



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 104th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 141

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MAY 25, 1995

No. 88

Senate

(Legislative day of Monday, May 15, 1995)

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

PRAYER

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

Gracious God, our source of spiritual, intellectual, and physical strength, we thank You for a good night's rest after an intensely busy yesterday, filled with many votes in a long and demanding agenda. Now, You have replenished our wells of energy and given us a fresh new day in which we have the privilege of serving You. Lord, it's great to be alive.

Lord, grant the Senators more than the courage of their convictions. Rather, give them convictions that arise from Your gift of courage. May this indomitable courage be rooted in profound times of listening to You that result in a relentless commitment to truth that is expressed in convictions that cannot be compromised.

We trust You to guide them so that all they say and decide is in keeping with Your will. We ask for Your wisdom in the crucial matter to be voted on today. Lord, take command of their minds and their thinking, speak Your truth through their speaking, and then give them clarity for hard choices. Help them to live this day to the fullest. In Your holy name. Amen.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS AND RESCISSIONS ACT, 1995—CONFERENCE REPORT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will now

proceed to vote on the conference report to accompany H.R. 1158, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The conference report to accompany H.R. 1158, an act making emergency supplemental appropriations for additional disaster assistance, and making rescissions for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1995, and for other purposes.

The Senate resumed consideration of the conference report.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

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

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

The result was announced—yeas 61, nays 38, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 203 Leg.]

YEAS—61

Abraham	Domenici	Kassebaum
Ashcroft	Faircloth	Kempthorne
Bennett	Feinstein	Kerrey
Bond	Frist	Kohl
Boxer	Gorton	Kyl
Brown	Gramm	Lott
Burns	Grams	Lugar
Byrd	Grassley	Mack
Campbell	Gregg	McCain
Coats	Hatch	McConnell
Cochran	Hatfield	Murkowski
Cohen	Helms	Nickles
Coverdell	Hutchison	Packwood
Craig	Inhofe	Pressler
D'Amato	Inouye	Reid
DeWine	Jeffords	Roth
Dole	Johnston	Santorum

Shelby
Simpson
Smith
Snowe

Specter
Stevens
Thomas
Thompson

Thurmond
Warner

NAYS—38

Akaka
Baucus
Biden
Bingaman
Bradley
Breaux
Bryan
Bumpers
Chafee
Conrad
Daschle
Dodd
Dorgan

Exon
Feingold
Ford
Glenn
Graham
Harkin
Heflin
Hollings
Kennedy
Kerry
Lautenberg
Leahy
Levin

Lieberman
Moseley-Braun
Moynihan
Murray
Nunn
Pell
Pryor
Robb
Rockefeller
Sarbanes
Simon
Wellstone

NOT VOTING—1

Mikulski

So the conference report was agreed to.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes on this rescissions package.

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

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I merely wanted to say, in conclusion of this process on the rescissions package, I am very hopeful that the President will sign this bill. If he does not sign this bill, of course, there are problems relating particularly to the supplemental appropriations that are included in this bill.

We have worked long and hard on this. I want to take this occasion to thank my colleague from the Democratic side of the aisle, Senator BYRD, the ranking member of the full committee; each of subcommittee chairs and each of the subcommittee ranking members, and the extraordinary staff that we have on both sides that have worked together very carefully.

Mr. President, I cannot predict what will happen. There have been discussions between the Republican leadership of the House and the Senate with the White House wondering if there might be a better way to achieve a

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S7405

common goal that the President has and we have. I make no predictions.

I must say, I am terribly disappointed we had so few Democrats support this measure today, because I can say one thing: If there is a revision or if there is a new package that comes down the track, we will not have enough votes on this side to pass it. I, therefore, would urge that the White House take a very careful view of the politics of getting any other package passed, even one that we might be able to agree to.

I thank my colleagues on the committee, both the Republicans and Democrats, for having brought us to a conclusion at this point on the rescissions conference report.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I voted against the bill before the Senate today because of its misplaced priorities: cuts in education, cuts in training, cuts in housing, but no cuts in programs which do not address critical needs or waste tax dollars.

