

liberal Senate I have ever seen. I shudder to think how many votes we would get under a similar situation today.

But the arguments abounded on this floor that this is not conclusive; there is not enough evidence to disrupt this industry. And we were only trying to phase it out; we were not trying to kill it all at one time. And all those industry arguments made about how this was even a conspiracy of the Soviet Union KGB, a disinformation attack by the Soviet KGB to sow seeds of discord in the United States.

My argument was simply this: If it takes 15 years for these chlorofluorocarbons to work their way into the stratosphere, even if we banned all CFC's at that moment, it would be 15 years before we would begin to reverse the damage that had already been done.

And I said, "This is the time, if there ever was a time, to err on the side of caution." These comments are not self-serving. I actually said those things on the floor of the Senate. I said them to everybody I could find to say them to, that I thought our committee hearings had produced enough evidence that the ozone depletion theory was real, that we ought to err on the side of caution and no great damage would be done if we were wrong.

Mr. President, we were not wrong. We were dead right. And the National Academy of Sciences started their studies. And in 1985, thanks to a slightly separate theory by Paul Crutzen, who was also honored yesterday, of the Max Planck Institute for Chemistry, Mainz, Germany we discovered the hole in the ozone layer developing over Antarctica. And it created such a stir in this Nation that we had the big 1987 Montreal Protocol. We agreed to phase out the manufacture of all chlorofluorocarbons—and, incidentally, the principal one being Freon gas in your refrigerators and automobile air conditioners—that we would phase out the manufacture of all of those by this year, 1995, and hopefully we are going to.

So, Mr. President, I really came to the floor to say, No. 1, I told you so—and that will get you about a half of one vote to say, "I told you so"—but more importantly than anything else, to extend my profound and sincere thanks and congratulations to Mario Molina, who was just a postdoctoral fellow working under "Sherry" Sherwood Rowland. Everyone calls him Sherry. Yesterday they were awarded the Nobel prize for chemistry, along with Dr. Crutzen, the three of them.

I cannot tell you how gratifying it is to me that the Nobel committee has chosen two people I feel that I have known all of my public life. As I say, I just came here this afternoon to publicly say on the Senate floor this Nation owes those two men a deep debt of gratitude. I am most grateful that we have people like that in this country.

I yield the floor.

Mr. DOMENICI addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. I might first make a parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President. Is there a consent order about voting today?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is a consent order under which a vote on cloture will take place at 8:30 p.m.

Mr. DOMENICI. On the pending matter?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to speak for 5 minutes as in morning business.

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

Mr. DOMENICI. Could I precede that with a remark to my good friend, Senator BUMPERS, after which I will go on in morning business?

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

Mr. DOMENICI. I say to Senator BUMPERS, I did not get here in time to listen to all of his remarks, but I vividly recall that we served on a little subcommittee. I was on that subcommittee, I might share with my friend and the Chair, because freshmen Senators then did not get very good assignments. And so one of my assignments was to the Public Works Committee, now Environment and Public Works. And that was a top assignment then because the senior Senator from New Mexico, who was a Democrat, was also on that committee, and he was second from the top.

I was not only on the Republican side, but I was the last and brandnew person. And then they gave me a seat on Space, which was being phased out. And it is in one of those subcommittees under the rubric of space that the Senator and I held hearings on this very strange phenomenon from whence came the Nobel awardees because of their research. I think that little subcommittee was the first to hold a hearing.

Mr. BUMPERS. Absolutely.

Mr. DOMENICI. I am not sure I understood the breadth at that point, but clearly while there are not answers on all of it, there are some very significant answers, and we have done a great deal in the United States against tough odds in reference to the combinations that are occurring out there, some of which we were causing with what we used.

I compliment the Senator on the remarks and compliment the awardees. I do not know them as well as the Senator does. I think it is rather a sensational award, and people ought to continue to do work like that if there are going to be Nobel awards for them for that kind of exciting work.

