

Executive Committee of the M.I.T. Board of Trustees.

And despite her heavy responsibilities, Dr. Jackson puts aside time to help recruit more women and more African-Americans to the sciences.

Dr. Jackson has always blended her advanced scientific research with an eye toward practicality. She has researched subjects as esoteric as the electronic and optical properties of strained layer semiconductor superlattices. But she has also worked toward basic goals that you and I can understand—like economic development in the State of New Jersey.

I understand that President Clinton has said he would like Dr. Jackson to head the NRC after her confirmation and I enthusiastically support that decision.

I am confident that her scientific and management backgrounds have been ideal preparation for that leadership position.

Mr. President, I believe that Dr. Jackson's background has made her a unique, unparalleled nominee for this position. I urge my colleagues to vote for in support of this excellent nomination, and I yield the floor.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO REPORT

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the committees have between 10 a.m. and 3 p.m. on Tuesday, April 18, to file legislative or executive reported items.

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

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS AND RESCIS-SIONS ACT—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on H.R. 889 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 889) making emergency supplemental appropriations and rescissions to preserve and enhance the military readiness of the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1995, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses this report, signed by a majority of the conferees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the conference report.

(The conference report is printed in the House proceedings of the RECORD of April 6, 1995.)

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I want to strongly urge the Senate to adopt today the conference report on H.R. 889, the emergency Defense supplemental appropriations bill.

On Wednesday, the conferees completed work on this bill, which will ensure that the readiness, quality of life and pay for our Armed Forces will not be impacted by the costs of overseas peacekeeping and humanitarian missions.

As chairman of the Defense Subcommittee, there is no question in my mind that we must act on this bill prior to the recess.

In summary, this bill provides \$3.04 billion in new funding for the Department of Defense, and \$28.3 million for the Coast Guard, to pay for these contingency operations, and other emergency requirements.

For DOD, in addition to the contingency operations amounts, \$258 million is included to meet the increases in overseas personnel costs due to the decline in value of the dollar.

These amounts go directly to the men and women, and their families, stationed overseas, to defray the increased expenses they face because of this devaluation.

All new Defense spending in the bill is offset by rescission to DOD, defense related and foreign aid appropriations.

From available DOD funds, \$2.26 billion is rescinded. Also, \$200 million from function 050 nuclear facility funds, \$100 million from military construction funds, and \$120 million from foreign aid appropriations.

The conferees worked to ensure that no significant military program was damaged by these cuts. Most reductions come from savings in programs underway, or from reduced efforts in lower priority programs.

Some of these funds will need to be replaced in 1996, but will not reduce military readiness or capability this year.

The amount rescinded from DOD represents an increase of \$300 million over the levels adopted by the Senate.

These reductions were necessary to ensure that these new appropriations did not increase the deficit, thus hampering our ability to provide needed funds for 1996.

All the military services have identified the severe cuts in training and readiness that will result if this bill is not enacted early this month.

Navy fleet steaming days will be reduced. Flight training will be reduced. Ships will not undergo needed overhauls at shipyards, resulting in substantial layoffs.

Air Force flight training will be slashed by 25 percent. Aircraft will be parked on the ramp, because they will not receive necessary depot maintenance.

In short, we face a return to the hollow force that many of us remember from the 1970's. We cannot permit this.

In the 1970's, that hollow force was the result of the Congress not appropriating the funds needed for military readiness. This crisis is the result of the President diverting the funds provided by Congress for the military.

Let me make clear, the 1995 Defense appropriations bill provided the funds

needed to maintain military readiness and training for 1995.

During the last quarter of 1994, and the first quarter of 1995, the President used these funds to undertake the overseas missions in Kuwait, Korea, Bosnia, Iraq, Somalia, Cuba, and Haiti.

In no case did the President come to the Congress, to seek approval, and funding, for these missions.

The result was a \$2.5 billion diversion of readiness and personnel appropriations.

I want the Senate to know that the appropriations committees of the House and Senate were unanimous in their commitment that this circumstance should not happen again.

Included in the statement of the managers on the conference report is an explicit statement of our objections to the course followed by the administration. This bipartisan, bicameral statement reflects our views. I ask unanimous consent that this statement be inserted in the RECORD.

