

That is the kind of down-to-earth goodness and humbleness that Jimmy Stewart brought to the stage and to the screen and to the families of millions and millions of Americans and millions around the world.

He, frankly, deserves a greater tribute but, frankly, I cannot think of a more appropriate tribute to a modest man, to a good man, than a modest museum in his own hometown.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. SPECTER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I am pleased to join with my distinguished colleague, Senator SANTORUM, in commemorating the opening of the museum in Indiana, PA, on May 20 of this year, which will commemorate the 87th birthday of a great American.

James Stewart spoke in the Senate of the United States to a spellbound crowd in the movie "Mr. Smith Goes to Washington," unlike those assembled here today, who are still conducting some substantial business as we near the completion of this important appropriations bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will suspend while we get order on the floor.

Could we please have order in the Senate?

I thank the Senator.

The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I feel a particular affinity for James Stewart for many reasons. In addition to playing a U.S. Senator for the movies, he was also the lead actor in "The Philadelphia Story," for which he won an Academy Award.

He is a Pennsylvanian from a small town, Indiana, PA, which has a very striking statue in his honor.

In opening this museum on May 20—we talk about it on an appropriations bill—it is relevant to know that there is no Federal funding, at least to my knowledge, for this museum, which the people are offering as a tribute to James Stewart.

He has really a remarkable career as an actor and as a great patriot, one of the first movie stars to enter in World War II. He rose from the rank of private to the rank of colonel. He had 20 missions over Bremen, Frankfurt, and Berlin. He is an all-American hero. He reminds us of that when he appears frequently on television and in the reruns of "It's a Wonderful Life."

James Stewart is an American success story, and it is entirely appropriate that he be honored in his hometown on May 20 of this year.

Jimmy Stewart's achievements on and off the silver screen are well known to us, and Indiana, PA, is indeed fortunate to claim him as one of its own. He was born in Indiana, PA, on May 20, 1908, and graduated from Princeton University in 1932 with a degree in Architecture. Shortly after his graduation, Jimmy joined a summer

theater group, debuting that same year in a production of "Goodbye Again." After several years of performing in Broadway productions, Jimmy made his film debut in "The Murder Man" in 1935. His legendary film career was launched, and over the next several years he would bring us such classics as "It's A Wonderful Life," "Destry Rides Again," and "The Philadelphia Story." His 1939 "Mr. Smith Goes to Washington" stands before us all—here in Washington and all throughout our country—as an abiding testimony to the importance of courage and integrity.

Jimmy Stewart's excellence in film, however, is matched by his sense of duty and patriotism. When his country called him to serve in World War II, he answered willingly; he served as a bomber pilot in the U.S. Air Force with dedication and distinction, earning several medals and commendations—and yet all the while with a sense of modesty and humility that belied the star-of-the-screen status he had left behind. By the time he returned home to the States, Mr. Jimmy Stewart had become Col. Jimmy Stewart, and over the course of his continued service in the Air Force Reserve in the years after the war he rose to the rank of Brigadier General.

His post-war return to the world of film brought us some of his greatest cinematic achievements, including such collaborative efforts with Alfred Hitchcock as "Rear Window," "The Man Who Knew Too Much," and "Vertigo." In 1950, he brought us "Harvey," in 1953, "The Glenn Miller Story," and in 1962, "The Man Who Shot Liberty Valance." And in the most gloriously atypical fashion, he and his wife Gloria remained together through it all year after year until her recent passing.

Jimmy Stewart's many contributions to the world of film, as well as the steadfast humility of his character and the tremendous sacrifice that he made as he served in behalf of his country, have endeared him to us all, and the occasion of the opening of this museum in his honor is a special one indeed. I am personally grateful for the joy that he has brought to us in his films and for the tremendous model of integrity and selflessness that he has exhibited for so many years, and I am hopeful that this modest museum erected in his honor will serve to enshrine his contributions and his character for many generations to come.

These remarks, along with the remarks by my distinguished colleague, Senator SANTORUM, as we pay tribute to this very, very distinguished American and Pennsylvanian.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota has been recognized.

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

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

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair reminds the Senator, the question before the Senate is amendment No. 441 in the second degree to amendment No. 427. The Senator needs to ask unanimous consent for that to be set aside.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I ask unanimous consent that that amendment be set aside.

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

Mr. WELLSTONE. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, shortly I think we will have some agreement on an amendment that I will offer. I thought what I might do is take advantage of this time to briefly summarize this for colleagues. I appreciate the hard work of the majority leader and the bipartisan spirit of this.

Senior citizens face a confusing world of rules, conditions, exceptions, limitations, and even outright scams when choosing their supplemental health insurance and grappling with the Medicare system. Congress recognized the difficulty seniors face when it established a program, which is really a wonderful program. It is sort of the best example of grant money going a long way, and is called the Insurance Information Counseling and Assistance Grant Program in OBRA 1990. This was a recognition by the Congress that Medicare beneficiaries need help, not help through a Washington agency, but person-to-person help at a local level.

All 50 States have established insurance counseling and assistance programs with the help of Federal grant dollars. As a result, these programs provide local volunteer based assistance to Medicare beneficiaries.

Mr. President, this grant program is a perfect example of a small program—it is basically seed money—that has produced big results. Let me repeat that—a small program that has produced big results.

Over 10,000 volunteers have been trained through the program, and over \$14 million is saved each year for beneficiaries just by good counseling for senior citizens who have a difficult time.

I remember that both my mom and dad had Parkinson's disease and, in the latter years of their lives, among their struggles was the struggle of just wading through some of the paperwork that they had to do, and some of the forms that they found bewildering.

In my own State of Minnesota, 300 volunteers have been trained, and 3,300

beneficiaries were assisted in 1994 alone—just in the State of Minnesota—and \$867,000 was saved on their behalf.

Mr. President, I just simply want to make the case that what we are trying to do here is restore \$5.5 million that is part of the proposed rescissions. What we are working on now is what the offset will be.

This is \$5.5 million to be added on to what I think is now being spent, which is also about \$5.5 million, which will go a long way. Again, this is not a program centered in Washington, DC. This is a program that uses a small amount of Federal dollars that goes a long, long way. We train volunteers in each of our States, and I say to my colleagues that I know if you just talk to people in your State, especially senior citizens, you will find that there is a tremendous appreciation for the Insurance Information Counseling and Assistance Grant Program.

So I am just trying to restore \$5.5 million. We are now working on an offset. As soon as we have that offset—and I think it will be soon—it is my hope that my amendment will have unanimous support.

Mr. President, I also want to say to my colleagues, the reason that I have been working on this amendment is, at least for me, one of the better reasons to be in the U.S. Senate—the need for this program comes directly from a lot of senior citizens in the State of Minnesota. People are really committed to this program. They feel it is not very expensive. I am just trying to get \$5.5 million back in here to provide counseling assistance to seniors all across the country, and people tell me it is a huge help to them.

I think this is a good example of public policy that is not overly centralized, Mr. President, and not overly bureaucratized. It takes place back in our States and local communities, and constitutes the best example of using a small amount of money to get a lot of volunteers to provide a lot of help to senior citizens working their way through these forms, and it is a wonderful consumer protection and prevention program against some of the scams that all too often, unfortunately, happen to seniors.

I suggest the absence of a quorum. I hope soon we will have some resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GORTON. 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. GORTON. Mr. President I ask unanimous consent that we lay aside the pending amendment if we have one.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 576 TO AMENDMENT NO. 420

(Purpose: To restore \$614,000 proposed for rescission from the Weir Farm Historical Site, CT, and \$700,000 proposed for rescission from the Jefferson Expansion Memorial, IL, offset by rescissions of \$700,000 from land acquisition for the Wayne National Forest, OH, and \$690,000 from the Highway Trust Fund; and to prohibit the purchase of lands in Washington County and Lawrence County, OH)

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Washington [Mr. GORTON] proposes an amendment numbered 576 to amendment No. 420.

Mr. GORTON. 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 19, line 2, strike "\$11,297,000" and insert: "\$9,983,000".

On page 21, line 17, strike "\$3,020,000" and insert: "\$3,720,000".

On page 21, line 17, after "rescinded" insert "and the Chief of the Forest Service shall not exercise any option of purchase or initiate any new purchases of land, with obligated or unobligated funds, in Washington County, Ohio, and Lawrence County, Ohio, during fiscal year 1995".

On page 44, line 77, insert the following:

FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION
FEDERAL AID HIGHWAYS
(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)
(RESCISSION)

Of the available contract authority balances under this heading in Public Law 100-17, \$690,074 are rescinded.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, this amendment includes five items, all of which apply within the general direction of the Interior Committee portions of this bill. They are at the request of individual Senators and have offsets there for relatively small projects. They have offsets. They have been cleared with the majority and minority parties.

They include elements in Ohio, Illinois—that is one in which Missouri is interested—and Connecticut.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. BUMPERS. Has the Senator from Washington sent the amendments to the desk? Are they at the desk?

Mr. GORTON. They are.

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, those amendments have been cleared on this side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further debate, the question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 576) was agreed to.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

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

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

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, as I understand it, the Senator from Nevada is prepared to offer an amendment. I wonder if we might agree to a 30-minute time agreement on the amendment?

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, if I may respond, Senator BUMPERS is the primary sponsor of this. I am trying to reach him. He will be here momentarily. I am certainly agreeable in principle to the time limit to accommodate the leader and move this along, but I am reluctant to agree to a specific time until I speak with him.

Let me assure the leader I will try to ferret out the distinguished Senator from Arkansas and will be in communication with the leader as soon as possible.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I just want to give my colleagues a status report on where I think we are. I believe we are making progress, but I am not certain because I see some additional amendments that have been added, additional cost items, add-backs—about \$60 million. Then the offset has been reduced by about \$60 million. It is about \$120 million that has sort of disappeared here without our knowledge on this side.

We are perfectly willing to discuss these items or look at offsets that might be offered.

\$46 million for Job Corps; I do not know where that came from. That came out of the blue; never discussed it yesterday. TRIO, whatever TRIO is; immigration and education; substance abuse and mental health—all these things. There is already a great deal of money in the bill for all of these programs.

Then the IRS offset disappeared. That was \$50 million. Library is \$10 million; maybe one or two others.

So we have sort of gone backwards on the deficit reduction and forwards on spending more money. Now, maybe in the overall mix of things, because this is about a \$16 billion rescission package, we should not quarrel about \$120 million. But I think there may be principle involved here, too.

If we are going to negotiate, then we ought to negotiate and finish this bill, or finish it tomorrow. I am not going to stay here very much longer tonight if we are not making any more progress than we are. So we will come back tomorrow. But I hope before that decision is made we can come to some conclusion on where these amendments came from. Why were there not any offsets? Why did we lose some \$60 million on the offset side, savings side? Then I think we would be prepared to reach some agreement.

I know the Senator from Nevada has an amendment. I know the Senator from Minnesota has an amendment. And I know there is a managers' amendment. Then I think there was one additional amendment. The Senator from Iowa has an amendment on CPB. I thought those were all of the amendments. Then we discovered there are four more amendments that have been added back without a vote or anything else. Then there were some taken out of the savings side without a vote or anything else.

I just say to my colleagues on the other side. We want to be cooperative, but we cannot do business this way. I am prepared to see if we cannot work something out in the next 30 minutes. If not, we will recess for the evening and come back sometime tomorrow.

Are we yet in a position to get a time agreement? We are never going to finish it unless some people are willing to give us some time agreements.

Mr. FORD. Will the majority leader yield for just a moment?

Mr. DOLE. Sure.

Mr. FORD. We are doing our best to try to put things together. I understand the push. I understand getting out in 30 minutes and coming back tomorrow. But then you have a cloture petition filed. That ripens Saturday. So we are trying to put it together, and people understand that. The amendments that we have there, the new entrants, are the ones that are the amendments that basically have been agreed to. We have been trying to put—

Mr. DOLE. On your side.

Mr. FORD. On our side. We are trying to put it together where we can get that agreement. It becomes very difficult. We understand that there is no budget out here. We are trying to get rescissions in this year's allowances. That cuts off a lot of money for people that already started work. It does make it a little bit difficult.

I wanted to assure the majority leader that we are working. We are sweating trying to agree to what he is offering here. I just wanted to assure him. There was not anyone else out here to take it up.

Mr. DOLE. I am not quarreling with the Senator from Kentucky.

I will give you one example. The Senator from Mississippi, Senator COCHRAN, has been following the Women, Infants, and Children program, WIC, very carefully. He is very sensitive to that program. So we are adding back \$35 million, which he says we cannot spend, just cannot spend it. But you know we added it back. So I assume it will not be spent. So it is not really an add-on. I am certain there are other programs which are the same.

But all I am suggesting is I think we are very, very close to getting this done, except for these new add-backs that I was not aware of, and then some of the deductions that have gone on that I was not aware of. So, hopefully, we can resolve those matters very quickly. And one way to do it quickly

is to get Members to give us a time agreement.

I wonder if we not in a position to get a time agreement on the BRYAN-BUMPERS amendment so we can move on to some other amendments and so we are not just wasting our time waiting for the Senator from Arkansas to give us permission to proceed. Is there another amendment that we can proceed to?

Mr. BRYAN. I have just been informed that Senator BUMPERS should be here momentarily. Once he gets here, I am can assure the leader that we are prepared to proceed and enter into a time agreement.

Mr. DOLE. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. HUTCHISON). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. DOLE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that there be 30 minutes equally divided on the BRYAN-BUMPERS amendment. In fact, we are prepared to give Senator BRYAN 20 minutes as the proponent of the amendment and we will take 10 on this side.

Mr. BRYAN. I thank the majority leader. That is agreeable.

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

Mr. BRYAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

AMENDMENT NO. 461 TO AMENDMENT NO. 420

(Purpose: To eliminate funding for the market promotion program)

Mr. BRYAN. Madam President, I have an amendment at the desk, and I ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the pending amendment will be set aside, and the clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. BRYAN], for Mr. BUMPERS, for himself and Mr. BRYAN, proposes an amendment numbered 461 to amendment No. 420.

Mr. BRYAN. Madam 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:

Strike lines 3-7 on page 4 of the Committee substitute, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "deleting '\$85,500,000' and by inserting '\$0.'"

Mr. DASCHLE addressed the Chair.

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, I have a parliamentary inquiry, if I might.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada has the floor.

Mr. BRYAN. I yield for the purposes of parliamentary inquiry. Will that be on our time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DOLE. Madam President, the Senator can have 5 minutes; 10 in opposition, and take 5.

Mrs. BOXER. That is quite satisfactory. So the agreement is that the Senator from California would have 5 minutes, and the Senator from—

Mr. DOLE. Wherever.

Mrs. BOXER. Wherever can have 5 minutes.

Mr. BRYAN. Is that satisfactory to the Senator from California?

Mrs. BOXER. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. BRYAN. I yield myself 7 minutes, Madam President.

Madam President, this year Ralston-Purina will spend \$13 million to advertise its Chex brand cereal, and Brown-Forman Corp. has budgeted \$20 million to help sell California Cooler, and last year McDonald's spent \$7.7 million in advertising in Singapore alone.

The question arises, what do all of these companies have in common besides each having multimillion-dollar advertising budgets? The answer is that they are all recipients of taxpayer funds which is known as the Market Promotion Program. This program was started in 1986 to promote American agricultural produce.

Let me just say a word by way of background. The amendment which the Senator from Arkansas and I have presently before the floor will zero out funding for this program for this year. Last year, the appropriators came up with \$85 million for this Market Promotion Program, and in the legislation we are acting on this evening, they have increased the appropriation level to \$110 million.

In my view, this program, which I am going to describe very briefly in a moment, is corporate welfare. We have debated in this session of the Congress where we can make cuts in the budget. We have talked about Women, Infants, and Children and school nutrition programs. Everything seems to be on the table except the sacred cow of American agriculture, the Market Promotion Program.

Very briefly, Madam President, the history of this program dates back a number of years. Currently, we are spending in the neighborhood of \$3.5 billion in America on export promotion—\$3.5 billion. Of that sum, \$2.2 billion is set aside specifically for agricultural promotion.

Now, to put this in context, 63 percent of all the money that we are spending for export promotion in America is devoted to agriculture. Agriculture represents about 10 percent of the foreign exports from America. So it is my view that is a disproportionate, indefensible amount. But let us put that aside for the moment. We can debate the merits or demerits of spending \$2.2 billion in agricultural promotion. I am talking about the Market Promotion Program. This is a program which, as I have said, is corporate welfare. It is the equivalent of food stamps

for the largest corporations in America.

The way this program works is that advertising budgets of some of the large corporations in America are supplemented by taxpayer moneys. Now, Conagra, a good company, makes the kind of products that are household names in America: Country Pride, Chung King, Wesson, Butterball, Swift, Peter Pan, Armour, Banquet, Swiss Miss. Since 1986, this company has received in taxpayer dollars \$826,000. This company has, by 1994 financial data, \$462 million in net profits. The advertising budget is \$200 million. The CEO receives compensation of \$1.229 million annually. How in God's world do we justify, Madam President, spending taxpayer dollars to supplement this program? This is a company that is large; it is successful; and they can effectively handle their own advertising and promotion budget.

Jack Daniels, a product that is familiar to many of us, \$2.41 million is what they have received through the Market Promotion Program and its immediate predecessor, TEA [Targeted Export Assistance]. The 1994 financial data: Net profits of \$146 million, an advertising budget of \$74 million, CEO compensation of \$703,000.

Again, Madam President, I suggest that it is indefensible to call upon the American taxpayer to subsidize a company of this size.

McDonald's. Who among us does not enjoy a Big Mac? I know I do. But this is a company that has received, since 1986, \$1.6 million, taxpayer dollars, all taxpayer money, to supplement a company that makes a net profit, according to the 1994 data, of \$1.2 billion, that has an advertising budget of nearly \$700 million, and CEO compensation of \$1.78 million.

In addition to this, it is not only American companies that receive it. Here is a list—not a complete list—of foreign companies that receive money from the American taxpayer.

The point to be made is that at a time when we are making some very tough budget cuts—very tough budget cuts—we are talking about the most vulnerable in our society who have been asked to step forward, whether it is the WIC program, or whether it is school nutrition, or aid to our schools in terms of drug assistance.

All of these programs have been hotly debated, but for some reason these agriculture programs are sacrosanct. It is time to eliminate these programs. First of all, they are indefensible in terms of taxpayer dollars being used to subsidize them. And secondly, there is a question as to its effectiveness.

The General Accounting Office has done an evaluation, and they find a number of problems with this program. Number one, it is not clear whether the taxpayer dollars that are going into the advertising budget simply are being exchanged for advertising money that is already in the corporate budget.

Secondly, there is no criteria as to who is eligible—big company, small company.

Third, there is no criteria as to how long you stay in. Do you get in and stay forever?

Now, there has been at least one reform that has been added that you have to get out in 5 years. But that is 5 years from 1994, and that means some of these companies have been in this program since its origin.

There is no objective statistical data, absolutely none, to suggest or to prove that in fact these dollars have assisted our export promotion program. Madam President, I remind my colleagues that we are spending separate and apart for this one agricultural promotion \$2.2 billion. Now, you will recall agricultural exports represent 10 percent of the exports from America. We are spending 63 percent of a total of \$3.5 billion that is being spent by the Federal Government on export promotion.

There are other brand names that are household products. I think the American taxpayer is entitled to be absolutely outraged when you look at some of these companies, highly successful companies. I have no quarrel with the companies. My quarrel with them is the fact that American taxpayer dollars are subsidizing the corporate giants in America.

Let me just give you some more information here. Welch's, marvelous fruit juice, and others, they have received since 1986 \$5.8 million; Blue Diamond, these are the folks who are involved in nuts, \$37 million; Dole fresh fruit, \$9 million. If the Pillsbury Doughboy looks a little chubby to you all, it is because the American taxpayer has been subsidizing his diet pretty heavily. Pillsbury, it says, received during this period of time \$10 million.

So my point, Madam President, is that if we are serious about cutting the deficit, if we are serious about making the hard choices, the tough cuts, we have to begin with programs like this. Corporate welfare ought to be on the line every bit as much as the other programs which have been targeted in this Congress either for elimination or reduction.

Let me say this is not a liberal amendment nor a conservative amendment that my friend, the distinguished senior Senator from Arkansas, and I offer. This is an amendment on which those who are to the political right in America, the Cato Institute, and those who are the moderates in America, the Political Aggressive Policy Institute, have taken a look at this program and both have reached the same conclusion: This is a program that ought to be eliminated.

To conclude, Madam President, it is time to take these companies off the taxpayer dole. They are capable of fending for themselves. They have marvelous programs, sophisticated staffs. They pay their people top dollar in terms of their promotion programs.

The American taxpayers ought not to be asked to spend their dollars to supplement these advertising accounts. The time for action is now.

Madam President, I yield the floor and reserve the remainder of my time.

Mrs. BOXER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recognized.

Mrs. BOXER. I thank the Chair.

I rise to oppose the amendment by my friend and colleague from Nevada. We agree on many things. This is one on which we do not agree. To zero out a program like the Market Promotion Program, which we know is working—and, when my colleague says there is no statistical proof it is working, I have other reports than he does on that matter. But to cut a program that is working to increase our exports, when we are approaching the 21st century mark and exports are crucial to our economy—and promoting those exports is certainly crucial to that—I think it would be a very radical move.

We have a budget that is coming up for review. We are going to look at this program in that budget review. After we do that—and I am on the Budget Committee—as my friend knows, we are going to take a real hard look at all of these things in the various authorizing committees and, of course, in the Appropriations Committee. But to take this move today to eliminate this program, I hope that we will not go along with it.

The Marketing Promotion Program is an important tool in expanding markets for U.S. agricultural products from California to many other countries in the world.

We talk today about redirecting farm spending away from price supports. I support that. I think we should move away from price supports. But we also should work toward expanding markets. I think it makes a lot of sense to do that.

My friend from Nevada says there is no statistical data to show that the Marketing Promotion Program is working. I would like to call to his attention a U.S. Department of Agriculture study. They estimate that each marketing promotion dollar results in an increase in agricultural product exports of between \$2 and \$7.

Madam President, that is a very good return on our money. Indeed, any business person would say if you put \$1 in and it results in \$2 of increased sales and even up to \$7 in increased sales, that is a very sound program.

And my colleague talks about large beneficiaries. Well, I think he is overlooking the number of small beneficiaries. We have seen much-needed assistance to commodity groups comprised of small farmers who are unable to break into those markets on their own. And I think that is a very important point.

I have been to the fertile valleys of California. I have met with those small farmers. I have seen those family farms. And alone they do not have

much power. But they come together as cooperatives, and they work together as marketing groups, and with the Market Promotion Program they have been successful in breaking into the export markets.

So I think it is fair to say to my friend that the small growers and the small farmers have benefited greatly. And that is one of the intentions of the program.

I also want to point out to my friend that last year a task force of the U.S. Agricultural Export Development Council met for 2 days in Leesburg, Virginia. Their function was to review the role of the Marketing Promotion Program and other agricultural programs as part of our overall trade policy. The task force concluded that the purpose of the Marketing Promotion Program is to "increase U.S. agricultural product exports." It also concluded that the increase in such exports helps to "create and protect U.S. jobs, combat unfair trade practices, improve the U.S. trade balance, and improve farm income."

And I am directly quoting from that meeting.

So I would say to my friend, although he has not found any documentation that this program works and it helps us and, in fact, is a wise investment, there are certainly other groups that have found that it is a wise investment. And it should be supported.

I would like to say to my friend, in closing, that we should look at what other countries do. Sometimes we do not look at the fact that other countries push for their exports, push for their agricultural products, promote their products, and fight for their products. And what do we do sometimes? We walk away from a program like this and let our people twist in the wind.

Madam President, I see my time is up.

I ask unanimous consent to have 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? If not, so ordered.

Mrs. BOXER. Thank you very much, Madam President.

I will conclude here. I think that we would be making a big mistake, as we move toward this global marketplace, to walk away from the Marketing Promotion Program. Our competitors have programs that do far more for their agricultural products than we do. And there is a reason. They understand that exports are key to any country's success as an economic power.

We do not have a level playing field out there. That is clear. So I hope that my friend would agree with me that there is no level playing field, and other countries are out there pushing hard for their products, helping their farmers to push exports. This is our only program that does that.

I hope we will defeat his amendment. I yield the floor at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada has 10 minutes 39 seconds remaining.

Mr. BRYAN. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas whatever time he wishes.

Mr. BUMPERS. How much time remains for the proponents?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Ten minutes 31 seconds.

Mr. BUMPERS. Madam President, I will yield myself such time as I may use, which I hope will be less than 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized.

Mr. BUMPERS. First of all, I want to thank my colleague and very good friend, Senator BRYAN, of Nevada, for his unstinting efforts in this.

In 1993, Congress directed GAO to prepare a report on the effectiveness of the Market Promotion Program. The report that came back was less than satisfactory. Subsequently, for Fiscal Year 1994, we cut MPP from \$147.7 million to \$100 million. In Fiscal Years 1991 and 1992, the funding level had been at \$200 million.

Last year, as Chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Agriculture and Rural Development, I made every effort to eliminate this program. However, the distinguished Senator from Washington, Mr. GORTON, was successful in reinstating the program, both in the committee and on the floor.

Madam President, I do not see how we can go through the agony we have been going through in here in trying to cut spending, particularly in light of the fact that we are cutting spending for school lunches and for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting and for a host of other things which, in my opinion, have great merit and go right to the heart and soul of America. How we can cut spending for them and actually add nearly \$25 million to the Market Promotion Program? It was at \$85.5 million for Fiscal Year 1995 and it now stands, by virtue of the bill now before the Senate, at \$110 million.

Senator BRYAN and I now propose to eliminate the Market Promotion Program and apply the savings toward deficit reduction. We are not setting it aside for something else. I would love to take this and put it in the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, but we chose to offer this amendment and apply the \$110 million for pure deficit reduction.

I do not believe any member of this body should be able to keep a straight face and support some of the measures we are voting for when we cannot kill a program, like MPP, that is a pure subsidy for some of the biggest corporations in America and abroad. If we were solely promoting an industry, an industry-wide product or an agricultural product, as we do in the Export Enhancement Program, it might make a little sense. But we are promoting brand loyalty. With MPP, we are using federal funds to promote a large number of popular retail items that most of us know as household words. MPP funds have been used to promote McDonalds' products, Gallo Wines, and

several popular items produced in my State which we can all easily identify in grocery stores across the Nation.

Look down the list of the people who benefit from this—143 foreign firms. You inquire, what on Earth are we doing spending American taxpayers' money subsidizing foreign companies and promoting their brand loyalty? The answer: They use some American products. So if foreign companies that use our products want to advertise their brand and create a brand loyalty, we give them money, too.

And, in addition to 143 foreign corporations, Madam President, over 700 American corporations participate in this program just last year alone.

I am not blaming them. When Uncle Sam throws a big trough full of money out and says, come and get it, if I were one of these corporations and I had a foreign presence, as most of them do, I would get up there and apply for it, too.

Now, Madam President, I started off saying that the 1993 GAO report gave us reasons to question the validity of this program. More recently, another GAO report was prepared which I received in March of this year, just a couple of weeks ago.

No Senator should vote on this amendment until they look at the March 1995 GAO report.

Here is what they say, and this is the meat of the whole argument:

The Foreign Agricultural Service has no assurance that marketing promotion funds are supporting additional promotional activities rather than simply replacing company industry funds.

The GAO did not just reach that decision without substantial program review. They studied it, and they said there is no evidence that this money is going for additional promotional activities that the companies themselves would not spend if we torpedoed this program. You cannot find a more compelling reason to vote for anything around here than a GAO report offers findings such as this.

If we were going to champion a program such as this—and I am not prepared to do that yet—it ought to be for small business, or companies new to market U.S. agricultural products abroad. Not big businesses that have been in the export business for years.

So, Madam President, I hate to use the term corporate welfare because big corporations make a contribution to this country, although members of the national press have not hesitated to attach that label to some results of the Market Promotion Program. I am not blaming them for standing at the trough and getting this money. There are 716 domestic and 143 foreign firms that received MPP funds in Fiscal Year 1994, and some of these are among the largest commercial enterprises in the World. Look down the list. It is shocking.

Here is an opportunity to save \$110 million, of which it can be argued that the farmers of this nation are only the indirect beneficiaries, if even that; \$110 million in genuine deficit reduction, much of which will otherwise go to some of the most affluent companies we know.

I listened to some Senators on the other side of the aisle 2 evenings ago talking about pork, talking about the Corporation for Public Broadcasting being an outrageous waste of the taxpayers' money. Here is an opportunity for everybody to quit talking and making partisan points. We need to make better use of our limited federal resources. We should join hands and eliminate this funding and allow these large companies to float free and easy on their own and spend their own money.

Madam President, I yield the floor and reserve the remainder of time that the distinguished Senator from Nevada has.

Mr. COCHRAN. What is the situation with the time? How much time remains on each side, allocated to individual Senators?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senators in opposition have 5 minutes; the proponents have 3 minutes 28 seconds.

Mr. COCHRAN. I thank the Chair.

Mr. BRYAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. BRYAN. How much time on our side is left?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Three minutes 28 seconds.

Mr. BRYAN. Madam President, let me, in the interest of moving this debate forward, just express my appreciation to the distinguished Senator from Arkansas for his efforts and make just a couple of brief points, if I may.

He made the observation, which is absolutely correct, that there are 140 foreign companies. Here is a partial list of them right here. Some of the names you may know and some, frankly, I have never heard of, but 140.

To make the point that the distinguished Senator from Arkansas was making, from 1986 to 1993, 20 percent—20 percent—of the budget for this program for branded advertising—that is the McDonald's and the rest of it—goes to foreign companies. Twenty percent, American taxpayer dollars. I do not know how you justify and how you support that.

The other point that I would like to make is the GAO report that the distinguished Senator makes reference to has a very interesting piece of testimony, and that is, one of the recipients of the program was asked by the auditors, "How did you all become involved in the program?"

"Well," she said, "we got a phone call. They said, 'Would you like to get some money?'"

As the Senator from Arkansas said, I do not fault the company.

She said, "Tell me how."

"Look, we are passing out money on this program called the Market Pro-

motion Program," and, indeed, the company did. The company, Newman's Own, Paul Newman's food company. They just got a call which said, "Look, would you like help for your advertising bills? We will reimburse you."

This was the testimony of A.E. Hotchner, from Newman's Own.

"We would be delighted to take it." As the Senator from Arkansas made the point, number one, it has not been established that it has accomplished its desired purpose. It is not effective. Is that not a prime reason to zero it out? And secondly, philosophically, I must say, Madam President, it sticks in my craw. Companies like this, and good companies—I am not maligning these companies—would get into the public trough and get this kind of taxpayer dollar when everybody in this Congress has talked a pretty good talk about reducing the deficit.

This ought to be a no brainer. This is not a difficult decision. This is one in which we should say these companies ought to have the ability to fly on their own.

I yield the floor and reserve any time I may have left.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 31 seconds left.

Mr. COCHRAN. Madam President, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi is recognized.

Mr. COCHRAN. Madam President, first of all, let me say putting the sign of McDonald's on the floor of the Senate and suggesting this program is designed to subsidize McDonald's, or any other particular firm, is an outrageous distortion of this program.

Let me read to you a memo written by the Poultry and Export Council about the McDonald's issue. It says in part:

Yes, our Council has used MPP to help McDonalds sell more American chicken—but not to promote McDonalds. The facts are that McDonalds franchises in other countries are foreign owned and operated. They are under no obligation to buy U.S. poultry or eggs and can readily find lower priced (and lower quality) product in Thailand, Malaysia or elsewhere.

But by allowing McDonalds to apply for and receive matching funds under MPP, requires their franchisees to be entirely supplied with U.S. products. The point is, we are NOT promoting McDonalds, we are getting McDonalds to advertise U.S. chicken and eggs. And it has been quite effective. In fact, the state of Arkansas has likely benefited more from this activity than any other state.

The point is this: The market promotion funds are made available almost 97 percent to non-profit and related U.S. trade associations, including state departments of agriculture. The National Cattlemen's Association says these funds have helped them break into the market in Japan, in Korea, and build market share.

We have seen the funds used in other countries for the same purpose, to try to overcome barriers to U.S. trade. The program has helped farmers, it has cre-

ated jobs in America, and it has benefited every community.

I ask unanimous consent, Madam President, to print a copy of a letter from the Coalition to Promote U.S. Agricultural Exports in the RECORD, which shows a listing of all of the agriculture and farm commodity groups in America that benefit from this program because they can sell what they produce more effectively with this program's promotion money in overseas markets when they have to combat the unfair and competitive subsidies from other countries.