Mr. President, President Clinton has shown real leadership by drawing a line in the sand and standing up for important investments in our future. The President has repeatedly made it clear that he wants to work with the Congress to reduce spending, but that it is his responsibility to protect important investments in our future. The President does not want to pile up a stack of veto messages. He wants to work with the Congress to move legislation that will help the American people. He saw gridlock in the last Congress and does not want to repeat the experience.

Despite his efforts to cooperate, the House of Representatives crafted a bill to cut programs which the President found unacceptable. The Senate, after a great deal of effort, came up with a deficit reduction bill which every Member voted for and which the President said he could sign. In conference with the House of Representatives, however, it changed again. Almost 85 percent of the funding for priorities important to the President was eliminated. That was done, in many cases, without Democratic members of the Appropriations Committee having access to the decisionmaking process. I support the President's decision to veto this bill, and have voted against it.

Mr. President, rather than force a useless confrontation, we can and should have revised this legislation and passed it. Everyone agrees that the disaster relief in this bill is important. Everyone agrees that the aid to Oklahoma in this bill is critical. Everyone agrees that the aid to Jordan in this bill protects our national self-interest. And everyone agrees that we can and should cut some of the funding appropriated for certain programs last year.

It was irresponsible for the Republican majority, in a fit of partisan political pique, to simply refuse to revise this legislation and get it passed. Yet the most ardent budget cutters claimed they were too busy to save the American taxpayers a mere \$10 billion or so

in what they see as unnecessary and wasteful spending. That, Mr. President, is ridiculous. If we had worked with the administration, we could have quickly adopted legislation to give people the aid they need and the reductions in overall spending they want.

Mr. President, I voted for the initial Senate version of this bill, a bill which more closely met my own priorities, especially when compared to the House measure. I was not entirely satisfied with the Senate bill. We cut billions from housing programs, but we did not touch a penny of military spending. We cut billions from education and training programs, but we did not touch wasteful subsidies which go to wealthy and corporate agricultural interests. We cut millions for dozens of important, productive, and efficient programs, but we did not look for the waste and mismanagement which permeates too many of our programs. That situation did not get better in conference. We cut \$1.4 billion in job training funds and another \$831 million in education. Look at the specifics: \$65 million for adult job training, gone; \$67 million for displaced workers, gone; \$12.5 million for school to work programs, gone; \$236 million for the Safe and Drug Free Schools Program, gone; \$91 million for vocational and adult education, gone. Those programs represent an investment in our future, and those cuts make that future a little darker.

So, Mr. President, I oppose this conference report. I still believe the Government can play a role in improving the lives of the American people. I accept and embrace the need to reduce the deficit and get control over spending, but I believe we can do that while still addressing the needs we face as a nation.

Given that, Mr. President, I voted against this bill and will support the President's veto. I hope our colleagues will quickly move to put together a bill which meets our obligations to reduce overall Federal spending while preserving programs that help people.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I voted for the original rescissions bill because the reductions were reasonable and because we had restored 80 percent of the education cuts that were contained in the House bill. I fervently hoped that the Senate position on education would prevail in the House-Senate conference. Unfortunately, it did not. As a result there are drastic cuts in several important Federal education programs, such as safe and drug free schools, dropout prevention, and education reform. Because of this, I cannot support the conference report.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today in support of this emergency disaster supplemental conference report. We are faced with a difficult decision: Parts of the Nation, including California, desperately need the emergency disaster funds contained in this bill, yet many of the cuts in this legislation, such as the Safe and Drug Free

Schools Program and the Summer Youth Employment Program, will harm many of those very people we are intending to help the most.

However, emergency spending is just that, and American families affected by natural disasters cannot wait for us in Washington to get our acts together to begin providing relief. Since the beginning of this year, there have been seven new disaster declarations, including two floods in California, flooding in South Dakota, tornadoes in Alabama, the great tragedy of Oklahoma City, and flooding in Louisiana and Mississippi. FEMA has also undertaken preliminary damage assessments in Tennessee and Kentucky as a result of the tremendous rain and hail storms that recently swept through that area, and in South Dakota as a result of flooding.

