health care coverage. That was before Medicare. Since 1965, seniors with health care has now risen to 99 percent.

I do not think we can underestimate the value of that to people, not just in terms of their health—as everybody knows, when you get older, you will face medical problems—but financially what it means to people and their families as well.

There was significant opposition to this program. This did not go through like some of the issues around here. It was debated and voted on three different times in 1965 before it became the law of the land. And 93 percent of those now in the majority at that time voted against this program in 1965. I think most of those people today would agree that this has been a very good program, indeed, and it has made a substantial difference in people's lives.

So I think it is in our critical interest that we at least—when you are talking about a $270 billion cut in this program over 7 years—understand what the implications are, what happens—not those who make $75,000 for an individual or $125,000 a year for couples—but for the woman making $8,500 a year, as so many are, or the 9 million who make less than $10,000 a year, or 50 percent of the entire population of Medicare recipients who make less than $17,000 a year. Today, they are paying about $3,000 in out-of-pocket of expenses. We are looking at a proposal—and, again, we do not have the details of all of this yet. But according to those who have seen the numbers, we are talking about an increase of maybe $2,700.

I ask unanimous consent to have 5 additional minutes on this. I see my colleague from Rhode Island here.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, we are talking here about people in that income category. The estimates are that we could be looking at an increase in Medicare out-of-pocket costs of some $2,700. Now, you can cut that down on a daily figure, and so forth. But if you are in that $17,000 or $20,000 range, putting aside the $8,500, that is a tremendous additional cost to people in that particular income category.

Mr. CHAFEE. I wonder if the Senator will yield for a question.

Mr. DODD. Quickly, if I can. I only have 5 minutes.

Mr. CHAFEE. I am the only one here. If you want to have more time, as far as I am concerned, you can add my question time on. Where did you get this figure about a $1,700 increase?

Mr. DODD. Those are the figures that have been in the House proposals.

Mr. CHAFEE. Let us not talk about the House. We are in the Senate. The Senate bill was announced today. The part B premium of 31.5 percent is going to stay at 31.5 percent. Is it going to go up with inflation? Yes. Thirty-one and a half percent of the cost will remain at 31.5. Is it going to stay exactly the same dollar figure as last year or 2 years ago? No. But under any administration, Democrat or Republican, it will increase.

Now, the second part is about the deductible. There is no increase in the copayments. They remain exactly the same, at the 20 percent. On the increase in the deductibles, over the years with inflation, the deductibles have gone up. Under this program, they would go from $100 to $150. That is certainly no $1,700.

Mr. DODD. I say to my colleague, not $1,700, but $2,700, which in the House plan.

Mr. CHAFEE. Then that is even more inaccurate.

Mr. DODD. No it is not.

Mr. CHAFEE. If you want to talk about the persons in the upper categories—

Mr. DODD. I am not the guy you want to ask. The person you want to ask the question to is the Speaker of the House and members of the Ways and Means Committee, who are putting the plan together. The Senate may decide it wants to go to something else. I have not seen the Senate proposals. I know what the Speaker and Ways and Means Committee are saying.

Mr. CHAFEE. We happen to be in the Senate, and they announced a plan today. We do not have to debate on the floor of the Senate what the House plan is. We have a Senate plan. I happen to know what the Senate plan is, and it is not $2,700. Now, if you are talking Jack Kent Cooke, one of the richest men in America, and if he continues taking the part B, yes, he will pay more and he jolly well ought to pay more; 75 percent of Jack Kent Cooke's medical bills are being paid by the taxpayer.

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, this is not a question and answer.

Mr. CHAFEE. It is not right.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut has the floor.

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Connecticut have another 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FORD. Will the Senator from Connecticut yield?

Mr. DODD. Yes.

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I am going through the Chair, as we should. Will the Senator yield for a question.

Mr. DODD. I am glad to yield to my friend.

Mr. FORD. Now, as I understand it, in the plan as we operate it today, the premium goes up only based on a COLA. So instead of being 31 percent, it is only at 28 percent. Therefore, as the COLA is increased, the other amount is increased, but it is basically at 28 percent instead of 31 percent, as our friend from Rhode Island has indicated.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I say to our colleague that he is absolutely correct. That is part of it.

We are talking about $270 billion in savings, Mr. President. And to suggest that somehow you can achieve that number, and not talk about the beneficiaries being affected, is exactly the kind of problem we get into here. Of course, it is going to cost. What I find even more disturbing about this, Mr. President, is the fact that we are looking here at a $245 billion tax break occurring simultaneously.

By the way, this tax break was higher originally. We were talking about $260 billion to $270 billion in a tax break earlier. They pared it back to $245 billion.

Is it not coincidental that the size of the Medicare cut and the size of the tax break almost match up dollar for dollar?

Now the tax break has been reduced a bit here, but nonetheless it seems quite obvious to this Senator how we pay for that tax break. That tax break is paid for, it seems to me, by the cut in Medicare.

In the cuts, and again watching this plan dribble out, not a single penny in the proposals being proposed in the House of Representatives actually go to the trust fund. Not a penny of it.

Here we are talking about this great problem with the trust fund and instead of dedicating the resources to the trust fund to put it in better shape we talk about dollars going here.

Mr. CHAFEE. I wonder if the Senator would yield?

Mr. DODD. I will complete my 5 minutes and my colleague can ask for 5 minutes to proceed.

Mr. President, 51.5 percent of the tax break proposed by the Republican plan goes to people making over $100,000 a year. Mr. President, that is a fact. Cut that any way you want, but that is the income level.

Watch down here in the zero to $30,000 category, they get 4.8 percent; people making 30,000 to $50,000, 11.6 percent; and it breaks down to 16 and 15 percent.

I am not objecting even to the idea of having some tax proposals. My view is to postpone these. I put them aside because I think deficit reduction is a completely legitimate issue and we ought to focus on it.

If you want a deficit reduction, take this idea, put it on the table for a couple of years and then look at the Medicare issue for really what it is, instead of coming up with a phony number here that basically in my view, and as it appears to those who have looked at this, satisfies the needs of a tax break proposal.