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

COALITION TO PROMOTE
U.S. AGRICULTURAL EXPORTS,
Washington, DC, March 28, 1995.

Hon. THAD COCHRAN,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR COCHRAN: We are writing to urge your continued strong support for maintaining and strengthening funding for USDA's export programs, including the Market Promotion Program, when the Senate takes up the FY 1995 supplemental appropriation and rescissions package.

As approved by the Senate Appropriations Committee, the package includes \$24.5 million to restore funding for USDA's Market Promotion Program to its authorized level of \$110 million. Such an increase, we believe, sends a strong and positive message that U.S. Policies and programs will remain equally competitive with those of other countries as allowed under the Uruguay Round GATT Agreement.

For this reason, we are very concerned over possible amendments to reduce or even eliminate funding for the entire program when the package comes to the Senate floor. Such action would be devastating to U.S. interests—especially in the face of continued subsidized foreign competition.

The GATT agreement, it should be emphasized, did not eliminate export subsidies, it only reduced them. The European Union (EU), which outspent the U.S. by 6 to 1 over the last 5 years, will be able to more than maintain its historical advantage. As export subsidies are reduced, they and other competitors can be expected to redirect much of those resources into other GATT allowable programs, including market development and promotion, to maintain and expand their share of the world market.

In fact, the EU and other competitors, including Australia, Canada and New Zealand, are moving aggressively with their farmers and ranchers, and other exporters, in support of market development and promotion efforts. According to USDA, total expenditures for such activities are estimated at nearly \$500 million—well above similar expenditures by the U.S. and are expected to increase.

American agriculture is the most competitive in the world. But, it is not enough to be economically competitive. U.S. policies and programs also must be competitive. Many of us supported the Uruguay Round agreement because of assurances that U.S. policies and programs would continue to be maintained and aggressively implemented to the full extent as allowed under GATT and U.S. law. Without this commitment, America's farmers and ranchers will be at a substantial disadvantage in the new global trade environment.

U.S. agriculture exports, which are projected to reach as high as \$48.5 billion this year, account for as much as one-third of total production. In addition to helping strengthen farm income, exports are vital to our nation's economic well-being as highlighted below:

Jobs—Nearly one million Americans have jobs which are dependent on agriculture exports. A 10 percent increase in exports would help create as many as 100,000 jobs.

Economic Growth—U.S. agriculture exports help generate approximately \$100 billion in economic activity and account for \$8 billion or more in federal tax revenues.

Balance of Payments—U.S. agriculture exports result in a positive trade balance of nearly \$20 billion. Without agriculture, the U.S. trade deficit would be even higher.

Again, such economic benefits can only be maintained to the extent that U.S. policies and programs remain competitive with those of our foreign competitors. America's farmers and ranchers, and others engaged in international trade, can not and should not be required to compete alone against the treasuries of foreign governments.

USDA's Market Promotion Program has been and continues to be an important element in our nation's trade strategy and in helping U.S. agriculture build, maintain and expand export markets in the face of continued subsidized foreign competition. As a cost-share program, it has been extremely cost effective with farmers and ranchers, along with other participants, required to contribute as much as 50 percent of their own resources in order to be eligible. It has also been highly successful by any measure.

For these reasons, we urge your continued strong support and that you oppose any amendment which would reduce or eliminate funding for this important program.

Sincerely,

AG PROCESSING, INC.
ALASKA SEAFOOD
MARKETING INSTITUTE.
AMERICAN FARM BUREAU
FEDERATION.
AMERICAN FOREST & PAPER
ASSN.
AMERICAN HARDWOOD
EXPORT COUNCIL.
AMERICAN MEAT INSTITUTE.
AMERICAN PLYWOOD
ASSOCIATION.
AMERICAN SEED TRADE
ASSOCIATION.
AMERICAN SHEEP INDUSTRY
ASSN.
AMERICAN SOYBEAN
ASSOCIATION.
BLUE DIAMOND GROWERS.
CALIFORNIA AVOCADO
COMMISSION.
CALIFORNIA CANNING PEACH
ASSN.
CALIFORNIA KIWI FRUIT
COMMISSION.
CALIFORNIA PISTACHIO
COMMISSION.
CALIFORNIA PRUNE BOARD.
CALIFORNIA TABLE GRAPE
COMMISSION.
CALIFORNIA TOMATO
BOARD.
CALIFORNIA WALNUT
COMMISSION.
CHERRY MARKETING INST.,
INC.
CHOCOLATE
MANUFACTURERS
ASSOCIATION.
DIAMOND WALNUT
GROWERS.
DOLE FRESH FRUIT
COMPANY.
EASTERN AGRICULTURAL

AND FOOD EXPORT
COUNCIL CORP.
FARMLAND INDUSTRIES.
FLORIDA CITRUS MUTUAL.
FLORIDA CITRUS PACKERS.
FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF
CITRUS.
GINSENG BOARD OF
WISCONSIN.
HOP GROWERS OF AMERICA.
INTERNATIONAL AMERICAN
SUPERMARKETS CORP.
INTERNATIONAL APPLE
INSTITUTE.
INTERNATIONAL DAIRY
FOODS ASSOCIATION.
KENTUCKY DISTILLERS
ASSOCIATION.
MID-AMERICA
INTERNATIONAL AGRI-
TRADE COUNCIL.
NATIONAL DRY BEAN
COUNCIL.
NATIONAL GRAPE
COOPERATIVE
ASSOCIATION, INC.
NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF
STATE DEPARTMENTS OF
AGRICULTURE.
NATIONAL CATTLEMEN'S
ASSN.
NATIONAL CONFECTIONERS
ASSN.
NATIONAL CORN GROWERS
ASSN.
NATIONAL COUNCIL OF
FARMER COOPERATIVES.
NATIONAL COTTON COUNCIL.
NATIONAL MILK PRODUCERS
FEDERATION.
NATIONAL PEANUT COUNCIL
OF AMERICA.
NATIONAL PORK PRODUCERS
COUNCIL.
NATIONAL POTATO COUNCIL.
NATIONAL RENDERERS
ASSOCIATION.
NATIONAL SUNFLOWER
ASSOCIATION.
NATIONAL WINE COALITION.
NORPAC FOODS, INC.
NORTH AMERICAN EXPORT
GRAIN ASSOCIATION.
NORTHWEST
HORTICULTURAL COUNCIL.
OCEAN SPRAY
CRANBERRIES, INC.
PRODUCE MARKETING
ASSOCIATION.
PROTEIN GRAIN PRODUCTS
INTERNATIONAL.
SIOUX HONEY ASSOCIATION.
SOUTHERN FOREST
PRODUCTS ASSN.
SOUTHERN U.S. TRADE
ASSOCIATION.
SUN-DIAMOND GROWERS OF
CALIFORNIA.
SUNKIST GROWERS, INC.
SUN MAID RAISIN GROWERS
OF CALIFORNIA.
SUNSWET PRUNE
GROWERS.
THE CATFISH INSTITUTE.
THE POPCORN INSTITUTE.
TREE FRUIT RESERVE.
TREE TOP, INC.
TRI VALLEY GROWERS.
UNITED EGG ASSOCIATION.
UNITED EGG PRODUCERS.
UNITED FRESH FRUIT AND
VEGETABLE ASSOCIATION.
USA DRY PEA & LENTIL
COUNCIL.
USA POULTRY & EGG
EXPORT COUNCIL.
USA RICE FEDERATION.
U.S. FEED GRAINS COUNCIL.

U.S. LIVESTOCK GENETICS
EXPORT, INC.
U.S. MEAT EXPORT
FEDERATION.
U.S. WHEAT ASSOCIATES.
VODKA PRODUCERS OF
AMERICA.
WASHINGTON APPLE
COMMISSION.
WESTERN PISTACHIO
ASSOCIATION.
WESTERN U.S.
AGRICULTURAL TRADE
ASSOCIATION.
WINE INSTITUTE.

Mr. COCHRAN. Madam President, let me give one example. The European Community this year is going to spend \$89 million just promoting wine exports and subsidizing wine exports, a lot of that into the U.S. This entire program is \$85.5 million, and the sponsors of this amendment are trying to knock out every dollar of it. We are not going to have any funds left to help combat the unfair and heavily subsidized trading practices of foreign countries if you take away this tool.

I am hoping that we can increase the funding. It used to be \$200 million a year, and because of cuts in this and other programs, we had to downsize the program. It is now only \$85.5 million, and they are trying to take away that.

The President and the administration requested additional funds to help companies, to help farm groups and State departments of agriculture deal with these competitors, to increase their market share. The administration asked for an increase from \$85.5 million to \$110 million, and this committee recommended it, the Appropriations Committee agreed to it, and we ought to approve it.

I am hoping the Senate will reject this amendment. I yield whatever time remains to the Senator from the State of Washington.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington has 1 minute 7 seconds.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I would like to say a few words about a program that I have not often praised in the past. The Market Promotion Program (MPP) is designed to help U.S. agricultural producers develop export markets overseas.

Most people do not associate Vermont with agricultural exports, but in fact the state exported almost 122 million agricultural products in 1994. The food products industry is the fastest growing sector of the state's economy. And profitable value added products make up a good part of that total.

In my state, the Market Promotion Program has fulfilled its potential to help small companies develop a niche in foreign markets. Thanks to the program Mexicans have discovered the joys of Vermont maple syrup, Canada is importing Vermont cheesecakes, Bermudans are drinking our cider and finding that they like it, and our friends in the United Kingdom are eating MacIntosh apples they never even knew Vermont produced.

Through MPP, the Vermont Department of Agriculture is introducing Vermont companies to new opportunities in Europe, Canada, Asia and Latin America. During the next year, Vermont companies will be participating in trade missions and export seminars in Hong Kong, Guangzhou, Canada, Brazil and Mexico. These opportunities would not be available to Vermont agriculture without the MPP.

Unfortunately MPP dollars are not always as well spent. As Chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee, I held oversight hearings on MPP that uncovered a number of problems with USDA's management of the program. And, in 1993 I worked for real reform of the program to correct the abuses that were reducing MPP to a massive corporate welfare program.

The Market Promotion Program has come a long way from where it was 3 years ago. The Clinton Administration has reformed the program to curb abuses and focus the program where it should always have been targeted—toward small businesses. MPP is far from perfect. We must continue to look for ways to put scarce dollars where they are needed the most. But eliminating the program is not the way to do it.

Mr. GORTON. Madam President, I find it simply incredible that almost the only suggestion for the reduction in funds that we get from Members who, by and large, have been voting to increase funds for all sorts of income transfer purposes is to take away funds that help the United States sell its agricultural products abroad.

This program does more to benefit hard-working American farmers and food processors than almost any other program we have.

It helps to deal with a terrible deficit in our trade balance, the largest this country has ever had. It is a more positive impact on what we do to produce money for our farmers, for the people who work for them, for those who process food, than practically any other program.

By all means, we should not turn down the opportunity to help our economy become more and more competitive. We should reject this amendment.

Mr. COCHRAN. Madam President, is there time left in opposition to the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired. The Senator from Nevada has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. BRYAN. Thank you, Madam President.

Let me just say in response to my friends on the other side of this proposition, I am not arguing with the distinguished Senator from Arkansas that no agricultural promotion is defensible or justified.

We are spending \$2.2 billion—\$2.2 billion—on agriculture promotion for exports aside from this program. What I am saying is this particular program that subsidizes the wealthiest corporations in America cannot be defended, particularly when we are spending \$12.2

billion, 63 percent of all the money spent for promotion around—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

Mr. COCHRAN. Madam President, I move to table the amendment offered by Senators BRYAN and BUMPERS and ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is on agreeing to the motion to table amendment No. 461 offered by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BRYAN]. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LOTT. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HELMS] is necessarily absent.

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from Maryland [Ms. MIKULSKI] is necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Maryland [Ms. MIKULSKI] would vote "nay".

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

The result was announced—yeas 61, nays 37, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 130 Leg.]

YEAS—61

Akaka	Exon	McConnell
Ashcroft	Feinstein	Moseley-Braun
Baucus	Ford	Murkowski
Bennett	Frist	Murray
Biden	Gorton	Nunn
Bond	Gramm	Packwood
Boxer	Grams	Pressler
Breaux	Grassley	Pryor
Burns	Hatch	Robb
Campbell	Hatfield	Shelby
Coats	Heflin	Simon
Cochran	Hutchison	Simpson
Cohen	Inouye	Snowe
Conrad	Jeffords	Specter
Craig	Johnston	Stevens
D'Amato	Kassebaum	Thomas
Daschle	Kempthorne	Thurmond
DeWine	Kerrey	Warner
Dole	Kohl	Wellstone
Domenici	Leahy	
Dorgan	Lott	

NAYS—37

Abraham	Graham	McCain
Bingaman	Gregg	Moynihan
Bradley	Harkin	Nickles
Brown	Hollings	Pell
Bryan	Inhofe	Reid
Bumpers	Kennedy	Rockefeller
Byrd	Kerry	Roth
Chafee	Kyl	Santorum
Coverdell	Lautenberg	Sarbanes
Dodd	Levin	Smith
Faircloth	Lieberman	Thompson
Feingold	Lugar	
Glenn	Mack	

NOT VOTING—2

Helms	Mikulski
-------	----------

So the motion to lay on the table the amendment (No. 461) was agreed to.

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

Mrs. BOXER. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

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

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

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, let me advise my colleagues I think we may have an agreement here if we can have everybody's cooperation, and we may be able to finish this bill tonight and we may be able to finish all other business by voice votes including the defense supplemental, the district board, kiddie porn and whatever else might be remaining. So it would mean that my colleagues will be able to tend to other business tomorrow either here or somewhere else.

AMENDMENT NO. 577

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk on behalf of myself, Senator DASCHLE, and others, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the pending amendment will be laid aside.

The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. DOLE], for himself and Mr. DASCHLE, proposes an amendment numbered 577.

Mr. DOLE. 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 will be printed in today's RECORD under "Amendments Submitted.")

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent there be 30 minutes for debate on the Dole amendment to be equally divided in the usual form and that no amendments be in order during the pendency of the Dole-Daschle amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. HARKIN addressed the Chair.

Mr. DOLE. I am coming to the Senator's.

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

Mr. DOLE. I further ask that the following amendments be the only remaining amendments in order and limited to the following time restraints where noted, all in the usual form. And I have been advised by Senator LEVIN he will not offer the one amendment—he does have an amendment that has been worked out; an amendment by Senator WELLSTONE relating to seniors; a managers' amendment, a Hatfield/Byrd amendment; and a Harkin handback for CPB, and on that there be an up-or-down vote.

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

Mr. JEFFORDS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. President.

Mr. DOLE. Excuse me. I did not give times on those amendments: On Harkin, there will be 20 minutes equally divided; on the Wellstone amendment, 20 minutes equally divided; and the Hatfield/Byrd managers' amendment, 15 minutes equally divided.

Mr. HARKIN. Reserving the right to object.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I have an amendment for which I do not need more than 10 minutes which I intend to offer.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I ask the distinguished majority leader, on my amendment, I had initially asked for 20 minutes on our side. I do not know how much time the other side will take. I need 20 minutes because I have at least two other people who want to speak on it. If I can just have 20 minutes, that is fine.

Mr. DOLE. Twenty minutes and we will take 10 minutes.

Mr. HARKIN. Whatever. The amendment is not only CPB. It is also an add-back for the senior community appointment program.

Mr. DOLE. What is the total of the amendment?

Mr. HARKIN. The total of the amendment is \$40 million.

Mr. DOLE. And it is offset?

Mr. HARKIN. It is offset by the cut in Radio Free Europe. Some of the money goes to get CPB back up to the inflation increase, and then some of it goes for the senior community appointment program. The Senator did not mention it, and I wanted to make sure that it was in there.

Mr. DOLE. So that will be 20 and 10, 20 minutes for Senator HARKIN and 10 minutes in opposition.

Mr. HARKIN. That is fine. My concern, when the unanimous consent was read, was that when I sent my amendment to the desk and it was also for somebody in the senior community appointment program, it would not be pulled out of order on this type of agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. JEFFORDS. Reserving the right to object, I am not sure where I stand, Mr. President.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I withdraw my objection.

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

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent that, following the disposition of the above listed amendments, the Senate proceed to vote on the Hatfield substitute, to be followed by third reading and final passage of H.R. 1158, as amended, all without any intervention action or debate.

But before the Chair rules on that, I think it is best to have a colloquy at this time with the distinguished Senator from New York with reference to the amendment on Mexico, which would be critical to winding up this package this evening, as I understand from the Democratic leader and others.

So I am happy to yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. D'AMATO addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, I thank the majority leader.

I recognize the situation and the dilemma that the Senate finds itself in in confronting the necessity of moving forward with this bill. I recognize that we are moving up against a time deadline.

Mr. President, I am going to say now that I am not going to pursue this amendment for two reasons. Number one, I do not want to be accused of scuttling a very difficult agreement that has been worked out, where other of my colleagues have stepped back, and insist that I be the only one that goes forward.

Having said that, I want to indicate very clearly that this Senator is deeply troubled by the manner in which we are discharging our constitutional responsibility as it relates to Mexico and the attempt of this administration to help them.

And I want to help. But this Senator wants to see to it that the dollars that we are committing are used appropriately. I think at the very least we are entitled to the kind of accountability that we would be if it were a foreign aid program and even more since it is a clear circumvention of the manner in which foreign loans should be made.

To that extent, I suggest that the second-degree amendment which was offered by Senator MURKOWSKI is absolutely, totally appropriate; that the legislative initiatives undertaken by Congressman Cox should be, without question, something that is carried out in terms of making information available to us as it relates to what preceded the crisis in Mexico before it became public and the collapse of the Mexican economy. What was our role and what has been our role since then? And what do we anticipate as we move along?

Again, I will press this matter. I do not claim that the legislative initiative that I have undertaken should be adopted in its present form, but I do believe that when we are talking about sending billions of dollars, taxpayers' dollars, to a program that may or may not work—and the administration has testified before the Banking Committee that it may not work—that we have an absolute obligation to know what is taking place and how it is administered, at the very least.

I do not think that those who say this is without doubt within the administration's prerogative would deny us that. I believe that is giving tremendous latitude.

When we come back from our recess, undoubtedly billions of dollars more of American moneys will have been placed into this program. The question as to whether or not we will ever have repayment is a very legitimate ques-

tion. But how far do we go, in a very important but a very risky undertaking; how far do we go before we say, "Wait, this may not be working"? Do we leave this just in the prerogative of the Secretary of the Treasury to determine if it is working, or should we not at the very least have that information?

Mr. President, I tell the majority leader that I will move forward by way of legislation, if necessary, to at least obtain that information, obtain the facts. And, in addition thereto, if we find, and if I am not convinced, that the program is working or that there is a chance of us recovering moneys, I will then move by legislative action again to accomplish the things that I have said before on this floor and to cut off further dollars.

By the time we come back, there is no doubt in my mind that we will have committed directly from the United States probably in the area of \$10 billion or more. That is a lot of money. We are working on a rescission package to try to save money. We certainly, at the very least, are entitled to know that those dollars are being used wisely, appropriately, and that there is some chance of success, a bona fide chance of success. That is what troubles this Senator.

So with that statement, I will say that I do want to accommodate my colleagues, but I also want them to know that there may be more legislation moving through this Senate, and I reserve the right, as all of us have that right, to move forward with this initiative. It will be at a time when there is legislation that may be critical, that the administration needs or that people are interested in. I will not move on a piece of legislation that is not critical and therefore be denied bringing this matter to a vote.

At some point in time, it is my belief that this Congress and this Senate should be required to vote as to whether or not we should continue this program.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the pending amendment, amendment No. 427.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is withdrawn.

The amendment (No. 427) was withdrawn.

Mr. DOLE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I think we have the agreement.

I think I did ask unanimous consent that following the disposition of the above-listed amendments, the Senate proceed to vote on the Hatfield substitute, to be followed by third reading and final passage of H.R. 1158, as amended, without any intervening action or debate.

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

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I want to say to the Senator from New York, I think he has raised a very important issue, and it is not going to go away. Sooner or later, Congress is going to have to become involved, because we are spending taxpayers' money. I think it is safe to say that Speaker GINGRICH and I indicated early on that we wanted to support the administration, the President. That is what we said at that time, and that is what I would say at this time, but with one caveat: We should know precisely what is happening. And I think that is the thrust of the Senator's amendment. It is an important amendment.

We have a responsibility. We are talking about \$5 million here in one amendment we cannot agree on—\$5 million. And you are talking about \$5 billion. So I just suggest it is important, and I hope that we do not lose sight of that.

I thank the Senator for withdrawing the amendment. That will permit us to complete action on this bill, hopefully, tonight or tomorrow at some hour. I would like to do it tonight.

I ask unanimous consent that all the votes that we order be stacked, in effect, so we could have all the votes and then final passage, and then see if we cannot get some agreement to do the rest of our business by voice vote, if there is no objection to that.

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

Mr. DOLE. I also ask unanimous consent that, if there is more than one vote, any succeeding votes be limited to 10 minutes.

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

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I would also ask my colleagues, even though they have 20 minutes or 15 minutes, different time allotments, that I think we could save some time.

I want to thank the distinguished Democratic leader for his cooperation throughout the day and throughout yesterday, and throughout part of the night last night.

I believe we are within striking distance of concluding a bill that now totals about \$16 billion in rescissions—\$16 billion. This bill will go to conference and some of the issues that some people have concerns about will be raised again in the conference. Regardless of what your concern may be, if you think it is too much or too little, it can be raised in the conference.

So I thank all of my colleagues for their cooperation. I think we have made progress. I can tell you that the end is in sight.

I yield the floor.

Mr. DASCHLE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority leader.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, let me also thank all of our colleagues on both sides of the aisle for their cooperation in the effort that has been made to bring us to this point. It has been a

long day. There have been a lot of people who have been responsible for bringing us to this point, and I want to publicly commend them and thank them for that effort.

We still have some very big decisions to make on amendments that are going to be offered. I appreciate everyone's willingness to accommodate a debate on each one of these issues, but I do think that we are getting close, and I think that it is an agreement we can all support. Obviously, people are going to come down on either side of the issue when we come to final passage, but I think this accommodates Senators in a way that allows us to get to that point.

So I think it is a good agreement, and I hope that we can work through the amendments and get to final passage sometime tonight. I yield the floor.

Mr. LEVIN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

AMENDMENT NO. 578 TO AMENDMENT NO. 420

(Purpose: To restore funds to the National Sea Grant's program on research to control and prevent the spread of aquatic non-indigenous species)

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment and send an amendment to the desk which has been cleared by both sides, reference to which was made by the majority leader in the UC.

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN], for himself, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. SPECTER, Mr. KOHL, Mr. GLENN, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. SIMON, and Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN, proposes an amendment numbered 578 to amendment No. 420.

Mr. LEVIN. 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 9, line 16, strike "\$13,000,000" and insert "\$15,000,000".

On page 9, line 12, strike "\$37,600,000" and insert "\$35,600,000".

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I am sending this to the desk on behalf of myself, Senator ABRAHAM, Senator SPECTER, Senator GLENN, Senator KOHL, Senator SANTORUM, Senator SIMON, and Senator MOSELEY-BRAUN.

This amendment will restore \$2 million to the research program on the zebra mussel, which is a pest which has infested the Great Lakes and is now spreading through the tributaries from and to the Great Lakes.

It is a very important program for the fresh water supply of this country. The reduction of \$2 million will hurt the research program. Many, many States benefit by it, and the offset for the \$2 million restoration comes from the NOAA construction money.

I understand that this has been accepted on both sides.

The \$2 million rescission in the National Sea Grant Research Program will limit Federal, State, and university research to help stop the spread of the zebra mussel, and other non-indigenous species.

Fifteen States' programs would likely continue efforts to educate natural resource managers as to the devastating impacts of zebra mussels if this \$2 million is restored. They will study these pests' life cycles to determine when and where they are most vulnerable to pesticides or nonchemical control. The States that received funds in fiscal year 1994 besides the Great Lakes States include California, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Maryland, New Jersey, Delaware, Texas, Connecticut, and Florida.

This is not just a zebra mussels amendment. Sea Grant's Program is crucial. We need to keep cataloging the ways nuisance species reproduce. There are over 130 nonindigenous species in this country, two-thirds of which entered the country since 1959, when the St. Lawrence Seaway was opened.

Some of my colleagues may be familiar with some of the most economically damaging exotic species that industries, municipal sewerage and drinking water facilities, boaters, farmers, et cetera have been forced to confront besides the zebra mussel, such as the water milfoil, the water flea, purple loosestrife, the round Gobi, and the ruffe.

But, the zebra mussel invasion provides the most compelling reason to support research that will enable us to develop control methods and prevent infestation. The mussel has now spread to 20 States and continues to spread. Between July and September 1994, mussel densities on the southern Mississippi River increased from 10/sq meter to 40,000/sq meter.

A relatively new pest, the ruffe, is spreading throughout the far reaches of Lake Superior threatening commercial and recreational fisheries, and is heading toward Lake Erie's \$800 plus million perch and walleye fishery.

The sea grant performs high-quality, peer-reviewed science. It does not duplicate other nonindigenous programs conducted by other agencies.

My bipartisan amendment would take an additional \$2 million out of NOAA's construction account and restore it to NOAA's National Sea Grant Program for research on nonindigenous species.

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, I rise to commend my colleagues from the Great Lakes region, on their efforts to restore needed funding for Sea Grant's critical research on aquatic nuisance species.

As the cochair of the Senate Great Lakes Task Force, I have worked hard to protect and restore the economic and environmental health of the Great Lakes. This aquatic ecosystem is home to nearly 30 million Americans who depend on these waters as avenues of commerce, as sources of drinking

water, and as recreational playgrounds attracting millions of visitors. Under the Nonindigenous Aquatic Nuisance Prevention and Control Act (P.L. 101-646) I sponsored in 1990, Sea Grant is authorized to conduct critical exotic species research which allows the Great Lakes to provide such a wide range of benefits.

Exotic species cause severe economic and ecological damage along our Nation's marine coasts and freshwater systems. In a surprisingly short time, the zebra mussel has spread to 20 States taking a heavy toll on biodiversity of hosting systems and forcing private and municipal waterworks and powerplants to withstand increased and costly maintenance efforts. However, Sea Grant aquatic nuisance species research is not exclusively dedicated to the zebra mussel. The restoration of \$2.0 million for Sea Grant's nonindigenous species funding continues research on the serious Eurasian ruffe problem in Lake Superior which threatens the region's \$4 billion fishing industry.

The increasing number of harmful nonindigenous species and their cumulative impacts continue to create growing economic and environmental burdens for the United States. Sea Grants research and outreach efforts complement other Federal programs and enable us to adopt a national approach toward stewardship of our natural resources. Reducing funding for the critical aquatic nuisance species research conducted by Sea Grant will curtail ongoing research which benefits the Great Lakes and the entire Nation.

Mr. GORTON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, the Senator from Michigan is correct. This amendment has been accepted on this side.

Mr. LEVIN. I thank the Senator from Washington.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator FEINGOLD be added as a cosponsor of the amendment.

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

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 578) was agreed to.

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

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. HARKIN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

AMENDMENT NO. 579 TO AMENDMENT NO. 420

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I have an amendment at the desk, and I ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HARKIN], for himself, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. REID, and Mr. KEN-

NEDY, proposes an amendment numbered 579 to amendment No. 420.

Mr. HARKIN. 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:

Insert after page 7, line 18:

INTERNATIONAL BROADCASTING OPERATIONS
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading to the board for international broadcasting in Public Law 103-317, \$40,500,000 are rescinded.

On page 27, delete lines 4 through 12.

On page 36, line 10, strike "\$26,360,000" and insert "\$17,791,000".

On page 36, line 12, strike "\$29,360,000" and insert "\$11,965,000".

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I understand I have 20 minutes; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. HARKIN. I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. President, this amendment, offered on behalf of myself, Senator HOLLINGS, Senator LEAHY, Senator REID, and Senator KENNEDY, would rescind \$40.5 million from the funding for the organization known as Radio Free Europe. Of that money, we would take \$26 million and put it into the Corporation for Public Broadcasting in America, and the other \$14 million would go for the Senior Community Service Employment Program.

Again, Mr. President, I point out that adding this money, this \$26 million to the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, still leaves the CPB at \$29 million less than what was appropriated last year. This does not even bring it up to the fully appropriated level. It would allow for only an inflationary increase for CPB.

But I want to point out very emphatically that this amendment does not even bring the Corporation for Public Broadcasting up to what was funded last year.

It does take \$40 million out of Radio Free Europe, and I think it reflects an important historical reality; namely, the cold war is over, and it is time we take some of these old relics of the cold war and we start defunding them.

Mr. President, right now we have a lot of people who are opposing Federal funding for public radio and television in the United States. The same opponents who rail against U.S. contributions to public radio for Americans are willing to write, without question, a check of almost equal amount to fund public radio for Europeans to fight a war against an enemy that no longer exists. In short, sending U.S. taxpayer dollars abroad to fund public radio in Europe is OK, but using U.S. tax dollars to finance public radio and TV for Americans at home is not.

Our amendment attempts to correct that injustice by restoring federally financed public radio for Americans and cutting a little from U.S. financed public radio for Europeans.

I will also point out that this amendment, plus the \$14 million that is in the agreement, provides for a \$54 million total cut in Radio Free Europe. The Dole substitute, offered by the majority leader, had a \$98 million cut in Radio Free Europe. So I am not even advocating cutting as much from Radio Free Europe as the Senator from Kansas did in his first proposal. He proposed to cut \$98 million out of it. We are only proposing to cut \$54 million.

Even with this cut in Radio Free Europe, Radio Free Europe's funding level will be \$175 million. That is \$100 million more than the \$75 million the administration requested for this program in fiscal year 1996.

I point out further that President Clinton, in February of 1993, proposed eliminating Radio Free Europe. He said the cold war is over; there is no use to keep funding RFE.

Opponents of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting are working to phase out public broadcasting at home and are willing to sustain that same service in Europe. Make no mistake about it, this is public broadcasting in Eastern Europe; it is paid for by U.S. taxpayers. But there are existing alternatives available to Eastern Europeans and Russians—CNN, FM radio, AM radio, in addition to the Voice of America.

Mr. President, let me recite briefly the history of Radio Free Europe. It started 40 years ago as a covert operation of the CIA broadcasting short-wave signals behind the Iron Curtain. All three of these—Radio Free Europe, Radio Liberty, and Voice of America—played a tremendous role in bringing news and information to people in Communist countries. They all played a critical role in fighting and winning the cold war.

I would never have suggested this kind of amendment if the cold war were still on, but the cold war is over. And yet our overburdened American taxpayers are still paying more than \$200 million for Radio Free Europe—I have dubbed it "Radio Expensive Europe"; it is not Radio Free Europe, it is "Radio Expensive Europe"—plus another \$100 million for the Voice of America and another \$2 million for the administrative costs for the Board of International Broadcasting.

Mr. President, you will hear arguments against my amendment. They will claim that RFE provides independent broadcasting, and therefore performs a different role from the Voice of America. Who is kidding whom? Radio Free Europe, created by the Central Intelligence Agency—the board that runs it is appointed by the President of the United States.

Second, Radio Free Europe continues to be funded to this day solely by U.S. taxpayers. Why? Why not the Germans? Their mark, as we know lately, is a lot better than the U.S. dollar. Why do the Germans not come in and

pay a little bit? Why do they not pick up the tab? Or how about the French or the Norwegians or the Swedes or the Poles or the Italians? Why do they not come in and contribute?

No, it is our U.S. taxpayers footing the whole bill for Radio Free Europe. Quite frankly, Mr. President, I want to make my feelings known. I think Radio Free Europe ought to be zeroed out. But I am not proposing to do that in this amendment. I am still leaving \$175 million for RFE for Fiscal 1995. I think we ought to come back and zero it out, maybe next year, but we ought to use some of this money to at least provide an inflationary increase for public broadcasting here at home, and restore funding for the senior citizen community employment program.

Mr. President, let me just talk a little bit more about the Senior Community Service Employment Program. As I said, the amendment I have offered takes \$26 million for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. It still leaves it \$29 million less than what we appropriated last year. And it takes \$14 million and puts it into senior community service employment, the only work force program designed to help seniors, elderly, get jobs in community service.

I suspect all Members have gone to a senior citizens center providing meal programs, and we know how much good this program does.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article from the Washington Post of January 27, 1995, titled "A Federal Program That Does It Right," and I also ask unanimous consent to insert a letter from the National Council of Senior Citizens in support of this program.

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

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 27, 1995]

A FEDERAL PROGRAM THAT DOES IT RIGHT

(By Judy Mann)

Let's say you run a small company and you need a filing clerk. A 67-year-old Latino woman applies for the job and so does a newly minted high school graduate. Which one would you hire?

