

"radiogenic disease" or provides medical evidence of a cause and effect relationship between his or her disability and exposure to ionizing radiation, the VA, pursuant to §3.311 must obtain a dose estimate as to the range of doses to which the atomic veteran may have been exposed. Final review of direct service connection claims based on exposure to ionizing radiation is conducted by the Under Secretary for Benefits, who may obtain and consider any opinion of the Under Secretary for Health in reaching his determination whether the atomic veteran's disease resulted from radiation exposure in service.

Mr. chairman, although §3.311 was passed by Congress in 1984 as remedial legislation, designed to assist atomic veterans and their survivors in obtaining compensation for illnesses, diseases, disabilities, and death due to exposure to ionizing radiation, this legislation has benefited very few atomic veterans or their survivors. Until recently, the VA considered the list of "radiogenic diseases" as an exclusive list thereby refusing to consider any claims for direct service connection for residuals of radiation exposure if the atomic veteran or his or her survivors could not demonstrate that the atomic veteran suffered from a listed "radiogenic disease," regardless of the evidence submitted in support of the claim. The VA's practice of adjudicating only those claims where the atomic veteran suffered from a recognized "radiogenic disease" was overturned by the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit on September 1, 1994, in *Combee vs. Brown*, 34 F.3d 1039, 1045 (Fed.Cir. 1994).

Once an atomic veteran seeking direct service connection for residuals of exposure to ionizing radiation has established that he or she suffers from a recognized "radiogenic disease" or have provided the VA with medical evidence of a cause and effect relationship, the burden of proof then shifts to the VA for consideration of the case on the merits. It is at this point that atomic veterans face their greatest obstacle in establishing their entitlement to service connection. Dose estimates and dose reconstruction data for the various radiation tests are handled by the Defense Nuclear Agency.

In more cases than not, no actual individual exposure record is available for the atomic veteran, and reconstructed dose estimates routinely fail to provide an accurate estimation of the level of radiation exposure experienced by the atomic veteran. Film badges, not issued to all participants in nuclear tests, did not provide a complete measure of radiation exposure, since they were not capable of recording inhaled, ingested, or neutron doses, or often shielded during the detonation, and were worn for only limited periods during and after each nuclear detonation.

Many atomic veterans who participated in the nuclear tests in the Pacific report visiting these islands a short time after the test detonation and eating locally grown fruits and swimming in the lagoons. Atomic veterans who participated in the Nevada test sites report being covered in fallout dust which was either brushed off of them by hand or with brooms. Many report being transported to mess halls shortly after walking through "ground zero" and not being able to properly clean themselves before eating. These factors are extremely important in determining a proper reconstructed dose estimate; however, it does not appear that the participant's comments are used to further the analysis with regards to the dose reconstruction estimate. Without accurate reconstructed dose estimates, atomic veterans and their survivors find it virtually impossible to obtain the benefits they seek.

All too often, reconstructed dose estimates show that the overwhelming majority of par-

ticipants were supposedly exposed to one rem or less of external doses of ionizing radiation. It is extremely difficult to believe, based on the statements made by participants, that their total exposure was so minimal. The DAV believes that a great injustice has been done to America's atomic veterans and their survivors. As will be discussed later, only ten percent of those atomic veterans who seek compensation for their residual disabilities are granted service-connected benefits, although the VA cautions that "[i]t cannot be inferred from this number that service connection was necessarily granted on the basis of radiation exposure." In other words, although the atomic veteran claimed residual disability as a result of his exposure to ionizing radiation, the claim could have been allowed under general principles establishing service connection such as the disease or illness was evidenced in the service medical records, etc. . . .

Adjudication of radiation claims pursuant to 38 C.F.R. 3.311 have been a total failure. With almost 95% of atomic veterans failing to establish service connection for their illness, disease, or disability, the remedial legislation passed in 1984 has not provided atomic veterans with meaningful consideration of their claims. The present statistical data showing an extremely high denial rate has changed very little since 1984 when former Senator Cranston expressed the need for this remedial legislation.