That is what this amounts to. There will be squawking, a lot of hemming and hawing, but if this were truly a decent and fair plan we would have more than 1 day of hearings. We would not try and have a stealth program that comes in and all of a sudden is sprung on this body.

I know what will happen. We will have one vote under the reconciliation that will be lumped together. We will have little or no chance to amend it, change it or offer different ideas, in the single largest transfer of wealth in the history of the United States.

Frankly, Mr. President, I do not think people will stand for it. I believe when people know more about this, and they will want to know more about it, they will not be satisfied with one day of hearings, with an idea of wrapping this all together, minimize the kind of political confrontation people will have to deal with here if they are going to address this issue.

As I said at the outset of these remarks, I am more than happy to take a look at what needs to be done with Medicare, more than happy. I have advocated means testing for more than a decade on this program. I will not take a back seat to anyone in that area.

The suggestion that $270 billion is necessary here when none of the resources go to that trust fund I find less than genuine when it comes to trying to deal with the issue of the Nation's health care needs.

Let me go back and remind our colleagues here. Consider where we were, and consider the history of this. In 1959 only 46 percent, less than half the population of seniors had health care. Today we are getting almost universal coverage.

There are those that have been hostile to this program from day one and have disagreed with it. I am not opposed to the idea of coming up with ways in which people can participate in their own financial and health security down the road. I think that is a good idea. That is not going to work for everyone.

To say you will have that as a substitute for Medicare is to be terribly naive, in my view, about what needs to be done to satisfy the needs of people in this category.

While we are talking about the 37 million who are the Medicare recipients, remember it is their children and their families who also are affected. There are people out there today who are trying to meet the needs of two generations, their own children as well as their parents, so this burden just does not fall on those in the category of retirement age. These people are trying to plan for educational needs, their children, their mortgages, rent, and food. While some say $1,700 or $2,700 does not amount to much—$21 a week, that is part of the problem here. We are so out of touch in terms of the economic realities of what millions of Americans face every day, we do not think it is much anymore. Go home and listen to your people. They will tell you that it is. They ought to at least be given the common decency of a review of what is about to be done to them, more than one day of hearings. I hope that will be the case.

I yield the floor.

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I want to correct a few inaccuracies that were in the statement of the distinguished Senator from Connecticut. I am confident that these were unintentional, but they were delivered with considerable vigor so I think I might take this opportunity to rebut then.

The Senator from Connecticut said not one penny from these savings in Medicare go into the trust fund. That just plain is not so.

Every single nickel, every single penny saved under the part A, the reduction in the payments to the hospitals, the reductions in the payments to the other providers, the providers dealing with the hospitals' side, all go into what is known as the hospital insurance fund, or part A.

Every single penny—I am not sure of the exact amount in billions of dollars, but of the total $270 billion, a very substantial, I will not say half, but I suspect close to half will go into that part A hospital insurance trust fund.

When the Senator says with all the vigor he can muster that none of that is going into the trust fund, that just plain is not right.

Now, second, the Senator says 51 percent of the tax cuts are going to the rich. That is a very interesting statement because in the Senate we do not have any idea what the tax cuts are going to be.

All that we have done in the Senate is to say that up to $240 billion of tax cuts can take place. That means there could be zero, there could be $1 or there could be $240 billion. No one has said so far—the Finance Committee that deals with the tax cuts has not come up with any proposals dealing with what the tax cuts will be.

Some say they want $500 credit for every child. Now, if that is adopted, no one is suggesting that 51 percent of that is going to the rich people. Every taxpayer, even taxpayers who pay $501 will get a $500 credit, so they pay $1 in taxes.

Indeed, the person who pays less than that, I presume would not only get a refund but get some kind of an income tax credit in addition to the regular $500 credit.

Who knows what we will adopt? Knowing how legislative bodies are, I suspect that we will go right up to the $240 billion. No one has decided that yet. No meetings of the Finance Committee have taken place in connection with taxes. No decisions have been made. It is total nonsense to say that 51 percent of the tax cut is going to the rich under any Senate plan.

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 25, 1995

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today it stand in adjournment until the hour of 2 p.m. on Monday, September 25; that following the prayer, the Journal of proceedings be deemed approved to date, no resolutions come over under the rule, the call of the calendar be dispensed with, the morning hour be deemed to have expired, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and there then be a period for morning business until the hour of 3 p.m, with the Senators to speak for up to 5 minutes each with the exception of the following:

Senator BENNETT for up to 45 minutes; Senator DORGAN for up to 15 minutes.

I further ask that following morning business at 3 o'clock, the Senate begin consideration of H.R. 2099, the VA–HUD appropriations bill.

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

PROGRAM

Mr. CHAFEE. For the information of all Senators at 3 p.m. on Monday, the Senate will begin consideration of VA–HUD appropriations bill. The managers of that bill have indicated that Senator BUMPERS is prepared to offer his amendment on the space station on Monday. The majority leader has indicated that any other Member who is intending to offer an amendment to VA–HUD appropriations bill should be prepared to offer that amendment on Monday, so the Senate may complete action on the bill at the earliest possible time.

In addition, the majority leader has indicated there will be no rollcall votes on Monday, and any votes ordered in connection with the HUD–VA bill would be postponed until after the weekly party luncheons on Tuesday.

NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM DESIGNATION ACT OF 1995

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the House message to accompany S. 440, the national highway bill, that the Senate move to disagree with the House amendments and agree to a request for a conference, the Chair be authorized to appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

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

The motion was agreed to, and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. WARNER, Mr. CHAFEE, Mr. SMITH, Mr. KEMPTHORNE, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. MOYNIHAN, Mr. REID and from the Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation, solely for matters within their jurisdiction, Mr. PRESSLER, Mr. LOTT, and Mr. HOLLINGS conferees on the part of the Senate.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I now ask the Senate stand in adjournment under the previous order, following the remarks of Senator BYRD.