Also, and more recently, the specter of the Mississippi River's recent cresting and the snowpacks melting in California reinforces the urgency for this timely assistance. I note with trepidation and concern that tornado season in the South and Midwest, and hurricane season in the Gulf and East Coast States will both soon be here.

In addition to this year's disasters, this funding will also go to continue or closeout the disaster assistance accounts in 40 other States for over 280 separate Federal disaster assistance obligations.

I understand President Clinton has said he will veto this bill. I welcome the recent comments by Chairman HATFIELD and Chairman LIVINGSTON which would indicate at the very least a willingness to work toward providing this needed relief. I urge the administration and the leadership of both parties to work together toward a speedy resolution of the impasse we will soon face.

I fully support efforts to cut spending and reduce the deficit and look forward to working with my colleagues in the future toward that end. However, there are other vehicles for deficit reduction; we spent most of this week on the fiscal year 1996 budget resolution. Very soon we will also begin considering the fiscal year 1996 appropriations bills. I respectfully submit to my colleagues that these are the proper vehicles for controlling spending and deficit reduction and I pledge to work with them at the appropriate time to make those difficult decisions.

Let me reiterate that this is a national disaster relief bill. Now is the time for the Congress to come through for Americans who have been affected by national disasters. Let us not allow this obligation to get mired down in partisan bickering over which programs to cut and when to cut them. We will have the opportunity to make these cuts later; this emergency assistance, however, cannot wait.

I urge my colleagues to pass this conference report and to work with the administration toward formulating a disaster assistance bill that can both pass

the Congress and be signed by the President.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, today the Senate passed the conference report on the emergency supplemental and rescission bill. Some of the cuts in the report were well deserved. The emergency relief for California and Oklahoma is certainly much needed. But you do not buy a horse because it has two good legs, and I will not vote for a rescission bill whose cuts have such a lopsided affect on low- and middle-income Americans. There is a better way to cut spending.

Last month I supported the Senate in overwhelmingly passing a rescission bill that, while far from perfect, put the emphasis of cuts where it should be, on pork not the poor. The Senate bill included cuts to earmarked courthouse construction, American subsidized broadcasting to Europe—a hard program to support when public broadcasting at home is being cut, and unused funding for transportation projects.

The House cuts had a much different focus, a focus that unfortunately the conference report has adopted. The conference package cuts \$319 million from low-income fuel assistance programs, \$113 million—five times the Senate level of cuts—to low-income education programs, and \$1.5 billion more than the Senate proposed in cuts to assisted housing programs. Affordable housing took the biggest cut, with the conference report rescinding \$7 billion from Department of Housing and Urban Development—30 percent of this year's budget.

These cuts are not equitable, they are not fair to working American families, they are not the cuts the Senate voted for on April 6. I hope that there will be an opportunity to return the focus of this rescission bill to the programs that the Senate bill targeted. The disaster victims need the assistance the supplemental will provide. Let us get it to them without making victims of middle-class American families.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, regretably, I do not support the conference agreement before us today. While it cuts this year's funding by \$16.4 billion, and adds new spending for the California earthquake, other disasters and the Oklahoma City catastrophe, it misses the target on some very fundamental issues. I support cutting spending and reducing the deficit. But the cuts in this bill are in the wrong programs and in the wrong amounts.

Mr. President, I voted for this bill when it originally passed the Senate. I did so because immediately before final passage a carefully crafted bipartisan amendment by Senators DOLE and DASCHLE was adopted to restore some money for certain critical health, education, and training programs that had been deeply cut in the bill.