In May 1988, aware that something more was needed, Congress passed Pub. L. No. 100-321, §2(a), 102 Stat. 485, which grants service connection on a presumptive basis for certain diseases becoming manifest in an atomic veteran to a degree of 10% or more. Currently, the list of presumptive diseases, a total of 15 in all, include: leukemia, other than chronic lymphocytic leukemia; thyroid cancer; breast cancer; cancer of the pharynx; esophageal cancer; stomach cancer; cancer of the small intestine; pancreatic cancer; multiple myeloma; lymphomas, except Hodgkin's disease; bile duct cancer; gall bladder cancer; primary liver cancer, except if cirrhosis or hepatitis B is indicated; salivary gland cancer; and urinary tract cancer. While 20 diseases are recognized as "radiogenic diseases" pursuant to 38 C.F.R. §3.311, only 15 diseases are presumed to be service-connected as a result of exposure to ionizing radiation. Yet, pursuant to the Marshall Islands Nuclear Claims Tribunal Act, 25 separate medical conditions are irrebuttably presumed to be the result of radiation exposure and Marshall Islanders are compensated for these disabilities. It is difficult to understand the lack of consistency in these lists. Why are only 15 diseases given a rebuttable presumption of service connection for atomic veterans while Marshall Islanders receive an irrebuttable presumption for 25 medical conditions? Further, at the very least, why are not all 20 "radiogenic diseases" presumed to be service-connected as a result of ionizing radiation exposure pursuant to 38 U.S.C. 1112(c)? Why does our government continue to put the needs of its veterans behind those of other groups, such as the Marshall Islanders? America's veterans should always be considered a special and unique group for having served their nation with honor. . . .

Congress should consider making all the recognized "radiogenic diseases," and any other disease, illness, or disability that others, such as the Marshall Islanders, are being compensated for, with those diseases for which presumptive service connection is granted. The Marshall Islanders have an irrebuttable presumption, at the very least, America's atomic veterans should receive a rebuttable presumption for all diseases, illnesses or disabilities for which others are compensated.

The DAV commends this subcommittee for its recent, favorable action on adding bronchiolo-alveolar carcinoma, a form of lung cancer, to the list of diseases presumed to be service-connected for veterans exposed to ionizing radiation. As stated above, however, all recognized "radiogenic diseases" including lung cancer should be added to the list of diseases presumed to be service-connected. . . .

In closing, I would like to refer to a phrase which appears on the Atomic Veterans' Newsletter, published by the National Association of Atomic Veterans, Inc. that states: "The atomic veteran seeks no special favor . . . simply justice." This justice is long overdue. DAV encourages this subcommittee to do everything necessary to ensure that this group of forgotten veterans—atomic veterans—receive meaningful justice from our government.

This concludes my statement. I would be happy to answer any questions you may have.●

THE OMNIBUS APPROPRIATIONS BILL

● Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, even in an age of spin control, when it is often difficult to wade through the rhetoric to find the truth, it is possible to determine the true measure of a government. That measure can be found quite revealingly in the budget. For it is in the budget that the priorities become clear. It is in the budget that the rhetorical claims can be separated from the real claims. In Elizabethan England, as the old saw tells us, the proof may have been in the pudding. But in modern day America, the proof of an administration's or a political party's claims is in its budget proposals.

We have just come through two exceptionally challenging years. The Republican Party, led by Speaker of the House NEWT GINGRICH and then-Senate majority leader and now Presidential nominee Bob Dole, sought to upend government—to eliminate or slash service after service upon which Americans depend. The effect of their efforts, had they been successful, would have been to heap on the rich and the powerful in this Nation even greater riches and power. Those additional riches and power would have come at the expense of working Americans, at the expense of the environment which we have been laboring for decades to clean up, at the expense of those who need health care, at the expense of children and young people seeking quality education, at the expense of those who have been victimized by crime, drug abuse, and domestic violence, at the expense of America's future.

The Republican Party correctly identified the importance of gaining control of our Nation's fiscal household, but then threw wisdom and prudence to the wind, and concluded that the only legitimate objective was to slash Federal spending, regardless of how or where, regardless of the harm that would be caused to our Nation and its people as a result of those actions. Paradoxically, the only large category

of discretionary spending Republicans excepted from their frenzied assault was that for armies and weapons, despite the fact that the cold war ended over 5 years ago, and that, for the first time in 50 years, we have no super-power adversary.