TRIBUTE TO RACHEL SCHLESINGER

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my wife Nancy and

my family, I would like to speak a few moments about Rachel Schlesinger, who died this past Tuesday. For the most part, when we hear the word "Schlesinger" around here, we think of Rachel's husband, Jim Schlesinger, who has held some very high Cabinet posts with both Democratic and Republican Presidents. But I do not want to speak about him today.

I want to just take a few minutes in my way to speak about Rachel Schlesinger, who died this past Tuesday. There are going to be a lot of eulogies for Rachel because there are so many of us who were touched in some special way by this remarkable woman. Let me add a few personal thoughts and sentiments about her.

Rachel, in my opinion, personified what one committed individual can do for those who are less fortunate, those who need special help, and those who cannot always fend for themselves. She was a gentle and unassuming lady. Those of us who saw her in action knew that behind her quiet exterior was a person of great strength and dedication to issues of importance to her and, in many instances, to her family.

Years before the issue of mental illness became as well understood as it is today, Rachel Schlesinger was speaking out and advocating for more research about this disease.

She testified in behalf of the mentally ill. She offered her support to those small, but valiant, organizations who worked so hard to share the message of this dread disease, which we now call mental illness or mental disease.

My wife reminded me how amazed she was that just a few months ago, while suffering her own health battles, she attended a meeting of the National Alliance of the Mentally Ill and was as gracious and friendly as ever, while suffering immensely from the disease that would finally cause her demise.

Rachel always believed more could and should be done to find a cure for mental illness, be it schizophrenia, manic depression, bipolar illness, or any of the dread illnesses that we choose now to call mental illness or mental disease.

She was a strong influential and outspoken communicator about this issue. We appreciate deeply all of her help, her selfless energies in behalf of this cause.

Another example of Rachel Schlesinger's great heart was her concern for the homeless. We remember that she handed out sandwiches from a food wagon. She was one who took time from her own busy schedule to lend a hand to those in need. Today, people say, and we learn this from our young generation, "If you're going to talk the talk, you better walk the walk." Well, Rachel was one of those who really did, she walked the walk.

Let me also mention one other facet of her life that so many people close to her admired, and that was her love of music. As a musician herself, Rachel

saw music as a private expression of oneself as well as something that should be nurtured for the community and by the community.

Literally up until a few days before she died, she was a driving force in fundraising for the Arlington Symphony Orchestra. She had founded and for many years she had managed the highly acclaimed Arlington "Pops" concerts. She opened up her home on countless occasions for the orchestra's donor activities. No work or effort was too much to ensure that it survived.

She believed, quite simply, that music was a love that could be shared with others. She could be found wherever and whenever help was needed, and her devotion and great spirit will be forever remembered and missed by all those who benefited from and shared her deep love and passion of this beautiful music that she became so attached to.

Mr. President, some will comment in the days ahead about Rachel Schlesinger's full life, her exciting ventures in far places of the Earth, her wonderful family of eight children and her devoted husband who respected and admired her so deeply. All of these comments will be heartfelt and true. I would just like to close with the thoughts that Rachel was a very special person to those of us who were touched by her, by her enthusiasm and her personal commitment to so many good causes and important issues.

I share my wife Nancy's simple but heartfelt summation: "Rachel was, most of all, a caring person."

To her family and many friends, Nancy and I join you in our thoughts and our prayers and joy in having known a remarkable and wonderful lady, Rachel Schlesinger.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. COCHRAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the conference report to accompany H.R. 1976, the agriculture appropriations bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 1976) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs 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 all of the conferees.

The Senate proceeded to consider the report.

(The conference report is printed in the House proceedings of the RECORD of September 28, 1995.)

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I am pleased to report to the Senate that we successfully concluded the conference with the House on September 28 on the Agriculture appropriations bill. We worked out our differences. The other body has adopted the conference agreement, and it is now before the Senate. I urge the Senate to adopt it.

