

with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 5 minutes each.

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

SCHEDULE

Mr. LOTT. In the meantime, for the information of all Senators—and Senator DASCHLE is here—we will be talking about the schedule for the balance of the evening. We believe we are ready to move forward on the NIH reauthorization bill. We are still working to see if we can get an agreement on the pipeline safety bill which, although it is completed, still has the gag rule issue pending to be resolved. I understood they were making some progress, and now I understand that maybe they are not.

During the next few minutes, while we are having 5-minute speeches, we will work on this and make that information available to all Senators.

I yield the floor.

Mr. BROWN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes in morning business.

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

Mr. BYRD. Will the Senator yield briefly?

Mr. BROWN. I am happy to.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the Senate is still not in order. There are entirely too many conversations going on in the back of the Chamber.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's observations are entirely correct. Will the Senators to the Chair's right please take their conversations to the Cloakroom? The Senator from Alaska, the Senator from Arkansas.

I thank the Senator from West Virginia.

The Senator from Colorado is recognized.

EMERGENCY FUNDING FOR FISCAL YEAR 1996 AND FISCAL YEAR 1997

Mr. BROWN. Thank you, Mr. President. I thank the distinguished Senator from West Virginia for his courtesy for allowing me to be heard.

Mr. President, I want to draw Members' attention to the President's emergency funding request. Not so long ago the President sent up to Congress a communication requesting \$1.1 billion in emergency funding for fiscal years 1996 and 1997. Members will find it in their offices. The communication of the President is dated September 17, 1996. Mr. President, I ask Members to review that communication because I have some concerns with it.

Mr. President, it is my hope that Members will give these requests some careful review. All of us are concerned about terrorism, but I hope in exhibiting our concern that we will also recognize that we have an obligation to the taxpayers when considering these requests.

I draw Members' attention to the fact that the President's original re-

quest in March of this year—not so long ago—was for exactly \$27.9 million. That is increased 4,000 percent, in a few months, in this request. Obviously, terrorism is a matter that deserves careful and full scrutiny and strong action on the part of the Federal Government. But I would suggest to Members also that a 4000-percent increase in the request for funding also deserves our attention.

Mr. President, let me give some specific examples. In this enormous request under the banner of "emergency," only 6 months after the original request, I think some questions need and should be asked. We looked through these requests and I hope Members will study them. We found huge increases in spending spread throughout the Federal Government.

For example, the request includes an additional \$34,000 for additional facilities for security expenses at the Office of the Inspector General under the Department of the Treasury. When we inquired or looked in the report for how this \$34,000 was to be spent, the report indicates, and I quote, "No further details provided."

So we ended up calling the Office of the Inspector General. We talked specifically to the budget officer who ends up coordinating these matters. Here is what he said and I'll quote this because I think it is imperative that his exact words be included in the RECORD. He said, "This is the first I have heard of any emergency supplemental funding." Now, this is the officer who controls the budget for that office. He said, "This is the first I have heard of any emergency supplemental funding. I am not aware of any request for extra funding. I do not know what we need it for."

The OMB publication didn't spell out what it was for, and their budget director does not even know what it was for.

From the Bureau of Public Debt at the Department of the Treasury, we received a request of \$161,000 "for additional facilities security operating expenses." Once again, no further details were provided in the report. We called the Bureau of Public Debt and asked them what this request would be used for. We simply wanted a justification and some simple facts. The budget officer was unaware of the emergency supplemental request. This is what the budget officer said, "I'll be real honest with you. This is the first I've heard of it. We have not made a request for supplemental funding."

Now, this is an emergency funding request and the budget officer tells us that he has not even heard of it?

Mr. President, the dilemma goes on.

For the Federal Aviation Administration there is a \$15.5-million request to acquire and install dual energy automated x-ray systems and quadruple resonance devices for screening checked baggage at U.S. airports. According to the FAA, these x-ray systems and resonance devices, and I quote, "have not been certified by the

FAA as meeting the U.S. national performance standards for explosives detection systems." We called the Financial Review Division at the FAA. We asked the manager of this division at the FAA why they needed emergency funding for x-ray systems and resonance devices that do not meet the U.S. performance standards and have not been FAA certified. Let me repeat that.