The budget the Republicans brought forward last year dramatized this extremist philosophy. It portrayed a singular absence of vision, confirming that the Republican party neither understood nor subscribed to the concept of investment in the future by our Government on behalf of this Nation's citizens.

The Democrats in the Senate and the House, led by President Clinton, rejected this extreme agenda. We did not shy from the fierce conflict the Republicans promised if anyone dared challenge their zealous actions to demolish vital services.

After nearly a year of pitched battle over the 1996 budget—that resulted in several Government shutdowns—it became clear even to the Republicans that the American people did not support their objectives or their approach. A budget finally was enacted halfway through the fiscal year that came much closer to reflecting the principles and priorities Democrats had consistently said the American people supported.

But while the Republicans acknowledged tactical defeat, they had not yet learned the lesson. Once again, in the form of the 1997 budget, they showed their true colors. Once again, they launched forth in pursuit of an extremist agenda to cut education funding, cut job training, cut health care, cut law enforcement assistance, cut assistance to small businesses, cut programs to help American companies more effectively compete with foreign firms.

Again, the Clinton administration and congressional Democrats met them head-on. Today we have reached the end of this second budget campaign of the 104th Congress. Once again, because the congressional Democrats more accurately reflected the values and views of the American people, the Republicans' budget has been repudiated in large measure. This time, in fact, the battle has been won with far less bloodshed and in far less time. The Republicans, knowing they did not have the support of the majority of the Nation, and knowing the elections are only weeks away, ran up the white flag almost as soon as the battle was really joined.

Mr. President, the American people are the winners. The future of our Nation is the winner. I am relieved and heartened to see that our democratic process has operated in such a way as to earn our faith and confidence.

With the leadership of President Clinton and his administration, we have taken a devastating Republican budget and transformed it into one that manages to pass the basic test of responsibility. I commend the President and the Vice President for their

courage and resolve. I commend White House Chief of Staff Panetta and his staff, the Office of Management and Budget, and others from the Administration who were involved. Also deserving of praise are Senate Democratic Leader TOM DASCHLE and his staff, Appropriations Committee ranking Democrat ROBERT BYRD and his staff, and the subcommittee ranking members and their staffs.

While none of us has ever seen a budget that is identical to the one he or she would have proposed, the budget that emerged from the negotiations in the wee hours of this past Saturday morning is one that I can support. It is true that the portions that address our Government's domestic services generally are preferable to the portion that addresses defense; the defense portion provides more funding than we need in the post-cold-war era to ensure our national security. We have pressing domestic needs to which this surplus defense funding would be more beneficially targeted. And some of this excess funding beyond the Defense Department's request should be used to further reduce the deficit, a vital objective.

Not only for this reason—but significantly for this reason—this legislation could be better; it could be stronger; it could be fairer. But it passes the threshold test. With many reservations, I voted for it because it is better than anything we've seen in the past 2 years; it is better than we were afraid we would see this year; and it protects and in some cases enhances some vital services for the American people. In some cases the best that can be said for it is that it preserves important services through another year so that we may return to attempt to allocate sufficient resources to them next year. But that was enough to secure my vote.

I would like to mention several of the bill's components that are of particular importance to Massachusetts and the Nation.

PARKS AND INTERIOR

I am proud of the rich historical heritage of my State of Massachusetts and I am pleased to support funding for many of the State's historic sites in the continuing resolution for fiscal year 1997.

The first historic site, established in 1938, the Salem National Historic Site, represents a slice of Massachusetts life from the 17th through the 19th centuries, when Salem traded with the East Indies and throughout the world, opening new markets for exports and importing treasures from far away. The site includes 18th- and 19th-century wharves, the Custom House, the West India Goods Store, and the 17th-century Narbonne-Hale house, where local craftsmen worked. In June 1994, the new regional visitors center opened after a \$4.7 million Federal investment. The operational funding increase of \$341,000, plus five additional personnel, will ensure that the regional visitors

center, which offers information about cultural and natural resources throughout Essex County, remains open year-round. These increased funds will help the site to accommodate the growing number of visitors to the park, which has grown by at least 30 percent since 1990, and exceeded 1 million in 1992.