This bill appropriates funds for the Department of Agriculture, the Commodities Futures Trading Commission, the Food and Drug Administration and related agencies for the fiscal year that began October 1.

The funding level in the bill is \$63.2 billion. This represents a reduction in spending of \$5.8 billion from last year's level. It is less than the President's requested level of funding for these programs for the next year. It is actually a smaller amount than we agreed to when this bill was before the Senate. It is \$631 million less than the total appropriated by the Senate-passed bill, but it is \$615 million more than the level recommended in the House bill. I am pleased to report that the discretionary spending level is \$13.3 billion in budget authority and \$13.6 billion in outlays and that these amounts are within the subcommittee's discretionary spending allocations.

There are things that can be said about the fact that we do not have enough funds to provide levels of support that we would like for many areas under the jurisdiction of this committee, but this is a time of constraint, it is a time when we are trying to reduce the overall costs of Government, insist upon new efficiencies in the operation of Government agencies, and this bill is, therefore, consistent with our overall budgetary goals and policy goals.

The committee of conference on this bill considered 160 amendments in disagreement between the two Houses. It was our desire to complete conference on this bill before the start of the new fiscal year and we did that. I would like to thank all members of the conference committee for their support and cooperation in this effort. I believe this conference report reflects a mutually satisfactory resolution of the differences between the two Houses, and does so in a manner which reflects the funding requirements of the many programs and activities covered by the bill within the limited resources available.

Approximately \$39.8 billion, close to 63 percent of the total new budget authority provided by this bill, is for domestic food programs administered by the U.S. Department of Agriculture. Excluding the Food Stamp Program reserve, this represents an increase of \$1.5 billion above the fiscal year 1995 level for these programs, which include food stamps; commodity assistance; the special Supplemental Food Program for Women, Infants, and Children

[WIC]; and the school lunch and breakfast programs.

The \$260 million increase above fiscal year 1995 for the Women, Infants, and Children [WIC] Program, as recommended in both the House and Senate bills, remains the single largest discretionary program funding increase provided by this bill.

The conference agreement accepts the House bill proposal to consolidate funding for commodity food assistance programs and provides \$166 million for this purpose. It also provides the House recommended level of \$65 million, \$32 million above the fiscal year 1995 level, for the Food Donations Program on Indian reservations; and maintains the fiscal year 1995 level of \$150 million, as proposed by the House, for the Elderly Feeding Program.

The House bill recommended no fiscal year 1996 funding for a Food Stamp Program reserve. The Senate bill provided \$1 billion for this purpose. The conferees have resolved this difference by agreeing to provide a \$500 million Food Stamp Program reserve. Although this reserve has not been required for a period of years, this amount will assure that sufficient funds are available to cover benefits in the event of an economic downturn or unforeseen event resulting in increased program participation levels.

With respect to rural development programs, the Senate-passed bill consolidated funding for seven rural development loan and grant programs, while the House bill consolidated funding for three programs—water and waste disposal grants and loans and solid waste management grants. The conferees have adopted the House bill position and have provided a total of \$487.9 million for this consolidated account. The conferees also have provided \$2.9 billion in total rural housing loan authorizations, \$415 million more than the House and \$42 million less than the Senate bill levels.

I am also pleased to report that the Senate bill's higher levels for farm operating and ownership loans were retained by the conferees. Loan authorizations totaling \$2.45 billion are provided for these important farmer assistance programs.

For discretionary conservation programs, the conferees have provided total funding of \$857.7 million. The conference agreement also retains the Senate recommendation providing for the enrollment of an additional 100,000 acres in the Wetlands Reserve Program, the same as the fiscal year 1995 level.

In addition, this conference agreement provides \$53.6 million for the Commodity Futures Trading Commission. It retains a number of Senate bill provisions, including the provision regarding poultry labeling regulations issued by the USDA, a provision which limits eligibility for the market promotion program, and a provision prohibiting the use of FDA funds for the Board of Tea Exports.