The request is for machines that do not meet the U.S. performance standards. These machines are not FAA certified. Here is what the manager said, "I don't know why we are asking for safety equipment that is not FAA certified."

Mr. President, the list goes on.

Mr. President, we have a responsibility to take care of the important business of the public, and we ought to fund serious antiterrorist efforts. But "I don't know" is not a good enough answer. The American citizen deserves more. It is irresponsible for the President to ask for money when they do not even know how they would spend it. It is even more irresponsible for this Congress to appropriate it.

My hope is that we give close attention to these requested matters and that we not fund matters where they have no clear idea how they are going to spend it, and that we take out of the emergency supplemental areas any clear waste out of areas where we, and they, simply don't have any idea where it will be spent.

Last, Mr. President, if you were going to identify an area of abuse in spending over the past years, it would surely be in the area where we come up with an emergency supplemental where it does not receive the full review and investigation of the Appropriations Committee.

I hope this Congress will not be derelict in its duty. I hope we will not write a blank check from the Public Treasury. Our responsibility and obligation to the American people is not to write blank checks for requests we know nothing about. Mr. President, I hope this Senate will act to make sure these "I don't know" requests from the President are denied.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. THOMPSON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. THOMPSON. I thank my colleague from Colorado. The Senate will surely miss his wise counsel. I rise to express similar concerns.

Mr. President, recent, tragic events have raised the fight against terrorism higher in the public consciousness. In response, President Clinton has submitted a request for \$1.1 billion in emergency antiterrorism funding for fiscal year 1996 and fiscal year 1997.

While it is imperative that we act in a timely way to fight terrorism and to preserve the safety of our citizens, it is also important that we not simply throw money at a problem for efforts that do little more than make us feel a little better for a little while.

Indeed, it's important that we not let our actions be reduced to reactions.

Unless these programs make a difference, we will be wasting the taxpayer's money. And when terrorists strike again, we'll be standing here once more, asking ourselves what went wrong with the programs whose appropriations we are debating today.

I fear that the President's emergency request represents greatly increased spending without greatly increased thought.

Do we know that this \$1.1 billion will go toward effective measures? The President's proposal represents an increase in spending on antiterrorism measures of about 4,000 percent, from his earlier proposal of something under \$50 million. I am not yet convinced that this spending is anything more than an expensive way to make the public believe that the Government is doing something constructive.

I happen to think we have long since passed the day in this body when we can equate the expenditure of large amounts of public funds with results. It simply does not happen in too many respects.

There is a significant difference between doing things that look effective and doing things that are effective. For example, it may look good to expand wiretapping authority, but is it necessarily a positive way to deal with the problem? What kinds of terrorists are we fighting? Will wiretapping even be effective to combat what we are going to be facing in the future?

Would wiretapping have helped stop the Atlanta bombing? Would it have mattered in Oklahoma City?

And just as important as that question is considering the price we may pay in the infringement on our personal freedoms.

It is no small question to define what is a reasonable and acceptable infringement on our rights and privileges. Before we plunge into any cut back on our personal freedoms, we need to carefully consider what we are getting when we trade them away.

Obviously, the President's request has arrived so late that we can't give it the scrutiny and possible revision it seems to need. So we are moving ahead and appropriating the funds he has asked for, hoping that they will do some real good.

Mr. President, I submit that what we truly need is a thoughtful, coordinated, long-range plan about how to address the threat of terrorism. I fear that the administration's emergency request comes more out of reaction than it does from a careful examination of the problem.

Cobbling together afterthought reactions is not sufficient to address this matter. And \$1.1 billion is a great deal of money to spend with such little consideration.