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

CONTINGENCY AND NONTRADITIONAL MISSIONS

The conferees express their deep concern over the process by which U.S. military forces are being deployed on major, large scale contingency operations. The conferees note that the Administration neither sought nor received advance approval of or funding for military operations from the Congress in support of peacekeeping and humanitarian missions. The missions involving Somalia, Rwanda, Haiti, and refugee relief in the Caribbean all mark significant departures from previous emergency deployments of American forces dealing with valid threats to the national security. The conferees strongly believe that military deployments in support of peacekeeping or humanitarian objectives both merit and require advance approval by the Congress.

This issue is of special concern to the conferees because of the effect these operations have had on the defense budgeting and planning process. There is no question but that the recent spate of "contingency" deployments, none of which was approved in advance by Congress nor budgeted for, have wreaked havoc upon the ability of the Department of Defense to maintain military readiness. These operations have led to substantial and repeated diversions of funds intended for training, equipment and property maintenance. From the Secretary of Defense to commanders in the field, there is universal acknowledgment that this practice has led to degradations in readiness.

A related issue involves the rapid increase in Defense Department participation in activities which under both law and tradition are the responsibility of other Federal departments. The principal example of this trend is the use of DoD funds, personnel, and facilities to deal with the issue of Cuban and Haitian refugees. The cost of these operations has been almost entirely borne by the Department of Defense, even though other Federal entities have long had primary responsibility for dealing with refugee and immigration issues and have, in the past, reimbursed the Department of Defense for such support in accordance with the Economy Act. At present, DoD is being forced to bear \$1 million per day in costs for these operations, out of funds intended to be used for

military operations, training, and readiness. The conferees believe DoD should not be forced to bear the cost of operations which are not its responsibility, especially when it results in a substantial diversion of funds provided by the Congress expressly for military activities.

These problems underline the need for the Executive Branch to seek congressional approval for unanticipated nontraditional military operations in advance. The conferees intend to address these issues in connection with the fiscal year 1996 appropriations process, in order to avoid the recurrence of situations such as those which created the need for the appropriations contained in this measure. The conferees strongly urge the Administration to provide detailed and timely proposals to assist in resolving these issues.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, there was no reluctance on the part of the conferees to meet the needs of our Armed Forces. This was accomplished in a fashion that is fully offset in new budget authority, and virtually offset in new outlays for 1995 from rescissions.

The Senate-passed version of this bill fully offset all new outlays. This conference agreement results in only \$4.3 million in additional outlays for fiscal year 1995, though it provides over \$3 billion in new spending.

I want to thank our chairman, Senator HATFIELD, and Senator BYRD for their leadership and commitment to move this bill forward prior to the recess.

In our first conference with the new House team, I want to report the exceptional efforts of the Defense Subcommittee chairman, BILL YOUNG, and the full committee chairman, BOB LIVINGSTON, to work with us to move this bill forward.

They drove a hard bargain of many of the differences between the two bills, but we were united on our commitment to meet the needs of the military services.

As I stated when this bill was presented to the Senate last month, the work of the Defense Subcommittee reflects the longstanding partnership between myself and Senator INOUE on defense matters.

His efforts were invaluable in seeking compromises with the House on matters of interest to the Senate, and I am indebted to him once again for his hard work and wise counsel.

Mr. President, I hope the Senate will act immediately to pass this conference report, and send this bill to the President.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I support adoption of this supplemental appropriation bill, H.R. 889, and compliment the distinguished chairman, Mr. HATFIELD, for his excellent work in putting together this conference report prior to the April break. It was a difficult task, but it was driven by the need to replenish vital funding for the readiness accounts of our armed services.

The conference agreement includes a total of over \$3 billion for these vital defense purposes. These accounts were seriously depleted in fiscal year 1995

because of unanticipated operations, in particular Somalia, Rwanda, and Haiti, as well as elsewhere, and the conference had to balance this need to restore DOD readiness funding with the goal of maintaining our progress toward deficit reduction. The result was to shift defense funding from lower-priority items in the defense budget to replenish these readiness accounts.