Precisely. And that's one of the reasons behind the Senior Company Service Program, an organization that trains low-income people 55 and older and helps them find jobs. Participants usually receive minimum wage for 20 hours of training, and then they go to work, often in community service jobs that help the elderly. Those subsidized jobs often serve as bridges into permanent positions.

By last June, the program had placed 27.3 percent of its people in unsubsidized jobs such as bookkeeping in banks, driving delivery vehicles, tutoring in schools and working as health aides. That is a higher rate than the 25 percent job placement rate in California's program for its welfare parents.

The Senior Community Service Program is the backbone for most meals-on-wheels programs and for many day-care centers in rural areas, an essential feature of the program is that it matches seniors with the service needs of each community. The program also works closely with businesses to ensure that enrollees are getting indispensable job skills.

The program is administered by the Department of Labor, which contracts with na-

tional nonprofit organizations, such as the National Council of Senior Citizens (NCSC) and the American Association of Retired Persons, to run them. About 70 percent of the enrollees are women, 56 percent are 65 or older, a third have less than a high school education and about 40 percent are members of a minority group—one of the highest rates of minority participation for any domestic program.

Chris Oladipo, who runs the NCSC program in Prince George's County, says it is particularly helpful as a bridge for older immigrants who have trouble earning a living because of language barriers.

While most employment programs operate on the premise that they get more for their money by concentrating on young people, "we look for the oldest and poorest people we can find," says Andrea Wooten, president of Green Thumb Inc., which trains 18,000 people a year.

The programs have also played an important role in retraining displaced workers, says Donald Davis, who directs the programs run by the National Council on Aging. He tells the story of a professional man in San Francisco who had looked for a job for eight months after being laid off.

"We worked with him for three months. He is now heading up a multilingual program and making \$30,000 a year," Davis says. "Every study that's been done of this program says it is one of the most effective ever developed by the federal government."

In the three decades since the senior community service and job training program has evolved, it has enjoyed strong bipartisan support. But it is in danger of getting caught up in the current rush to decentralize welfare programs and to fund them through block grants to states, where various programs are having to compete with each other for fewer resources.

David Affeldt, the former chief counsel with the U.S. Senate Committee on Aging who developed legislation creating the program, says it came about because block grant programs historically have not served older workers well. He predicts that, at a minimum, 15,000 to 20,000 older workers served each year "will get their pink slips" if the program is funded through block grants.

"One of the main problems that older workers have is that they are not as visible or outspoken about their needs. . . . The program has given these people hope and an opportunity to help themselves while helping others, rather than be dependent upon public assistance."

The Senior Community Service Program, also known as Title V of the Older Americans Act, costs \$410 million a year and is supposed to serve about 67,000 people. "We actually serve over 100,000 people because we've used this program to get people up and out," says Sheila Manheimer, of the NCSC.

Half the members of the U.S. House of Representatives have been elected since 1992, and many are riding a streamroller called "mandate for change" without having a very good idea of the territory they are rolling over. The Senior Community Service Program serves the poorest of the elderly while providing a wide variety of services that make our communities livable. Far from a candidate for dismantling, this is one federal program that everyone should look to as a model of what works.

NATIONAL COUNCIL
OF SENIOR CITIZENS,

Washington, DC, March 30, 1995.

DEAR SENATOR: The National Council of Senior Citizens (NCSC), in behalf of our five million affiliated members, asks you to vote in support of Senator Harkin's amendment

of H.R. 1158, the 1995 Rescission bill. This amendment is expected to come before the full Senate today and your support would be appreciated by seniors and families throughout the nation.

This amendment would restore funding to many programs important to the elderly, children and our communities, including the Senior Community Service Employment Program (SCSEP), the Child Care Block Grant, the Safe and Drug Free Schools Program, Drug Courts and the Corporation for Public Broadcasting.

The Council is particularly concerned about the \$14.4 million rescinded under H.R. 1158 from the Senior Community Service Employment Program. The SCSEP designs needed community service programs and provides subsidized training and part-time employment which maximizes the productive contributions of older persons in these community services. Senator, please note that the \$14.4 million rescinded under H.R. 1158 would result in the loss of jobs for almost 3,000 low-income senior citizens now staffing community service programs nationwide under Title V of the Older Americans Act.

In a January 27 article in *The Washington Post*, which I have attached, Judy Mann said it best when she said, "Far from a candidate for dismantling, this is one Federal program that everyone should look to as a model of what works." Every study has shown the SCSEP to be one of the most effective programs ever developed by the Federal government.

Again, please do right by the elderly, young and our communities by supporting Senator Harkin's amendment restoring funding to these critical programs. Short of the changes included in Senator Harkin's amendment, the Rescission bill does not merit support.

Sincerely,

LAWRENCE T. SMEDLEY,
Executive Director.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, how much time is remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are 2 minutes of the 10 minutes allotted yourself and another 10.

Mr. HARKIN. I yield 2 minutes or whatever more he needs to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, the amendment Senator HARKIN and I are offering would partially restore cuts to public radio and television by reducing the appropriation for Radio Free Europe.

Radio Free Europe [RFE] is a World War II program, designed to broadcast news to people living behind the Iron Curtain.

News flash—The Iron Curtain has fallen.

The Cold War is over. While the rest of the world is moving ahead with satellite communication and other technological advances, we are still using U.S. tax dollars to support broadcasts by shortwave radio.

I find when I go on the internet, I can reach people in Eastern Europe. I think I can reach them quicker on internet than by shortwave radio on Radio Free Europe.

I really cannot see, when we are cutting out our own public broadcasting, why we are paying for this in Germany.

We are shortchanging an American audience in deference to overseas listeners.

Our amendment cuts \$40.5 million from what U.S. taxpayer is currently paying to support Radio Free Europe. This will still leave \$175 million for RFE.

The Corporation for Public Broadcasting would receive \$26 million of this savings.

This is not a total restoration of the cuts in this bill for public television and radio—we understand that tough choices have to be made. This restoration will support CPB at the 1995 level with a small increase to compensate for inflation.

Continuing public television and radio programs are especially important in rural areas where residents might not be able to afford or have access to cable programs.

I hear from hundreds of Vermonters each week on how important Vermont ETV and Vermont Public Radio are to their lives. For some, it is the only news and educational programming they can get.

We should not be diminishing this valuable national resource.

The remaining savings from the RFE budget would restore cuts to the Community Service for Older Americans Program.

The war against communism is over. We must focus our efforts on another battle that is still being waged here at home:

Adoption of this amendment will send a clear signal that our priority is to support programs that will help educate and enrich the lives of Americans.

Mr. HARKIN. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. WELLSTONE. First of all, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be included as an original cosponsor of this amendment.

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

Mr. WELLSTONE. I thank the Chair. Mr. President, it is difficult to cover the ground in less than 2 minutes.

Let me just make three points. First of all, I want to associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from Vermont. Second of all, I would like to focus on the import of this amendment, which is to restore as much funding as possible for public television.

I go back to just one gathering in Appleton, MN, in southwest Minnesota, where it is just crystal clear for anyone who wants to look at public TV that it is far from a "sandbox for the rich." Public television is so important to the enrichment of lives of citizens in our country, both urban and rural, but I think especially in the rural communities it is vitally important.

Second of all, the community service for older Americans program is a huge success. The way I define "success" is we are talking about low- and moderate-income elderly people who, number one—it is kind of a marriage—are able to have the dignity of being able

to work; and number two, their work is this service of community, whether it be delivery of meals to homebound, whether it be taking care of children, whether it be recreational services.

I remember in talking with citizens in Willmar, MN, we can get a wonderful feel for how important this program is on the basis of investment of really very few dollars.

I want to make it clear that I am in full support of this amendment and proud to be an original cosponsor.

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, if the leader would yield 5 minutes.

Mr. HATFIELD. I yield 5 minutes.

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, this amendment represents the complicated dilemmas that can be presented. Of course, I am in favor of senior citizens, and I also support public broadcasting. In fact, I contribute and have contributed to public broadcasting through the years.

As chairman of the Commerce Committee this year I have discovered that public broadcasting could well become self-funding. I agree with AL GORE that we need to reinvent and privatize wherever possible.

In talking to a lot of telecommunications people, I discovered that they plan to get into video dial TV and so forth, and I asked them where they are going to buy their programming? They would say from Arts and Entertainment, the History channel, or Learning channel. I said, "Why not buy it from public television or radio? They have all kinds of public programming." And they said, "Well, they do not try to sell it."

I came up with a plan, along with some House leaders, and an agreement has been reached, or an informal agreement, with some of the leading people in public broadcasting to move towards self-funding.

Where would the money come from? First of all, public broadcasting can digitize and sell a lot of their programming. There is a good market for that type of programming. They can sell it to the channels I mentioned as the History channel, the Learning channel, Arts and Entertainment. Nickelodeon is marketing a lot of children's programming in France where it is dubbed—educational children's programming. There is money to be made in this. Public television has taught that.

Second of all, the spectrums that public broadcasting has throughout the country. Now we are finding that, with modern technology, we have extra spectrum. They can sell it or rent parts of their spectrum and make a great deal of money.

Third of all, they have a lot of overlapping spectrum that can be sold or represented. For example, in the Washington, DC, area, many homes get two or three public television signals with the same programming or virtually the same programming. The taxpayers of the country need some relief.

Fourth, the great bureaucracy that has grown inside the beltway here and

the excessively high salaries that are paid to foundations that get grants directly from the corporation can be cut. There is great room for efficiency there.

By the way, our States are not getting their fair share of the money. In fact, our State legislatures support most of the public broadcasting in this country as well as private contributors such as myself.

Finally, public stations could make money by getting a bigger percentage of what is played on the free public platform. I have spoken out about this, and indeed I commend the board of directors of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting because they passed a resolution to start getting a bigger percentage of Barney and other programming that appear on the free public platform provided by the taxpayers of this country.

Mr. President, the States are not getting their fair share. My little State of South Dakota, which is vast in geography but small in population, gets \$1.7 million, but they have to send \$1 million back immediately for programming, which they might be able to buy elsewhere at a better rate.

The "shields" used by public broadcasting are children in rural areas. Let me say the State legislature in my State voted against a resolution to seek more funding for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting because it is such a charade they must go through.

So, I believe strongly in lowering the deficit. I believe in less Government involvement. This is an opportunity, a plan has been developed, and they are working with a big investment bank in New York to privatize, to become self-funding.

There is not a need for taxpayers money here. If we are going to transfer this money, we do not need to transfer it to the corporation. The House leaders reached an agreement to privatize, to work toward self-funding. I have outlined various sources of revenue the Corporation for Public Broadcasting can get. I have not mentioned additional advertisement. They already have a great deal of advertising. They call it "enhancements" or something. That is fine.

Even without further advertising they sit on a treasure trove of resources here. I recently wrote an article in the Washington Post outlining the five ways public broadcasting can get more revenue without any more advertising. They are sitting on a treasure trove of spectrum, of overlapping spectrum. Inside the beltway here their headquarters are bloated bureaucracies.

The States are really not getting the money that they are supposed to be getting.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the Washington Post article I mentioned printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 8, 1995]
REALITY-BASED BROADCASTING

(By Larry Pressler)

"Public broadcasting is under attack!" "Congress wants to kill Big Bird!" These and other alarmist cries have been common in recent weeks. The problem is they are lies. That's right, lies. I tried to conceive of a more polite way to say it. I could not. With rare exceptions the press largely has ignored the specifics of the position taken by members of Congress seeking to reinvent public broadcasting.

I have struggled to make my position clear. Yet the misrepresentations continue. I am convinced many simply do not care to report the facts—facts they do not find as interesting as the scenarios they create. That is too bad. The average American taxpayer would find the facts extremely interesting.

As chairman of the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, I am not seeking to destroy public television and radio. I am a strong supporter of public broadcasting, both in my home state of South Dakota and nationally. Pull the plug? Absolutely not. Rather, my plan would expand opportunities and save taxpayer dollars.

Why do I seek change? Because times have changed. Today's electronic media are vastly different from those of the 1960s, when the current system of federal subsidies for public broadcasting was established. The old theory of "market failure" for educational programming is completely untenable in today's environment. Educational and cultural programs can and do make profits when their quality is good and marketing astute. The only money losers in today's arrangement are the taxpayers.

A Feb. 24 Post editorial stated it is time for the public broadcasting industry to face reality. The issue no longer should be whether federal subsidies for public broadcasting will be cut. I could not agree more. Congress now is debating when and how much. The House Appropriations subcommittee on labor, health and human services already has cut the public broadcasting budget. The House leadership promises more to come. I fully expect the Senate to follow suit.

Instead of crying over public cash, it would be more prudent for public broadcasting executives to use their talents and resources developing the numerous potential sources of revenue available to replace the federal subsidy rather than continuing to fan the flames of fear and exaggeration. As captains of a major corporation, their responsibilities should be clear. The Corporation for Public Broadcasting (CPB), National Public Radio (NPR) and the Public Broadcasting System (PBS) need to learn to stand on their own feet.

To help in that effort, I recently provided the chairman of the board of CPB with a plan to end its dependency on federal welfare in three years. Ideas to end CPB's addition to taxpayer dollars include:

PROFITS FROM SALES

CPB should renegotiate sales agreements and improve future agreements to get a larger share of the sales of toys, books, clothing and other products based on its programming. In 1990, Barney-related products retailed at \$1 billion! Steps have been taken by the CPB board to improve its share of such sales. More should be done.

MAKE THE MOST OF NEW TECHNOLOGY

Use of new compressed digitization technology would permit existing noncommercial licensees to expand to four or five channels where once they had only one. Public broadcasting stations could rent, sell or make use of the additional channels for

other telecommunications and information services.

END REDUNDANCY

At least one-quarter of public television stations overlap other public television stations' signal areas. Public radio also suffers from the inefficiencies of redundancy. Ending this overlap and selling the excess broadcast spectrum would provide substantial revenues to public broadcasting.

SWITCH CHANNELS

Moving public television stations from costly VHF channels to less costly UHF channels in certain markets would provide a substantial source of new revenue.

TEAM WITH OTHER INFORMATION SERVICES

CPB could increase commercial arrangements in the computer software market and with on-line services.

These are only a few of the ways in which the CPB could reinvent itself into a self-sufficient corporation for the '90s and, indeed, for the next century. Ending federal dependency does not end public broadcasting. Today's subsidy amounts to only 14 percent of the industry's spending! Indeed, my current plan asks the Corporation for Public Broadcasting to end its dependency on federal welfare in three years—that's one year more than what current proposals would give welfare recipients to get off federal assistance.

It would be tragic if the public broadcasting industry ignores its responsibilities when the federal budget is in crisis. It also would be tragic if the industry spurns exciting opportunities in new markets and technologies. Perhaps most tragic of all, however, would be continued retrenchment from public broadcasting executives crying, "It can't be done." It can be done. It should be done.

Mr. PRESSLER. So, let me conclude by saying that it may well be that moneys could be transferred from here to there, but they do not need to be transferred anymore for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. The committee level and the House level gives them more than they need.

I yield the remainder of my time to my chairman.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, how much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Five minutes; 5 minutes and 8 minutes.

Mr. SPECTER. How much time remains for the opponents of the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Five minutes.

Mr. SPECTER. How much time was there originally?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Ten minutes.

Mr. SPECTER. We have 5 minutes left. Will the Senator from Delaware take 2½?

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I will make it real quick. First of all, I think the characterization of my friend from Iowa is bizarre. It makes it sound like this is a CIA plot that is still underway. It is one of the most noble undertakings that the Western World has ever engaged in. If you ask any people in Eastern Europe, from Lech Walesa to Vaclav Havel to Boris Yeltsin, and others, who in fact were there before the Wall came down, they credit Radio Free Europe or Radio Liberty more than any single thing.

Number two, is it still needed? It is needed now. There is an enemy. The enemy is called censorship, and if you wonder whether or not it is true, some of us met this week with Mr. Gusinsky, the fellow who has the media empire in Russia now who is criticizing the present President. They are threatening to take down the television stations. They are taking down the radio and television access to the news for the people everywhere from Slovakia through Russia.

The third thing is this notion it is no longer needed. Mr. President, 25 million people still listen to it on a regular basis in Eastern Europe and Russia. Anyone who thinks democracy has taken root and the free market system is in place in those areas, I respectfully suggest they take another close look. And the notion that they can watch CNN—I would say to my friends, CNN is in English; it can be censored. It, in fact, can be impacted upon. And CNN communicates international news, not what is happening within those countries—as RFE/RL does. What we are doing is fully emasculating the ability of Radio Free Europe or Radio Liberty to continue to function.

I am a supporter, an unabashed supporter of public television. I believe it should be more than it is now. But this is like having the hearing impaired steal from the physically impaired, from those who are unable to walk. They are pitting two very important functions of government against one another. But we should not undermine Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty.

Again, those who think democracy is secure in those areas, please stand and raise your hands and tell me that censorship is still not the single biggest enemy of the prospect for freedom to flourish and democracy to flourish in Eastern and Central Europe.

Let me give a few more examples. In Russia, we have heard about the media courageously reporting on the war in Chechnya.

But that does not mean that Russia is now blessed with completely free media.

Last year, the State Duma in Russia adopted a new media law which requires that State-owned media must inform the public of activities of the President, Government, and Parliament within 24 hours after any noteworthy event.

And although the State Department reports that "print media [in Russia] functioned largely unhindered," this optimistic picture is clouded by the situation in many provinces:

Regional political authorities [in Russia] resorted to various devices to close down critical newspapers.

Last winter and spring, during the parliamentary campaign in Kazakhstan, a television station went off the air for several days when local authorities, upset by broadcasts critical of the mayor of the capital, shut off electricity to the station.

In Slovakia, as the Washington Post reported last Tuesday, the newly elected Government has increasingly pressured—and at times forced—television, radio, and newspapers to accept wholesale changes or drop programs.

In my view, Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty are as important today as they were during the past 40 years.

Because the establishment of free and independent media in the region has been a slow process, RFE/RL today have a dual role: To provide a model of how independent media should function in a free society, and to keep honest those who seek to reestablish repression and to silence the press.

This function is not one conceived in the abstract; the practical reality lies in the public response: The people of the region continue to tune in to RFE/RL.

In nearly every country in Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union, the listenership of RFE/RL today equals or exceeds that of the Voice of America.

It also exceeds the audience of the British Broadcasting Corporation's World Service.

All told, some 25 million people in the region listen to RFE/RL on a regular basis.

Surveys conducted last fall of leading citizens in the region found that an average of nearly 75 percent supported the continuation of western radio broadcasts.

Equally important, every leader of the new democracies in the region continues to urge that these radios remain open.

Let me quote from a letter from Czech President Vaclav Havel to President Clinton:

[RFE broadcasts] remain important to the development of independent journalism and democracy in our country.

The Presidents of the three Baltic States expressed a similar view:

These broadcasts [are] an integral part of the continuing development of [our] democratic institutions.

These are not leaders whose budgets benefit from RFE/RL—these are leaders who recognize that RFE/RL still make a contribution to the establishment of democracy.

This year, the administration proposes to spend \$100 million on the so-called "Warsaw Initiative," a program to assist the new democracies of Eastern Europe to modernize their militaries.

I would argue that Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty are as important as this military assistance in helping to secure the democratic foundation in the former East bloc.

Yet I predict that hardly anyone around here will blink an eye when the Congress votes on the \$100 million "Warsaw Initiative."

RFE/RL IS CUTTING ITS BUDGET

I agree with the Senator's belief that we need to reduce our international broadcasting budget.

We are doing just that.

The State Department authorization bill, enacted last year, provides for the consolidation of all U.S. international broadcasting.

The plan will reduce operations at both RFE/RL and the Voice of America. By next October, VOA and RFE/RL will have reduced their combined broadcast hours to Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union by 32 percent.

RFE/RL will reduce its budget by 67 percent—from \$220 million to \$75 million annually by fiscal 1996.

In terms of employees, RFE/RL will be cut by a similar amount—from 1,600 in September, 1993 to about 420 in fiscal 1996.

The research arm of RFE/RL has already been privatized: Its operations have been taken over by the open media society—a project funded by the philanthropist George Soros.

The new institute will undertake the restoration and preservation of the invaluable archives owned by RFE/RL—40 years of material that trace the dark era of totalitarianism in Eastern Europe and Eurasia.

This is a project for which no Federal funds were available. But because of this public-private partnership, that important objective will be realized.

The changes that I have enumerated will produce \$400 million in savings over the period from 1994 to 1997. All this is not a one-time phenomenon—it is a permanent structural change.

In addition, Congress has directed RFE/RL to begin an effort to privatize the radios—that is, that the funding should be assumed by the private sector by the end of the decade.

The radios are taking that directive seriously. Their ongoing move to Prague is a critical part of the effort to prepare for privatization.

Let everyone understand what this amendment will do—it will emasculate Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty.

The fiscal year 1995 budget for the radios is \$229 million. That includes \$103.5 million for one-time downsizing costs.

Nearly \$67 million of those costs are mandated by German labor laws.

Restrictive German labor laws require RFE/RL to pay severance and other benefits to the hundreds of employees who will be laid off—laws that RFE/RL, as a private corporation operating in Germany, must comply with. It is undisputed that RFE/RL, Inc. is subject to German labor laws.

A recent case, decided in February in the D.C. Circuit (*Mahoney v. RFE/RL, Inc.*), made clear that as a corporation with its principal place of business in Munich, RFE/RL would violate the laws of Germany if the corporation breached its collective bargaining agreements.

THIS WILL STOP AN IMPORTANT MOVE TO PRAGUE

In short, the effect of this amendment would be to place a dagger in the heart of the radios—at a moment when they are in the midst of a move from Munich to Prague, where they are preparing for the eventual privatization of RFE/RL.

This would break faith with a decision that the President and Congress jointly made last year.

Last January, the Senate voted to consolidate RFE/RL and the Voice of America.

Last summer, the President sent a reprogramming to Congress which provided for the move of the headquarters of RFE/RL from Munich to Prague.

I do not recall any of my colleagues objecting at that time to the continuation of RFE/RL.

But now the move to Prague is in motion. Four language services are now being produced in Prague: Russian, Ukrainian, Latvian, and the South Slav service.

RFE/RL plans to be out of Munich by June 10.

Because Munich is one of the most expensive cities in Europe, the move will achieve important savings. Per capita personnel costs will be reduced by one-third.

The President of the Czech Republic, President Havel, made an extremely generous offer to allow the radios to use the former Czechoslovak Federal Parliament Building for a nominal fee of one Czech crown per day—or 12 dollars per year.

The President of the United States accepted that offer last summer. This amendment would obviously undercut that commitment.

That is why the Clinton administration is strongly opposed to the Harkin amendment, as stated in the letter I read earlier from Joe Duffey, director of the U.S. Information Agency.

RFE/RL AND VOA ARE NOT DUPLICATIVE

It is not true that RFE/RL duplicates the Voice of America.

The two radios have different missions. The Voice of America's is mandated to tell America's story.

By contrast, Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty, radios provide news and information about local events within the recipient countries.

In this manner, RFE/RL act as home service or surrogate radios in the absence of fully free and independent media in the emerging democracies of the Eastern Europe and Eurasia.

As a result of the broadcast consolidation, the amount of overlapping broadcasts—that is, broadcasts by both RFE/RL and the VOA in the same language at the same time—was reduced from 24 hours to zero.

It is ludicrous to suggest that the cable news network now suffices for the countries of the former Soviet Empire.

In most countries, there are only two ways to obtain CNN—by staying in an expensive hotel or to buy a satellite dish.

I do not have any data on how many such dishes are available, but I cannot believe they are widespread.

More important, the news of CNN is in English, and it is international news. The news on Radio Free Europe

and Radio Liberty is in the vernacular—the local language; and it focuses mainly on local news.

Do not take my word for it that these broadcasts are still needed. Listen to the results of a survey conducted last fall in the region.

A poll of decisionmakers in each country—government, military, media, and economic leaders—clearly demonstrates this point.

When the proposition was put to them that Western radio is needed despite the new media freedom, some 75 percent of those polled disagreed or strongly disagreed.

I sympathize with my friend from Iowa about the choice we face in this bill.

I am in favor of restoring the cuts to the corporation for public broadcasting—but not at the expense of one of the most valuable instruments in American foreign policy.

The last point I will make is the administration is opposed to the amendment of my friend from Iowa. And I hope I have done this within 2½ minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I oppose the amendment. Much as I would like to see additional funding for public broadcasting, the subcommittee of which I am the chairman, the Subcommittee on Labor, Health, Human Resources and Education, has made a very careful allocation and has in fact reduced considerably the rescission by the House of Representatives for fiscal years 1996 and 1997. The House wanted to cut public broadcasting by \$47 million. We limited the rescission to \$26,360,000 for fiscal year 1996. For fiscal year 1997, the House of Representatives wanted to cut public broadcasting by \$94 million, and our subcommittee limited that rescission to \$29,360,000, leaving public broadcasting at its current rate of \$285,640,000.

That is fairly complicated arithmetic, but what it boils down to is on the current mark, there has been substantial consideration given to public broadcasting. The responses which the committee has heard from those who are interested in public broadcasting is a sigh of relief that their funding has been maintained at its present level.

I would like to see more funding for public broadcasting. But in setting this mark we feel there has been a realistic and appropriate balancing of priorities.

When the Senator from Iowa talks about employment for older Americans and would like to add funding there, of course it would be fine to add \$14 million additionally to the \$396 million recommended by the committee. But here again, the Appropriations Committee has made a very careful balancing of priorities. It is possible to pick apart the appropriations bill in a thousand ways and to take accounts which sound wonderful, like older Americans or public broadcasting, and take them from accounts like Radio

Free Europe which makes a great sound bite or looks complicated when the Sunday papers reprint the vote. But this has been very, very carefully worked out.

Senator BIDEN has made as good an argument as you can make in 2½ minutes. I am sorry he is not on the floor to compliment him, because it is seldom that Senator BIDEN makes that good an argument in 2½ minutes. Usually it is longer and proportionately it may not justify the additional time. I wish he were here to reply to that.

It is with some reluctance that I oppose my colleague, Senator HARKIN, who serves as ranking member on the subcommittee. We have worked together for a very, very long period of time. But as the allocations now stand, there is an appropriate allocation and balancing of priorities.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for an additional 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. HATFIELD. Will the Senator yield for just a moment?

Mr. SPECTER. I yield.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to extend this debate for 10 minutes, to be equally divided between both sides.

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

Mr. SPECTER. If the time is extended for an additional 10 minutes—

Mr. HATFIELD. And I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania 2 minutes.

Mr. SPECTER. I would want to reserve time until I hear from Senator HARKIN and reply, if I may.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, the 10 minutes has been agreed to, 5 on a side?

Mr. SPECTER. I yield the floor and will reply to whatever additional arguments remain.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Illinois.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, Senator SPECTER's argument on the Corporation for Public Broadcasting is we are not hurting the corporation nor public broadcasting as much as the House is. That is not a very good argument.

Let me point out one thing. This body, I am pleased to say, unanimously supported me in an effort to have an exemption to the antitrust laws so that the television industry could get together on the question of violence. The evidence is overwhelming.

The Presiding Officer is a physician. The American Academy of Pediatrics, the American Medical Association, the National Institute of Mental Health, the Surgeon General of the United States, all have issued studies saying that television violence that glorifies violence adds to violence in our society.

I am pleased to report to this body, thanks to your efforts and to voluntary efforts in the industry, broadcast television has reduced violence appre-

ciably. Cable has moved very, very modestly. But one network and one network alone provides violence-free television for the children of America, and that is public broadcasting.

I think we have to put our vote where our mouth is on this. I think we have to encourage the only network in this Nation that provides violence-free television for our children. There is one children's program, for example, that is broadcast in this country which is produced in two versions. One is the violent version for the United States of America, and the other is the non-violent version for all the other countries in the world. When the Christian Science Monitor asked the producer why, she said, "Well, the United States people demand violence, and we get no complaints. We cannot sell it in other countries with the violence in it."

The Corporation for Public Broadcasting is doing a superb job of giving us violence-free television for our children, and we ought to be supporting it and supporting them strongly.

I am proud to be a cosponsor of the Harkin amendment. If I am not already, I want to be added.

I thank the Senator from Iowa.

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

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 10 minutes and 39 seconds.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I yield 4 minutes to the Senator from Arkansas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, I thank my distinguished friend from Iowa for yielding to me. I congratulate him on trying to maintain a semblance of culture, decency, and civility in this Nation.

The Senator from Illinois spoke just before I did. He spoke about the fact that our children, by the time they graduate from high school, will have seen 18,000 murders, to say nothing of the other unspeakable violence they are going to see on network television. We have grappled in the Senate with how to control children's exposure to violence in light of the free speech provisions of the first amendment, and nobody has been able to come up with a workable solution.

I was speaking with a Senator's wife about a week ago and she said, "You know, Dale, we don't subscribe to cable at our house. We have a 12-year-old son. We do not want him exposed to MTV." I tell you, there are an amazing number of people in this country who deplore what their children are watching on television, and some of them are opting, as she does, not to purchase cable television.

Mr. President, you can be assured that this is not the final definitive debate on the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. There is an assault in the U.S. Congress on public broadcasting. With NEWT GINGRICH leading the charge, the Republicans in Con-

have decided to take dead aim at Big Bird, rather than deal with the problems that really cause harm to our society.

Mr. President, we have heard the argument: "CPB can be privatized; let them do as everybody else does." Let me ask you about the magnificent, unprecedented series on the Civil War which was so poignant. 14 percent of Americans tuned in to see it. I promise you, most Americans were in tears watching, but above all, learning about the most defining moment in American history—13 hours on public broadcasting. Can you imagine watching that series on one of the commercial networks and being interrupted every 5 minutes with a car being dropped on top of a mountain top, or a Budweiser beer commercial?

I cannot believe that the Harkin amendment is even being challenged. If the Senator from Iowa prevails on his amendment, there will be \$175 million left in the Radio Free Europe account. That is \$100 million more than the President requested. In addition, even if the Senator from Iowa prevails, we will still be \$29 million short of what public broadcasting was supposed to get.

Mr. President, how many times during the balanced budget amendment debate did you hear the argument, "Senator, how can you vote against the balanced budget amendment? Eighty percent of the people of this country favor it. You are going against the wishes of the people."

So, for the Senators here who are prepared to vote against the amendment of the Senator from Iowa, let me remind you that between 65 percent and 70 percent of the people of this country do not want the Corporation for Public Broadcasting to be cut. Is it for dilettantes? The statistics show that the average salary of the people of this country who watch opera is \$40,000 a year. Where else could they see Pavarotti, Kiri Te Kanawa, all of the magnificent voices; are they to be silenced? Are we going to say to the American people that other countries of the world are willing to spend up to \$38 per household for the very same thing the American people are paying \$1.09 for?

It is troubling to hear the assaults on things like the Corporation for Public Broadcasting and National Public Radio—I never move my radio off NPR. When I get in the car in the morning, that is what is on; and when I go home at night, that is what is on, because I want to know what is going on in the world and I do not want all those commercials interrupting it. I want a definitive, honest-to-goodness, analysis of what is happening all over the world. I wonder what the opponents of the Harkin amendment listen to in order to get their news.

Mr. President, I thank the Senator for yielding.

I yield the floor.

Mr. HARKIN. How much time is remaining on both sides, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Five minutes on this side.

Mr. HARKIN. I yield myself 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, first of all, I want to thank my colleagues who have spoken so eloquently on this amendment. I thank them for their support.

Second, I want to again thank and congratulate my colleague, Senator SPECTER, for doing a truly outstanding job in getting the provisions through our Labor-HHS-Education Appropriations subcommittee that he has done in this bill. Having been in his position, I know it is a tough job, a thankless job. I want to commend him for all the work he has done. He has done a good job. I support him in that effort.

I point out, however, that in this case, Radio Free Europe is not in our subcommittee. So I am not hanging that on his head. It is funded in another subcommittee. Senator SPECTER and our subcommittee does not fund Radio Free Europe.

Mr. President, I also want to say—and I do not have the time to do this. The compensation package that was agreed upon for the employees of Radio Free Europe because they are now moving to Prague, Czechoslovakia, you ought to read it. Let me read a couple of its provisions.

Employees having children shall receive a one-time payment in the following amount: One month of gross salary, but in no event more than deutsche mark 10,000—that is \$7,500 in U.S. dollars—for every dependent child aged no more than 27. How about that?

Employees terminated effective as of July 30, 1994, shall receive in respective school fees for the children to go to school 10,000 deutsche marks per child. So they can go to school. That is \$7,500 a year.

What is going on here? This is criminal. Talk about a golden parachute. And at the same time, we are saying we are going to cut broadcasting for Big Bird and for our kids in this country. What nonsense.