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

Mr. CHAFEE. Now, Mr. President, we have the opportunity to hear the distinguished Senator from West Virginia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I thank my friend, the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. CHAFEE] for his courtesy.

Mr. President, I want to be very observant of the rules of comity that exist between the Senate and the House. And, so, I seek never to call the name of a Member of the other body. I think the rules of comity are very important and I hope never to violate them.

However, Mr. President, I cannot allow the recent comments made by a Member of the other body, regarding a possible government-wide default, to go unanswered. Both the Washington Post and the New York Times today contain articles that suggest that a leading Member of the other body is willing to put the United States into default in order to coerce the President of the United States into swallowing a set of budget proposals that large segments of the public and the Congress consider to be extreme.

A Member of the other body has reportedly stated, ''I don't care what the price is,'' and is also quoted as saying that he does ''not care if we have no executive offices and no bonds for 60 days—not this time.'' He has further stated that he would use his office to prevent a vote to increase the debt limit until the President agrees to his proposals for balancing the budget.

That Member may not care, Mr. President, but I do. I care very deeply about the welfare of the United States and the people of the United States. This kind of arrogant brinkmanship can do irreparable damage to the United States, to its creditworthiness, and to its international standing. It could have long-lasting effects on the world stock and bond markets, with unseen ramifications for U.S. interests around the world. That is very careless—careless talk, Mr. President.

With each passing day, we climb ever closer to the $4.9 trillion ceiling on Federal debt imposed by Congress in 1993. We may hit that ceiling as early as the end of October, or as late as mid-November, but hit it we will, as sure as I am standing here today, unless action is taken soon to increase that limit. In the first 5 days of November, the Government must pay $50 billion in Social Security benefits, Medicare, and active-duty military pay. On November 15, some $25 billion in interest payments will be due on interest payments on the debt. Without an increase of the debt ceiling, the Government may be able to limp along until these payments are due, but no amount of accounting legerdemain will cover these large payments. Without an increase in the Government's ability to borrow, Government checks would not be honored. For the first time in history—we have been talking about history here today—the United States would default. It is almost inconceivable for me to imagine the Government of the United States bouncing a check, but that stark possibility looks us right in the face.

A Government default is not something to be taken lightly, as the author of the reported remarks seems to feel. This is a very, very serious issue. It does not just mean that ''executive offices'' might be shut for 60 days. It does not just mean that there will be ''no bonds'' for 60 days. It is far more devastating than that glib picture would imply. The Congressional Research Service paints a far darker scenario. Let me quote the CRS report:

> It is difficult to describe the extent of the problems the Government would face if the debt limit were not increased when needed. Under current Federal borrowing needs (for 1996), the effect would be similar to a 10 percent reduction in spending with no preplanning and uncertain authority to rank activities by importance. From past experience, most non-essential operations of the Government could be shut down. Most Federal employees might be sent home. National parks and monuments could close. Regulatory activities could cease. Discretionary Federal activities would probably be cut back as much as possible so that mandatory activities could be paid for. Depending on how long the situation lasted, employees, and eventually beneficiaries, could stop receiving checks from the Government. Government bondholders might not receive their interest payments. Federal construction projects could stop. Payments to State and local governments could stop. Federal contractors could find their payments delayed or missed. Through its reach into all parts of society, the disruption of Federal activities could spread over the entire country.

Mr. President, this comes from the CRS Issue Brief entitled ''The Debt Limit,'' updated August 10, 1995, by Philip D. Winters, Economics Division.

So, Mr. President:

> Payments to State and local governments could stop. Federal contractors could find

their payments delayed or missed. Through its reach into all parts of society—

Not just here within the beltway; but in all parts of society.

the disruption of Federal activities could spread over the entire country.

Mr. President, if that is not enough to rattle your teeth and curl your hair, it will certainly send a shiver of fear down the spine of every single American.

But let us further consider the international consequences of a failure to increase the debt limit and subsequent default. Perhaps the distinguished—and he is a very distinguished Member of the other body for whom I have a great deal of respect—perhaps he does not care about the dire consequences that his words threaten for the individual American who helped to put him into office. After all, he will continue to be paid, as I will continue to be paid, and as every Member of this body and every Member of the other body, and the Chief Executive at the other end of the avenue will be paid, even if the Government shuts down—down, down.

A failure to raise the debt limit in a timely manner could turn the international economy into a sea of quicksand. The U.S. dollar has been the backbone of international trade for most of this century. A default by the United States, that solid pillar of fiscal sobriety, would cause investor confidence in the dollar and U.S. government securities to plummet—plummet like Lucifer's fall into the lake of fire—affecting both domestic and international stock markets.

But the glib threats made by that distinguished Member of the other body reportedly have already shaken the confidence of the investors that the United States depends upon to finance our debt, through Treasury bond sales. Already, in partial reaction to his words, the value of the dollar dropped by five percent before recovering somewhat. That drop in the value of the dollar will be insignificant in comparison to the effects of an actual default. Only 11 percent of the total value of publicly held U.S. Government debt securities are held directly by U.S. individuals. Some 22 percent are held by individuals and entities residing abroad. These foreign investors cannot be expected to understand the U.S. political system, and will simply invest elsewhere until this whole crisis blows over. But if the United States defaults, these investors will not be quick to come back. Indeed, domestic investors will be hard to win back, even if lured with higher interest rates, which cost the Government more. What used to be called ''government securities'' will become ''government insecurities'' for a long time to come. Is this what we want? Is this what you, the American people, want? I cannot believe that we do, or that you do. This is not in the best interests of the United States.

This political brinkmanship—that is precisely what it is, political brinkmanship—this political brinkmanship which could so easily backfire can only result in the United States being the loser in the long term.