Mr. President, I note that the conferees, in the statement of managers, have addressed their deep concern and desire not to repeat the problem of engaging in expensive, non-traditional, humanitarian-oriented military operations without a more careful assessment of the costs. The conference agreement rightly recommends that prior congressional approval should be sought and obtained for such operations. Given the budgetary constraints we are facing in discretionary spending, including defense spending, I do not think that the Congress will easily approve supplementals in the future such as we have before us today, for operations which do not have the advance approval of the Congress. Certainly it is in the interest of the President to have Congress on board if and when he decides to launch the Nation into these kinds of expensive, non-traditional operations, which are not directly related to the vital interests of the United States.

In addition to over \$2 billion in DOD rescissions, the conference agreement includes a number of rescissions of international and domestic funds, including foreign operations, the Departments of Transportation, Commerce-Justice-State, Interior, Education, Veterans Affairs, and a variety of other accounts. The net effect of the bill on Federal spending is a reduction in excess of \$700 million.

Again, I compliment the chairman of the committee, as well as the managers of the Defense Chapter, specifically, Mr. STEVENS and Mr. INOUE, for a particularly workman-like job in rearranging, in a deficit-neutral manner, the department's accounts so as to support the basic readiness of our armed forces.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I want to commend my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee for a conference agreement which is, on the whole, an excellent bill.

It is fully paid for.

It contains needed funds to reimburse DOD for the costs of conducting humanitarian and peacekeeping operations.

It provides full funding for authorized military pay raises.

It rescinds \$300 million from TRP and places restrictions on the ability to provide grants for projects with little or no military relevance.

It also rescinds \$122 million from the Service R&D accounts for general science and technology programs—low-priority programs with little demonstrable relevance to defense requirements.

It puts in place a requirement to notify Congress in advance of large obligations from the Emergency and Extraordinary Expenses account.

It rescinds funding from excess Guard and Reserve equipment which was added by Congress.

It restores much of the funding in the BRAC cleanup and construction accounts that is recommended for rescission in H.R. 1158, the domestic rescission bill currently before the Senate.

I particularly want to thank my colleague from Montana, Senator BURNS, for his successful efforts in negotiating an excellent compromise with the House regarding elimination of military construction at closing bases. I understand the opposition he faced in defending the provision adopted by the Senate, and I appreciate his diligence. The compromise—which prohibits obligation of funds for military construction at closing bases or for realigning functions—is actually an improvement over the Senate position, since it makes these funds available for other high-priority defense needs, rather than returning them to the Treasury.

Mr. President, there are a few rescissions with which I am not in agreement, namely, the rescission of environmental cleanup funds in the Departments of Defense and Energy. I believe it is irresponsible to reduce these accounts at a time when all indications are that the cost of cleaning up Federal facilities is skyrocketing. These funds will likely have to be restored in the fiscal year 1996 appropriations process.

On March 1, I provided a list of more than \$6 billion in suggested rescissions of low-priority and non-defense items funded in the fiscal year 1995 defense bill. With a few exceptions, the Senate chose not to rescind these funds, and they were therefore not within the scope of the conference. However, I believe rescinding earmarked funds would have been a much better decision for the conferees than rescinding environmental restoration funds.

In addition, I am disappointed that the conferees chose not to rescind \$400 million for construction of two aeronautical wind tunnels, as proposed by the House. Our nation's fiscal crisis requires that we eliminate projects that do not return good value to the American people. I believe half a billion dollars for wind tunnels is one of those projects that should be cut in favor of a higher purpose—deficit reduction.

I also question the necessity to set aside additional funds in this emergency bill to renovate Penn Station in New York, when many other train stations in the country could probably use a portion of this funding to upgrade their facilities. I understand that this requirement arises from safety concerns and recent fires at the station, but I have not seen any official estimates of repair costs or safety modifications. In addition, last year, cost-sharing was an essential element of providing Federal funding for this

project; I trust that will also be the case with these additional funds.

There are a number of other rescissions which were not accepted by the conferees which could have provided additional deficit reduction in this bill. While these projects are a very, very small part of this bill, I feel it is imperative that I bring to the attention of the Senate that certain Members are still able to protect their special interests at the expense of the American taxpayers.

Mr. President, again, I commend my colleagues, Senator HATFIELD and Senator BYRD, for this conference agreement. On the whole, it is a responsible balance between restoring military readiness funds and eliminating unnecessary Federal spending across-the-board. My outlook on the upcoming fiscal year 1996 appropriations season is much improved because of the excellent work in this bill. I hope we can eliminate, or at least minimize, as this bill does, the earmarks and pork barrel projects in the fiscal year 1996 appropriations bills.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I rise in support of the conference agreement accompanying H.R. 889, the emergency defense supplemental appropriations and rescission bill for the fiscal year 1995.