My friend from Delaware talks about censorship. If that is going to be our guiding light, let us start Radio Free Asia, Radio Free South Africa, Radio Free South America.

Mr. BIDEN. We have.

Mr. HARKIN. Censorship can rear its ugly head anywhere, anywhere—in Uruguay and Paraguay, in Chile and Argentina, in any country in Africa. But what we have is the Voice of America. Now, he talked about Lech Walesa. I have some statements from other people I will put in the RECORD telling about the Voice of America, the present Prime Minister of Albania saying it was the Voice of America that brought them through, not Radio Free Europe.

Second, Mr. President, here is a list—I ask unanimous consent to put these in the RECORD—of every country in

Eastern Europe and all of the radio and TV stations they already have that are operating. I ask unanimous consent to put that in the RECORD.

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

Ukraine: Russian TV programming is widely viewed.

Belarus: European music stations and BBC TV programs have been on air since last year.

Latvia: 6 commercial stations broadcasting most of day.

Lithuania: Recent formation of an association of independent TV and radio stations. TV programs broadcast; also several TV and radio stations broadcasting in Polish.

Hungary: VOA and BBC rebroadcast on Kossuth, FM, a state radio network.

Poland: RWE, Inc. broadcasts on Polish Program 4, a nationwide mediumwave network; BBC and VOA rebroadcast locally on both MW and FM. A National Broadcasting Council has issued 3 private national licenses in addition to 115 local licenses. The first national private TV license was recently awarded to Polsat over competing bids involving well-established foreign firms such as Time Warner Inc., Bertelsmann AG, and Reuters.

Czech Republic: VOA and BBC broadcast on FM networks in locations throughout the country; 2 public radio networks. Many of the independent stations with music and news often broadcast 24 hours a day.

Slovakia: Slovak Radio broadcasts despite financial problems BBC broadcasts on FM networks throughout the country.

Bulgaria: Numerous local independent radio stations operate in Sofia and other major cities. VOA, BBC, Deutsche Welle and Radio France International broadcast on FM in Sofia; VOA and BBC in cities outside.

Romania: Romania Radio, with 3 national networks all due to go on FM in the near future, is a less controversial institution than state TV. Numerous local independent radio stations operate in Bucharest and other major cities. VOA, BBC, Radio France International and DW are currently being rebroadcast on FM in Bucharest; BBC and DW also broadcast on FM in other cities.

Azerbaijan: Iran and Turkey supply television and radio programs to Azerbaijan; radio and TV cooperation between Iran and Azerbaijan is expanding.

Georgia: "Free Georgia" radio reportedly has been set up in Mingrelia by Gamsakhurdia supporters. Western and Turkish TV is available in Tbilisi.

Kazakhstan: TV broadcasts from Russia. Almaty is home to several independent radio stations. Print media are diverse. BBC and VOA broadcast, but only in Russia.

Tajikistan: An opposition radio, "Free Tajikistan," has begun broadcasting 90 minutes a day. BBC and VOA broadcast in Russian.

Uzbekistan: Voice of Iran and radio Saudi Arabia transmit to Uzbekistan in Uzbek; other regional broadcasters can be heard in Persian or Turkish. VOA broadcasts; BBC plans to begin broadcasting in Uzbek in later 1994.

Mr. HARKIN. The Senator from Delaware says the administration is opposed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's 3 minutes have expired.

Mr. HARKIN. I will take 30 more seconds. Here is the OMB pass-back budget 1994:

Presidential decisions. The pass-back includes some specific policy issues that were personally reviewed and decided by the President and cannot be changed. BIB, RFE, RL will be terminated in 1995, capital assets will be transferred to and merged with USIA.

So if this is something new, then the President obviously has changed his mind. But the President made a decision to personally zero it out.

I would also point out that even in this fiscal year the President asked for \$75 million.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. HARKIN. And this is \$100 million more than the President asked for.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield me 2 minutes?

Mr. SPECTER. I yield the Senator 2 minutes.

Mr. BIDEN. I do not say this with any rancor, but it is clear the Senator from Iowa is correct; he is uninformed on this issue. The reason he is uninformed on the issue, Radio Free Europe or Radio Liberty, the administration is not opposed.

I will submit the letter for the RECORD. I ask unanimous consent it be put in the RECORD.

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

U.S. INFORMATION AGENCY,
Washington, DC, March 31, 1995.

Hon. JOSEPH BIDEN,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR JOE: It is my understanding that the Senate may take up an amendment that would rescind major funding for the operations of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty. We appreciate your past and continuing support for RFE/RL and hope you will join the Administration and me in opposing this amendment.

As you know, we are currently in the process of shutting down RFE/RL in Munich and moving the newly configured operation to Prague. We have managed to get major components of the operation off the government budget and all of those involved in this effort have proceeded in good faith on the basis of reductions agreed to last year. The budget is being drastically reduced.

The operation will be overhauled under the leadership of Kevin Klose, President of RFE/RL, and a new Board of Directors, chaired by David Burke, former Vice President of ABC News. We have, however, let go more than a thousand long-time employees in Germany and must meet major obligations (legal obligations) there for German Government mandated separation costs, pension and health costs, etc. A cut in this year's budget of the one-time expense set aside for this purpose will break faith with those who have moved ahead with creativity and no little courage to help reinvent this old institution and make it serve a new purpose in a new time. It will also create a monumental management disaster in Munich and Prague, which will cause operations to come to an abrupt halt and create obligations and penalties for the U.S. Government beyond the savings sought by the amendment's sponsors.

I stand ready to meet you in the Senate Lounge at any time to talk with you about

this, as does Mort Halperin, who can express President Clinton's and the National Security Council's strong opposition to the proposed amendment.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

JOSEPH DUFFEY,
Director.

Mr. BIDEN. Let me clarify this for the Senator. At the beginning of this administration, the President proposed terminating RFE/RL. That decision was reversed in the spring of 1993. And that summer, the President proposed consolidating all U.S. sponsored international broadcasts. Congress accepted it. And we ordered budget cuts. We cut the costs. The reason it is \$175 million, \$100 million more than the request for Fiscal 1996, is that it costs more—in the current fiscal year—to reduce the size of the radios. That is what it cost under German law to reduce the operation. We are bound under German law. When we lay off people and fire people under German law, we are required to pay this severance pay. That is the reason why it is more money this year and drops to \$75 million next year.

Thirdly, I point out to my friend from Iowa, he did vote for and we did vote for Radio Free Asia. We authorized the establishment of a new service last year, and began appropriating money last year. We did it because there is censorship in China and the other communist countries in Asia; because there is a gerontocracy in Beijing that does not let people express their points of view. We did do that. So he is ahead of himself without even realizing it. We did in fact vote and have voted to guarantee that where there is censorship in the world, we will be involved to the extent that we can.

So, Mr. President, if we do not send troops, and we are not going to send money, and we are not going to send information, and we are not going to send access to the truth, what the heck are we going to do? I resent the fact that this is being pitted against public television. The reason public television is cut is not because of Radio Free Europe. When we reach the point—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's 2 minutes have expired.

Mr. BIDEN. When you reach the point your time has expired, you sit down.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, how much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Three minutes 9 seconds remain.

Mr. SPECTER. How much for the opposition?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. One minute thirty-two seconds. But the Senator from Iowa yielded back his time.

Mr. HARKIN. No, the Senator did not.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair thought the Senator did.

In that event, 1 minute 32 seconds remain.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

When the argument is made by the Senator from Arkansas that there is an

assault on public broadcasting, I would remind him that the major assault is on the deficit, and as chairman of the subcommittee we looked at \$5.9 billion of rescissions by the House, and we reduced that to \$3.05 billion, and asked public broadcasting to take a fair share, leaving them with the same amount they had last year. And that has received the comments of gratitude that they are able to function without the larger cuts recommended by the House.

The amendment is an attractive one, obviously, when they move into community service with older Americans, but that account already has \$410 million. So the \$14 additional million, while making this amendment look attractive, really is not very significant in the overall picture.

The distinguished Senator from Delaware has spoken about Radio Free Europe, but I think the point has not been made that the \$229 million is being reduced next year to \$75 million, and \$7 million has been added this year for consolidation and wind-down purposes.

My colleague from Iowa, who was chairman and is now ranking member, worked with me over these sheets, and I can understand his interest in wanting more money for public broadcasting. And I understand the Senator from Illinois, who has done outstanding work to try to combat violence on television. But this is a fair allocation, and if we are going to reach a balanced budget—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's 2 minutes have expired.

Mr. SPECTER. I yield myself 1 additional minute.

If we are to reach the balanced budget by the year 2002, there is going to have to be a fair share reduction on many items which we would like to have. And I think it is a fair submission that the Corporation for Public Broadcasting is able to tighten its belt and do the job within the parameter of the existing budget, so additional funds should not be added at the expense of another worthwhile account.

I yield the floor and reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. BIDEN. Will the Senator give me 5 seconds?

Mr. SPECTER. I do.

Mr. BIDEN. I would like to point out that in the Dole-Daschle compromise we are cutting the international broadcasting account by \$35 million. The Senator from Iowa proposes to cut \$40 million from RFE/RL in addition to what we are about to cut.

I yield the floor.

Mr. HARKIN. How much time is remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. One minute 30 seconds.

Mr. HARKIN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. First of all, let us face it. The Voice of America is broadcasting all over the world, in China, in Europe. The Prime Minister of Albania said it was the Voice of America, not Radio Free Europe that they listened to, plus we have BBC, German. These countries all have other broadcasts. So it is just a question of choices.

This is deficit neutral. This does not increase the deficit. But the choice is just this. Are we going to privatize the Corporation for Public Broadcasting or are we going to privatize Radio Free Europe? Will we have a compensation package for the Germans that I just mentioned or will we have jobs for our senior citizens here in America?

I would also point out, Mr. President, that the Dole substitute had a \$98 million cut in Radio Free Europe, much more than what we are asking for here in ours.

Lastly, Mr. President, I would point out again, this amendment provides \$26 million more for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. It also provides \$14 million for the senior community service employment program.

I ask unanimous consent to put at the end of my remarks some supporting documents regarding the senior community service employment program.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. HARKIN. So, again, Mr. President, the choice is clear. Are we going to spend our taxpayers' dollars for Radio Free Europe when the Voice of America is already broadcasting? Or are we going to bring that money here and make sure we have public broadcasting and jobs for our seniors?

EXHIBIT 1

EXAMPLES OF VOA PROGRAMMING GENERAL

They do news broadcasts (in English and native languages), descriptions of US foreign policy, pieces on popular US culture, information about studying in America, English lessons including Special English broadcasts in slow English, and editorials (which are criticized for being one-sided and potentially damaging the credibility of VOA.)

You can think of VOA as the public relations arm of the US Government for foreign publics.

SPECIFICS

During China's 1989 Tiananmen Square demonstrations and massacre, VOA correspondents broadcast in real time back to China eye-witness accounts of the massacre, and gave public exposure in China to the demonstrators demands for democracy and openness—information that Chinese authorities were censoring.

During the Gulf War, VOA stepped up broadcasts in Iraq and throughout the Middle East in English and Arabic to counter misinformation by Sadaam Hussein, and explain US goals and achievements in the world.

VOA reports on the Middle East peace process from the US perspective so that Arab populations, who live in countries where press is often censored, will hear additional views.

President Clinton broadcast an appeal for calm and non-violence to Burundi in Feb-

ruary 1995 just as ethnic violence in Rwanda is heating up between Tutsi and Hutu extremists: in this case the President is using VOA to circumvent hostilities without resorting to force or sanctions.

The Prime Minister of Albania, Dr. Alexander Meksi, praised VOA for its role during 5 decades of totalitarianism and during the 1990-1991 revolutions:

"On Voice of America we heard about the revolution in Eastern Europe as well as about internal developments in our own country. The role of the radio station was vital in the democratization of Albania. Through interviews that VOA conducted with prominent personalities in Albania we heard the first public criticism of the communist regime from within Albania."

VOA correspondents were in Mogadishu to report on the US feeding mission, getting out information about where the US Marines were, what they are doing, and where feeding centers were.

When the Congress voted to lift the trade embargo against Vietnam, Vietnamese heard it on VOA along with appeals for continued cooperation on POW-MIAs—which well reflected US policy.

VOA broadcasts to Tibet news about international efforts for their struggles that China authorities would not allow. The Dalai Lama can address his people on Tibet on VOA.

English classes in the English Corner throughout the world. It's a language lesson everyday on radio.

VOA also feeds its broadcasts to local FM stations to expand distribution

10 GOOD REASONS TO SUPPORT SCSEP

The Senior Community Service Employment Program (SCSEP) authorized under Title V of the Older Americans Act should be preserved and expanded for the following reasons:

1. The SCSEP is our country's only workforce development program designed to maximize the productive contributions of a rapidly growing older population through training, retraining, and community service. History has taught us that mainstream employment and training programs like JTPA and CETA are not successful in serving older workers. A targeted approach is needed.

2. The SCSEP is primarily operated by private, non-profit national aging organizations that are customer-focused, mission driven, and experienced in serving older, low-income people. These nonprofits work in close partnership with the Governors, Department of Labor, aging network, and employment and training system, actively participating in One Stop Service initiatives designed to streamline and integrate services.

3. The SCSEP is a critical part of the Older Americans Act, balancing the dual goals of community service and employment and training for low-income seniors. Many nutrition programs and other services for seniors are dependent on labor provided by the SCSEP.

4. The SCSEP has consistently exceeded all goals established by Congress and the Department of Labor, surpassing the 20% placement goal for the past six years and achieving a record 135% of goal in FY 1993-94. Virtually all appropriated funds are spent each grant year, in stark contrast to similar programs.

5. The SCSEP provides a positive return on taxpayer investment. One study found that the program returns at least \$1.47 for every dollar invested by empowering individuals to become self-sufficient and productive members of their communities.

6. The SCSEP is a means tested program, serving Americans age 55+ with income at or

below 125% of the poverty level, or \$9,200 for a family of one. The program serves less than 1% of those who are eligible; long waiting lists are common in most areas of the country.

7. The SCSEP serves the oldest and poorest in our society and those most in need: 39% of enrollees are minorities—the highest minority participation rate of any Older Americans Act program; 72% are female; 32% are age 70 and older; 81% are age 60 and older; 41% do not have a high school education; and 9% have disabilities.

8. The SCSEP ensures national responsiveness to local needs by directly involving participants in meeting critical human needs in their communities, from child and elder care to public safety and environmental preservation. The SCSEP has been a major contributor to national disaster relief efforts, most recently resulting from floods in the mid-west, hurricanes in the southeast, and the California earthquakes and riots.

9. The SCSEP has demonstrated high standards of performance and fiscal accountability unique to government programs. Less than 15% of funding is spent on administrative costs—one of the lowest rates among federal programs and despite a unit cost that has not been adjusted for increased administrative expenses since 1981.

10. The SCSEP historically has enjoyed strong public support because it is based on the principles of personal responsibility, lifelong learning, and service to community. In addition, the program is extremely popular among participants, host agencies, employers, communities, and the membership of our nation's largest aging organizations.

[From Green Thumb, Inc.]

IOWA SCSEP CASE HISTORIES

Donald Huntley of Boone county came to a Green Thumb pre-app day last spring out of desperation. He had worked for many years at a large turkey manufacturing plant that had gone out of business. His annual income for a family of two at the time was \$1,380. Don had very good skills and life experiences and a wonderful personality. He began his assignment in June with the Iowa 4-H Education Center. Prior to his orientation his Area Supervisor, Denise Juhl, told him that this was a chance to prove to the agency that they couldn't live without him. Don told her, "consider it done". On January 1, 1992, Don became a permanent full-time employee of the Iowa 4-H Education Center. His beginning salary will be \$18,400 with full benefits—an increase of more than 13 times his salary when he enrolled in June! Way to go, Don—we knew you could do it!

Jerry Burgett, a once very successful business owner and entrepreneur, found himself physically disabled and as a result lost his business. He had been a concrete sawer, which took an extreme amount of physical activity. At age 55 he experienced major back surgery and was unable to lift more than five pounds. He became homeless, living with different relatives. His life learned working skills were no longer of value to him. At the intake and assessment, he indicated that he wanted to learn computers and word processing. He was dual enrolled in Green Thumb and JTPA to begin an eight week course in computers and word processing. At the completion of his course, he finished with a perfect attendance and top scores in his class. Jerry began working for a local greenhouse firm the day he finished classes. He is in charge of a city wide satellite greenhouse system. He insures each satellite is staffed and ready for business each day. Jerry credits his new job to his recently acquired training. He now has a small apartment and rediscovered self esteem and self worth.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time has expired.

Mr. SPECTER. How much time remains on my side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifteen seconds.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, this has been a lively debate. I think all of the issues have been aired. I think the accounts as they currently stand express appropriate priorities as best we can determine them, and I move to table the Harkin amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion to table is not in order under the unanimous consent agreement.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I understand there was an agreement on an up-down vote. I was not present at that time. I withdraw the motion to table.

Mr. HARKIN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, all yeas and nays will be stacked. We are ready for other amendments.

Mr. HATFIELD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, may I inquire of the Chair the list of the amendments that were incorporated in the unanimous consent agreement?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Wellstone seniors' amendment, the Hatfield-Byrd managers' amendment, the Harkin add-back for Corporation for Public Broadcasting.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, so far as the process of those needing to be disposed of, we have the Wellstone amendment and the managers' wrap-up amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, we have resolved the Wellstone amendment. We are now putting that together with the managers' wrap-up. Therefore, I believe that would complete the business at this point as far as amendments are concerned; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That would be correct.

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

Mr. WELLSTONE. Would the Senator from Oregon yield for a moment?

Mr. HATFIELD. I withdraw the request for a quorum call.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I just want to thank Senator HATFIELD for his graciousness in our negotiations. I wanted to say to the Senator and to my colleagues that this program, the insurance information counseling and assistance grant program, again, is a program that we have in every single State, with seniors receiving assistance from trained volunteers

in dealing with all the Medicare forms and the Medigap policies to provide really good protection for people. It is a program, with very little by way of money, that has gone a long ways. I thank my colleague from Oregon for all of his help.

Mr. HATFIELD. I thank the Senator.

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, will the distinguished chairman yield for a question?

Mr. HATFIELD. I am happy to yield.

Mr. FORD. The only amendment left now will be the managers' amendment. When will that amendment be prepared to be offered and how much time will it take for that amendment, could I ask the good Senator?

Mr. HATFIELD. My estimate at this point is that we are in the process of putting that together and of alerting our colleagues who are involved.

I notice Senator MCCAIN is here. He will have an amendment in that wrap-up. Senator WELLSTONE will have one. Senator JEFFORDS will have one.

In each case, Mr. President, I say to the Democratic whip, each of these amendments that are in the wrap-up are totally offset amendments. So they do not add to the deficit. And they have been cleared on both sides. We should have that within the next few minutes.

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I say to my good friend, I was not objecting to that amendment. I understand it is basically agreed to and it has complete offsets, so most people are satisfied with it.

The only thing I was trying to do is figure out how much longer it would be and when you think the votes will be occurring.

Mr. MCCAIN. I would like to make about a 4-minute statement.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I say to the Senator, at this point, I would say it should all be wrapped up, as far as the managers' amendment, in about 15 minutes.

Mr. FORD. I thank the chairman very much.

AMENDMENT NO. 578, AS MODIFIED

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I will now make a unanimous consent request to make a technical correction. We had cleared the Levin amendment No. 578, but I ask unanimous consent to correct a drafting error by modifying it with the language that I now send to the desk.

What we are doing is we are, on page 9, line 12, striking one figure, \$37 million, and putting in \$25 million; and one figure \$35 million and putting in \$23 million. This does not change the basic content of the amendment. It was inaccurately drafted.

I ask that it be modified.

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

The amendment is so modified.

The amendment (No. 578), as modified, is as follows:

On page 9, line 16, strike "\$13,000,000" and insert "\$15,000,000".

On page 9, line 12, strike "\$25,100,000" and insert "\$23,100,000".

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, that will appear in our wrap-up package now that it is corrected. It is easier to correct it now than correct it down the line. That is why I took the time to do that at this point.

I yield the floor.

Mr. MCCAIN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I know the hour is late, and I will be brief. But I would like to make some comments on the compromise amendment that has been so long in its gestation period today and yesterday.

I want to start out by thanking the chairman of the Appropriations Committee and all those Members of the Senate who have worked to produce a good substitute rescission bill. I give them credit. I am only sorry we had not been able to do more.

Over the last week, freshman Senators have led a noble fight, in my view, to add new cuts to these bills. The amendment originally proposed by my freshman colleagues would have called for cuts in the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, AmeriCorps \$206 million, IRS, Foreign Operations, Youth Build, and many other cuts that would have totaled \$1.3 billion. Obviously, they sought to have that amendment passed. They were unable to do so for a variety of reasons which are not worth going into now.

But I really want to comment, Mr. President, about the difference that those freshmen bring to this body, which is the message of November 8, which is that we have to make tough decisions. We have to make difficult cuts in the budget and we have to do so because we have an obligation to the American people to balance the budget. Mr. President, we are not going to do that with this compromise amendment.

I especially thank Senator Santorum. I thank Senator Ashcroft, who is in the chair. I thank my colleague from Arizona, Senator Kyl, and many others who played such an important role in their efforts and came here to succeed and maybe will succeed next time. Those cuts that they proposed were difficult decisions. They alienated substantial constituencies in all of their States. But the fact is, we needed to enact those cuts and many more.

I have to say, Mr. President, I am a little bit dissipated because, if we cannot enact these cuts, I wonder what is going to happen when we take up budget reconciliation and we have to consider some really important and difficult reductions in the Federal budget. I am not positive we will have the courage to do so, particularly in light of the rejection of the so-called freshmen amendment.

I point out, in the compromise amendment, there are some good programs. I think they are very nice to have these programs. These add-backs

all have nice-sounding names to them, like TRIO and substance abuse and mental health and Goals 2000 and school-to-work, et cetera, et cetera. But Mr. President, the question is where the role of Government ends and our obligation to the American people to balance the budget begins.

I am particularly pained by the so-called offsets that are in this amendment, because the majority of the offsets, about \$1.2 billion of the \$1.6 billion, are contained in two so-called offsets. One is for the HUD section 8 project reserves and the other is for airport improvement. Both of those funds will have to be replenished within the next 6 months.

So the fact is what we have done is add back \$834 million and really only subtract from that around a couple hundred million. So the offsets are illusory. The offsets are not meaningful.

And it was interesting that Radio Free Europe and foreign operations were two of the major so-called savings in offsets, neither of which have any domestic constituencies. The other one that I see here was Federal administration and travel, which is always a convenient one. If anyone believes that there will be a \$337 million reduction in Federal administration and travel that is unspecified, I would say they have more optimism about the Federal bureaucracy's reactions to the mandates of Congress than I have seen in the past.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's 4 minutes have expired.

Mr. McCAIN. I did not ask for unanimous consent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We are under controlled time.

Mr. McCAIN. I ask unanimous consent for an additional 2 minutes.

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

Mr. McCAIN. I am sorry for taking so much time.

I believe it is important for us to recognize the effort that was made by the freshman Senators. I think it is disappointing that they did not succeed. I urge them to continue in their efforts, because I think they best reflect the views, aspirations, and hopes of the American people, as expressed on November 8.

I am disappointed in this so-called compromise. I hope that in the future we will not agree to such compromises again.

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 579

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I voted for the Harkin amendment to

transfer \$40.5 million from the Board for International Broadcasting and Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty, Inc. to the Corporation for Public Broadcasting and the seniors community service program because I believe they are higher national priorities than overseas broadcasting is.

Last year I led the fight to reduce RFE/RL's budget from \$220 to \$75 million—by two-thirds—and to slash their outrageous management perks because I believe that RFE/RL is a cold war relic, which also suffered from terribly sloppy fiscal management in the past. I do have some concerns about this formula, however,

During the debate on consolidation last year, we discovered that because of contractual obligations that the BIB never should have entered into on behalf of the U.S. Government, we have to spend some money this year in order to cap RFE/RL at \$75 million next year. It seems to make little sense, but I have done the math many times, and unfortunately, concluded that these sums are necessary if we are to downsize. It actually demonstrates how this organization ran amok for years under the guise of national security interests. In any case, I am concerned that if BIB funds are rescinded this year, we may not be able to reduce fully to \$75 million next year.

At the same time, I think CPB is a far better investment that so-called surrogate broadcasting—particularly when we already have radio services to the transitioning democracies through the Voice of America. I am carefully monitoring RFE/RL's budgeting and expenditures. If their request exceeds \$75 million next year, I will be the first to propose their termination.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I support the amendment to reduce funding for Radio Free Europe and to restore \$40.5 million for programs cut in this bill before us. Specifically, this amendment would restore: \$26 million for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting; \$14.4 million for the Community Services Program for Older Americans.

Mr. President, for many years, I have been a supporter of the continued operation of Radio Free Europe. Every year as chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee, I supported the Board for International Broadcasting's appropriations. But, now I look at this rescission bill and I look at the reductions that are proposed for programs like the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, programs to prevent the use of illegal narcotics, and programs that serve the elderly and children—all programs that serve Americans here at home—and I can no longer support the appropriations for the radios. Programs for Americans here at home should and must have a higher priority.

I have listened to the attacks on the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, on support for National Public Radio and Public Television. The other side

has argued that taxpayer funds should not be used to support public radio and television. I disagree. Public radio and television are among the finest investments made by this Government. They are an investment in the education of our people. But, if the other side is arguing against taxpayer support for public radio for Americans, how can they justify taxpayer support for Radio Free Europe. And, in this bill that the Appropriations Committee reported they have even proposed supplemental funding for Radio Free Europe while they are proposing rescissions in the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. That simply doesn't make sense.

One of President Clinton's first reinventing government proposals was to phase out Radio Free Europe and to consolidate it with the Voice of America. This country spends over \$320 million per year for the Voice of America's operations and facilities, and almost \$230 million per year for Radio Free Europe.

We did not phase-out Radio Free Europe. They conducted an impressive lobbying campaign to continue their existence, and the administration backed down. It agreed to reduce the Radios, but not to end their operation.

But, times are changing. The world has changed. The cold war has ended. Many of the nations in Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union had developed their own media and radio stations, and without jamming, they now had access to the BBC, CNN, Sky Television, and other Western media. Just last week the Washington Post carried an article discussing Russia since the fall of communism. While the article bemoaned the outbreak of organized crime, it also noted that Russia has developed a vigorous, and free mass media.

And, as everyone can see from this rescission bill, times have changed here at home too. We have before us a \$13 billion rescission bill. We are cutting programs that Americans rely on.

Mr. President, in the budget game, in the appropriations business, we are continually involved in a process of setting priorities—of determining what is more important than something else. And, when I look at the programs that Senator HARKIN, Senator LEAHY, and Senator REID have suggested in this amendment, for this Senator, there is no contest. They clearly are higher priority than continuing radio stations for Europe.

There is no one in this room that does not think the Older Americans Act Community Service Employment Program has been a success. The average participant is a 68-year-old woman who has just lost her husband and has little or no work history outside the home. There are both elderly men and elderly women in the program, but this is the typical situation. All of the participants are low income by definition.

This program provides a grant to nonprofit organizations to train participants and to place them in jobs. Initially, the program supports them at the minimum wage. For those who have good work skills, it moves them into full-time, unsubsidized employment. For the others, it provides either formal or on-the-job training to prepare for employment.

In any case, the work done by these seniors in libraries, home health agencies, child care centers, and other public, nonprofit, and private jobs is an absolute boon to the community and to the taxpayer. It would be pennywise and pound foolish to send these low-income senior citizens to the welfare line instead of letting them do work that is needed for the minimum wage.

Furthermore, we are talking in committee about getting people off of welfare and into work, and here on the Senate floor we are cutting a program that does just that.

Mr. President, 16,000 elderly people are being supported at the minimum wage nationwide through the Community Service Employment for Older Americans Program. There are 900 in South Carolina alone, and we will cut 106 if this amendment fails. The dignity of these elderly people is certainly more important than overextending our past commitment to taxpayer-funded European radio.

Mr. President, Senator HELMS, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, and Senator SNOWE have proposed a major reorganization of our international affairs agencies. They are, at this time, considering major reductions in international affairs agencies. Their proposed organization chart for the reinvented Department of State includes an "America Desk." Well, it is clear to me that time has run out for Radio Free Europe, and we could well help their reorganization effort at this time. Clearly, Radio Free Europe no longer can pass the "America Desk" review.

I commend Senators HARKIN, LEAHY, and REID for bringing this amendment to the Senate. Phasing out Radio Free Europe is a tough decision to make. But, it is far preferable to the other reductions that have been proposed in this rescission bill.

I urge the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I rise in strong opposition to the pending amendment proposed by the Senator from Iowa.

Let me first state that I fully understand the valid impulses that give rise to an amendment such as this. It takes money from Radio Free Europe, and puts it into a small number of other domestic spending categories, some of them bringing benefits to children and to the elderly.

The point being made is clear. It is one that we always hear whenever we go to our town meetings. If a Senator such as myself stands up to describe the vast increases in direct transfer

payments to American citizens—from the young worker to the older retiree—increases which indeed have driven our deficit to near extremity, one always hears the same old refrain in response: "What are you going to do about foreign aid? What about Congressional perks?"

Of course, spending on those two items amounts to less than 1 percent of the budget. But as long as some of it is still there, one can always gain a few more political points by taking a little bit more out of international spending, and spending a little bit more on the domestic side.

Now, I come to this issue from an unusual stance, which I would hope the Senator from Iowa appreciates. Unlike some of my colleagues on the Republican side, I fully support public broadcasting. I think it is especially valuable in a rural State such as my own, where we simply do not have the market power to make available to our citizens all of the best that commercial programming has to offer in a cost-effective way.

But despite my general support for public broadcasting, I oppose this amendment. It would take \$40.5 million out of Radio Free Europe in order to make it available for other domestic programs.

The first point I would make is that there has been a series of amendments here from the other side of the aisle, each of them designed to score big political brownie points by giving more money to children, to the poor, to the elderly. They're trying to make the crude charge stick, that somehow Republicans are wreaking havoc upon all these programs.

It is a war of symbolism, and it is being waged by various feints, jabs and deceptions. I would say to my colleagues over there on that side that I believe this tactic is getting quite worn and tired. The press, believe it or not, is beginning to figure this one out. They did fall a bit for the school lunch sophistry, buying the notion that we were snatching the food out of children's mouths, simply by giving the States more control over that program. But increasingly they are starting to understand what is a cut and what is a slower rate of increase. That's what we are proposing with all domestic and welfare spending generally—and if the American public can't figure that one simple gem of logic out, then they are, all of them, going straight to the poorhouse themselves.

So that's what gives rise to these partisan amendments. And of course, if you want to get some money for the ragged and downtrodden, there is no more politically popular place to get it than something that smacks of the evil term "foreign aid"—as in Radio Free Europe.

I would say that the U.S. is still getting a very fine return on its investment in Radio Free Europe. One thing that the collapse of the Berlin Wall has shown to us is the power that Radio

Free Europe had in beaming a message of hope and freedom to those striving for democracy. It is said by some that, now that the wall has come down, RFE has outlived its usefulness. But we have seen eloquent testimony that this is not the case.

Indeed, Radio Free Europe has moved its base of operations precisely because President Havel of the Czech Republic offered them various forms of subsidy assistance if only they would relocate in Prague. That's what he personally feels about Radio Free Europe's usefulness in the post-Cold War World. If the charge was to be made that Radio Free Europe was too expensive, then the people of Central Europe were willing to chip in their own bucks and give some help in order to enable it to stay.

Radio Free Europe has kept its operation up-to-date and relevant. It remains a tremendous source of reliable information on many subjects of international import, often giving more timely and profound coverage of events than the commercial news services. They have managed to stay ahead of the game in a number of areas of particular movement and importance in recent years—reports on the evolution of ethnic tensions as well as burgeoning controversies in economic and military matters. They provide translations of articles in major international newspapers, and academic analysis of events that cannot always be found in commercial papers and broadcasts.

In a budget in which we devote less than 1 percent of our resources to trying to affect the course of events beyond our borders in a way that is beneficial to us, it seems to me to be very pennywise and pound foolish, to take yet another whack at something which is so inexpensive to the taxpayer—indeed becoming less expensive as a result of the recent decision to move—simply to make the sudden, cynical political point that the loyal advocates of the amendment stand for more spending for the downtrodden.