A default would result in the United States facing permanently increased borrowing costs when the time comes to roll over our debt. Interest rates on those loans, which are secured with government bonds, would be raised, increasing the costs to the taxpayer. The Treasury Department estimates that every increase of one percentage point in interest rates would swell the deficit by $4.9 billion this year. So this political extortion game being perpetrated by a single member of the other body on the President and the American people could cost a minimum of $4.9 billion this year alone. And those interest rates would not be lowered again for some time. Is this any way to balance the budget? I thought that was the point of this painful process that we have been engaged in this year, balancing the budget. But with a few foolish, ill-considered, and arrogant words, this whole painful year of cuts to one important program after another can be wiped out, erased in one fell swoop. This is an outrage being perpetrated on the long-suffering American public in order to satisfy the political ambitions and hubris of a single individual. For one party to put its own agenda ahead of the best interests of the American people is a complete abrogation of the trust of the American people.

Mr. President, the sooner we all stop playing this game of chicken, the better off we will be. The sooner we stop talking about a ''train wreck'' on both ends of the avenue, the better off we will all be.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, Mr. President, articles from the New York Times and the Washington Post to which I have referred today.

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

[From the New York Times, Sept. 22, 1995]

GINGRICH THREATENS U.S. DEFAULT IF CLINTON WON'T BEND ON BUDGET

(By David E. Sanger)

WASHINGTON, Sept. 21.—House Speaker Newt Gingrich threatened today to send the United States into default on its debt for the first time in the nation's history, to force the Clinton Administration to balance the budget on Republican terms.

His comments, a more extreme version of the hardball stance frequently used in past budget showdowns, raised the specter that the looming standoff may begin to rattle financial markets around the world. Mr. Gingrich's remarks came in the middle of a day in which the dollar plunged as much as 5 percent against major currencies before recovering slightly, sending interest rates up sharply. [Page D13.] The Speaker's statement appeared to be one of several factors that added to the markets' unsettled condition.

More broadly, Mr. Gingrich's speech to the Public Securities Association, which represents traders in Government debt, underscored the growing agitation and sense of imminent collision in official Washington as both Democrats and Republicans move toward a confrontation that could shut the Government down this fall.

Throughout the capital, there was a sense that the current had quickened and the rumble of a great waterfall could be heard close ahead. Angry disputes broke out on wildly varying issues. Republicans threatened to block sending American ground troops to enforce the Bosnia peace plan, agreed to vast reductions in the protection for endangered species and Federal lands, and pushed ahead with plans for radical changes in Medicare and Medicaid. Democrats fumed and vowed to do what they could to slow the legislation's breakneck pace.

Clearly part of Mr. Gingrich's autumn endgame strategy is to force the White House to accept much of this agenda—many parts of which President Clinton has vowed to veto—by holding an increase in the Federal debt limit hostage. Without an increase in the limit, the Government will be unable to meet many of the payments due in November for Social Security, military pay and interest on the Federal Government's $4.9 trillion in debt.

Such confrontation techniques have been used in the past. But it was highly unusual for a high Government leader to suggest, as Mr. Gingrich did today, that default on Government payments was not beyond the pale.

''I don't care what the price is,'' he said in his speech. ''I don't care if we have no executive offices and no bonds for 60 days—not this time.''

Without concessions from the White House across the board, he said, there will not be any increase in the debt ceiling. ''And we'll see how long they will last,'' he added.

Administration officials were still trying tonight to figure out how seriously to take Mr. Gingrich's comments. A few months ago, the Speaker was forced to back away from his off-the-cuff suggestions that the United States should recognize Taiwan as an independent country, a step that would lead to a breach with China.

But Congress has little direct influence over foreign policy. By contrast, its control of the Government's purse strings gave added force to Mr. Gingrich's remarks. Indeed, the Speaker's comments drew a quick and harshly worded response from Treasury Secretary Robert E. Rubin. ''The President won't be blackmailed by the use of the debt limit as a negotiating lever,'' he said in a telephone interview from Miami, where he was giving a speech tonight.

''It would be unprecedented and unwise for anyone in a position of authority to dismiss the consequences of default on the debt of the United States of America for the first time in our history,'' he added. ''Even the appearance of a risk of default can have adverse consequences, and a default itself would increase the cost of debt for the United States Government for many, many years to come. A sovereign country's credit-worthiness is a precious asset not to be sacrificed under any circumstances.''

Mr. Rubin said he did not expect the United States to default on any debt payment, a step that he has repeatedly called ''unthinkable.'' But even a serious threat of a disruption in payments can move the markets, and may send borrowing costs soaring for the United States.

The Treasury Department estimates that every increase of one percentage point in interest rates would swell the budget deficit by $4.9 billion this year. Republicans, however, argued that interest rates should decline if the ultimate outcome of the dispute between the parties is a big cut in spending. They contend that any short-term blips in the market—because of conflicts with the White House—would be washed away by long-term benefits.

Aside from all the Sturm und Drang in Washington, the debt limit debate has not yet had much effect, traders said. ''The markets have not yet focused on it,'' said David M. Jones, vice chairman of Aubrey G. Lanston & Company, which trades Government bonds. ''One of the risks is that foreign investors will not understand what is happening here. And if they get nervous, they will just flee until it all sorts out.''

The issue will take on added urgency in the first five days of November, when the Government must pay $50 billion in Social Security benefits, Medicare and pay for active-duty members of the military. On Nov. 15, about $25 billion of interest payments are due.

As Treasury officials concede, a number of financial tricks are available to keep the Government afloat even if the ceiling on debt is not raised. There are temporary debt limits, emergency ''cash management sales'' to keep money flowing in the coffers as short-term loans, and borrowing against other Government reserves. But all of the steps come with a cost, and none can go on for too long. Though the overall Government debt is $4.9 trillion, the Treasury sells about $2 trillion of debt securities every year because so much of the Government's borrowings are ''rolled over'' into new bonds.

The debt limit exists as an institution in Washington because the Constitution mandates that only Congress can authorize borrowing. Before World War I, every bond issued by the United States required separate Congressional approval. Today, the raising of the debt ceiling essentially permits the Treasury Secretary to make the day-to-day decisions required to meet the Government's obligations.

From the Washington Post, Sept. 22, 1995)

GINGRICH VOWS NO RETREAT ON DEBT CEILING INCREASE—I DON'T CARE WHAT THE PRICE IS, SPEAKER SAYS

(By Clay Chandler)

House Speaker Newt Gingrich (R-Ga.) threatened yesterday to take the government into default for the first time in history unless President Clinton bows to Republican demands for a balanced budget.