I don't take the matter of terrorism lightly. Indeed, none of us can. Everyone observing the proceedings from inside this Chamber has already gone

through a metal detector to get in the Capitol, and then through another, stronger detector just be inside this room.

House and Senate staff members wear ID badges, and they pass by guards every day as they come in to work. We are all aware of the threat—it is a part of daily life.

Even so, extraordinary tragedy is always possible. I was in Atlanta this summer when the pipe bomb exploded at the Olympic games. It is profoundly disturbing to know that a determined individual can still penetrate even the most stringent security measures. So I appreciate the threat of terrorism and the need for swift action. At the same time, I submit that unless we carefully plan our tactics and strategy to counter this threat, we will have squandered our resources that could have made a real difference. Without planning, we will have nothing to show for our efforts.

The President's request comes in response to the Atlanta bombing and the downing of TWA Flight 800 off of Long Island. Has President Clinton merely scraped together whatever ideas were at hand in order to appear tough on terrorism? We need to move forward to combat terrorism from a position of leadership and not simply reaction. We should not simply expand the power of the Federal Government after every act of terrorism.

The proposal from 6 months ago for fiscal year 1997 was much different than the one we see now. It included a 40 percent cut in the Attorney General's counterterrorism fund. The new proposal calls for millions in security upgrades for Federal buildings. What are these upgrades? And, most important, will they make the people in those buildings any safer? And why were they not suggested in the original fiscal year 1997 proposal if they were needed?

It is difficult to turn down the President's request at this late date. I remind my colleagues that if in a year or two this \$1.1 billion appropriation turns out to be no more than a quick gesture to allay public fears, if these proposals are ultimately ineffective and hollow to the core, then we will be faced with the unpleasant fact that we spent \$1.1 billion for simply being safe, or feeling safe for a few days or a few weeks in order to be able to say that we just did something.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. CONRAD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

The Senate is currently in a period of morning business. The Senator has the right to speak for 5 minutes.

Mr. CONRAD. I thank the Chair.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator be kind enough to yield for a unanimous consent request that has been agreed to on both sides?

Mr. CONRAD. I will be pleased to.

Mr. LOTT. I thank the Senator for yielding. This is an issue we have been

working on for quite some time. We finally got it done. We would like to get it done before it becomes unglued.

Mr. CONRAD. I am happy to yield to the majority leader.

NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH REVITALIZATION ACT OF 1996

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 583, S. 1897.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1897) to amend the Public Health Service Act to revise and extend certain programs relating to the National Institutes of Health, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill which has been reported from the Committee on Labor and Human Resources, with amendments; as follows:

(The parts of the bill intended to be stricken are shown in boldface brackets and the parts of the bill intended to be inserted are shown in *italic*.)

S. 1897

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; REFERENCES; AND TABLE OF CONTENTS

(a) *SHORT TITLE*.—This Act may be cited as the "National Institutes of Health Revitalization Act of 1996".

(b) *REFERENCES*.—Whenever in this Act an amendment is expressed in terms of an amendment to a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 201 et seq.).

(c) *TABLE OF CONTENTS*.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; references; and table of contents.

TITLE I—PROVISIONS RELATING TO THE NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

Sec. 101. Director's discretionary fund.

Sec. 102. Children's vaccine initiative.

TITLE II—PROVISIONS RELATING TO THE NATIONAL RESEARCH INSTITUTES

Sec. 201. Research on osteoporosis, Paget's disease, and related bone disorders.

Sec. 202. National Human Genome Research Institute.

Sec. 203. Increased amount of grant and other awards.

Sec. 204. Meetings of advisory committees and councils.

Sec. 205. Elimination or modification of reports.

TITLE III—SPECIFIC INSTITUTES AND CENTERS

Subtitle A—National Cancer Institute

Sec. 301. Authorization of appropriations.

Sec. 302. DES study.

Subtitle B—National Heart Lung and Blood Institute

Sec. 311. Authorization of appropriations.

Subtitle C—National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases

Sec. 321. Research and research training regarding tuberculosis.