So I regret to say to the Senator from Iowa that I cannot support his amendment. I would say to him and to the rest of this chamber that if we are squeezing funding for the programs that he has attempted to provide for here, it is not spending on Radio Free Europe that has caused the difficulty. Come the year 2013, unless we do something about entitlement spending, we not only will not have money for Radio Free Europe, but for national defense, highways, prisons—turn them all loose—upkeep of the national parks—nothing. So we should turn the spotlight onto the spending that got us here and we'll be looking for the Senator's vote, otherwise we won't be able to fund any of the programs that the Senator from Iowa or anyone else cares about.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I will just take one or two moments at this time, prior to the time that we are going to have a final vote on this issue

on the rescissions, to, first of all, express my own deep personal appreciation for the leadership of Senator DASCHLE, on our side, over the course of this debate and his perseverance in pursuing the restoration of extremely important funding that had been cut in the areas which were targeted on children and on education. There is close to a billion dollars which has been returned to this measure as a direct result of his strong commitment and work over these past days.

Many of us were prepared to have extended debate on priorities, which I think the rescission issue basically brings forward, to try and reflect in this body what we think are the real priorities of the American people with regard to children and with regard to education.

We know that over this year and in the future, we are going to have to be much sharper in prioritizing this country's expenditures. Funding in and of itself is not necessarily the answer to all of our problems, but it is a pretty clear reflection of a nation's priorities. This is particularly true when we are talking about a number of the different items that were included in the measure which was supported by Senator DASCHLE and others, including some Members from the other side of the aisle.

I am speaking about the restoration of the funds at Head Start, Chapter 1, and the day care programs, which are so important for working families, particularly working mothers, and are an indispensable part of our planning if we are trying to be serious about welfare reform. I should also note the return of the funding on the Goals 2000, which will help some 1,300 schools to move ahead in terms of enhancing academic achievement and accomplishment.

Those were extremely important programs. Other important measures that were restored include the School-to-Work Program, which will provide additional opportunities for the 70 percent of the young people that do not go on to college and are facing dead-end jobs when they get out of high school.

Because of the School-to-Work Program that was passed last year and strongly supported with the leadership of President Clinton, we were able to work through a partnership with public and private sectors to try to offer a greater opportunity for young people. That, I think, is important.

I know that Senator KASSEBAUM is working through the restructuring and reorganizing of our youth training programs, and the role of the School-to-Work Program may very well be—I believe will be—the center focus of reform of youth training. It will also help in redesigning the outreach to the some 400,000 young people who drop out of school every year. With this program and some of the other efforts, these dropouts may be brought back into the educational system.

Finally, I want to mention the restoration of funding for the national

service program. While we have had some debate and discussion on that measure, I wish we had had the chance to go into greater detail on the extraordinary contributions that so many of the young people in this country are involved in through community service.

If there was really a failing during the period of the 1980's, and we all have our list of shortcomings in national policy, I think one of the important areas was the failure to offer a vehicle and an avenue for young people, particularly, to give something back to their community in the form of voluntary service. We didn't give them an opportunity to repay what the community has done for them.

Under the leadership of President Clinton, we have seen service programs growing, not only in the AmeriCorps programs, but the other programs which are creating an opportunity for service while students are in school, from kindergarten through high schools. In my State of Massachusetts, enormously impressive programs are taking place.

I was talking recently to the service learning director of the community service programs, and she mentioned that Massachusetts is one of the top States in taking advantage of the service learning programs.

We could go on about other programs restored—the TRIO program—and about some that were not, such as the technology programs, which are so important in making sure young people are going to be able to get the best in terms of new technology, and not only technology but training programs in the use of these technologies. All of these are enormously important.

We are going to have debates on these measures as to funding levels in the future. But we want to make very clear in this body and to the country that there are going to be a number of Members that will stand for the children, stand for education, stand for investing in the future of this country by doing all that we can to strengthen the support for the youngest and the most vulnerable. We will support children in the Head Start programs and support strengthening our education system. Another issue we will watch closely will be aid to college students. We must ensure that young people that are taking advantage of the student loan programs, work study programs, and other higher education programs which have been targeted by Republicans over in the House of Representatives are not hurt by Republican cuts. We must make sure the Republicans bent on eliminating these programs are not going to be successful.

I believe that there is a bipartisan coalition for education. Perhaps, had we had more votes on education it would have been reflected in the course of this debate, but I believe it is there. It will be tested over the period of these future months.

I do think in this early skirmish that it is very clear that even though the

funding levels are not what I would certainly like to see in these areas, the areas nonetheless where there has been the greatest restorations have been in children and in education. I think that that is what the American people would want. I know that these are what we will want as we go through the process of prioritizing this Nation's needs. We will keep them on the front burner.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, by my calculation, we should be voting by now. Could I be advised why we are still talking?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We still have another amendment to be offered, the managers' amendment.

Mr. DOLE. Is anybody entitled to time on the managers' amendment, or are the managers entitled to time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is a total of 15 minutes remaining on the managers' amendment.

Mr. DOLE. I just say to my colleagues, if they want to stay here all night, that is fine. But we are going to come back in the morning if we cannot close this down in about 5 minutes.

It is about 10 o'clock. Most everybody is here tomorrow, and we will come back if we cannot conclude this, come back tomorrow morning. If everybody needs to talk, let them talk and we will come back and vote tomorrow morning.

Mr. President, why can we not proceed to vote on the Harkin amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The unanimous consent provided that the votes would be stacked.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 579

Mr. DOLE. I ask unanimous consent that we now proceed to vote on the Harkin amendment.

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

The question is on agreeing to the Harkin amendment No. 579. On this question, the yeas and nays have been requested, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. FORD: I announce that the Senator from Maryland [Ms. MIKULSKI] is necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 46, nays 53, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 131 Leg.]

YEAS—46

Akaka	Dorgan	Johnston
Baucus	Exon	Kennedy
Bingaman	Feingold	Kerrey
Boxer	Feinstein	Kerry
Breaux	Ford	Kohl
Bryan	Glenn	Lautenberg
Bumpers	Graham	Leahy
Byrd	Grassley	Levin
Cohen	Harkin	Lieberman
Conrad	Heflin	Moseley-Braun
Daschle	Hollings	Moynihan
Dodd	Inouye	Murray

Pryor	Roth	Warner
Reid	Sarbanes	Wellstone
Robb	Simon	
Rockefeller	Snowe	

NAYS—53

Abraham	Faircloth	McCain
Ashcroft	Frist	McConnell
Bennett	Gorton	Murkowski
Biden	Gramm	Nickles
Bond	Grams	Nunn
Bradley	Gregg	Packwood
Brown	Hatch	Pell
Burns	Hatfield	Pressler
Campbell	Helms	Santorum
Chafee	Hutchison	Shelby
Coats	Inhofe	Simpson
Cochran	Jeffords	Smith
Coverdell	Kassebaum	Specter
Craig	Kempthorne	Stevens
D'Amato	Kyl	Thomas
DeWine	Lott	Thompson
Dole	Lugar	Thurmond
Domenici	Mack	

NOT VOTING—1

Mikulski

So the amendment (No. 579) was rejected.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, may we have order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will come to order.

The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. HATFIELD. I ask unanimous consent to make a technical correction to an amendment previously offered by Senator GORTON and adopted by the Senate. It is a technical correction because the amendment is flawed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order. The Senator will suspend until the Senate is in order.

Without objection, the amendment is so modified.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 580 THROUGH 592, EN BLOC

Mr. HATFIELD. Now, Mr. President, I would like to have the attention of the body.

Mr. President, this is the last act for this bill except final passage, and this is referred to as a managers' wrap-up. What we have done is incorporate into this one action amendments that have been agreed to on both sides. If there is any additional money, it is fully offset. So it is totally deficit neutral. And instead of having them offered one at a time, we are offering them en bloc. Let me enumerate them because those of you who have such amendments make certain that we have incorporated them. The following list: HATFIELD has THREE, LAUTENBERG, BURNS, MCCAIN, JEFFORDS, PELL, KENNEDY, AKAKA, KEMPTHORNE, INOUBE, and WELLSTONE.

Now, that is our listing of all of the amendments that have been agreed to, cleared.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be considered and agreed to en bloc and that motions to reconsider votes by which these amendments were agreed to be laid upon the table en bloc and any statements with regard to the amendments be placed in the RECORD at the

appropriate place. And I yield to the ranking member of the committee.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I shall not object, these amendments have been cleared on this side and they are fully offset.

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

The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD], proposes amendments numbered 580 through 592, en bloc.

The amendments en bloc are as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 580

(Offered by Mr. HATFIELD, for himself and Mr. BYRD.)

On page 26, line 12, reduce the sum named by "200,000,000".

On page 26, line 20, reduce the sum named by "\$200,000,000".

On page 27, line 21, strike "\$3,221,397,000" and insert in lieu thereof: "\$3,201,397,000".

AMENDMENT NO. 581

In Amendment number 437 to Amendment 435 strike the following:

"Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Laws 101-136, 101-509, 102-27, 102-141, 102-393, 103-123, 103-329, \$1,842,885,000 are rescinded from the following projects in the following amounts:"

and insert in lieu, thereof: "Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Laws 101-136, 101-509, 102-27, 102-141, 102-393, 103-123, 103-329, \$1,894,840,000 are rescinded from the following projects in the following amounts:"

and strike: "Tucson, Federal building, U.S. Courthouse, \$121,890,000"

and insert in lieu thereof: "Tucson, Federal building, U.S. Courthouse, \$80,974,000".

AMENDMENT NO. 582

On page 44 line 16 insert: "Provided further, Of the available contract authority balances under this hearing in Public Law 97-424, \$13,340,000 are rescinded; and of the available balances under this heading in Public Law 100-17, \$126,608,000 are rescinded."

AMENDMENT NO. 583

(Purpose: To restore funding for the purchase of buses and the construction of bus-related facilities as authorized under section 3 of the Federal Transit Act)

(Offered by Mr. HATFIELD, for Mr. LAUTENBERG.)

On page 43, line 17, strike the numeral and insert "\$1,318,000,000."

On page 46, strike all beginning on line 6 through the end of line 11.

AMENDMENT NO. 584

(Offered by Mr. HATFIELD, for Mr. BURNS.) At the appropriate place insert the following:

(a) SCHEDULE FOR NEPA COMPLIANCE—Each National Forest System unit shall establish an adhere to a schedule for the completion of National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) analysis and decisions on all allotments within the National Forest System unit for which NEPA analysis is needed. The schedule shall provide that not more than 20 percent of the allotments shall undergo NEPA analysis and decisions through Fiscal Year 96.

(b) * * * other law, term grazing permits which expire or are waived before the NEPA analysis and decision pursuant to the schedule developed by individual Forest Service System units, shall be issued on the same

terms and conditions and for the full term of the expired or waived permit. Upon completion of the scheduled NEPA analysis and decision for the allotment, the terms and conditions of existing grazing permits may be modified or re-issued, if necessary to conform to such NEPA analysis.

(c) EXPIRED PERMITS—This section shall only apply to permits which were not extended or replaced with a new term grazing permit solely because the analysis required by NEPA and other applicable laws has not been completed and also shall include permits that expired in 1994 and 1995 before the date of enactment of this Act.

AMENDMENT NO. 585

(Purpose: To address issues of equity in rehiring former Federal employees)

(Offered by Mr. HATFIELD, for Mr. MCCAIN.) In title II—General Provisions, SEC. 2001 Timber Sales, add the following to the end of subsection (6) SALE PREPARATION: The Director of the Office of Personnel Management, and the Secretary of the relevant Department, shall provide a summary report to the governmental affairs committees of the House and Senate regarding the number of incentive payment recipients who were rehired, their terms of reemployment, their job classifications, and an explanation, in the judgment of the agencies, of how such reemployment without repayment of the incentive payments received is consistent with the original waiver provision of P.L. 103-226.

This report shall not be conducted in a manner that would delay the rehiring of any former employees under this Act, or effect the normal confidentiality of federal employees.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I would like to make a few brief comments to describe the intent of the amendment I have offered today to S. 619. It addresses my concerns about the rehiring of former Federal employees who received a voluntary separation incentive payment to leave the Federal service, but now will be rehired under the provisions of this bill.

Under the terms of the "Federal Workforce Restructuring Act"—popularly known as the buyout bill—Federal employees could receive an incentive payment as high as \$25,000 if they voluntarily agreed to leave their agency. These buyouts will help achieve a reduction in the Federal work force of approximately 275,000 employees, which will significantly reduce the size of our Federal bureaucracy and save taxpayers hundreds of millions of dollars.

After receiving such a buyout, the Federal employee would be barred from rejoining the Federal work force for 5 years. A special waiver provision afforded former employees with unique capabilities to be rehired by a Federal agency if no other qualified individual was available.

I supported this legislation, and am pleased that it has already helped reduce the Federal work force by some 30,000 employees. I am concerned, however, by one provision of the recessions bill before us today that would allow individuals who received a buyout payment to be rehired without having to either repay their buyout, or meet the terms of the existing waiver provision.

Mr. President, I recognize the need for highly qualified individuals to be brought back to Federal service with

the Bureau of Land Management and the Forest Service to assist with new timber harvests. They must be brought back quickly, and are likely to be re-employed for a fairly short period of time.

I do believe, however, that the agencies rehiring these individuals should advise the Congress on the extent of former Federal employees who received a buyout and have been rehired. We have a responsibility to ensure that the spirit of the buyout legislation is not abrogated by this new rehiring authority. Furthermore, it would be wise for the Congress to monitor that the taxpayers investment in this buyout program is not improperly utilized.

My amendment is intended to allow the Congress to fulfill these obligations. It would require OPM and the relevant Federal Department to advise the Governmental Affairs Committees of the House and Senate their use of the rehiring authority established in S. 619. More importantly, it will require these agencies to explain how rehiring buyout recipients without a repayment of their separation incentive award is consistent with the original waiver provision of Public Law 103-226.

This requirement will provide the Congress with some idea of not only how many former Federal employees who received a taxpayer funded buyout have been rehired, but also whether their reemployment truly meets the congressional requirement of highly skilled individuals, and a shortage of similarly talented candidates. I do not want to see the expedited rehiring authority established in this bill to be used in such a manner that undermines the merits and purpose of the cash awards given to individuals.

I think it is important that we treat rehired Federal employees fairly in this regard, but we also need to ensure that taxpayers are protected due to the fact that they have paid for the cash buyouts that have been awarded. After all, these voluntary separation payments are intended to downsize the bureaucracy, and save taxpayers money. Individuals should not be able to take advantage of large buyout bonuses and then reenter the Federal service except under very special circumstances.

This amendment will help the Congress evaluate this rehiring program as it proceeds, without hindering the Forest Service or the BLM in their legitimate efforts to bring skilled individuals back into their work force on a short-term basis.

Mr. President, I want to thank Senator GORTON, Senator HATFIELD, and Senator BYRD for their assistance and acceptance of this amendment.

AMENDMENT NO. 586

(Offered by Mr. HATFIELD for Mr. JEFFORDS.)

On page 14, line 12 strike \$81,500,000 and insert "\$71,500,000".

On page 13, strike the figure on line 24 and insert "\$60,000,000".

AMENDMENT NO. 587

(Purpose: To provide continued funding for the national center for research in vocational education)

(Offered by Mr. HATFIELD for Mr. PELL.)
On page 33, line 9, strike "\$236,417,000" and insert "\$242,417,000".

On page 33, line 14, strike "\$8,900,000" and insert "\$14,900,000".

On page 34, line 4, strike "\$60,566,000" and insert "\$54,566,000".

On page 34, line 7, strike "\$8,891,000" and insert "\$2,891,000".

AMENDMENT NO. 588

(Offered by Mr. HATFIELD, for Mr. KENNEDY.)

On page 36 after line 5, insert:

"PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION.

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103-333, \$4,424,000 are rescinded."

On page 34, line 18, Strike \$57,783,000 and insert in lieu "\$53,359,000".

On Page 35, line 2, strike \$6,424,000, and insert in lieu of "\$2,000,000".

AMENDMENT NO. 589

(Purpose: To restore certain funding for the demonstration partnership program which is administered by the Office of Community Services within the Administration for Children and Families)

(Offered by Mr. HATFIELD, for Mr. AKAKA.)
On page 31, strike line 9 and insert the following: "Public Law 103-333, \$10,988,000 are rescinded."

On page 31, between lines 9 and 10, insert the following:

"Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103-333 and reserved by the Secretary pursuant to section 674(a)(1) of the Community Services Block Grant Act, \$1,900,000 are rescinded."

On page 32, line 5, strike \$2,918,000" and insert "\$4,018,000".

AMENDMENT NO. 590

(Purpose: To make an appropriation for the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations and to increase the rescission amount for diplomatic and consular programs)

(Offered by Mr. HATFIELD, for Mr. KEMPTHORNE.)

On page 11, line 19, strike "\$2,000,000 are rescinded." and insert the following: "\$2,500,000 are rescinded."

ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

For the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations for purposes of section 306 of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (Public Law 104-4), \$500,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 591

(Purpose: To strike the provision that prohibits the application of the Davis-Bacon Act to any contract associated with the construction of facilities for the National Museum of the American Indian)

(Offered by Mr. HATFIELD, for Mr. INOUE.)
In chapter V of title I, under the heading "CONSTRUCTION" under the heading "SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION" under the heading "OTHER RELATED AGENCIES" strike: "Provided further, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, the provisions of the Davis-Bacon Act shall not apply to any contract associated with the consideration of facilities for the National Museum of the American Indian."

AMENDMENT NO. 592

(Offered by Mr. HATFIELD, FOR MR. WELLSTONE)

On page 29, line 16, strike "\$2,185,935,000" and insert in lieu thereof \$2,191,435,000".

At the appropriate place in the bill insert the following:

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, administrative expenses & travel shall further be reduced by \$5,500,000.

So the amendments (No. 580 through 592) were agreed to.

Mr. HATFIELD. I thank the Chair.

I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendments were agreed to.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

MARKET PROMOTION

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I rise to express my outrage at the provision in this rescission bill that would increase funding for the Market Promotion Program by \$25 million in fiscal year 1995. A provision that would increase subsidies for major corporations, at the same time that we are cutting billions from programs that are vital to our Nation's children.

My opposition to the Market Promotion Program is long-standing. I do not believe that the U.S. Government should be spending \$100 million a year to subsidize overseas advertising by large corporations.

In recent years, the Market Promotion Program has used taxpayer money to subsidize such corporations as McDonalds, Miller Beer, Sun Maid Raisins, and General Mills: hardly struggling corporations in need of Government largesse.

It would be a travesty for the Senate to increase spending on this wasteful program while we are considering billions of dollars in cuts from far more important programs in the fiscal year 1995 budget.

How can we cut housing assistance for low-income families and seniors while we increase subsidies for large corporations?

How can the U.S. Senate cut the Head Start Program, the Youth Training program, the National Service Program, the Safe and Drug Free School Zones program, Child Care, Education, and so many other programs that benefit our Nation's children and families, help hard-working Americans, and prevent drug abuse and crime? How can we cut all those programs and then turn around and increase funding for multinational corporations?

Mr. President, this is wrong. Dead wrong. The market promotion program should not be increased. It should be eliminated. If we can cut funding for child nutrition programs and elderly housing, we certainly can ask billion-dollar multinational corporations to do their fair share as well.

I recently introduced legislation that would eliminate the Market Promotion Program and several other wasteful subsidy programs operated by the Department of Agriculture. I am pleased that the Senate has an opportunity today to cut some real waste out of the Federal budget.

I hope that my colleagues in the Senate will join with me in supporting the Bumpers-Bryan amendment.

FUNDING FOR THE UNITED NATIONS POPULATION FUND [UNFPA]

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I rise today to reaffirm my full support for U.S. funding for the U.N. Population Fund [UNFPA]. President Clinton resumed funding for the Population Fund last year after a 7 year suspension during the Reagan and Bush administrations. Last year, Congress appropriated \$40 million for the fund, and \$50 million was appropriated for 1995. Unfortunately—and I think unwisely—the House rescinded \$25 million of the funding in its emergency supplemental and rescissions bill.

With Senator HATFIELD's courageous support, the Senate did not rescind any money for the fund in its bill. I am most appreciative of my fine colleagues, Senator HATFIELD and his efforts and longstanding support for international population stabilization activities including the UNFPA.

I do understand that funding for all programs across the board needs to be reduced if we are to properly fund this supplemental bill. However, I do not want to see population programs unfairly targeted for larger reductions than other foreign assistance programs. Reducing the Population Fund's money by one-half is surely an unreasonable reduction in funding.

This huge reduction in funding will surely send exactly the wrong message to the rest of the developed nations across the world. Last year, the United States was seen as the world's leader on population and development assistance at the International Conference on Population and Development in Cairo. I was a congressional delegate at the Conference and I came away very much impressed with the leadership and direction displayed by Vice President GORE and the assistance given him by our former colleague, Under Secretary of State Tim Wirth in guiding the Conference and its delegates in developing a consensus document on a broad-range of short- and long-term recommendations concerning maternal and child health care, strengthening family planning programs, the promotion of educational opportunities for girls and women, and improving the status and rights of women across the world.

We surely do not want to lose our moral leadership role and relinquish any momentum by abandoning or severely weakening our financial commitment to population and development assistance. The United States needs to continue its global efforts to achieve responsible and sustainable population levels, and to back up that leadership with specific commitments to population planning activities.

That is why it is so very important that we show our support by funding the U.N. Population Fund. The fund is supported entirely by voluntary contributions, not by the U.N. regular

budget. There were 101 donors to the fund in 1993, most of which were developing nations. Japan and the United States are the leading contributors to the fund with the Nordic countries not lagging far behind. UNFPA assistance goes to over 140 countries and territories across the world. It would certainly be a real shame if the United States were to back away from its commitment to the world's largest source of material assistance for population programs.

Mr. CHAFEE, Mr. President, I want to join my colleague from Wyoming in expressing my strong support for the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA). There are many challenges to be faced in the next century with regard to global population growth, and international programs such as UNFPA are critical to the world's population and development assistance efforts.

UNFPA, which receives funds from some 101 donor nations, has had a somewhat tumultuous history in the US over the past decade. Indeed, UNFPA funding was suspended altogether during both the Reagan and the Bush Administrations.

Under the Clinton Administration, modest funding for UNFPA has resumed. However, of the \$50 million appropriated for UNFPA in Fiscal Year 1995, \$25 million—or one-half—was rescinded by the House of Representatives in its Emergency Supplemental and Rescissions Bill.

Let me emphasize that in these difficult budgetary times, U.S. federal spending, including U.S. contributions to international foreign assistance programs such as UNFPA, need to be adjusted accordingly. However, in this process we must ensure that programs are not unfairly targeted for disproportionate funding reductions. Moreover, I believe it is important in this instance to continue the U.S. leadership role that was demonstrated at the 1994 International Conference on Population and Development in Cairo.

For these reasons, I believe that a 50 percent cut in funding for UNFPA is excessive, and thus unwise. I was pleased, therefore, to find that the Senate rescissions package does not cut the U.S. allocation for UNFPA. I particularly want to commend and thank the Chairman of the Appropriations Committee, Senator HATFIELD, for recognizing the importance of this international effort.

UNFPA will continue only if member nations continue to provide it with support. I believe that the United States has a clear interest in the success of UNFPA and similar population and development assistance efforts, and I join with Senator SIMPSON and my other colleagues in urging the Senate to maintain U.S. support.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, as the Senate prepares to take final action on H.R. 1158, I rise to draw the attention of my colleagues to the provisions of the bill and the Dole-Daschle amendment making rescissions in U.S.

foreign policy programs. Along with my distinguished colleagues, Senators SIMPSON, CHAFEE, SIMON, and others, I believe a direct and substantial benefit flows to the United States from our modest investment in sustainable development and population efforts. I am pleased the Senate bill rejects specific cuts to these vital programs and instead attempts to minimize harm to on-going, cost-effective foreign assistance programs.

Mr. President, I disagree with certain provisions of the bill before us. Nonetheless, I want to commend the distinguished Chairman and Ranking Democrat of the Senate Appropriations Committee, Senators HATFIELD and BYRD, and the distinguished Chairman and Ranking Democrat of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Senators MCCONNELL and LEAHY, for their very commendable effort to make equitable rescissions in U.S. foreign policy programs.

It is significant that the cuts recommended by the Foreign Operations Subcommittee are not based on a fundamental dislike for particular programs. Nor are they driven by a belief that one or two foreign aid programs are unnecessary. Rather, the Subcommittee's recommendation of \$100 million in general reductions to programs within its jurisdiction reflects the laudable belief that deficit reduction can be achieved in a manner which minimizes harm to all programs.

Over the next few weeks, as my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee take this bill to conference with the House, I urge them to remain firmly committed to the Subcommittee's goal of making equitable rescissions in foreign policy programs. More specifically, I urge them to resist House efforts to target and cut vital population and development programs.

Under the House-passed bill, population and development programs would disproportionately bear the burden of foreign policy rescissions. Development assistance would be cut by \$45.5 million and population assistance would be targeted for \$9 million in cuts. In my view, these cuts are extremely shortsighted. In the long-term, they could end up costing the U.S. far more than we would save in fiscal year 1995. The Senate should remain firm in its commitment to making foreign policy rescissions that are rationale and fair, and the House rescissions should be rejected in Conference.

From my perspective, attention to global population issues and support for world-wide development is critical to our future successes here in the United States. Because I so strongly believe this, I joined with Senator SIMPSON—and Congressman BEILENSEN and Congresswoman MORELLA—to introduce legislation called the "International Population Stabilization and Reproductive Health Care Act," S. 1096, in the 103rd Congress. Our bill, which we are revising for re-introduction in this Congress, would have focused U.S.

foreign policy on a coordinated strategy to help achieve world population stabilization; encourage global economic development and self-determination; and improve the health and well-being of women and their children.

I believe these three objectives are inextricably tied to one another. The way I see it, all U.S. efforts to help develop economies and promote democracy around the world will be futile if we do not first address the staggering rate of global population growth. How can we expect under-developed countries to pull themselves up when the world's population is growing at a rate of more than 10,000 people per hour? When the women and men who make up a nation's workforce pool do not even have the right to plan their families? And when millions of women around the world do not have access to basic—and lifesaving—reproductive health care or educational opportunities?

Fortunately, national and international awareness of two fundamental concepts is growing: (1) population, poverty, patterns of production and consumption, and the environment are so closely interconnected that none can be considered in isolation; and (2) sustained economic growth, sustainable development and population are fundamentally dependent on advances in the education, economic status and empowerment of women.

Tonight, we in the Senate are re-affirming these principles, and we are rejecting the House's attempt to drag U.S. foreign policy backwards. I sincerely hope the Senate conferees carry this message into Conference. I urge them not to waiver from the Senate's position on this issue.

AMENDMENT NO. 445

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. Mr. President, I rise today in strong support of the amendment proposed by the minority leader that would restore funding for several important programs that address the needs of our Nation's children.

Mr. President, the bill we are debating here today, H.R. 1158, would rescind \$13.4 billion in previously appropriated funds—including \$600 million appropriated last year for Federal education programs.

Needless to say, I am vehemently opposed to taking this kind of giant leap backward. In my view, it would be unconscionable for Congress to reduce the Federal Government's share of public education funding which has already fallen from 9.1 percent during the 1980-1981 school year to 5.6 percent during the 1993-1994 school year.

It is vital to the interest of our Nation that we maintain quality public education for everyone. Education is not just a private benefit but a public good. It is the cornerstone of a healthy democracy and, as a society, we all benefit from a well educated citizenry.

We are currently experiencing a new era in economic competition. All over the world, barriers to trade between

nations are falling. We are witnessing the development of a truly global marketplace. I believe that America can lead the way in this marketplace. But if we are to succeed, if we are to retain our competitiveness into the 21st century, there must be a renewed commitment to education in this country.

Several international institutions recognized the increasing importance of education just a few weeks ago at the United Nations summit on social development when they urged developing nations to invest in education rather than on defense.

In fact, for the first time in history, over 130 world leaders also agreed to a non-binding goal known as the 20-20 proposal which recognizes that economic and social problems have global consequences by creating immigration problems, epidemics, markets too poor to buy exports, and economies too risky for investors.

This proposal encourages all donor nations and international institutions to earmark 20 percent of their foreign aid for basic social needs including education and health care. It also encourages developing nations to allocate 20 percent of their expenditures to the same underfinanced sectors.

Nonetheless, while leaders from around the world were recognizing the increasing importance of education, Members of the U.S. House of Representatives were busy passing H.R. 1158. If enacted, H.R. 1158 would rescind \$17 billion—including \$1.7 billion in education funding for our Nation's children and \$2.3 billion in job training funding for our Nation's unemployed youth.

In fact, this legislation would also withdraw funding for all new education initiatives—including the education infrastructure act which I introduced last April to help local school boards ensure the health and safety of their students.

Mr. President, I simply do not understand why some of my colleagues are so determined to slash funding for programs that increase economic, social, and educational opportunities for our Nation's children. According to the Children's Defense Fund, every day in America: 3 children die from child abuse; 15 children die from guns; 27 children die from poverty; 95 children before their first birthday; 564 babies are born to women who had little or no prenatal care; 2,217 teenagers drop out of school; 2,350 children are in adult jails; 100,000 children are homeless; and 135,000 children bring guns to school.

Although S. 617 would reduce our investment in our Nation's children by less than H.R. 1158, it still asks them to bear too much of the pain created by this effort to pay for emergency spending.

The Daschle amendment would improve the bill by restoring \$1.3 billion for some of the most important and successful education and job training programs in this country. More specifically, the Daschle amendment would

provide: \$42 million for the Head Start Program which has successfully given hundreds of thousands of pre-schoolers the chance to start school ready to learn; \$100 million for the Safe and Drug Free Schools Program which is helping local school districts keep drugs and guns out of our Nation's \$72 million for the Chapter 1 Program which has helped States and local school districts meet the educational needs of economically disadvantaged children for 30 years; \$69.6 million for the goals 2000 program which is helping States create coherent frameworks for education reform founded on the national education goals; \$30 million for the school-to-work program which helps States and local school districts improve the educational and employment opportunities of our Nation's high school students who do not plan to attend college; \$8.8 million for the immigrant education program which helps local school districts meet the educational needs of recently arrived immigrant children; \$16.3 million for the impact aid program which compensates local school districts for revenue losses incurred due to removal of Federal property from local tax rolls; \$35 million for the WIC Program which provides important nutrition supplements to 6.5 million women, infants, and children everyday—including more than 3 million children under 5; \$100 million for the Youth Training Program which helps States prepare youth and young adults for high skill, high wage careers; and \$210 million for the Americorps Program which provides a \$4,725 scholarship to individuals who serve the educational, environmental, public safety, and human needs of our communities.

By providing this needed and long overdue support, the Daschle amendment will begin to address our failure to adequately engage resources in behalf of preparing our children for competition in the emerging global economy. It will help our children to succeed—to make a living, to participate in the community, to enjoy the arts, and to understand the technology that has reshaped our workplace. This is in our children's interest; this is in our national interest.

Mr. President, I would like to conclude my remarks by urging my colleagues to support these investments in our Nation's children by voting for the Daschle amendment.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, while there are a number of features of the Daschle amendment which significantly improve this legislation, I would like to draw particular attention to two provisions that reinstate funding the original bill intended to rescind—\$14.7 million for the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration [SAMHSA] and \$100 million for the Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program—because it was my intention prior to their inclusion in the Daschle

amendment to offer amendments to restore these funds and to offset the consequent additional costs by rescinding funds from programs less vital to our Nation and its people.

SAMHSA funds both Substance Abuse Block Grants and the Children's Mental Health Program. Substance Abuse Treatment Block Grants are the most important vehicle of support for substance abuse treatment efforts in this country. Funding for these grants cannot be compromised if we are to succeed in our efforts to reform welfare, reduce crime, and contain health care costs. The grants account for over one-third of the funding for public substance abuse treatment nationwide.

The California Drug and Alcohol Treatment Assessment, July 1994 [CALDATA], found that each day of substance abuse treatment pays for itself on the day it is received, primarily through reductions in crime. The Rand Corporation reports that drug treatment is the most cost-effective form of drug intervention, compared with other potential drug strategy program options, such as interdiction or imprisonment.

Mr. President, every \$1 invested in drug treatment saves taxpayers \$7 dollars. There are several sources for this figure, including CALDATA and the National Institute on Drug Abuse.

The heavy toll drug use exacts on the United States is most easily measured by the criminal and medical costs imposed on and paid for by the Nation's taxpaying citizens. One major study, conducted by Dorothy Rice at the Institute for Health and Aging at the University of California at San Francisco, concluded that drug abuse costs taxpayers \$67 billion, alcohol abuse costs \$99 billion, for a total cost to the Federal Government of \$166 billion per year. "The impact of substance abuse and addiction on Federal entitlements is equivalent to more than 40 percent of the Federal deficit for 1995," states Joe Califano, former HEW Secretary and President of the Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse (CASA) at Columbia University. Ninety-two percent of the funds spent by health care entitlement programs as a result of substance abuse are used to pay for treatment of the consequences of such abuse; only 8 percent is spent to reduce dependency.