The bill provides for a net decrease in fiscal year 1995 budget authority and outlays of \$4.0 billion and \$1.3 billion, respectively. These are real cuts to the deficit.

Title I of the bill provides supplemental appropriations of \$3.1 billion in budget authority and \$1.2 billion in outlays for the Department of Defense. These funds, largely for unanticipated contingency operations, are necessary to maintain the readiness of our Armed Forces.

This title also rescinds \$2.9 billion in budget authority and \$1.2 billion in outlays for various defense programs to help offset the cost of this additional military spending.

Title II provides for non-defense rescissions amounting to \$1.1 billion in budget authority and \$0.1 billion in outlays for fiscal year 1995. Most of

these savings are to be devoted to deficit reduction.

The final bill does include the emergency designation for these additional funds as requested by the President and approved by the House.

I must note, however, that the spending in this bill is largely offset by the rescissions in the bill, and I think this is an important achievement by both the Senate and House.

I thank my colleagues for the fine job they have done, and I urge the adoption of this bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that tables showing the relationship of the pending bill to the Appropriations Committee 602 allocations and to the overall spending ceilings under the fiscal year 1995 budget resolution be printed in the RECORD.

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

H.R. 889, DEFENSE EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL AND RESCISSIONS CONFERENCE REPORT

[FY 1995, in millions, CBO scoring]

Subcommittee	Current Status ¹	H.R. 889 ²	Subcommittee total	Senate 602(b) allocation	Total comp to allocation
Agriculture-RD:					
Budget Authority	58,117		58,117	58,118	-1
Outlays	50,330		50,330	50,330	-0
Commerce-Justice:					
Budget Authority	26,873	-180	26,693	26,903	-210
Outlays	25,429	-42	25,387	25,429	-42
Defense:					
Budget Authority	243,628	-2,685	240,943	243,630	-2,687
Outlays	250,661	-1,106	249,555	250,713	-1,158
District of Columbia:					
Budget Authority	712		712	720	-8
Outlays	714		714	722	-8
Energy-Water:					
Budget Authority	20,493	-200	20,293	20,493	-200
Outlays	20,884	-100	20,784	20,888	-104
Foreign Operations:					
Budget Authority	13,679	-142	13,537	13,830	-293
Outlays	13,780	-18	13,762	13,816	-54
Interior:					
Budget Authority	13,578	-2	13,577	13,582	-5
Outlays	13,970	-2	13,968	13,970	-2
Labor-HHS³:					
Budget Authority	266,170	-300	265,870	266,170	-300
Outlays	265,730	-12	265,718	265,731	-13
Legislative branch:					
Budget Authority	2,459		2,459	2,460	-1
Outlays	2,472		2,472	2,472	-0
Military construction:					
Budget Authority	8,836	-36	8,800	8,837	-37
Outlays	8,525	-2	8,523	8,554	-31
Transportation:					
Budget Authority	14,265	-72	14,193	14,275	-82
Outlays	37,087	-1	37,085	37,087	-2
Treasury-Postal⁴:					
Budget Authority	23,589		23,589	23,757	-168
Outlays	24,221		24,221	24,225	-4
VA-HUD:					
Budget Authority	90,256	-365	89,891	90,257	-366
Outlays	92,438		92,438	92,439	-1
Reserve:					
Budget Authority				2,311	-2,311
Outlays				1	-1
Total appropriations⁵:					
Budget Authority	782,655	-3,981	778,674	785,343	-6,669
Outlays	806,241	-1,283	804,957	806,377	-1,420

¹ In accordance with the Budget Enforcement Act, these totals do not include \$1,394 million in budget authority and \$6,466 million in outlays in funding for emergencies that have been designated as such by the President and the Congress, and \$877 million in budget authority and \$935 million in outlays for emergencies that would be available only upon an official budget request from the President designating the entire amount as an emergency requirement.

² In accordance with the Budget Enforcement Act, these totals do not include \$3,070 million in budget authority and \$1,232 million in outlays in funding for emergencies that have been designated as such by the President and the Congress.