''I don't care what the price is,'' Gingrich declared in a speech to the Public Securities Association, which represents the nation's bond dealers. ''I don't care if we have no executive offices and no bonds for 60 days—not this time.''

Gingrich said that if Clinton refuses to sign a package of tax and spending proposals reflecting Republican priorities, he would block attempts to raise the government's credit limit.

''I, the speaker, will not schedule'' a vote on an increase in the debt limit' ''it will not come to the floor until we have an agreement'' on balancing the budget according to the Republican proposals, Gingrich told the securities group.

Gingrich's pledge provoked sharp criticism from Clinton administration officials. ''It would be unprecedented and unwise for anyone in a position of authority to dismiss the consequences of default,'' Treasury Secretary Robert E. Rubin said last night. ''Even the appearance of a default can have adverse consequences, and a default itself would increase the cost of debt to the U.S. government for many, many years to come.''

''The U.S. has never defaulted on its obligations and it is extremely irresponsible to suggest that that might happen,'' said White House budget director Alice M. Rivlin.

The government is rapidly nearing the $4.9 trillion ceiling on federal debt imposed by Congress in 1993. The government will have difficulty paying $25 billion in interest obligations due Nov. 15 unless Congress agrees to raise the government's credit line so that it can borrow more money to pay the bill, financial analysts estimate. Treasury officials have warned that the government's cash crunch might come as early as the end of October.

The prospect that action to raise the debt limit could be held hostage while Clinton and Congress slug it out over the budget may have made some investors in global financial markets nervous. Some administration officials suggested that Gingrich's comments were responsible for yesterday's drop in the value of the dollar and declines in stock and bond prices, although Rubin would not draw that connection.

On Wall Street, though, some analysts questioned the significance of Gingrich's statements.

Allen Sinai, chief global economist at Lehman Brothers Inc, said the prospect of fiscal deadlock was cause for concern among foreign investors, who ''don't completely understand our ways and the pressures of the election year.'' But he said U.S. analysts were likely to shrug off Gingrich's remarks as political posturing.

The prevailing view on Wall Street is that the two sides eventually will strike a deal, said Carl Steen, an analyst at the global economic consulting firm of Maria Fiorini Ramirez Inc.: ''Somebody's going to blink. . . . They'll have to.''

Steen said it is ''much more likely that the Senate Republicans will say, 'Okay, look, we're winning anyway. Let's not push this thing too far.'''

Rubin also said, ''I do not believe there will be a default.''

But Gingrich warned against underestimating the commitment of House Republicans: ''What we are saying to Clinton is; 'Do not assume that we will flinch, because we won't.'''

Gingrich's comments appeared to conflict with remarks made on Sunday by House Budget Committee Chairman John R. Kasich (R-Ohio). In an appearance on NBC's ''Meet the Press,'' Kasich said House Republicans would not agree to a long-term extension of the debt limit ''until we can show that there's light at the end of the tunnel.

But he also said, ''What we want to do is avoid a default by the government of the United States. So if we can do a short-term, temporary raising of the debt ceiling, that's not inconsistent with the fact that on a long-term basis, we will not raise it.''

The prospect of breaching the debt ceiling is distinct from a looming government shutdown, which could happen unless Clinton and Congress come to terms on 13 separate spending bills making their way through the legislature before Sept. 30, the end of this fiscal year. On Wednesday, Republican leaders offered a temporary spending plan to carry the government through until Nov. 13, but the White House said many aspects of the resolution were unacceptable.

Regarding the debt ceiling, Republicans argue that temporary disruption in financial markets is a small price to pay to ensure a balanced budget.

But Rubin warned that ''a sovereign country's creditworthiness is a precious asset that should not be sacrificed under any circumstances.'' Clinton, he said, could not be ''blackmailed'' into signing a budget deal.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I thank the Chair.

I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 25, 1995, AT 2 P.M.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in adjournment until 2 p.m. on Monday, September 25, 1995.

Whereupon, the Senate, at 2:57 p.m. adjourned until Monday, September 25, 1995, at 2 p.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate September 22, 1995:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

ERIC JAMES BOSWELL, OF CALIFORNIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE, VICE ANTHONY CECIL EDEN QUAINTON.

ANTHONY CECIL EDEN QUAINTON, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF CAREER MINISTER, TO BE DIRECTOR GENERAL OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE, VICE GENTA HAWKINS HOLMES.

FOREIGN SERVICE

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED CAREER MEMBERS OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT FOR PROMOTION IN THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE TO THE CLASSES INDICATED:

CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, CLASS OF CAREER MINISTER:

CAROL A. PEASLEY, OF CALIFORNIA
CHARLES F. WEDEN, JR., OF VIRGINIA
JOHN R. WESTLEY, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
AARON S. WILLIAMS, OF VIRGINIA

CAREER MEMBERS OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR:

KEITH E. BROWN, OF VIRGINIA
MYRON GOLDEN, OF OHIO
JOSEPH B. GOODWIN, OF MISSOURI
WILLIAM T. OLIVER, JR., OF VIRGINIA
CYNTHIA F. ROZELL, OF CALIFORNIA
BARBARA P. SANDOVAL, OF VIRGINIA
KENNETH G. SCHOFIELD, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
WILBUR G. THOMAS, OF OKLAHOMA

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED CAREER MEMBERS OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT FOR PROMOTION INTO THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, AND FOR APPOINTMENT AS CONSULAR OFFICER AND SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE, AS INDICATED:

CAREER MEMBERS OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, CLASS OF COUNSELOR:

ANNE H. AARNES, OF WASHINGTON
GLENN E. ANDERS, OF FLORIDA
GRANT WILLIAM ANDERSON, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
LILIANA AYALDE, OF MARYLAND
PATRICIA K. BUCKLES, OF FLORIDA
JONATHAN M. CONLY, OF PENNSYLVANIA
J. MICHAEL DEAL, OF CALIFORNIA
DIRK WILLEM DIJKERMAN, OF NEW YORK
KENNETH C. ELLIS, OF VIRGINIA
PAULA FEENEY, OF WEST VIRGINIA
LINDA RAE GREGORY, OF FLORIDA
TOBY L. JARMAN, OF VIRGINIA
EDWARD L. KADUNC, OF FLORIDA
DONALD G. KEENE, OF CALIFORNIA
GAIL M. LECCE, OF VIRGINIA
MARY L. LEWELLEN, OF NEVADA
LEWIS W. LUCKE, OF TEXAS
DONALD R. MACKENZIE, OF FLORIDA
TIMOTHY M. MAHONEY, OF VIRGINIA
LAURIER D. MAILLOUX, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
DESAIX B. MYERS III, OF CALIFORNIA
WALTER E. NORTH, OF WASHINGTON
THOMAS E. PARK, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
DONALD L. PRESSLEY, OF VIRGINIA
EMMY B. SIMMONS, OF VIRGINIA
MARCUS L. STEVENSON, OF MARYLAND
KAREN D. TURNER, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
RONALD E. ULLRICH, OF VIRGINIA
ALAN E. VAN EGMOND, OF MARYLAND

CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF COUNSELOR, AND CONSULAR OFFICER AND SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

SARAH S. OLDS, OF PENNSYLVANIA

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate passed Military Construction and Legislative Branch Appropriations Conference Reports.

Senate passed D.C. Appropriations, 1996.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S14107–S14146

Measures Introduced: Four bills were introduced, as follows: S. 1266–1269. **Page S14132**

Measures Reported: Reports were made as follows:

Special Report entitled "Revised Allocation to Subcommittees of Budget Totals from the Concurrent Resolution for Fiscal Year 1996". (S. Rept. No. 104–146)

S. 1267, to amend the Congressional Award Act to revise and extend authorities for the Congressional Award Board. (S. Rept. No. 104–147) **Page S14132**

Measures Passed:

District of Columbia Appropriations, 1996: Senate passed S. 1244, making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, after agreeing to committee amendments, and taking action on amendments proposed thereto, as follows: **Pages S14118–28**

Adopted:

(1) By 88 yeas to 10 nays (Vote No. 462), Byrd Amendment No. 2768, to establish a uniform dress code for the District of Columbia Public Schools, and require community service for suspended students. **Pages S14120–22, S14127–28**

(2) Byrd Amendment No. 2769 (to Amendment No. 2768), to limit the amendment to 2 school years in order to evaluate the effectiveness of the amendment. **Pages S14121–22, S14126**

(3) Inhofe Amendment No. 2771, to prohibit the use of funds for the renovation of property commonly known as the Eastern Market. **Pages S14122–23**

(4) Jeffords Amendment No. 2772, to make a technical correction. **Page S14123**

(5) Kohl/Jeffords Amendment No. 2773, of a technical change to the membership provisions of the Commission on Consensus Reform in the District of Columbia Public Schools. **Page S14123**

(6) Kohl (for Bingaman) Amendment No. 2774, to reduce the energy costs of Federal facilities for which funds are made available under this Act. **Pages S14123–24**

(7) Boxer Amendment No. 2775, to provide that Members of Congress and the President shall not be paid during Federal Government shutdowns. **Page S14124**

Rejected:

Dorgan Amendment No. 2770, to express the sense of the Senate that the Committee on Finance and the Senate should approve no tax legislation which reduces taxes for those making over $101,000 per year, and the savings from limiting any tax reductions in this way should be used to reduce any cuts in projected Medicare spending. (By 54 yeas to 43 nays (Vote No. 460), Senate tabled the amendment.) **Pages S14122, S14125–26**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that when the Senate receives the House companion measure, that all after the enacting clause be stricken and the text of S. 1244, as passed by the Senate, be inserted in lieu thereof, that the House bill, as amended, be passed, that the Senate insist on its amendment, request a conference with the House thereon, and the Chair be authorized to appoint conferees on the part of the Senate, and that S. 1244 be indefinitely postponed. **Page S14128**

Military Construction Appropriations, 1996 Conference Report: By 86 yeas to 14 nays (Vote No. 459), Senate passed the conference report on H.R. 1817, making appropriations for military construction, family housing, and base realignment and closure for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year

ending September 30, 1996, clearing the measure for the President. **Pages S14107–14**

Legislative Branch Appropriations, 1996 Conference Report: By 94 yeas to 4 nays (Vote No. 461), Senate passed the conference report on H.R. 1854, making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, clearing the measure for the President.

Pages S14114–18, S14127

National Highway System Designation Act—Conferees: Senate disagreed to the amendments of the House to S. 440, to amend title 23, United States Code, to provide for the designation of the National Highway System, requested a conference with the House thereon, and the Chair appointed the following conferees: Senators Warner, Chafee, Smith, Kempthorne, Baucus, Moynihan, and Reid; and from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation solely for matters within the committee's jurisdiction: Senators Pressler, Lott, and Hollings.

Page S14144

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

Eric James Boswell, of California, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

Anthony Cecil Eden Quainton, of the District of Columbia, to be Director General of the Foreign Service.

A routine list in the Foreign Service. **Page S14146**

Communications: **Page S14131**

Petitions: **Pages S14131–32**

Statements on Introduced Bills: **Pages S14132–34**

Additional Cosponsors: **Page S14134**

Amendments Submitted: **Pages S14134–35**

Authority for Committees: **Page S14135**

Additional Statements: **Pages S14135–44**

Record Votes: Four record votes were taken today. (Total—462) **Pages S14114, S14126, S14127, S14127–28**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 9:30 a.m., and adjourned at 2:57 p.m., until 2 p.m., on Monday, September 25, 1995. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's RECORD on page S14144.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

MONETARY POLICY

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Committee concluded hearings to examine the Federal Reserve's conduct of monetary policy, after receiving testimony from Alan Greenspan, Chairman, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

BUDGET RECONCILIATION

Committee on Governmental Affairs: Committee completed its review of certain spending reductions and revenue increases to meet reconciliation expenditures as imposed by H. Con. Res. 67, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal years 1996, 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002, and agreed on recommendations which it will make thereon to the Committee on the Budget.