The costs to the Federal Government do not begin to account for the higher costs substance abuse wreak on the private economy. Every man, woman, and child in America pays nearly \$1,000 annually to cover the costs of unnecessary health care, extra law enforcement, auto accidents, crime, and lost productivity resulting from substance abuse, according to a Brandeis University study.

The impact of substance abuse on crime is staggering. Substance abuse is linked to between one-quarter and one-third of all suicides, according to the Public Health Service, and the Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health Admin-

istration. Substance abuse is linked to half of all homicides, rapes, spousal abuse, and traffic fatalities. Substance abuse is linked to two-thirds of all cases of manslaughter, drownings, burglaries, robberies, thefts, and assaults.

According to a study by the National Association of State Alcohol and Drug Abuse Directors [NASADAD], approximately 1 million people—40 percent of those in need—want and pursue substance abuse treatment at this moment but do not get it: instead of helping them to help themselves, the Government leaves them sitting on waiting lists across the country.

These individuals—the vast majority of which are mothers, workers, or professionals—are willing and eager to improve their lives and the lives of those around them, but the government fails to extend a helping hand. Not only taxpayers, but society at large, foots the bill for this neglect.

SAMHSA also funds the Children's Mental Health Program, which provides services for children with very serious emotional disturbances [SED]. This program is targeted at the 1 million children with SED—out of 7.5 million nationwide—who are in State-administered systems encompassing child welfare, juvenile justice, and special education programs. This amendment restores \$1.3 million to this program that the bill would have rescinded. This money goes to 22 service sites that will not survive without the funds. The future of these children is at stake.

Even in the face of all these facts, Mr. President, the rescissions bill—prior to the Daschle amendment—would have taken a random, unexplained, unjustifiable slice out of the budget for SAMHSA.

At the same time, it would have taken \$100 million out of the Safe and Drug Free Schools—Safe Schools—program.

Mr. President, on this subject, I would like to take a few moments to talk about a reality that is very separate from the one in which my colleagues and I live.

Someone who lives in this reality, Mr. President, wakes up worried that today he could very well be killed. He realistically expects that someone he knows might be shot this week, or stabbed, or beaten. He goes through his day fearing everyone who passes by, constantly alert for trouble and danger, always keeping an eye on the nearest exit or hiding place. He might carry a weapon, purely for protection, and hide it on his person—a crude knife hidden in his sleeve, a length of pipe tucked into his boot, a makeshift handgun in his pocket, a box-cutter taped to his stomach. One hand is probably always on this weapon, this small piece of security. If he makes it back to bed at the end of the day, he will be thankful, relieved, and certainly a little surprised.

This reality is not a war, and the people who inhabit this world are not sol-

diers. This reality is only blocks away from this Chamber, and is mirrored in towns across our country. And the participants in this reality are not adults, they are children, they are as young as 5 and 6 years old, and rarely over the age of 18. I am talking about the reality found in many elementary and secondary schools across the United States, where 150,000 students bring a gun every day; where shootings and stabbings are commonplace; where gangs are in control; and where 3 million violent crimes are committed each year. I am talking about a national disgrace, a monumental embarrassment, a failure on the part of all who care about the future of this country and the quality of life of our children.

I am talking about a state of events that we cannot tolerate, that we cannot allow to endure.

In the Steven Spielberg film "Schindler's List," a Nazi soldier stands on the balcony of his home overlooking the busy center square of a Jewish concentration camp. Calm and precise, he aims his powerful rifle at random Jews passing through the crowded streets below, and effortlessly pulls the trigger. His aim is never faulty, and he always succeeds in ending a life. The people near the murder recoil in fright only momentarily, then continue on their way, perhaps a little quicker, perhaps a little slower, thankful for the moment that the gun was not trained on them, fearful that the next shot will terminate their existence. The bullet has struck them, too, and changed them permanently, leaving them forever horrified, forever damaged, forever in shock.

This sequence is brutally painful for so many reasons. The only relief I expected to feel when I watched this sequence was the lack of any connection between the events on the screen and present day reality in America. But such a connection is exactly what I felt. Violence in portions of our country has become so rampant and so deadly that almost all of us live in a collective state of fear and acceptance. Our cities and schools have become infested with random violence and bloodshed and criminals with no conscience and no check on their destructive impulses. And when this state of affairs has infected our Nation's schools, then we know that our children are going to be conditioned to accept this disease as normal. Not only are some of our children dying in our Nation's schools, but the ones who survive are learning that murder and violence are simply a part of life—in fact, the most important part. Mr. President, we are permitting our Nation's youth to grow up emotionally scarred, terminally frightened, and permanently embittered.

Mr. President, the Safe Schools Program is a necessity if this systemic child abuse and neglect is to cease.

A study examining the effects of the first 2 years of funding for the Safe Schools Program showed increases in

the number of school districts with formal drug and violence prevention programs in every State and territory in the United States.

The same study also showed increases in school-community collaboration on drug prevention issues in 50 States and territories; increases in parent involvement in drug education efforts in 49 States and territories; increases in the degree of community involvement in prevention programs for youth in 46 States and territories; and increases in the number of high-risk youth served in drug education programs in 38 States and territories.

Prior to the Daschle amendment, the rescission would reduce or eliminate violence and drug prevention programs serving approximately 39 million students attending the schools operated by 94 percent of local educational agencies in the Nation.

Also at risk would be every state Governor's drug and violence prevention programs designed for youth not served by local educational agencies. So would be the development and distribution of publications on school violence and drug/alcohol prevention, which have been the cornerstone of nationwide efforts to provide schools with information on models and effective practices. The Parent's Guide on Drug Prevention alone has been requested by over 30 million persons.

The original rescission would have eliminated assistance and model development in the area of alternatives to expulsion. With expulsion rates increasing dramatically in several regions, it is essential to provide leadership in this area, or more and more kids will go straight from the schoolhouse to the courthouse.

Consequently I commend the Democratic leader for his leadership and his sensitivity to the importance of these issues. I appreciate the opportunity to work with him to gain the inclusion of these important provisions in his amendment. And I am pleased that the ultimate goals of the amendments I intended to offer were realized. Since the House version of the rescissions bill rescinded no funds from SAMHSA, fiscal year 1995 funds for SAMHSA are now secure. I wish I could say the same about Safe Schools funds. The House bill eliminated Safe Schools funds altogether. I urge the conferees to the rescissions bill to protect Safe School funds. We owe the children and the future of this Nation nothing less.

AMENDMENT NO. 448

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. President, I rise this afternoon to express my wholehearted support for the Sense of the Senate resolution proposed as an amendment today by Senator KENNEDY. As a member of the Finance Committee, I offered an amendment to H.R. 831 that would have closed a loophole that allows wealthy citizens who renounce their American citizenships to avoid U.S. taxes. My amendment would have dedicated all of the savings from closing this loophole to deficit re-

duction. According to estimates of the Joint Committee on Taxation, my amendment would have reduced the deficit by approximately \$3.6 billion over the next 10 years.

Unfortunately, although the Finance Committee adopted this amendment on an undivided voice vote and the Senate approved it as part of H.R. 831, the joint House-Senate conference committee re-opened this loophole. Senator KENNEDY's resolution simply expresses the sense of the Senate that in the interest of tax equity and in the face of on-going Federal deficits, we must close this loophole.

Mr. President, the amendment that I proposed was fundamentally about fairness. Not only is it fair to those who enjoyed the benefits of U.S. citizenship to make billions and are now attempting to avoid paying tax on such gain, it is also fair to those Americans who stay behind to shoulder the burdens of citizenship. All my amendment would have done is treat those who renounce their citizenship on par with Americans who stay and pay their share of the tax burden.

While U.S. citizenship confers tremendous benefit, it also requires responsibility. Although we may not always be happy about the amount, most of us willingly pay our fair share of the tax burden. However, for many Americans it becomes just too much when they have to pay not only their share of taxes, but also an additional share for those few, wealthy individuals who made their money in this country, but are now trying to skip town without paying their portion of the tab.

Significantly, my amendment would have excluded pension income, real estate assets, and the first \$600,000 in gain. As a result, of the roughly 850 U.S. citizens who renounced their citizenships in 1994, only a handful would be affected by the closing of this loophole. In fact, representatives from the Treasury Department testified that the amendment would have affected only 24 Americans each year.

Mr. President, significant deficit reduction will be necessary to put our country back on the right track. However, until we close these special-interest tax loopholes for the few, we cannot ask for the shared sacrifice from the many that will be necessary to reduce the deficit. Therefore, I urge all of our colleagues to support the Kennedy sense of the Senate amendment.

AMENDMENT NO. 470—RENEWABLE ENERGY

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, the rescissions bill we are discussing today, H.R. 1158, cuts \$35 million from the Department of Energy's solar, wind and renewables research and development budget. The amendment I offer today will limit to \$25 million the amount to be rescinded from this account, thereby protecting vital renewable energy programs. I offer this amendment on behalf of myself, Senator WELLSTONE, Senator CHAFEE, Senator DASCHLE, Senator ROTH, Senator CAMPBELL, Senator HARKIN, Senator LEAHY, Senator

Kerry, Senator PELL, Senator KOHL, Senator KENNEDY, Senator MURRAY, and Senator FEINGOLD.

Mr. President, this amendment is about creating jobs, reducing our foreign debt, reducing our reliance on imported oil, making American business more competitive, maintaining our commitment to these small energy companies and continuing on the path of developing clean, cheap, efficient energy.

Mr. President, we are proposing to restore \$10 million to the Department of Energy's solar, wind and renewables R&D budget. This money is primarily used for research, joint ventures with small U.S. companies, market development and commercialization. Federal support for renewable energy research and development has been a major success story. Costs have declined, reliability has improved and a domestic industry has been born. More work still needs to be done in basic research at our national labs and applied development to bring down costs and work with industry.

The \$10 million we restore to renewables will come from the \$1 billion Army Corps of Engineer's construction account.

Mr. President, I hope my colleagues will vote for clean domestic energy, domestic jobs, reduced trade deficit and a stronger economy. I would like to thank the managers of this bill for their support.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I just want to express my appreciation to the Senators from Oregon, West Virginia, New Mexico, and Louisiana for their help in allowing this amendment to go forward. The amendment decreases the rescission from renewable energy research and development by \$10 million, paying for it by increasing the rescission for the Army Corps' general construction activities by the same amount.

This amendment reflects the growing recognition that funding for research and development of renewable energy technologies is money well-spent. The rescission provided in the Committee Substitute was just too high.

There is a nationwide movement toward funding only R&D that is going to lead to commercially viable, economically realistic technology in the relatively short-term. Renewable energy R&D fits that description. Renewable energy R&D has been and continues to be a major success story. Costs have declined, reliability has improved, and a domestic industry has been born. While the United States is currently the world leader in renewable energy technologies, other nations are investing heavily in this area. Given that many utilities are averse to investing in new technologies, the continued strength of DOE's programs is necessary to protect our position in the world market.

The American people agree that renewable energy R&D ought to be a priority for Federal R&D funding. According to a December 1994 survey by RSM Inc., when asked what energy source should be highest priority for R&D spending, Americans overwhelmingly supported renewables. The top finisher was renewable energy, receiving 42 percent of the vote.

Again, I appreciate the help of my colleagues in making acceptance of this amendment possible. It is time that our federal energy R&D dollars reflect the public's funding priorities.

AMENDMENT NO. 490

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I offer this amendment on behalf of myself, Senator FEINSTEIN, Senator FEINGOLD, and Senator SIMON.

The amendment will insure continued funding for the National Center for Research in Vocational Education. The Center is a consortium of institutions of higher education in California, Wisconsin, Illinois, New York, and Virginia. The Center is widely recognized for the important research work it does in vocational education, and it would be very unfortunate, indeed, if funding to permit it to continue its work were curtailed.

As my colleagues know, we will soon be considering reauthorization of the Vocational Education Act. The work of the Center has provided the authorizing committee invaluable information to help guide and facilitate our work. But even more critical, their research efforts are vital to improving the quality of vocational education throughout our Nation.

I view the amendment as an important placeholder so that when the Senate and House conferees meet on this legislation, they will have the opportunity to give this matter full and complete consideration. I am very hopeful they will ultimately decide to retain funding for the Center, but without this amendment there will be no chance whatsoever to provide continued funding for the Center and the important work it does.

CITIZENSHIP TRAINING AND NATURALIZATION SERVICES

Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, I and my colleagues from California and Illinois, Senators FEINSTEIN and MOSELEY-BRAUN, had intended to offer an amendment restoring \$6 million dollars for citizenship training and naturalization services that had been rescinded in the Senate, but not in the House.

Although naturalization has been identified as a priority by the administration in its immigration policy, naturalization services have been chronically underfunded and naturalization backlogs begin to grow. It is my belief—and I believe that of my colleagues—that these funds are essential to the important goal of providing those who want to naturalize with an opportunity to do so. Admittedly, \$6 million dollars is a small amount of money, but the program rescinded in the Senate is crucial to the continued

health of those providing citizenship training.

In discussing my intention with the Honorable Chairman of the Labor/HHS Appropriations Subcommittee, Senator SPECTER, I was impressed with his willingness to attempt to resolve this problem in conference with the House of Representatives, which, as I mentioned before, did not rescind the \$6 million in citizenship training money. I would like to ask the Honorable Chairman if it is in fact his desire to take a second look at the \$6 million citizenship money in conference.

Mr. SPECTER. I thank the Senator from Illinois. The committee's intent, in recommending this rescission, was to revisit funding once authorizing legislation has been enacted through the regular process of Judiciary Committee consideration. There is some concern that adding this responsibility to the Office of Refugee Resettlement in the Department of Health and Human Services could increase pressure on already underfunded domestic resettlement activities, as opposed to placing responsibility under the Immigration and Naturalization Service. I believe this is an issue the authorizing committees need to address. Nevertheless, it is indeed my intention to resolve this matter in conference to the satisfaction of all those who—like myself—value legal immigration and recognize the importance to our immigration policies of an effective naturalization process. I look forward to working with the distinguished Senate Appropriations Committee Chairman, Mr. HATFIELD; my counterpart in the House, Congressman PORTER, chairman of the House Labor/HHS Appropriations Subcommittee; and the other conferees to address this issue, and I thank Senator SIMON, Senator FEINSTEIN, and Senator MOSELEY-BRAUN for their attention to this important matter.

Mr. SIMON. I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania. His concern for issues of legal immigration and naturalization has long been recognized, and I am gratified that he will undertake to review seriously, and hopefully restore, the \$6 million Senate rescission with our colleagues in the House.

THE MILDGAS PROCESS UNIT

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. Mr. President, this amendment has a simple purpose—to restore \$4.8 million in fiscal year 1995 fossil energy research and development funds to help complete a small coal technology testing facility, the Mildgas Process Unit.

I am joined in this amendment by my distinguished senior Illinois colleague, my good friend, Senator SIMON.

The Mildgas Process Unit is a facility that will test a technology known as mild gasification, a process where lower-grade domestic coals are heated at moderate temperatures and pressures to produce a variety of gaseous fuels, liquid hydrocarbons, and a solid product known as char.

Char, the primary product of the Mildgas facility, can be briquetted into

form coke, creating a new alternative to conventional coke now used by American steel firms and foundries. This is particularly important because the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990 imposed strong restrictions on the emissions from coke ovens.

Those are two major reasons why my amendment is important, Mr. President. For a modest investment today, the Mildgas experiment promises hundreds of millions of dollars in new uses tomorrow for Illinois Basin and Appalachian high-sulfur coals. And those new uses solve a significant economic and environmental problem of our Nation's iron and steel industries.

However, I am concerned that the decision to cut funds for the Mildgas Process Unit has been based principally on deficit reduction, and on a belief that this technology is unwanted and unneeded.

This year, overall Federal spending will be in excess of \$1½ trillion, and it will take \$1.2 trillion in deficit reduction to achieve a balanced budget by the year 2002. Laid along figures of that size, the \$4.8 million we seek for the Mildgas project may seem to be a small matter.

That is not to say that its relatively small size should not immunize the Mildgas project from review. After all, to paraphrase a famous Illinoisan who preceded me in the Senate, the Senate Republican leader of his day, Everett Dirksen, "A few dollars here, a few dollars there, and pretty soon you're talking about serious money." What that means, it seems to me, is that nothing can be off limits—not small items, not large items, not any item.

I therefore agree that review of Federal support for mild gasification technology demonstrations is both necessary and appropriate. It is because my own review of the facts convinces me that going forward is the right decision, the prudent decision, and the right budgetary decision, that I am offering this amendment to restore funding toward completing the Mildgas project.

It is worth noting, in this era of concern about earmarks and pork-barrel spending, that this project did not originate with the Congress. The Department of Energy originally selected this project in 1991 in a competitive solicitation. The Mildgas project had to compete with a number of other proposals.

In the years since the Mildgas project won that competition, over \$7.5 million has been provided by Congress—half of the Federal share. The State of Illinois has funding that amounts to 20 percent of the total cost. A team of participants, which includes Kerr McGee Coal Corp., Southern Illinois University, and the Institute of Gas Technology in Chicago, has broken ground at the Coal Development Park in Carterville, IL, in preparation to test this technology.

The contracts are now in place to turn this demonstration into reality. Construction of the facility will end

late 1995, followed by 1 year of testing, after which the project will be shut down.

I am well aware that there are several similar projects currently being funded by the Department of Energy. But, success cannot be defined as simply demonstrating one example of a broad class of mild gasification technologies. The spectrum of mild gasification techniques is quite broad. There are different types of coals used, products produced, and markets served.

That is why the Mildgas process unit is important. It does not reinvent the wheel. It does not duplicate other mild gasification technologies. It is unique.

Mildgas can use many types of coals. The Encoal clean coal demonstration project in Wyoming, a project often compared to Mildgas, utilizes only Western coal. Mildgas technology makes use of Illinois, Wyoming, and West Virginia coals.

And although Encoal's primary product is a value-added fuel, its market is still only a boiler fuel. Mildgas's product, char, creates an entirely new market for high-sulfur and lower-grade coals, and solves an environmental problem for the Nation's steel industry. And as aging coke ovens are shut down and not replaced, Mildgas can provide American steel industries with a domestically produced alternative to importing coke from the same countries that are our steel-making competitors.

Encoal and the other mild gasification technologies have been, and I hope will continue to be, successful, but their success will not address the Illinois Basin and Appalachian coals that Mildgas will use, nor meet the environmental needs of the steel industry like Mildgas will.

Mr. President, the Mildgas Process Unit is based upon years of detailed planning, investment, and careful research by industry and scientists in close cooperation with the Department of Energy. It deserves to continue.

Mildgas does not break the bank. For a minor investment today, Mildgas can open hundreds of millions of dollars in markets tomorrow.

Mildgas can help the coal industry, by exploring a way to shift high-sulfur coals from markets reduced by the Clean Air Act, to markets opened.

And, Mildgas is unique. Mildgas uses coals, produces products, and serves markets that other mild gasification technologies simply do not. I think it is worth investing a few more years to complete this experiment.

I strongly urge my colleague, the distinguished Senator from Washington, to give every consideration in conference to providing the necessary funds to complete the Mildgas Process Unit.

Mr. GORTON. I thank the Senator from Illinois for her comments regarding the mild gasification facility planned for southern Illinois. As I am sure the Senator knows, given the budget constraints that the committee

was forced to confront, we were simply unable to include the funds needed to initiate construction of the Mildgas Process Unit. I can assure the distinguished Senator, however, that I will give appropriate consideration to this project within the budget limitations that we will continue to face in conference.

FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, I rise at this time to voice my concerns with apparent inconsistencies in the administration of disaster recommendations by the Federal Emergency Management Agency [FEMA].

As my colleagues well know, H.R. 1158, the fiscal year 1995 Disaster Supplemental/Rescissions Bill, contains \$1.9 billion for outstanding expenses accrued from previous disasters in 39 States, including recent flooding in Southern California.

I am sure all of us have seen news footage of the raging winter storms that have wreaked havoc across virtually the entire State of California. The devastation families have endured is terrible. As a result, the President—acting on recommendations made by FEMA—declared many California counties disaster areas. This includes Ventura County, which is located along the Southern California coast north of Los Angeles.

There is one particular area of Ventura County I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues. Homes located on a hillside in La Conchita, CA recently sustained considerable damage. Because of the President's declaration, private and public property damaged by the disaster is eligible for four different kinds of FEMA assistance. These homeowners rightfully have the hope of relief.

My concern is not with the fact that relief is being made available to those affected by the La Conchita mudslide. Rather, I am concerned with what I believe could very well be an inconsistent approach to disaster recommendations made by FEMA.

Permit me to explain. Mr. President, geologists have known for several decades that the La Conchita hillside has been moving for 23,000 years. In other words, La Conchita was a potential disaster waiting to happen. Thus, FEMA is making relief available in response to a disaster resulting from a pre-existing condition. This is a policy vastly different from one FEMA applied last July.

I see my colleague, the chairman of Appropriations Committee, is now on the floor. I ask the Senator if he is familiar with a similar situation that occurred in Lead, SD.

Mr. HATFIELD. No, I am not familiar with the situation. Could the Senator from South Dakota please explain.

Mr. PRESSLER. I thank the Senator from Oregon for inquiring.

Last May, a slow moving landslide damaged homes, businesses, and infrastructure. This landslide was exacerbated by excessive precipitation. De-

spite a request by the governor of South Dakota and the urging of the State's Congressional delegation, FEMA recommended that the President deny South Dakota's relief request for the Lead landslide. According to FEMA, the landslide resulted from a preexisting condition and did not pose "an immediate threat to public health, safety, and improved property."

The Lead landslide forced the community's only grocery store, pharmacy, and discount store to close. Some of the stores were forced to relocate to the community hall and church basement.

Clearly, the people of Lead suffered a great deal. This isolated community has yet to reopen the only grocery store in the area. Although the Economic Development Administration has offered a grant to help mitigate the slide, the city will have to sacrifice vital repairs to streets, gas lines, and water lines.

By contrast, the residents of the La Conchita hillside in Ventura County will have access to expedited FEMA assistance. This lack of consistency concerns me.

I would like to verify with the Senator from Oregon that monies provided in H.R. 1158 will be used, in part, to assist the victims of this winter's storms in California. Is this correct?

Mr. HATFIELD. The Senator from South Dakota is correct. The bill, in its current form, provides \$1.9 billion to FEMA for disaster relief functions including expenses resulting from disasters in 39 States. Report language accompanying this bill acknowledges that these funds may be used to ensure unforeseen expenses associated with the recent disaster in California resulting from winter storms.

Mr. PRESSLER. I also understand my concerns regarding the consistency of disaster declarations are shared by others. As Chairman of the Committee, I am sure the Senator from Oregon is very familiar with questions regarding disaster declaration criteria. Does the Senator from Oregon agree this is a common concern?

Mr. HATFIELD. Yes, I do agree with the senior Senator from South Dakota. As he well knows, the General Accounting Office, the Congressional Research Service, and the Congressional Budget Office recently released a comprehensive study of the entire relief process.

Mr. PRESSLER. Will the distinguished Senator from Oregon agree that it is imperative that FEMA apply its declaration criteria consistently, regardless of where the disaster is taking place?

Mr. HATFIELD. I could not agree more with my friend from South Dakota. Consistency in the disaster declaration process should be a reasonable expectation of all Americans.

Mr. PRESSLER. I think it is clear, Mr. President, that FEMA needs to take a close look at its current declaration policies.

The similarities surrounding the landslides in Lead and Ventura County are striking. For the residents of Ventura County, FEMA's response is reassuring. For the people of Lead, the response from FEMA is disconcerting. I must stress a point I have made on this very floor in the past: Disasters occurring in isolated rural areas do not seem to capture the attention of the national media, Federal agencies, or the President. Lead, SD, does not compare to Southern California glamour, and it certainly is not near a major media outlet.

However, as we all know, the size of a community or its media outlets should not dictate whether or not Federal relief is granted or how fast the assistance gets to those in need.

I believe the time has come for FEMA take a close look at its policies. In the meantime, I have asked GAO to examine FEMA's responsiveness to urban and rural disasters. I hope Congress will be able to maintain an oversight role. If there is an inconsistency we should not hesitate to consider legislation to ensure emergency assistance is provided consistently and judiciously.

In fact, I believe it would be appropriate for the conferees of this bill to include language in the accompanying report to direct FEMA to report to Congress on how it found that disaster assistance could be provided in response to the identified preexisting condition in Ventura County, but came to a different conclusion with the preexisting condition in Lead. I believe this instruction is an appropriate first step in what I hope will be a comprehensive review by FEMA of its current declaration policies and criteria.

Would the distinguished chairman of the committee agree that this review is necessary?

Mr. HATFIELD. I agree with the Senator from South Dakota that a review of the disaster declaration process may be appropriate. His concerns have merit. The people of Lead, SD, deserve to be assured that they are being treated fairly by the federal government. The Senator from South Dakota is to be commended for his diligent attention to the needs of his constituents. The Senator can be assured I will deliver this message to the conferees and will do my best to include a directive to FEMA regarding its declaration policies and criteria in the conference report to this bill.

Mr. PRESSLER. I thank my good friend the Senator from Oregon and thank him for his leadership. I yield the floor.

HEALTH CARE FINANCING RESEARCH AND DEMO PROJECTS

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I would like to clarify the situation with respect to funding of research and demonstration projects by the Health Care Financing Administration. The Senate recommendation calls for a rescission of \$11 million, which would reduce fiscal year appropriations to \$45.1 million

for research and demonstration projects. This is an increase of nearly \$2 million over the amount needed to fund continuations of on-going activities, so that even if the entire Senate rescission is enacted into law, the Health Care Financing Administration should be able to fund about \$2 million of new projects. I would ask Senator SPECTER, the chairman of the Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee, is that his understanding.

Mr. SPECTER. Yes, based on information supplied to me by the Department of Health and Human Services, there would still be about \$2 million available for new research and demonstration projects by the Health Care Financing Administration, even after the Senate recommended rescission.

ESSENTIAL AIR SERVICE

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, I am very concerned about a section in chapter IX of this legislation that in my view could have an adverse impact on the future of the Essential Air Service (EAS) Program. Specifically, I am very concerned about the language affecting "Payments to Air Carriers," otherwise referred to as EAS subsidies.

I see the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee on the floor. Would the chairman be willing to enter into a short colloquy on this issue and explain the intent of this section of the bill?

Mr. HATFIELD. Certainly. I understand the chairman of the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation has always supported EAS. Therefore, I would be pleased to explain the intent of these provisions and answer any questions posed by the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. PRESSLER. I thank my friend from Oregon. First, I understand this legislation would rescind \$5.3 million in "Payments to Air Carriers." What is the impact of this rescission?

Mr. HATFIELD. This rescission should have no real impact on the program. The Appropriations Committee was informed sufficient funding would remain available to continue the EAS program through the end of this fiscal year. In other words, all communities currently provided air service with EAS assistance will continue to be served through this fiscal year.

Mr. PRESSLER. I understand about 79 cities rely on EAS to remain linked to the national air transportation system. I am pleased the chairman of the Appropriations Committee will continue to uphold our commitment to these small communities.

Now, as my friend from Oregon knows, there are EAS agreements in at least 13 States that will expire before September 30 of this year. The committee amendment to the bill before us includes a provision to prohibit the Secretary of the Department of Transportation [DOT] from entering into any new EAS agreements beyond September 30, 1995. I am concerned about the purpose of this restriction. In my

view, it implies congressional support for EAS ends September 30, 1995—the end of the current fiscal year. My support for EAS will not end on that date. Would the chairman explain the purpose of this specific provision?

Mr. HATFIELD. Yes. First, let me assure the Senator from South Dakota this provision should not be read by any Member of Congress as an attempt to jeopardize future congressional support for EAS. This provision applies only to fiscal year 1995. Further, as the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Transportation, I intend to work with my friend from South Dakota on an appropriate level of EAS funding for Fiscal Year 1996.

Mr. PRESSLER. I am very pleased to know my friend from Oregon does not view the provision in question as a threat to the future of EAS. However, I still have strong concerns about the language in this bill. Specifically, I remain concerned the most economic continuation of EAS may be hindered by this provision. Permit me to explain.

As my friend from Oregon knows, when an EAS agreement is about to expire, current law requires the Department of Transportation to invite and consider competing proposals from any interested air carriers. The objective of that policy is to maximize the carriers' incentives to be efficient, to control costs effectively and to develop demand in the EAS market. This process yields two primary benefits: subsidy burdens are minimized and service to the community is often enhanced. That process has served the EAS program very well.

As I mentioned, EAS agreements will expire in 13 states before September 30th. Several already have expired. The practical reality of the proposed restriction to limit contract commitments would result in very short contracts at much higher costs in order to continue air service to those 13 states for the remainder of this fiscal year.

I am concerned efficiencies will be jeopardized if the DOT is prohibited from entering into any agreements beyond September 30th. I do not believe new carriers would seek to serve any of these 13 states for such a limited time period. In turn, those EAS carriers serving the 13 states will almost assuredly demand higher subsidies if they are held into those markets through the end of the fiscal year.

Further, DOT already issues notification to carriers that subsidy payments under EAS agreements are subject to the availability of funds in future fiscal years. Therefore, EAS carriers already know their subsidies are contingent on the annual approval of the Congress.

In my view, competition could be eliminated by this provision. In turn, subsidy rates will go up. What is the view of the Chairman?

Mr. HATFIELD. This language simply forces the EAS office to have EAS contracts conform to the federal fiscal

year. The office has had almost twenty years to make this adjustment. When the Appropriations Committee tries to get data from this office it often does not comport to the fiscal year basis that the Committee must consider in its deliberations.

Mr. PRESSLER. As the Chairman knows, I am prepared to offer an amendment to strike all the language after the rescission provision. I am willing to modify my amendment to further ensure the future of EAS is not jeopardized. Would the Manager of the bill be willing to accept my amendment?

Mr. HATFIELD. I would be happy to accept the Senator's amendment which would strike lines 1 through 3 on page 42. As he knows, the language which was provided by the Department had the effect of totally canceling the EAS program which was not the Committee's intent.

Mr. PRESSLER. I thank the Chairman. I very much appreciate his support for EAS and his leadership on this overall legislation. I also thank him for his support of my amendment and urge its adoption.

COLLOQUY ON SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION FUNDING

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, when debate began on the House rescissions bill I intended to offer an amendment prohibiting the Smithsonian Institution from using appropriated funds to develop, plan, or build any new museum before congressional authorization had been obtained.

After speaking with the distinguished chairman of the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee, Senator GORTON, I chose to forgo proposing the amendment. Senator GORTON assured me that the Smithsonian has no intention of beginning any new museum without first seeking the appropriate authorization from Congress.

Mr. President, as a member of the Senate Rules Committee, which is the authorizing committee with jurisdiction over the Smithsonian, I have seen the Smithsonian initiate a new project without congressional authorization and then come to Congress to authorize the project bemoaning the waste of funds already spent should the project not be authorized.

It is important to stress that any new project requesting taxpayer funds, should first go to the committee that has authorizing authority and then, if and only if, the project has been authorized should the request go to the Appropriations Committee for funding.

The Smithsonian must not ignore this process.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Carolina yield?

Mr. HELMS. I welcome comments from the able Senator from the State of Washington.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I appreciate the decision of the Senator from North Carolina, Senator HELMS, not to offer his amendment so we can speed up debate on this important bill.

The issue that Senator HELMS has brought to our attention is a serious one that deserves emphasis. I am confident through my conversations with the current Secretary of the Smithsonian, Mr. Heyman, that the Smithsonian intends properly to fulfill its obligations as steward of this public trust. Secretary Heyman agrees that no Federal appropriation will be used for projects that have not yet been authorized by Congress.

Mr. HELMS. Will the Senator yield for a point of clarification?

Mr. GORTON. I yield.

Mr. HELMS. Senator GORTON, I am not sure that all of our colleagues realize that 72 percent of Smithsonian operating funds are public, taxpayer funds.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, Senator HELMS is correct.

Therefore, it is important for the Smithsonian, like all other entities that receive taxpayer dollars, to take note of the budgetary constraints under which we are working. It is a time for fiscal responsibility and the careful allocation of increasingly scarce resources.

I have been assured in all conversations I have had with Secretary Heyman that he is aware of his institution's role and its attendant responsibilities. The Secretary has underscored the importance of prioritizing projects during his tenure.

Mr. HELMS. Will the distinguished subcommittee chairman yield for a moment?

Mr. GORTON. Certainly. I yield the floor to the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. HELMS. I sincerely appreciate the work the Senator from Washington has done in this area. The Senate Rules Committee has yet to meet with the current Secretary of the Smithsonian, Mr. Heyman, but I have been assured we will soon be given that opportunity. I will welcome that important hearing.