³ Of the amounts remaining under the Labor-HHS Subcommittee's 602(b) allocation, \$1.3 million in outlays is available only for appropriations from the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund.

⁴ Of the amounts remaining under the Treasury-Postal Subcommittee's 602(b) allocation, \$1.3 million, in budget authority and \$0.1 million in outlays is available only for appropriations from the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund.

⁵ Of the amounts remaining under the Appropriations Committee's 602(a) allocation, \$1.3 million in budget authority and \$1.4 million in outlays is available only for appropriations from the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund.

Note: Details may not add to totals due to rounding.

Prepared by SBC majority staff, Apr. 6, 1995.

FISCAL YEAR 1995 CURRENT LEVEL—H.R. 880, DEFENSE SUPPLEMENTAL AND RESCISSIONS BILL

(Dollars in billions)

	Budget authority	Outlays
Current level (as of Mar. 24, 1995 ¹)	1,236.5	1,217.2
H.R. 889, Defense supplemental and rescissions, conference report ²	-4.0	-1.3
Total current level	1,232.5	1,215.9
Revised on-budget aggregates ³	1,238.7	1,217.6
Amount over (+) / under (-) budget aggregates ..	-6.2	-1.7

¹ In accordance with the Budget Enforcement Act, the total does not include \$1,394 million in budget authority and \$6,466 million in outlays in funding for emergencies that have been designated as such by the President and the Congress, and \$877 million in budget authority and \$935 million in outlays for emergencies that would be available only upon an official budget request from the President designating the entire amount requested as an emergency requirement.

² In accordance with the Budget Enforcement Act, these totals do not include \$3,070 million in budget authority and \$1,232 million in outlays in funding for emergencies that have been designated as such by the President and the Congress in this bill.

³ Reflects revised allocation under section 9(g) of House Concurrent Resolution 64 for the deficit-neutral reserve fund.

Note: Details may not add to totals due to rounding.

Prepared by SBC majority staff, Apr. 6, 1995.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I am pleased to note that the conference report for the Department of Defense supplemental appropriations bill includes an appropriation of \$21.5 million for capital improvements associated with safety-related emergency repairs to Pennsylvania Station in New York City.

Pennsylvania Station is the busiest intermodal station in the Nation, with almost 40 percent of Amtrak's passengers nationwide passing through every day. Unfortunately, it is also the most decrepit of the Northeast corridor

stations, others of which, such as Washington, DC's own Union Station, have been renovated with Federal grants. Today, Pennsylvania Station handles almost 500,000 riders a day in a subterranean complex that demands improvement. According to the New York City Fire Commissioner, there have been nine major fires at the station since 1987. Luckily, these fires have occurred at off-hours; as it stands, the station could not cope with an emergency when it is crowded with the 42,000 souls who pass through every workday between 8 and 9 a.m. In addition, structural steel in the station has shown its age and needs immediate repair. And these are just the most pressing needs.

There is a redevelopment plan to change things for the better, a \$315 million project to renovate the existing Pennsylvania Station and extend it partially into the neighboring historic James A. Farley Post Office, almost doubling the emergency access to the station's platforms which lie far below street level beneath both buildings. Moreover, there is a financing plan in place that could do this with \$100 million from the Federal Government (\$31.5 million has already been appropriated), \$100 million from the State and city, and \$115 million from a combination of historic tax credits, bonds supported by revenue from the project's retail component, and build-

ing shell improvements by the Postal Service, owner of the James A. Farley Building. Governor Pataki of New York and Mayor Giuliani of New York City strongly support the project and have made available funding in their budgets in accordance with a Memorandum of Agreement signed in August, 1994.

Thanks to our colleagues on the Committee on Appropriations, \$21.5 million can now be used immediately for pressing safety repairs at the existing station, in the first step of the overall redevelopment effort. These are the first Federal funds into the project that will actually go toward construction, and they will count towards the Federal share of the \$315 million project to transform the station into a complex capable of safely handling the crowds that have made Pennsylvania Station the Nation's busiest intermodal facility. For myself and the 75 million other people a year who use the station, I would like to thank all those who have labored hard to make the station safer, in particular our colleagues Senator HATFIELD, Senator BYRD, and Senator LAUTENBERG.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the conference report be agreed to and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

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

So the conference report was agreed to.