RUBY RIDGE

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Terrorism, Technology, and Government Information continued hearings to examine certain Federal law enforcement actions with regard to the 1992 incident at Ruby Ridge, Idaho, receiving testimony from William Sessions, former Director, and Robert E. Walsh, Special Agent in Charge (San Diego, California), and former Inspector, both of the Federal Bureau of Investigations, George Terwilliger, former Deputy Attorney General, and Barbara B. Berman, former Assistant Counsel, Office of Professional Responsibility, all of the Department of Justice.

Hearings continue on Tuesday, September 26.

BUDGET RECONCILIATION

Committee on Labor and Human Resources: Committee began their review of certain spending reductions and revenue increases to meet reconciliation expenditures as imposed by H. Con. Res. 67, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal years 1996, 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002, but did not complete action thereon, and recessed subject to call.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

The House was not in session today. It will meet next at noon on Monday, September 25.

Committee Meetings

TRANSPORTATION OF THE MEDICAID PROGRAM

Committee on Commerce: Ordered transmitted to the Committee on the Budget for inclusion in Omnibus Budget Reconciliation ''Transformation of the Medicaid Program.''

SAVING MEDICARE

Committee on Ways and Means: Held a hearing on Saving Medicare. Testimony was heard from Gail R. Wilensky, Chair, Physician Payment Review Commission; Stuart H. Altman, Chairman, Prospective Payment Assessment Commission; Roland E. King, former Chief Actuary, Health Care Financing Administration, Department of Health and Human Services; and public witnesses.

Joint Meetings

AFFIRMATIVE ACTION

Joint Hearing: Senate Committee on the Judiciary's Subcommittee on Constitution, Federalism and Property Rights concluded joint hearings with the House Committee on the Judiciary's Subcommittee on Constitution to examine the status and future of affirmative action, focusing on minority contracting, after receiving testimony from John R. Schmidt, Associate Attorney General, Department of Justice; George LaNoue, University of Maryland, Baltimore; Michael Carvin, Shaw, Pittman, Georgina Verdugo, Mexican American Legal Defense Fund, and Tony Robinson, Minority Business Enterprise Legal Defense Fund, all of Washington, D.C.; Thomas Stewart, Spokane, Washington; and Leon Goldstein, Atlanta, Georgia.

APPROPRIATIONS—DEFENSE

Conferees continued in closed evening session to resolve the differences between the Senate-and House-passed versions of H.R. 2126, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996.

CONGRESSIONAL PROGRAM AHEAD

Week of September 25 through 30, 1995

Senate Chamber

On *Monday*, Senate will consider H.R. 2099, VA/HUD Appropriations, 1996.

During the balance of the week, Senate expects to consider:

H.R. 2127, Labor/HHS/Education Appropriations, 1996;

H.R. 2076, Commerce, Justice, State, the Judiciary Appropriations, 1996; Conference reports, when available; and

Any cleared legislative and executive business.

(Senate will recess on Tuesday, September 26, 1995, from 12:30 until 2:15 p.m. for respective party conferences.)

Senate Committees

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry: September 27, business meeting, to consider recommendations which it will make to the Committee on the Budget with respect to spending reductions and revenue increases to meet reconciliation expenditures as imposed by H. Con. Res. 67, setting forth the Congressional Budget for the United States Government for fiscal years 1996, 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002, 9 a.m., SR–332.

September 28, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine the use of ethanol's impact on clean air and the farm economy, 9:30 a.m., SR–328A.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: September 27, business meeting, to mark up S. 650, to increase the amount of credit available to fuel local, regional, and national economic growth by reducing the regulatory burden imposed upon financial institutions, 10 a.m., SD–538.

September 28, Full Committee, to hold hearings on proposed legislation to reform public housing and tenant based section 8 assistance, 10 a.m., SD–538.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: September 26, business meeting, to consider recommendations which it will make to the Committee on the Budget with respect to spending reductions and revenue increases to meet reconciliation expenditures as imposed by H. Con. Res. 67, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal years 1996, 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002, 9:30 a.m., SR–253.

September 27, Subcommittee on Aviation, to hold hearings on S. 1239, to amend title 49, United States Code, with respect to the regulation of interstate transportation by common carriers engaged in civil aviation, 9:30 a.m., SR–253.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: September 28, to hold hearings on the nominations of Derrick L.

Forrister, of Tennessee, to be an Assistant Secretary of Energy (Congressional and Intergovernmental Affairs), Patricia J. Beneke, of Iowa, to be Assistant Secretary for Water and Science, and Eluid Levi Martinez, of New Mexico, to be Commissioner of Reclamation, both of the Department of the Interior, and Charles William Burton, of Texas, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the United States Enrichment Corporation, 9:30 a.m., SD–366.

Committee on Environment and Public Works: September 27, to hold hearings on the nomination of Kathleen A. McGinty, of Pennsylvania, to be a Member of the Council on Environmental Quality, 9:30 a.m., SD–406.

Committee on Finance: September 26, business meeting, to consider recommendations which it will make to the Committee on the Budget with respect to spending reductions and revenue increases to meet reconciliation expenditures as imposed by H. Con. Res. 67, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal years 1996, 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002, 9 a.m., SH–216.

September 27 and 28, Full Committee, business meeting, to continue to consider recommendations which it will make to the Committee on the Budget with respect to spending reductions and revenue increases to meet reconciliation expenditures as imposed by H. Con. Res. 67, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal years 1996, 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002, 9 a.m., SH–216.

Committee on Foreign Relations: September 26, to hold hearings on the nominations of James A. Joseph, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Republic of South Africa, and Charles H. Twining, of Maryland, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Cameroon, 2 p.m., SD–419.