NATIONAL BIOLOGICAL SURVEY'S GREAT LAKES SCIENCE CENTER IN ANN ARBOR, MI

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I would like to engage the distinguished chairman of the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Interior and Related Agencies in a brief discussion regarding the impact of S. 617 on the National Biological Survey's Great Lakes Science Center in Ann Arbor, MI. The committee's report accompanying S. 617 recommends rescinding \$4.136 million less than was included in the House-passed rescission bill, H.R. 1158. That is almost exactly the amount appropriated in fiscal year 1995 to maintain operations at the Great Lakes Science Center. If the Senate approves the committee's recommended rescissions from funds already appropriated for NBS research, will this center remain in business in fiscal year 1995?

Mr. GORTON. Yes. While there is not a correlation between the funding levels rescinded by the House and by the Senate and the fiscal year 1995 appropriations level necessary for keeping

the Great Lakes Center open, it is the committee's intent to provide sufficient funds for NBS research so that the Great Lakes Center and other NBS centers can continue to operate in fiscal year 1995.

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, if the subcommittee chairman would answer an additional question, I would like to know whether he will continue to support funding to keep the Great Lakes Center open in fiscal year 1995, during the conference on S. 617 and H.R. 1158?

Mr. GORTON. I am aware that both of my colleagues from Michigan and from elsewhere in the Great Lakes region strongly support the work being done by the NBS Great Lakes Science Center. Hopefully, in conference, we can arrive at a compromise which will prevent cuts in the NBS research budget that would close or hamper operations at NBS centers and cooperative units.

Mr. ABRAHAM. I thank the Senator from Washington for his responsiveness to our concerns. As he may know, the Great Lakes Center conducts fishery stock assessments that are relied upon by States, tribes, and Canada. And effective management of fish stocks in the Great Lakes is important to the \$4 billion fishing industry in the region.

Mr. LEVIN. I would also like to thank my colleague from Washington for his assistance in this matter. As my colleague from Michigan has indicated, the Great Lakes Center has important duties. Besides the fishery stock management element of its activities, the center conducts invaluable scientific research on preventing, controlling and mitigating the impacts on nonindigenous species, such as the zebra mussel. And, the center is conducting essential studies on the sources and health effects of toxics in the Great Lakes ecosystem.

WIC

Mr. LEAHY. I am very worried that the House Republican welfare reform bill ultimately could throw millions of pregnant women, infants and children off the WIC program [the Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants and Children].

That part of the Contract with America guts strong competitive bidding requirements which have put millions of pregnant women, infants and children on the WIC program at no cost to taxpayers in recent years.

These are provisions which I and my Senate colleagues from both sides of the aisle included in child nutrition legislation in 1987 and in 1989 and which the Senate Appropriations Committee mandated in 1988 with strong bipartisan support.

I am concerned that this victory is eliminated by the House bill.

These efforts on the House side raise serious concerns about why House members want to provide millions of dollars to the four huge corporations that manufacture infant formula.

The details of this tragedy are set forth in articles in the Wall Street

Journal "Four Drug Firms Could Gain \$1 Billion Under GOP Nutrition-Program Revision," Hilary Stout, February 28, 1995; the New York Times "Formula for Tragedy," Bob Herbert Op Ed, March 25, 1995; and the Washington Post "Food Program Defender Becomes a Dismantler," David Maraniss and Michael Weisskopf, April 4, 1995.

WIC serves children at some of the most critical times of their lives. It feeds mothers when they are pregnant or breastfeeding. And it feeds children during their important, early development years.

WIC is a proven success story. A 1991 USDA study showed that for every WIC dollar spent on a pregnant woman, between \$2.98 and \$4.75 was saved in Medicaid costs for the newborn during the first 60 days after birth.

Thus competitive bidding saves taxpayers doubly—first, it puts 1.5 million more eligible women, infants and children on the program at no costs to taxpayers, and it saves millions in Medicaid and other Federal costs, in addition to saving millions of dollars in family, local and State medical costs.

The details of this system are easy to explain. At retail stores, WIC participants exchange special vouchers for infant formula. The recipients pay nothing; the State reimburses the store for the full retail cost of the formula. The infant formula manufacturers then rebate a portion of the retail price to the State. The States are required to use the rebates to serve more persons who are eligible for WIC.

Under current law States are required to use competitive bidding, with certain exceptions, to buy infant formula for the WIC program. USDA has calculated that this provision now saves \$1.1 billion a year and thus puts 1.5 million more women, infants and children on WIC at no extra cost to taxpayers.

That provision is eliminated by the Contract with America. That Contract should be renamed the "Contract to Increase Profits of Drug Companies."

That part of the Contract is a sham. It contains an extremely weak cost containment provision which will allow infant formula manufacturers to make a killing off the WIC program while allowing them to pretend to help WIC.

It will let drug giants donate small amounts of formula to State WIC programs, in front of their cameras, while making hundreds of millions of dollars in increased profits.

How have they been able to get this done in this Republican Congress? The Washington Post article that I referred to earlier, "Food Program Defender Becomes a Dismantler," explains the influence of large corporations on the House. A short history lesson is in order.

Some years ago these drug giants hired the former Republican Ranking Member of the House Agriculture Committee and a former Republican Assistant Secretary of USDA who was in

charge of WIC to fight competitive bidding at the State level.

Unfortunately, actions of the infant formula and infant cereals manufacturers have made such mandatory competitive bidding language necessary and demonstrate why the House bill will be an invitation to drug companies and cereal companies to siphon millions out of WIC.

As reported in Senate Hearing 101-979 ("Competitive Issues in Infant Formula Pricing," May 29, 1990) efforts were made by two major manufacturers Ross Laboratories—a division of Abbott Laboratories—and Mead-Johnson—a division of Bristol-Myers Squibb—to prevent individual States from using competitive bidding procedures. In 1985 three States—Tennessee, Oregon and South Carolina—announced plans to institute a competitive bidding system for the purchase of infant formula for WIC.

A group called the Infant Formula Council, an association of formula manufacturers, immediately opposed these cost containment ideas. The IFC sent letters to USDA and State officials opposing the plans and testified against this approach.

The Council retained a Washington law firm to raise legal concerns with such attempts by States to buy formula more cheaply. The IFC argued that State efforts to buy formula through competitive bidding would disrupt commercial channels of distribution of infant formula.

Tennessee went ahead anyway and set a deadline for bids from the companies to supply formula to WIC participants. However, not a single company submitted a bid.

That is why I, and many of my Senate colleagues, are very worried. Under the House Republican bill any State could fall prey to these same practices today as already discussed in the April 4, 1995, Washington Post article.

The former ranking Republican member of the House Agriculture Committee, Congressman Wampler, was hired to oppose these State voluntary efforts to use competitive bidding. Congressman Wampler was one of several well connected lobbyists hired by Mead Johnson and Ross Laboratories to persuade USDA either directly, or indirectly through Congressional intervention, to prevent States from moving ahead with plans to institute competitive bidding. Senate Hearing 101-979.

Mead-Johnson also hired the former Republican Assistant Secretary, Mary Jarrett, to help make sure that States did not use competitive bidding.

The new plan of attack by the companies was to only offer paltry cost containment deals to States. This would include giving States some free formula, or modest cash rebates, or free coupons instead of participating in competitive bidding.

I am very worried that smaller States such as my home State of Vermont could be easily victimized by the drug companies under the House bill.

The lawyers hired by the formula manufacturers then raised legal objections at the State and Federal level to competitive bidding. They also tried to convince States not to use competitive bidding but to instead offer States formula at discounted prices under a system then called open bidding which is fully described in that report.

A full description of the efforts of Republican lobbyists and the drug companies to promote cost containment instead of competitive bidding is detailed in Joint Hearing Report 102-135—Pricing and Promotion of Infant Formula, March 14, 1991.

Also, on March 6, 1990, Mead-Johnson sent letters to the other formula manufacturers advising them that Mead would only provide a 75 cent rebate for each can of formula purchased through WIC. Ross Laboratories and Wyeth-Ayerst Laboratories—a division of American Home Products Corporation—followed suit and put in much lower rebate bids at or around 75 cents.

During the next 8 months, Mead submitted 75 cent rebate bids to 12 different States. In several States, Ross and Wyeth followed Mead's lead. Ross bid 75 cents 9 times, and 75.7 cents once.

When one company bids a rebate of \$0.75 and soon after another bids \$0.757, as Mead and Ross did in Wisconsin and Montana in early 1990, it does not take a genius to see how this could frustrate competitive bidding.

A very unusual development also took place which tipped off Federal investigators with the Federal Trade Commission. The same companies offered a better bid under what was called an open market system—whereby all companies matching a discounted price could sell formula to WIC in that State.

This higher rebate bid of \$1.00 made no economic sense since the companies would have made more money off the exclusive competitive bid of 75 cents rather than the open market bid. This apparently was done to discourage states from using competitive bidding since it signalled states that the companies would bid \$1.00 in an open market setting but only around 75 cents for a competitive bidding system. The chronology of infant formula rebate bids for 1990 shows this point.

I asked the FTC to investigate allegations of price fixing and bid rigging in the WIC program and the efforts to discourage states from using the best system for purchasing infant formula. The Federal Trade Commission found merit to the charges and filed actions against the three companies. Also, several States filed actions against formula companies for anti-trade activities which have been well detailed in the press.

In June, 1992, the Federal Trade Commission found that three pharmaceutical companies tried to fix prices of infant formula they supply to the WIC program.

The FTC also concluded that competition was reduced because Mead Johnson announced in advance the amounts to be submitted in sealed bids to provide formula to the WIC program. Also, it was alleged by the FTC that Mead Johnson sought to limit advertising to the public and provided information to competitors signalling bidding preferences.

Two of the drug companies consented to having a Federal court issue relief against them. The companies—Mead Johnson and American Home Products—were ordered to provide formula to the WIC program free of charge as partial restitution.

The Center for Budget and Policy Priorities analyzed the harm to States from the advance price signaling in 1990. It concluded that after the Mead-Johnson letter announcing what it would bid in the future that States were harmed by over \$14 million by increases in annual infant formula costs including the following: Indiana, \$3.7 million cost increase; Minnesota, \$1,811,000 increase; Mississippi, \$1.7 million increase; Oklahoma, \$1.4 million increase; Kentucky, \$868,000 increase; Oregon, \$867,000 increase; Colorado, \$820,000 increase; West Virginia, \$650,000 increase; Iowa, \$539,000 increase; and Montana, with a \$324,000 cost increase.

I am very worried, as are many of my Senate colleagues, that allowing these companies the opportunity to take more than one million participants off the program so the drug companies can make more profits is outrageous. The fact that the House cut \$25 million out of the WIC budget for fiscal year 1995 also raises some concern. We will work to see that no one is taken off the WIC rolls in fiscal year 1995 because of funding limitations.

Senator BUMPERS also took the lead in supporting and defending these competitive bidding requirements. What are the views of the Senator from Arkansas on this matter?

Mr. BUMPERS. I am also worried and concerned about the provisions in the House bill that eliminate the current WIC competitive bidding requirements. I have supported these efforts right from the beginning and will strongly oppose efforts to eliminate competitive bidding.

I share Senator LEAHY's concern that the new plan of attack by the companies will be to only offer paltry cost containment deals to States. This would include giving States some free formula, or modest cash rebates, or free coupons instead of participating in competitive bidding. This could mean that millions of infants, women and children would be forced off WIC.

Senator PRYOR has been a leader regarding child nutrition programs and I would like his views on this issue.

Mr. PRYOR. As I said at an Agriculture Committee hearing, I am also very troubled by the House efforts to cut child nutrition programs. The worst aspect of their bill relates to ef-

forts to give these drug companies the opportunity to increase their profits at a high cost to poor pregnant women and children.

The Senate reports show the efforts drug companies have exerted over the years to sell formula at a high cost to WIC. Since WIC is 100 percent federally funded, the Federal Government should insist that it get the best return on each dollar spent.

Competitive bidding, which is used by the Federal Government for much of its procurement, should be required as under current law. Clever efforts to hide profiteering under the cloak of weakened, so-called cost-containment measures, will hurt the WIC program in my State, and throughout the Nation. I know the drug companies may already be celebrating, but the Senate took the lead in the past in standing up to these corporate interests. I believe that despite all the money spent by the drug companies to influence opinion, the Senate will do the right thing.

Mr. DASCHLE. I fully agree with the views expressed by my fellow Democratic colleagues. We cannot give the WIC program to the drug companies and allow them to turn WIC into a formula for profit.

WIC is one of America's most effective child nutrition programs and I intend to fight any efforts of the House to repeal the WIC program. Senator HARKIN led the fight against the practices of one infant formula company that sold powdered formula to third-world countries. Low-income families would mix the formula with contaminated water and the formula would do more harm than good. I ask Senator HARKIN what are his views on competitive bidding?

Mr. HARKIN. I was very proud of my role in leading the fight against companies that tried to push formula in the third-world. While I am a very strong supporter of breastfeeding I recognize the formula does play an important role in the WIC program.

I agree fully with the remarks that Senator LEAHY has made about the importance of competitive bidding for WIC infant formula, and the comments of my colleagues on the subject, and I commend Senator LEAHY for his work on this issue as Chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry and now as ranking member.

To get the best deal for taxpayers I believe it is essential that we require that competitive bidding be used for WIC infant formula so that we can ensure that the States are not subjected to the kinds of pressure tactics to eliminate competitive bidding that have been so thoroughly documented. We owe it to taxpayers and to over a million and a half additional people who are served each month with the savings from competitive bidding. I do not want this provision watered down so that companies can increase their profit margins at the expense of WIC participants and taxpayers.

I have had a long involvement in the efforts to implement competitive bid-

ding for WIC infant formula. As Chairman of the Subcommittee on Nutrition and Investigations, I worked to include the provision in the 1987 Commodity Distribution Reform Act that allowed States to keep a portion of savings they achieved through competitive bidding in order to cover the increased administrative expenses of bringing additional participants into WIC.

Without that provision, the States could not have used the savings from WIC cost containment to serve more people in the WIC program. Unbelievably, the Republican Deputy Secretary of Agriculture wrote a letter to Chairman LEAHY officially opposing that provision in the bill.

I also requested the study by the General Accounting Office that was issued in October of 1987 demonstrating the savings that could be achieved through competitive bidding for infant formula.

And in 1989, as Chairman of the Nutrition and Investigations Subcommittee, I introduced the Child Nutrition and WIC Reauthorization Act of 1989, which included the provision requiring the use of competitive bidding or equally effective cost containment measures for WIC infant formula. Again, it was my privilege to work with Senator LEAHY, as Chairman of the Agriculture Committee, in getting this provision enacted into law.

The benefits of competitive bidding are simply too large to give up. The national benefits have already been described. In Iowa, as of late last year our State was gaining approximately \$630,000 a month for its WIC program through infant formula rebates, which allows approximately 12,000 additional Iowa women, infants and children to be served each month without increasing spending.

WIC is one of our Nation's most successful and cost-effective efforts. Competitive bidding makes WIC remarkably more cost-effective. We hear a lot about the importance of letting States have more freedom in administering programs. WIC already involves a partnership between the Federal Government and the States—it is already administered by the States, but it is funded entirely with Federal money. This proposal to do away with the competitive bidding requirement stands the idea of State flexibility on its head. It basically says that if the States want to squander federal taxpayer dollars by lining the pockets of the infant formula companies, that is just fine, have at it.

All I can say is that we have made too much progress and there is far too much at stake for this Senator to stand by and watch a proven and practical tool like competitive bidding be thrown out the window for the sake of some half-baked, radical theory. Not without a fight, not without a huge fight.

Finally, I am also concerned, as are my colleagues, about the ramifications of the \$35 million cut in WIC in this rescissions bill. The Congress should be fully funding WIC as per the President's proposals and should be very cautious about cutting the funding available for carrying out WIC efforts in the States. I too will work to see that no one is taken off the WIC rolls in fiscal year 1995 because of funding limitations.

I understand Senator BOXER also has concerns about the WIC program.

Mrs. BOXER. I also am very concerned about the Contract With America and how it will seriously hurt the WIC program. I am very proud to support the WIC program, and it is important to ensure that the competitive bidding process stays in place so that the largest number of women and children possible can be effectively served by this enormously successful program.

STUDENT AID

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, students on college campuses throughout Vermont have mobilized against cuts in student aid. The strong opposition around the country to these cuts has prevented most student aid programs from being included in the rescission bill we are debating today. The next step will be to make sure that students do not get short-changed in next year's budget.

On Monday, I had the pleasure of meeting with 19 exceptional college students in my office in Burlington, Vermont. These students: John Boyle of Landmark College; Stephen O'Keefe and Sean Brown of Southern Vermont College; Terri Taylor of Lyndon State College; Eric Sorenberger and Marlene Rye of Sterling College; Cecily Muller of Woodbury College; Beth McDermott of the University of Vermont; Alison Maling of Trinity College; Courtney Ryan of St. Michael's College; Kevin Canney of Burlington College; Sue Jean Murray of Champlain College; Theresa Morris of Vermont Technical College; John Wyrock and Laura Whitney of Green Mountain College; Jeff Albertson of Middlebury College; and Darryl Danaher, Ryan Carter and Matthew Thornton of Norwich University shared with me how cuts in student aid would affect them and other Vermont students.

One student is the youngest of nine children and is holding two work study jobs. Another is a mother of two and on welfare. Her daughter also is in college. Another is the third child in her family to go to school. Her mother went back to school to get a better job to help pay her children's student loans. Another is the mother of four who had to leave an abusive marriage. She relies on work study to help her stay in school. She also will have loans to pay for her daughter's education. Another is returning to school after having to change her occupation due to major back surgery.

I could go on and on about what these students are going through to earn their college degree.

These students are working hard to learn. Now, some Members of Congress would like to pull the rug out from under them by cutting student aid.

Earlier this week, the House Economic and Educational Opportunities Chairman confirmed that Republicans are considering eliminating the in-school interest subsidy on Stafford college loans.

If House Republicans are successful, 20,000 Vermont students will be paying more for college. Individual student debt will increase by 15 to 50 percent, depending on the length of time spent in school. An undergraduate student who borrows the maximum amount for a four year college could owe an additional \$3,407 in interest. This is an increase of about 20 percent, on top of debt that already is tough to manage.

There also has been talk about eliminating campus-based aid including Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grants, Perkins loans, and the work-study programs. Eliminating these need-based programs would cause hardship for students at 2-year and 4-year colleges throughout the country. A student who receives an aid package that includes average awards from all three programs would stand to lose \$3,152.

Increasing the financial burden to students and their families will discourage many students from attending college or enrolling in vocational or graduate programs.

As we encourage people, both young and old, to pursue higher education, we need to help them achieve this by providing realistic funding options.

These students are our future. All of us know just how difficult it is to pay for a college education these days. It is important that these students and their families do not see the dream of higher education slip beyond their grasp.

Decisions to cut student aid programs are based solely on short-sighted politics.

I am concerned that the debate over next year's budget is going to occur over the summer when many students are not on campus. I hope they will continue to work together to speak out against cuts in student aid.

RESTORATION OF DEFENSE CLEANUP FUNDS

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, I rise today in support of restoring \$104.2 million to the Department of Defense accounts that are used to fund the cleanup and redevelop of closing military bases. These funds were authorized and appropriated by Congress last year and they now are subject to a possible rescission.

Mr. President, less than a month ago the Secretary of Defense announced the 1995 hit list of military base closings. This list recommended closing 25 major bases. Communities with bases on this list are currently working to convince the independent Base Closure Commission to remove their hometown bases from the list and to spare them the economic trauma of a base closing.

Unfortunately, many of these communities will be unsuccessful in their efforts to save the base. In the first three base closure rounds, in 1988, 1991, and 1993, the Commission approved the closing of approximately 85 percent of the recommended bases.

These first three base closure rounds produced the closing of 75 major military installations and over 200 smaller installations nationwide. Each of these communities are now focusing on beating swords into plowshares. And to its credit, the U.S. military is trying to do its part to quickly cleanup these bases and prepare them for civilian use.

Mr. President, many have argued in the past that the federal government should not help beat swords into plowshares—that we do not have a responsibility to help the workers and communities that proudly supported our bases for decades. However, we can not and must not turn a cold shoulder to those who helped us win the cold war.

To be certain, base closings hurt. Communities that lose a base lose much more than just the daily sights and sounds of the military's presence. They lose the heart and soul of their local economy. In many cases, the military is the largest employer in the region. As my colleagues know, closing military bases causes an immediate economic trauma in these communities.

But some good news is beginning to arise in a few of the towns that lost bases in the early rounds. Lost military jobs are slowly being replaced by civilian employment. The private sector is moving in and jobs are being created at many old bases.

The local communities that are experiencing an economic revival have told us that their successful efforts to beat swords to plowshares were made possible only because the federal government, specifically the U.S. military, decided to become a partner in this worthy effort.

In helping communities rebound, the military services are focused on quickly cleaning up contaminated portions of the closing bases so private sector businesses can move in and begin creating jobs.

In order to quickly prepare closing bases for redevelopment, the DOD's base closure accounts, or BRAC accounts, must be fully funded.

It would be shortsighted to rescind funds for closing bases, especially given that the Base Closure Commission is currently preparing to add more bases to the closure list.

Cutting funds from the DOD base closure account will slow down the process of returning these bases back to the communities. By doing so, we would substantially damage the economic development efforts of base closure communities nationwide.

I urge my colleagues in the Senate, especially those on the Senate Appropriations Committee, to restore \$104.2 million to the DOD BRAC accounts.

AMENDMENT NO. 577

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, if there had been a rollcall vote on the Dole-Daschle amendment, I would have voted "no." As my colleagues know, I support many, if not all, of the programs that would benefit from the funding restorations of the amendment. They are worthwhile, meritorious programs that address important national needs.

But as I said at the outset of this debate, Mr. President, many of the Appropriations Committee's recommended rescissions were reductions in the rate of funding increases, not reductions in actual funding below the previous year's level. I see no reason to add more money now to simply increase the increase. The Appropriations Committee made a considered judgment on these matters, and we found our recommended rescissions to be reasonable. Further, we found them to be urgently needed for the task of deficit reduction.

On that point, Mr. President, I believe this amendment is a serious mistake. We do not have CBO scoring of this amendment as yet, but it would appear to me that the recommended "offsets" of this amendment reduce significant amounts of budget authority but very little in outlays. The reductions are primarily drawn from accounts with annual outlay rates as low as 1 percent, while the funding restorations occur in accounts with outlay rates as high as 80 percent. In short, Mr. President, it appears to me that this amendment may actually increase the deficit. The bill that I brought to the floor on behalf of the Appropriations Committee was a first step in the long march toward a balanced budget. This amendment is a step backward.

FUNDING FOR ACIR'S MANDATES STUDIES

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I rise to take note of an aspect of the managers' amendment to H.R. 1158, the supplemental appropriations and rescissions bill.

As my colleagues know, I helped write the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995, which just became law. This law passed the Senate on January 27 by an 86-10 vote. Part of this law requires the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations to conduct studies on unfunded mandates issues. The Senate passed my amendment giving these studies to ACIR by a vote of 88-0.

The law requires ACIR to make recommendations to the President and Congress about simplifying, consolidating, suspending or terminating federal mandates. It also requires ACIR to examine the measurement and definition issues involved in calculating the costs and benefits of unfunded federal mandates.

The law requires ACIR to do these studies very quickly. It must issue pro-

posed and final criteria for its studies, hold hearings, and publish a preliminary and a final report, all by March 22, 1995. The conferees on the mandates bill recognized that ACIR needed further funding in this fiscal year in order to do the studies. The conferees therefore authorized an appropriation of \$500,000 for fiscal year 1995.

The managers' amendment contains a provision that would appropriate this money. I am glad that the senior Senators from Oregon and West Virginia, Senators HATFIELD and BYRD, have funded the mandate on ACIR.

I would like to thank them for accommodating the Senator from Idaho, Senator KEMPTHORNE, and the Senator from Florida, Senator GRAHAM, and myself on this issue. And I look forward to helping ACIR carry out this mission.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I am supporting the Dole-Daschle compromise and the final passage of the supplemental appropriations and rescissions bill because I believe, on balance, the bill does take a significant step towards fiscal control and economy in government.

I am particularly pleased that the compromise restores nearly a billion dollars in House rescissions that would have jeopardized programs that benefit children and education.

Head Start, Title I Education, impact aid, WIC, Goals 2000, School to Work and Drug Free Schools are all programs that constitute investments in our national future, and restoration of funding for them lends balance and merit to the bill.

I am very pleased that the Senate bill restores funding for the LIHEAP program and housing modernization, two programs that are important to my State.

And finally I would note that the Senate bill would restore more than half of what the House bill would cut from our foreign aid programs—not a perfect outcome, but certainly far preferable to the House version.

Mr. President, none of us are going to be completely satisfied with the painful compromises that must be made in the current season of downsizing of government. But this bill does what had to be done with less pain than might otherwise have been inflicted. I commend the managers and give the bill my support.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I am pleased to commend the majority leader, Senator DOLE, and the Democratic leader, Senator DASCHLE, for the successful completion of the managers' rescission amendment package to H.R. 1158, the fiscal year 1995 supplemental appropriations bill for disaster assistance and rescissions. I am particularly gratified that the leadership has steadfastly retained, through a myriad of negotiations, the restoration of section 8002 of the Federal Impact Aid Program.

With funding of only \$16.29 million, nearly 200 school districts directly ben-

efit from section 8002 payments in lieu of taxes for Federal properties. As federally owned lands, these properties are tax-exempt and contribute nothing to local tax revenues. These monies are made available under strict criteria to help compensate local school districts for revenues they might otherwise be receiving.

The impact aid section 8002 program has been authorized since the inception of impact aid in 1950. For 45 years, the Congress has recognized its responsibilities to compensate local schools for tax-exempt Federal personnel and properties.

Furthermore, the entire impact aid program was just reauthorized last year as a part of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. This is no time to retreat from our longstanding commitment which is so vital to federally impacted school districts.

I am supporting that impact aid restoration because the York County School Division in the historic Hampton Roads region of Virginia is the largest recipient of section 8002 funding in the Nation. I commend the York County School Division finance director, Mr. Dennis Jarrett, as well as superintendent Steven Staples for their careful work in bringing this urgent matter to my attention.

This year alone, more than \$1 million of the York County School District budget is at risk because of the proposed rescission. I am confident that my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee had no intention for the budget cutting axe to fall so heavily on only one of some 200 school districts.

The restoration of the \$16.29 million for impact aid will symbolize our support of the communities across the Nation which house and serve the U.S. Armed Services and their families.

Mr. President, I thank the Chair and commend this small measure to the support of my colleagues.

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, I am pleased to rise today in support of the agreement offered today on H.R. 1158, the rescissions bill. The leadership can be commended for their hard work on this compromise. This rescissions bill has been a drawn-out and difficult process. But this hard-fought agreement represents good news for many South Dakotans: it contains my amendment that would restore funds for Section 8002 of the Impact Aid Program, otherwise known as Section 2. The inclusion of my amendment to save this important program is a significant reason why I offer my wholehearted support for this agreement.

The impact aid program is not aid in the traditional sense. It is called Impact Aid because the presence of the Federal Government is having an adverse impact on nearby school districts. The adverse impact is the loss of tax revenue to the schools, and the Impact Aid Program is designed to compensate schools for that lost tax base.

In short, impact aid is an ongoing Federal responsibility. Impact aid does

not represent extra dollars for special programs. Impact aid provides support payments for basic day-to-day operations. It is neither a wasteful nor ideologically driven program—these funds go directly to a school district's operating budget. Impact aid represents fairness—to the schools and the parents and children they serve.

Section 2 of the Impact Aid Program is the lifeblood of many schools across the Nation. This program provides support payments to school districts for Federal land. Across the country, schools in 27 States rely on Section 2 payments. It would be most unfair to federally impacted districts and the children they serve if the Federal Government opts to deny them both a tax base and Federal support.

If Section 2 payments had been terminated, the Pollock School district in northern South Dakota would have closed, forcing potentially displaced students to travel up to 50 miles in order to receive an education. Pollock and similarly situated school districts would have been forced into this drastic course of action because no other revenue options are available.

Mr. President, federally impacted schools already have taken their share of cuts. The Impact Aid Program suffered a \$70 million cut last year. If we were to add to this cut the elimination of Section 2 payments, federally impacted schools would be left without the assistance they had planned on to pay teachers, buy textbooks, or as in the case of Pollock, to even function.

Like my colleagues, I am committed to reducing wasteful government spending. My voting record consistently has been in favor of a balanced budget. I also appreciate fully the difficult nature of the Appropriations Committee's job this year. We are all in the difficult position of needing to cut bureaucracy and federal spending. However, our leadership can be commended for realizing where our priorities must lie.

Impact aid is a program that enjoys support on both sides of the aisle. However, I especially would like to thank my distinguished friends from New York and Virginia, Senators D'AMATO and WARNER, for their leadership on this issue. These Senators and others on both sides of the aisle were prepared to support my amendment to restore the Section 2 payments. It is because of this bipartisan commitment to education that the leadership has restored this important program. I appreciate their help and support.

I hope this bipartisan support for impact aid will send a clear signal to our colleagues and especially to the administration. Impact aid is vital to our schools and it should continue to be fully funded. It is my hope that we will not have to fight this battle again during the budget negotiations for fiscal year 1996. President Clinton has requested a \$109 million cut in the Impact Aid Program for next fiscal year. I hope it has been made clear that such a cut would be unacceptable.

I would be happy to work with my colleagues to demonstrate why impact aid is critical to so many school children. I also look forward to working with my colleagues on the budget and appropriations committees to maintain the vitality of the Impact Aid Program for many years to come.

RESTORE FUNDING FOR THE CDFI FUND

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. Mr. President, one of the provisions in the amendment the distinguished majority and minority leaders have offered, would partially restore funding for the Community Development Financial Institutions [CDFI] Fund. The full House and Senate Appropriations Committee have both rescinded \$124 million of the \$125 million appropriated for this bill in fiscal year 1995.

Although it is not clear when the Senate will have the opportunity to vote on this amendment, I want to take a few moments to discuss why the funding for the CDFI Fund is needed.

Clearly, the \$36 million included in the Daschle amendment is an insufficient amount compared to the \$125 million appropriated last year—but, this start up money will help the CDFI Fund get off the ground. The importance of this Fund is its profound affect on the lives of people who want to make their lives better and improve their neighborhoods.

The CDFI Fund is bipartisan initiative passed in the Riegle Community Development and Regulatory Improvement Act of 1994. I was proud to be a cosponsor, along with many of my colleagues, of this legislation.

The Fund will support and expand existing Community Development Banks and Financial Institutions [CDBFI] across the country. The CDFI Fund is based on the simple proposition—helping the private sector to help communities grow from the bottom up.

Over the last two decades, a diverse range of community development financial institutions have emerged to provide new opportunities for neglected communities. In urban, reservation-based and rural settings, more than 300 CDFIs are providing credit, investments and comprehensive development services. These institutions—working in 45 States—manage more than \$1 billion in primarily private sector capital. These institutions have loaned more than \$3 billion with a loan loss rates comparable to some of the best banks in this country.

Mr. President, across the country, many rural and urban communities are starved for affordable credit, capital and basic banking services. The lack of jobs is a critical issue for any community. The lack of jobs is also the crux of an important issue for the welfare reform debate that the Senate will soon be considering.

What the Fund is all about is creating jobs in communities that desperately needs jobs. What this amendment is all about is providing a very, very modest amount of Federal money to spur entrepreneurship, and assist

small and microbusinesses in low-income communities to help create those jobs.

Job creation is so important to the many critical issues that come before Congress. It is also the crux of the welfare reform debate now before Congress.

Almost everyone agrees that our welfare system needs major reform, and almost everyone agrees that welfare recipients who can work ought to be required to work. The question that remains is simple—where are those jobs supposed to come from?

The basic truth that must be faced is that there simply aren't enough jobs now in many communities where the poor are concentrated, are dropping. My own home town of Chicago illustrates the problem.

Between 1972 and 1990, the City of Chicago lost over 146,000 jobs. Between 1979 and 1990, the city lost over one-third of its manufacturing jobs. Over the same period, the central business district actually gained jobs over that period, which means that the impact of the declining job base fell most heavily on Chicago's neighborhoods, and particularly its poorest neighborhoods. In the decade of 1980's alone, the south and west side Chicago neighborhoods—where many of the City's low-income residents reside—lost over 82,000 jobs.