Unfortunately, Mr. President, the Dole-Daschle amendment was gutted by the conferees. This bill now rescinds

\$813 million in education funding, almost three times the amount that was included in the original Senate bill. It cuts education reform programs, it cuts student loan programs, and it cuts money to keep schools safe and kids off of drugs. That is simply unacceptable. What could be a higher national priority than investing in our kids? How can we say on the one hand that drugs in our schools have reached epidemic proportions, and on the other hand cut funding for the Safe and Drug Free Schools Program? These cuts just do not meet the commonsense test, and I think most Americans will agree.

Equally disturbing to me is the amount of funding that was cut from training programs. These cuts total \$1.4 billion. The bill makes deep cuts in the Youth Job Training Program, the Youth Unemployment Program, and the School-to-Work Program. These are programs that help disadvantaged kids obtain the skills they will need to move into the work force and become productive citizens.

How can we in good conscience support big cuts in programs for children from struggling families in order to pay for tax cuts for the wealthy? I do not think average Americans support these reductions. I think they would prefer that we close corporate tax loopholes rather than eliminate the helping hand low-income youth might need to have a brighter future. I think they would rather have us spend \$1 billion on youth training programs than \$50 billion on star wars. I think the average American family would rather have us spend money to keep poor seniors from freezing in the winter than paying for some Member's pork project.

There also appears to be a hidden agenda in this bill. Rather than earmarking all the spending cuts in the bill for deficit reduction, there are \$50 billion in long-term savings that are not set aside for that purpose. The motive of Republican tax cut proponents is clear. They want that money to finance a big tax cut package for the affluent.

Because I think this conference agreement establishes the wrong set of spending priorities and does not use all the savings for deficit reduction, I am pleased that the President has threatened to veto it. We start over, we can produce a better product.

The President has sent us his guidelines for a package of cuts he will support. His proposal has deeper spending cuts than are contained in this bill. But his priorities are different. He would restore money for education, training, health, veterans and poor pregnant women. And he would pay for spending on these programs by cutting funding for Federal buildings, government travel, and highway projects.

The President wants us to continue to invest in people, not pork. I happen to share that view. Investing in our people, especially in kids who are at risk of falling through the cracks of the social safety net, is the value sys-

tem I want to represent, and those are the values I believe most Americans support.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the Conference Report on H.R. 1158. While I am a strong supporter of deficit reduction, I am opposed to the precedent of requiring large budget cuts in order to pay for emergency disaster relief. In addition, I believe this bill undermines programs which make the investments in our Nation's future. In addition, my own State of Maryland suffers a disproportionate share of the rescissions which will have a negative impact on Maryland's economy. For these reasons, I am opposed to this bill.

The conference report made a very deep cut in funding for the consolidation of the Food and Drug Administration facilities in Montgomery County, MD. The conferees' decision to rescind \$228 million will delay the consolidation of FDA facilities which are in desperate need of modernization. I believe that modernizing the FDA is a national priority that is vital to protecting public health and safety and improving the regulatory capability of this agency.

This conference report also makes significant cuts in the VA/HUD Subcommittee budget in order to pay for disaster funding for Northridge, CA and Oklahoma City. It is wrong to require programs within the jurisdiction of single appropriations subcommittee to bear the costs of funding national disasters. Funding assistance for national disasters is a national responsibility requiring everyone to contribute.

During the Senate's consideration of H.R. 1158, I offered an amendment to that would have made an across-the-board cut in discretionary spending to pay for disaster relief in a more equitable manner. Unfortunately, this amendment was defeated.

As the flood waters once again rise throughout the Midwest, we are reminded of the need to establish a rainy day fund to prepay the costs of disaster relief. Our failure to establish such a fund is costing VA-HUD programs \$8.5 billion—over 10 percent of all the funds appropriated for VA-HUD programs in FY 1995.

The conference agreement also nearly triples the Senate-passed rescissions for education programs and doubles the amount of funding rescinded for national service. These programs represent the kind of strategic investments that I believe the we have to make if we are to prepare future generations for the 21st century.

While the conferees did recognize the value and need of moving forward with this project in the future, I will continue to fight for FDA consolidation despite the rescission contained in this bill.

For these reasons, Mr. President, I am opposed to the conference report to H.R. 1158.