September 28, Full Committee, to hold hearings on the nominations of Joan M. Plaisted, of California, to be Ambassador to the Republic of the Marshall Islands and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador to the Republic of Kiribati, and Don Lee Gevirtz, of California, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Fiji, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador to the Republic of Nauru, Ambassador to the Kingdom of Tonga, and Ambassador to Tuvalu, 2:30 p.m., SD–419.

Committee on the Judiciary: September 28, Subcommittee on Immigration, to hold hearings to examine non-immigrant immigration issues, 1:30 p.m., SD–106.

September 28, Full Committee, to hold hearings on pending nominations, 2 p.m., SD–226.

September 29, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine religious liberty in the United States, 10 a.m., SD–226.

Committee on Labor and Human Resources: September 26, business meeting, to resume their review of certain spending reductions and revenue increases to meet reconciliation expenditures as imposed by H. Con. Res. 67, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal years 1996, 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002, 9 a.m., SD–430.

September 27, Full Committee, business meeting, to mark up S. 1180, to amend title XIX of the Public Health Service Act to provide for health performance partnerships, and S. 1221, to authorize appropriations for the Legal Services Corporation Act, 9:30 a.m., SD–430.

Select Committee on Intelligence: September 27, to hold closed hearings on intelligence matters, 2 p.m., SH–219.

House Chamber

Monday, No legislative business is scheduled.

Tuesday, House not in session.

Wednesday and the balance of the week, Consideration of H.R. 743, Teamwork for Employees and Managers Act of 1995 (open rule, 1 hour of general debate);

H.R. 1170, Three-Judge Court Review for State-Wide Reference Act (open rule, 1 hour of general debate);

H.R. 1601, International Space Station Authorization Act of 1995 (open rule, 1 hour of general debate);

H.R. , District of Columbia Appropriations Act fiscal year 1996 (subject to a rule being granted); and

H.R. , Continuing Resolution for fiscal year 1996 (subject to a rule being granted).

NOTE.—Conference reports may be brought up at any time. Any further program may be brought up at any time.

House Committees

Committee on Banking and Financial Services, September 27 and 28, Subcommittee on Capital Markets, Securities and Government Sponsored Enterprises, oversight hearings on the Federal Home Loan Bank System, 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

September 27, Subcommittee on Financial Institutions and Consumer Credit, to mark up the Thrift Charter Convergence Act of 1995, 1 p.m., 2128 Rayburn.

September 29, hearing on the proposed United States Housing Act of 1995, 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on Commerce, September 27, to continue consideration of Budget Reconciliation issues, time to be announced, 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities, September 27, Subcommittee on Employer-Employee Relations, hearing on National Labor Relations Board Reform, 9:30 a.m., 2175 Rayburn.

September 28, full Committee, to mark up instructions contained in the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget, 10 a.m., 2175 Rayburn.

Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, September 28, Subcommittee on Human Resources and Intergovernmental Relations, hearing on the following bills: H.R. 2326, Health Care Fraud and Abuse Prevention Act of 1995; and H.R. 1850, Health Care Fraud and Abuse Prevention Act, 10 a.m., 2203 Rayburn.

September 28, Subcommittee on National Economic Growth, Natural Resources and Regulatory, hearing on Taxpayer-funded Political Advocacy, 2 p.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Committee on International Relations, September 27, to mark up the Committee's Response to the House's Reconciliation Instructions, 3 p.m., 2172 Rayburn.

September 28, hearing on Terrorism in Latin America/AMIA Bombing in Argentina, 10 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

September 28, Subcommittee on International Operations and Human Rights, hearing on Bosnian Refugees, 2 p.m., 334 Cannon.

Committee on the Judiciary, September 27, to continue mark up of H.R. 2202, Immigration in the National Interest Act of 1995, 10 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

September 28, Subcommittee on Crime, hearing on the following bills: H.R. 1241, DNA Identification Grants Improvement Act; H.R. 1533, to amend title 18, United States Code, to increase the penalty for escaping from a Federal prison; H.R. 1552, False Identification Act of 1995; H.R. 2359, to clarify the method of execution of Federal prisoners; and H.R. 2360, to amend title 18, United States Code, to permit Federal prisoners to engage in community service projects, 9:30 a.m., 2226 Rayburn.

September 29, full Committee, hearing on H.R. 497, National Gambling Impact and Policy Commission Act, 10 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Committee on Resources, September 27, to consider pending business, 11 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

September 28, Subcommittee on Fisheries, Wildlife and Oceans, oversight hearing on the Wild Bird Conservation Act of 1992 (P.L. 102–440), 10 a.m., 1334 Longworth.

September 28, Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests and Lands, hearing on the following bills: H.R. 194, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to make matching contributions toward the purchase of the Sterling Forest in the State of New York; H.R. 1256, Sterling Forest Protection Act of 1995; and the Snow Basin Land Exchange Act of 1995, 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

Committee on Science, September 27, Subcommittee on Space and Aeronautics, hearing on the Space Shuttle in Transition: Keeping Safety Paramount, 3 p.m., 2318 Rayburn.

September 28, Subcommittee on Technology, hearing on Impact of Government Regulatory, Tax and Legal Policy on Technology Development and Competitiveness, 9:30 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Committee on Small Business, September 28, hearing on SBA's Venture Capital Programs, 10 a.m., 2359 Rayburn.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, September 28, Subcommittee on Aviation, hearing on H.R. 2276, Federal Aviation Administration Revitalization Act of 1995, 9:30 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs, September 27, Subcommittee on Hospitals and Health Care, hearing on illegal activities at Department of Veterans Affairs medical facilities, 9:30 a.m., 334 Cannon.

Committee on Ways and Means, September 27, 28 and 29, to mark up the Medicare Preservation Act, 10 a.m., 1100 Longworth.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

2 p.m., Monday, September 25

Senate Chamber

Program for Monday: After the recognition of two Senators for speeches and the transaction of any morning business (not to extend beyond 3 p.m.), Senate will consider H.R. 2099, VA/HUD Appropriations, 1996.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

12 noon, Monday, September 25

House Chamber

Program for Monday: No legislative business is scheduled.

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.