This results in a declining population in the city, and high unemployment rates for those who want to stay, or who can't leave. For residents in public housing in the inner cities, jobs are almost non-existent. Of the households in the Robert Taylor Homes—the country's largest public housing complex located on Chicago's southside—an approximate 4 percent report any wage income at all.

The fact of the matter is—there is not enough economic opportunity in poor communities. It's no secret that what is needed to create jobs in any community is capital. However, poor communities, simply do not have the access they need to our capital market. What this means is that prospective homebuyers, oftentimes have difficulty getting mortgage money. What it also means is that people who want to start businesses—or expand businesses—in poor communities where all too often cannot get access to the money they need. The creation of the CDFI FUND is a crucial first step in helping low-income communities help themselves.

The CDFI Fund will invest in community development banks and other community development financial institutions which have a primary mission of community development, lending and equity investment and loan counseling services in distressed, underserved communities.

This capital assistance will serve only as seed capital that must be matched by private funds. All types of new and existing CDFIs will be eligible for assistance, including community

development banks, credit unions, micro-enterprise and revolving loan funds, minority-owned banks and community development corporations.

One of the exciting aspects of the Fund is the Bank Enterprise program will catalyze new community lending and investment activities by conventional financial institutions—complementing community reinvestment efforts by lenders.

Mr. President, the Fund will have an extraordinary impact on many of this country's low-income neighborhoods. It will support financial and technical support for new community development banks—which will support thousands of new loans—which, in turn, can result in thousands of new full-time jobs in low-income communities.

I have seen first hand what an important role community development financial institutions can play in the economic development of distressed communities and provide jobs to those who have relied on public assistance.

South Shore Bank—the country's first community development bank in my home town of Chicago—has had a tremendous impact in the South Shore neighborhood of Chicago. Since 1973, the bank and its affiliated community development activities have invested \$450 million in its target communities, financing the rehabilitation of 15,000 housing units and hundreds of businesses. South Shore was once a rapidly-deteriorating, inner city community abandoned by conventional lenders. Today it is a stable community with access to a range of sources of conventional credit.

Another example is the Women's Self Employment Project in Chicago which has lent more than \$800,000 to low income women—many of whom relied on public assistance—to start and grow microenterprises. This successful program has a repayment rate of over 94 percent.

Mr. President, these are just two examples of how community development works. The list of success stories in community lending goes on and on: the Self-Help Credit Union in North Carolina; the Federation of Appalachian Housing Enterprises in North Carolina; The Coalition for Women's Economic Development in South Central Los Angeles.

Mr. President, as I said in my opening remarks, the \$36 million included in this amendment is clearly not enough for the investment that is needed in low-income communities now. But it is a start to help the institutions I referred to, any many others throughout the country. They will be able to expand their capacity through modest federal investments provided by the CDFI Fund.

It is important to point out that the Fund does have an experienced and knowledgeable transition team to begin setting up operations and programs. While the Fund cannot issue regulations or take applicants until the administrator is confirmed, this

team is making significant progress to ensure that the programs are up and running.

By using very little Federal money to leverage significant private dollars, the Fund's investments will build partnerships between banks, thrifts, credit unions, and CDFIs.

The results in every equity dollar invested in a community development bank or loan fund can leverage at least \$10 in new private capital for development lending.

Community Development Banks and Financial Institutions provide capital where it is critically needed—and jump start a local economy. The CDFI Fund will support these institutions and represents an essential part of what's needed to build and strengthen the economies in many urban, reservation-based and rural communities.

In closing, let me add that the CDFI Fund, is a very good step in the right direction in creating jobs. If the federal government is going to succeed in reforming welfare, we must start by creating jobs and economic growth in impoverished communities where they are needed most.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the list of success stories be printed in the RECORD.

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

In North Carolina, the Self-Credit Union and its affiliated Self-Help Ventures Fund made a \$50,000 loan in 1985 to a small, rural worker-owned sewing company threatened with closing because it could not obtain credit from its local banks. With Self-Help's technical assistance and a series of working capital loans, the business now employs 80 people, making it the second largest private employer in its county. By 1992, the company had almost tripled its sales, to \$1.8 million.

In Chicago, the Women's Self Employment Project set up an entrepreneurial training and lending program to enable women receiving public assistance and with little or no asset to start their own income-producing enterprises. Seventy percent of the 20 women participating in the pilot program in 1987 were able to move off public assistance permanently as a result of their business activities. An expanded program now includes 150 women. WSEP's three lending programs have lent more than \$500,000 to 350 low- and moderate-income women for micro business ventures.

In Central Appalachia, the Federation of Appalachian Housing Enterprises [FAHE] provides loans that make homeownership a reality for very low-income families, many of whom have previously lived in rented trailers without heat or running water. FAHE has lent \$3.2 million for more than 172 housing units, including loans to borrowers with incomes as low as \$5,000 a year.

The Coalition for Women's Economic Development in South Central Los Angeles operates a 12-week training program in Spanish and English, for low-income women seeking to operate their own enterprises.

Santa Cruz Community Credit Union in California, which has lent more than \$27 million to small businesses, non-profits and cooperatives, supplements its credit union lending with a non-profit housing development subsidiary, Seascape Senior Housing. Seascape developed and owns an 80 unit low-income housing project.

The Quitman County Federal Credit Union in Mississippi is located in one of the ten poorest counties in the United States. As a community development credit union, the credit union has been able to supplement the small savings of its 600 members with more than \$1 million in nonmember deposits, enabling the development of home improvement and minority small business lending programs.

For years, the Delaware Valley Community Loan Fund was one of the only lenders in Camden, New Jersey. Its successful lending has led to a 7 bank multimillion dollar loan pool for the disinvested area managed by the loan fund.

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, I understand that an agreement has been worked out between the two sides on this legislation, but I want to set the record straight on a few issues which I believe to be of particular importance.

The initiative in question is the Corporation for National and Community Service. In the last few days, several of our colleagues have come to the floor and, for one reason or another, discussed this initiative in a way which has deviated substantially from the facts. I want to provide information for the record to eliminate some of the misconceptions which may have been formed about National Service.

First, I would like all of us to be clear on the facts. Contrary to what we have heard on the Senate floor in the last week, AmeriCorps does not cost the taxpayer outrageous sums. Counting all costs, the average annual cost per AmeriCorps member is \$17,600. \$4,725 of that amount is an education award which is not given until after the year of service is complete.

Additionally, the program has benefited the efforts of many private organizations which depend on volunteers for their work. Many charitable organizations, from Habitat for Humanity to the Red Cross have resoundingly rebutted the argument that National Service injures the ethic of voluntarism in this country. These groups have often stated that the presence of AmeriCorps members has made their efforts to attract traditional volunteers even more effective.

Charitable organizations are not the only ones who have seen sufficient worth in the program to give it their vocal support. Many businesses also have seen the value of AmeriCorps as an investment and given it their own dollars to supplement those provided by the federal government. These private partners range from Alcoa to Xerox, with many others in between. I request unanimous consent that this information regarding the cost per AmeriCorps participant and the number of volunteers and business organizations supporting AmeriCorps be printed in the RECORD.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. NUNN. My second point is that National Service is successfully accomplishing its primary mission—performance of service. The anecdotal evidence

on this score is abundant. From helping clean up after last year's floods in the Midwest to immunizing 105,000 children in Texas, to building 60 homes for poor people in Americus, Georgia, these youngsters are performing real work that is needed by our communities. The independent research firm of Aguirre, International provides confirmation. They did a study of 52 randomly selected AmeriCorps sites across the country, and the findings from the study confirm that the achievements of this program are many and varied. I ask consent that the Aguirre International study be also printed in the RECORD.

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

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, my final point is that this project should not be a partisan issue. The debate on the original authorization was not marred by the misinformation and partisan rancor that we have seen during the last week. Indeed, the 1993 bill passed with the support of a number of Republicans in both Houses. I would hope that we could return the debate to that higher plane in the future. To that end, I would hope that my colleagues, whether they agree or disagree with the program, would take the time over the upcoming recess to visit an AmeriCorps site in their states. To my colleagues who are willing to make this visit, if you still have concerns about the program after you have made this good-faith effort to see it in action, that will be useful to an open, straightforward debate on the upcoming reauthorization. I believe that the minds of my colleagues will be changed when they see the results of this program.

In conclusion, I appreciate the indulgence of my colleagues on this matter, and I hope that we can continue the debate in an objective fashion. I am fully aware of the funding constraints which face our nation's government, but I am confident that the program will be judged valuable to our nation if judged on its true merits and true costs. I yield the floor.

EXHIBIT 1

AMERICORPS BUDGET AND MEMBERS

	1994	1995	1996
Budget	\$376,000,000	\$579,000,000	\$828,000,000
[HUD/VA]	[\$318,000,000]	[\$516,000,000]	[\$750,000,000]
Members	20,000	33,000	47,000
Average cost per Member	\$18,800	\$17,600	\$17,600

Average total cost per member by category

Health/child care 7%	(\$1,200)
Grantee operations, planning, evaluation 23%	(\$4,075)
State Commissions 3%	(\$450)
Americorps' overhead 5% ..	(\$850)
(Represents 1995 Costs)	
Education Award 27%	(\$4,725)
Stipend 35%	(\$6,200)
Total	\$17,600

EXHIBIT 2

AMERICORPS USA AT FIVE MONTHS

A SUMMARY OF ACCOMPLISHMENTS FROM 52 RANDOMLY SELECTED SITES

The following report aggregates and summarizes the bulk of the accomplishments of 1,654 AmeriCorps USA Members serving at 52 sites that were selected randomly from across the nation. Listed accomplishments represent the efforts of approximately 8% of AmeriCorps USA's operating sites during the first five months of operation—from September, 1994 through January, 1995.

The accomplishments are grouped within AmeriCorps USA's four issue areas: education, public safety, health and human needs, and environmental and neighborhood restoration. The list, while both long and diverse, is not exhaustive; not every accomplishment has been captured. Nevertheless, the list summarizes the major accomplishments of the selected sites.

EDUCATION

The AmeriCorps Members helped children and youth from impoverished urban and rural communities to succeed in school. They taught in classrooms, established new learning programs in and out of school, and prepared preschoolers for the demands of school. Specific accomplishments include the following:

Taught 1,430 and tutored 7,638 pre-school, elementary, and junior high school students in basic educational skills.

Conducted enriched learning programs and initiated new ones—such as computer-based reading instruction, peer tutoring, scientific experimentation, and programs for children with special needs—for 6,414 children.

Established after-school and vacation programs to reinforce the academic involvement of 4,656 children.

The AmeriCorps Members helped at-risk children succeed in school by assisting them and their families to develop their sense of civic and community responsibility and to become more stable, more self-sufficient, and more involved in the community. Specific accomplishments include the following:

Organized and supervised community service projects for 4,469 at-risk children and youth. Projects included neighborhood cleanups and providing food for elderly people.

Counseled, taught parenting skills, and/or provided problem solving assistance to 390 families, 183 teen parents, and the low-income families of 440 children at risk of failing in school.

Provide literacy or employment-related training for 694 adults.

Provided intensive educational support—including regular counseling—to 30 troubled teenagers living in group homes and 33 low-income children, including 22 homeless preschoolers.

PUBLIC SAFETY

The AmeriCorps Members started neighborhood safety programs, mobilized neighbors, and improved community/police relations, resulting in safer communities. Specific accomplishments include the following:

Escorted 8,500 children to school through safe corridors.

Started 258 neighborhood safety programs and patrolled 250 vacant buildings to prevent violence, drug-dealing and other illegal activities.

Initiated 2 programs to improve community/police relations, including assisting a police mobile unit.

The AmeriCorps Members worked to prevent violence in school by teaching mediation techniques, resulting in decreased incidence of violence and negative behavior. Specific accomplishments include the following:

Resolved 414 school conflicts that might otherwise have ended in violence or with students dropping out of school because of fear of violence.

Taught conflict resolution techniques to 8,119 school children.

Counseled and taught alternatives to violence to 1,350 potential or actual gang members and 54 parents of children at risk of becoming involved in gangs.

Initiated 3 programs to train school and community members to implement violence prevention activities.

Secured donated materials and created a memorial garden and mural in memory of 3 children slain in the streets.

The AmeriCorps Members worked to prevent violence and drug abuse in families and communities and provided direct assistance to victims of crime as well as referring them to needed services. Specific accomplishments include the following:

Conducted workshops for 220 at-risk individuals about family violence prevention.

Answered crisis hotline calls and made referrals for 878 victims of sexual and domestic violence.

Provided each of 470 victims of sexual and domestic violence with 30 days of counseling and assistance.

Counseled 35 elementary or high-school students in crisis as a result of rape, violence, or home difficulties.

Counseled 1,180 teenager about alcohol and drug abuse.

Conducted home visits about drug or alcohol abuse prevention with 120 community residents.

HEALTH AND HUMAN NEEDS

The AmeriCorps Members made independent living easier for disabled, elderly, or hospitalized individuals by providing direct support service and by recruiting and organizing community volunteers. Specific accomplishments include the following:

Helped 123 elderly persons, 50 visually impaired adults, and 9 visually impaired children live independently.

Provided job-related training, independent living assistance and/or medical referrals for 135 mentally ill or developmentally disabled persons.

Organized weekly social activities for 400 elderly nursing home residents.

Constructed wheel-chair accessible trails, ramps, or sidewalks at 3 parks, 5 low-income homes, and 4 public buildings.

Obtained donated materials, trained 58 volunteers, and repair the homes 296 elderly persons.

The AmeriCorps Members provided emergency medical services, as well as health training and education. Specific accomplishments include the following:

Trained 1,144 inner-city residents in CPR. Provided emergency medical services to over 1,500 people.

Screened 1,100 low-income children for lead toxicity and other health risks.

Provided health counseling, education, or referrals and transportation to 220 low-income families and over 5,000 individuals.

Disseminated health care information to 4,567 individuals.

Distributed 150 children's car seats to low-income families.

Conducted immunization screenings—immunizing 158 individuals and notifying 500 others of their families' need to be immunized.

Administered 301 HIV tests and counseled patients regarding results.

Conducted workshops and distributed information on AIDS and tuberculosis to over 7,000 people.

The AmeriCorps Members helped meet the basic needs of low-income and homeless people for food and shelter. They improved low-income housing, fed the hungry, and improved the methods of service referral and delivery. Specific accomplishments include the following:

Renovated 238 inner-city housing units and 99 rural homes; began renovation of 121 more.

Refurbished 2 homeless shelters and began to renovate 3 buildings—one for seniors, one for battered women, and one for the formerly homeless.

Distributed food to more than 16,625 low-income people and packed 7,000 dinners and 32,000 breakfasts for the hungry.

Found shelter for 400 homeless families, and sorted and distributed clothes to 350 homeless individuals.

Secured hospice housing for 27 people with AIDS and helped feed (on a weekly basis) 1,250 people who have AIDS or who are HIV positive.

Provided housing information or counseling to over 500 low-income and homeless families.

Secured donated furniture, repaired it, and delivered it to 300 newly-housed families.

ENVIRONMENTAL AND NEIGHBORHOOD RESTORATION

The AmeriCorps Members responded to emergencies, including post-disaster environmental restorations, and worked to improve emergency responses capacity in parks and public lands. Specific accomplishments include the following:

Inspected and repaired 87 small dams, protecting 200 farms.

Provided disaster recovery assistance to 350 land owners recovering from a flood; activities included sand and soil deposit mapping, advice on pasture and hayland management, watershed mapping, and computer simulations to plan floodplain management.

Fought 2 major forest fires and saved 1 national park road from washing out.

Joined at least 5 search and rescue efforts. The AmeriCorps Members restored and stabilized the natural environment and wildlife habitats. Specific accomplishments include the following:

Planted 212,500 trees.

Restored 320 acres of wild land areas by repairing fire and flood damage, re-planting to prevent erosion, and fencing off wetlands to prevent illegal dumping.

Restored or stabilized 27 miles of riverbed and stream banks to improve the habitat of salmon; fenced another 7 miles to keep cattle from destroying spawning grounds; repaired three aquaculture tanks with a capacity to rear 1,000,000 salmon fry per year.

Removed 2,000 lbs. of trash from an urban river.

Monitored water quality in 2 parkland areas.

Surveyed 5,700 acres of National Forest land as part of reforestation programs to monitor reforestation efforts; conducted biological inventories on 12,000 acres of wetland.

Built, restored, or maintained 311 campsites, 88 miles of parkland trails, 17 bridges, and 1 mile of forest service road.

Cleaned up storm debris and trash on 3 beaches, protected sand dunes on one beach, and built one wildlife observation platform and 3 duck blinds.

The AmeriCorps Members improved neighborhoods, parks, and recreation facilities by converting vacant lots, renovating buildings, repairing public facilities, and conducting recycling and conservation programs, resulting in a heightened sense of community ownership. Specific accomplishments include the following:

Renovated 11 community buildings, including an inner-city medical clinic, community centers, and public schools.

Converted 29 overgrown lots into green space; built 7 community gardens; planted trees along 30 city blocks.

Cleaned 27 miles of road, restored 1 community reservoir, removed illegally dumped garbage from one community; and unclogged more than 14,000 storm drains.

Created 4 playgrounds, designed 1 picnic area, and improved safety at 1 scenic overlook. Restored, repaired, or maintained 19 historical landmarks and a traditional tribal longhouse.

Completed 61 inner-city neighborhood clean-ups—including a city-wide graffiti removal.

Distributed 1,375 low flush toilets and 1,700 water conserving showerheads in low-income neighborhoods—along with over 1,400 water conservation guides.

Recycled 920 inefficient toilets and 1,120 inefficient showerheads.

AMERICORPS COMMUNITY PARTNERS

The following is a partial list of national and local volunteer, charitable and service organizations through which AmeriCorps is getting things done in over a thousand communities across the nation.

4-H, Albany Police Department, American Red Cross, Arctic Village Tribal Council, Arlington Police Department, ASPIRA, Audubon Society, Big Brothers/Big Sisters, Big Horn Police Department, Boy Scouts of America, Boys and Girls Clubs, Camp Fire Boys and Girls, Casper Police Department, Catholic Charities, Chambers of Commerce, City of Decatur of Police Department, Clearwater Police Department, Coalition of 100 Black Women.

Confederated Tribes and Bands of Yakima, Dallas Police Department, D.A.R.E., Ft. Worth Police Department, Girl Scouts of the USA, Girls, Inc., Goodwill Industries, Habitat For Humanity, Hart County Police Department, Head Start Programs, Humane Society, I Have a Dream Foundation, Independent Sector, Indianapolis Police Department, Jewish Family Services, Jubilee Housing, Junior League.

Kickapoo Tribe, Lincoln County Sheriffs Department, Lions Club, Literacy Volunteers of America, Knick Tribal Council, Meals on Wheels, Metropolitan Police Department of St. Louis, Mid-Atlantic Network of Youth and Family Services, Navajo Nations, National AIDS Fund, National Center for Family Literacy.

National Council of Churches of Christ in the USA, National Council of Educational Opportunity Associations, National Council of LaRaza, National Council of Non Profit Associations, National Endowment for the Arts, National Multiple Sclerosis Society, National Organization for Victim Assistance, Neighborhood Green Corps, New York University, NezPerce Tribe, Northeastern University, Ouzinkie Tribal Council, Parents Anonymous, Philadelphia Bar Association, Pinelas Sheriffs Department, Points of Light Foundation.

Pompano Beach Police, Public Allies, Public Education Fund Network, Rotary Club, Salvation Army, Seattle Police Department, Shoshone-Bannock Tribe, Sierra Club, St. Petersburg Police Department, Sunflower Girls, Teach for America, Tuntutulkia Traditional Council, United Cerebral Palsy, University of Texas, Austin, United Way of America.

Urban League, Visiting Nurses Association, Volunteer Centers, Volunteers of America, Westin County Sheriffs Department, YMCA of the USA, YWCA.

Dozens of colleges and universities, community health centers, police and sheriffs departments, and hundreds of elementary, junior and high schools.

AMERICORPS INVESTORS

The following is a partial list of corporate giving programs and corporate, independent and community foundations that are investing in community service organizations that are a part of the AmeriCorps National Service Network:

Alcoa, AlliedSignal, Allstate, Amelior Foundation, American Airlines, American Express, Ameritech, Anheuser-Busch, ARCO, Arizona Foundation, Arthur Anderson, Bank of Boston, Bank of New Hampshire, Bechtel, BellSouth, Booth Ferris Industries, Boston Foundation.

British Petroleum, Bullitt Foundation, Burnett-Tandy Foundation, Cabletron Systems, California Community Foundation, Capital Community Foundation, Capitol Cities/ABC, Carnegie Corporation of NY, Amon G. Carter Foundation, Chevron, Citizens Bank, Compaq, Cowell Foundation, Charles A. Dana Foundation.

Digital Equipment Corporation, Echoing Green Foundation, Enron, Entergy, Fannie Mae, First Deposit National Bank, Fleet Bank, Ford Foundation, The Gap, General Electric, General Mills.

Grand Rapids Foundation, Greater Cincinnati Foundation, GTE, E. & W. Haas Jr. Foundation, Hall Family Foundations, Healthsource, Hogg Foundation, The Home Depot, Houston Endowment, IBM, JCPenny, J.P. Morgan, James Irvine Foundation, Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, Johnson & Johnson, Kansas City Community Foundation.

Kauffman Foundation, W.K. Kellogg Foundation, Key Bank of NY, Knight Foundation, Luce Foundation, MacArthur Foundation, MBNA, McKesson, Meadows Foundation, Mellon Bank, R.K. Mellon Foundation, Microsoft.

Millipore, Mobil, Monsanto, Morgan Stanley, Charles S. Mott Foundation, NationsBank, NH Charitable Foundation, Nike, NYNEX, Packard Foundation, Panhandle Eastern.

Patagonia, Pew Charitable Trust, Philip Morris, PNC Bank, Polariod, Prince Charitable Trust, Proctor and Gamble, Provident Bank, Prudential Insurance, Reebok, RI Hospital Trust Bank, Winthrop Rockefeller Foundation, The Rouse Company, Safeco Insurance, Sallie Mae, Joseph E. Seagram & Sons, Shell Oil.

Skillman Foundation, Sony Corporation of America, Sprint, Steelcase, Surdna Foundation, Tenneco, Texaco, Timberland, Time Warner, Toyota, Union Pacific, United Way of America.

UPS, U.S. Health Corporation, Waste Management, Western Resources, Lola Wright Foundation, Xerox.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the Dole-Daschle amendment No. 577.

The amendment (No. 577) was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 420

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the Hatfield substitute.

The amendment (No. 420) was agreed to.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I will vote yes on final passage of this supplemental Appropriations/Rescission bill, but I do so with reservations.

This bill provides 6.7 billion dollars for disaster assistance, more than 70 percent of which will go to California earthquake and flood victims. This is

an urgent and necessary response to the heartbreaking disasters California has faced.

I regret that Republicans have played politics with disaster assistance—for the first time in history—by using it as a hook for their agenda to slash programs that benefit children, education, working families, and the poor.

If the Senate were considering the House passed version of this legislation, I would vote no, because that is a bad bill for both my State and my country.

But the Senate bill is different in two significant ways:

First, the Senate Appropriations Committee added back funds in critical education and housing programs.

Second, Senate Democrats were successful on the floor in restoring funds for Head Start, Child Nutrition, Safe and Drug Free Schools, Housing, and other programs that are so important to the well-being of our children.

So I will vote to send this bill to conference with the House. But I reserve the right to vote no on the conference agreement if it comes back looking like the mean-spirited House bill. I cannot support any bill that does not maintain funds for our children at the Senate-passed level or higher.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. President, the Senate is about to finish consideration of a Rescissions bill that reduces the Operation and Maintenance Account of the Bureau of Reclamation by \$10 million. This amount is identical to the sum rescinded by the House, and I support it. As the former Chairman and current ranking member of the Subcommittee with authorizing jurisdiction over the Bureau, I have seen opportunities for the Bureau of Reclamation to reduce spending. I have no doubt that this cut can be absorbed, given the streamlining that is now occurring within the Bureau.

I note, however, that the Senate has wisely avoided commenting on particular operations. This has two benefits. First, it gives the Bureau the flexibility to deal with this cut in the most effective and appropriate manner. It won't be easy to cut this account, given that the fiscal year is half over. The project managers need to be creative and do not need legislative hand-cuffs.

Second, the House report suggests that one way to balance this account is to stop a study of the San Joaquin River that was established in law through the Central Valley Project Improvement Act. This language is notably absent from the Senate report.

As the author of this landmark CVPIA law, I am surprised at the House report language. This San Joaquin study is specifically ordered in this public law and, in fact, has a statutory deadline for action by the Bureau. Clearly, this statute is unaffected by any Committee Report language, and the law remains binding on the Bureau.

Additionally, I am puzzled by this suggested target, since cutting the San

Joaquin River Comprehensive Plan, either directly or through report language if possible, would not save the taxpayer any money. Indeed, the study is not even funded out of the Bureau's Operating Account! The Plan was established in the statute and financed through a surcharge on the sales of water from the Central Valley Project. In fact, if these funds are not spent on this Plan, the law still requires that the full amount be spent on other fish and wildlife restoration efforts. There can be and will be no deficit reduction from stopping this Plan.

Mr. President, in summary, I'm pleased with the Senate action. Spending cuts will occur, as agreed with the House. And the San Joaquin study will continue, as specifically directed in public law. The restoration of the San Joaquin River would bring benefits throughout California. We need to know if this restoration can occur and how it would be achieved.

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, I will vote for this rescission bill because I believe it will greatly benefit the citizens of Michigan by reducing the burden of Government spending and deficits on the economy. Each dollar that Washington does not spend on Government programs means \$1 more than Americans can spend for their families.

While I did fight to restore funding for a few specific programs slated for rescission because of their critical importance to Michigan—such things as the Low-Income Heating Energy Assistance Program and the Center for Ecology Research and Training slated to be located in Bay City, MI—I do believe that this rescission package is a win for the people of Michigan because it is the first down-payment toward reducing the size and scope of Government.

Specifically, this bill will reduce Government spending by \$15 billion. That represents a reduction of 1 percent of the entire Federal budget of \$1.5 trillion this year—hardly a draconian reduction in Government spending as some special interest groups have claimed.

Nonetheless, these spending reductions are crucial to our Nation, and to Michigan in particular. This bill will help my State by reducing the deficit, freeing up economic resources for the economy, and job creation in particular. Moreover, American taxpayers send 25% of their paychecks to Washington.

Furthermore, it is clear that we need to take immediate action to reduce Government spending because projected deficits are getting larger, not smaller, under President Clinton's budget policies.

Contrary to conventional wisdom, President Clinton's budget policies have had almost nothing to do with the slight improvement in the size of the budget deficit that has occurred in recent years. According to the CATO Institute, almost all of the deficit reduction since 1992 is attributable to three

main factors: No. 1, the one-time sale of assets and properties acquired by the Federal Government during the savings and loan bailout of the late 1980's—which alone has accounted for about \$75 billion in deficit reduction in recent years; No. 2, reductions in defense spending resulting from the end of the cold war; and No. 3, the cyclical economic recovery that began well before President Clinton took the oath of office.

Federal spending continues to spiral out of control. Under President Clinton, the level of Federal spending as a share of the national income is about 23 percent, near historic levels. According to the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, unless we take action to halt the growth of Government spending, it will automatically rise from \$1.531 trillion this year to \$2.202 trillion by 2002.

Under the President's budget plan, deficit spending would continue to explode. The CBO reports that the annual deficit will rise from \$170 billion this year to over \$200 billion next year and to almost \$300 billion a year over the next 4 years. Under President Clinton's policies, \$1.4 trillion dollars will be added to the national debt, thereby increasing interest payments, crowding out private sector investment, and reducing the economic well-being of America's children.

I am particularly concerned about the budget crisis occurring in the Housing and Urban Development's subsidized housing program. The CBO projects that the future obligations to renew the expiring section 8 contracts will add \$20 billion to the budget by the year 2000. This \$15 billion rescission package would partially offset these added budget costs.

Mr. President, this rescission package is only a small example of the kind of reductions in the growth rate of Government spending that will be required to balance the budget. According to the CBO projections, if we simply limit annual spending increases to 2.9 percent between now and 2002, we can balance the budget. In other words, achieving a balanced budget requires not absolute cuts in Government spending, but rather reductions in the rate of growth of Government spending.

Mr. President, the best thing I can do for the citizens of Michigan is to reduce the burden of Government and let them keep more of what they earn. By reducing the growth rate of Government spending and cutting taxes, we can strengthen America's and Michigan's families, businesses, and voluntary organizations. This rescission bill is an important first step in achieving the electorate's desire for smaller Government. I yield the floor.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, with all the rhetoric spoken over the last few

days, some of us seem to have forgotten why we are here—to cut unnecessary spending. Yes, there will always be differences of opinion as to priorities, but the fundamental commitment to reassess every Federal program and reduce Federal expenditures must be paramount.

I am pleased the Democratic leader and I have reached agreement, supported by our colleagues, that will enable us to help keep our promise to the American people. In the amendment, a very limited number of programs which Members on both sides of the aisle support, have received smaller reductions in their rate of increase. At the same time, the amendment also contains a number of items that will result in additional savings being achieved. Most important to this Senator, overall the amendment will result in additional deficit reduction.

As a result of this amendment, the package we will send to the conference will contain approximately \$16 billion in savings. I repeat, \$16 billion—that's not over 2 years or 5 years, that's this year.

For all those who supported a balanced budget—rest assured we are committed to achieving that goal even if it means making some tough choices. Of course, the real hard decisions have yet to be made. And, we will not be deterred by the hue and cry of the last few days about all the so-called terrible things the Republicans have proposed. This bill is certainly progress, but we still have a long way to go. While I am pleased we were finally able to reach consensus—I caution everyone that the real hard choices are yet to come.

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

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

Mr. DOLE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, if I could have my colleagues' attention.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

The majority leader.

Mr. DOLE. It is my understanding there will be no requests for a vote on either side on the defense supplemental bill, no request for a vote on the contract board, the District of Columbia, no request for a record vote on child pornography, and the paperwork simplification conference report is done, and other wrap-up material with only minor changes in the Constitution.

But I just say for my colleagues, it will be our intention at 1 o'clock on Monday, April 24, to begin consideration of H.R. 956, the product liability bill, and following disposition of product liability it will be my intention to proceed to S. 652, the telecommuni-

cations bill. Votes could occur during Monday's session of the Senate but will not occur prior to the hour of 3 p.m. on Monday, April 24.

Mr. CHAFEE. How about tonight?

Mr. DOLE. This will be the last vote until hopefully April 24, after 3 p.m. There could be votes after 3 p.m. If we should decide in the interim there will be no votes, we will try to notify you the earliest possible time before you are in the air.

I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass? On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. FORD. I announce [Ms. MIKULSKI] as necessarily absent.

I further announce that if present and voting, [Ms. MIKULSKI] would vote "nay".

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

The result was announced—yeas 99, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall vote No. 132 Leg.]

YEAS—99

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

NOT VOTING—1

Mikulski

So the bill (H.R. 1158), as amended, was passed.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill passed, and I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the enrolling clerk, in making technical and clerical corrections to the bill, may insert all amendments that have been adopted to

the committee substitute at appropriate places in the Senate amendment to the House bill.

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

Mr. HATFIELD. I move that the Senate insist on its amendment, request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses, and the Chair be authorized to appoint conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer (Mr. ASHCROFT) appointed Mr. HATFIELD, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. SPECTER, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. GRAMM, Mr. BOND, Mr. GORTON, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. MACK, Mr. BURNS, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. GREGG, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BYRD, Mr. INOUE, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. JOHNSTON, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. BUMPERS, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. HARKIN, Mrs. MIKULSKI, Mr. REID, Mr. KERREY, Mr. KOHL, and Mrs. MURRAY.

APPOINTMENTS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 94-304, as amended by Public Law 99-7, appoints the following Senators to the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe: the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. LAUTENBERG], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. GRAHAM].

The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 99-151, appoints the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GRASSLEY] as a member and Chairman of the U.S. Senate Caucus on International Narcotics Control.

APPOINTMENTS BY THE PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, on behalf of the President pro tempore, pursuant to Public Law 96-388, as amended by Public Law 97-84, appoints the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GRASSLEY], vice the Senator from Ohio [Mr. METZENBAUM], to the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Council.

The Chair, on behalf of the President pro tempore, in accordance with Public Law 99-498, section 1505(a)(1)(B)(ii), appoints the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUE] to the Board of Trustees of the Institute of American Indian and Alaska Native Culture and Arts Development.

The Chair, on behalf of the President pro tempore, in accordance with Public Law 99-498, section 1505(a)(1)(B)(ii), appoints the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. DOMENICI] to the Board of Trustees of the Institute of American Indian and Alaska Native Culture and Arts Development.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there now be a