The site is also completing construction of the sailing vessel *Friendship*, an exhibit dedicated to the master craftsmen shipbuilders of the 18th century. This funding will also go toward operating the Salem site. With its authentic replica of the historic *Friendship* nearly completed, it offers an educational opportunity for children and their families that can be a model for similar parks in the State.

I am also pleased, Mr. President, that funds have been approved for continued maintenance, protection, and development of the Lowell National Historic Site, and to continue the 17-year efforts of the Lowell Historic Preservation Commission. The operating increase of \$404,000 is required to continue operations in the park that commemorates the birthplace of the American Industrial Revolution. Located in downtown Lowell, the park includes the Boott Cotton Mills Museum, "mill girl" boarding houses, and the Suffolk Mill turbine, and offers guided tours depicting how the transition was made from farming to industry, the history of immigrants and labor in Lowell, and the development of industrial technology. Although the economy in Lowell has not been strong in the past few years, the tourist industry has been a staple of the city's livelihood. The National Park Service conducts tours that take visitors around the city, via canals, trolleys, and walking tours. With the addition of professional baseball and hockey teams, there are now more reasons than ever to visit Lowell, and its historic preservation efforts will reflect the renewed interest in the city.

To many of us, classic American poetry and Henry Wadsworth Longfellow are synonymous. His home, a national historic site, will justifiably receive an operating increase of \$112,000. Longfellow lived in this residence for nearly 50 years while teaching at Harvard. This house was also General George Washington's headquarters during the siege of Boston in 1775. In addition, the Longfellow National Historic Site manages one of the largest and most important fine arts collections in the National Park Service. Unfortunately, recent cutbacks in funding have forced the Park Service to close its door for 6 months a year, thus ending public tours and student programs from November to May. Countless historic books and textile exhibits have deteriorated. Moreover, the vast majority of the archives remain uncatalogued and inaccessible to researchers. This operating increase will enable the Longfellow House to provide critical security and management for the museum collections contained in this

monument to America's struggle for independence and rich cultural history.

Mr. President, I am pleased this continuing resolution contains \$301,000 for continued maintenance, protection and security of the Cape Cod National Seashore. This increased funding for park operations and maintenance will be used to improve park security, caretaking, and fire protection at the newest section of the Cape Cod Seashore, the decommissioned North Truro Air Force Station that was annexed in 1986. This request was supported by the Cape Cod Commission, many residents, and organizations on the Cape. Over 5 million visitors and vacationers annually visit the Cape Cod National Seashore, a park on the outer beaches of Cape Cod, extending 40 miles from Chatham to Provincetown. The park is made up of oceans, beaches, dunes, woodlands, freshwater ponds and marshes. It is home to a vibrant ecosystem of plants and animals. The area is also home to numerous historical structures, including Marconi's wireless station.

I am also very pleased that this omnibus package includes nearly \$1 million for the Blackstone River Valley National Heritage Corridor including \$324,000 to support the important ongoing efforts of the Corridor Commission and \$460,000 for development and construction projects in the Blackstone River Valley. With the passage last week of legislation to expand the boundaries of the Blackstone Corridor, the corridor size will increase by 60 percent, with approximately 150,000 new acres including two national historic landmarks. These funds are needed to develop resource inventories, interpretive programs, and protection strategies for the five communities newly included in the Corridor, including Worcester, MA.

Established in 1986, the Blackstone Valley National Heritage Corridor, encompassing 400,000 acres, is the largest national park in the North Atlantic Region of the National Park Service. It contains over 10,000 historic structures, and is significant for its 18th and 19th century industrial production systems of mill villages, farms, and transportation that illustrate America's transition from an agricultural to an industrial Nation. It also includes acres of farms and pastures and beautiful riverside scenery. The Blackstone Corridor is unique in the National Park Service because it is predominantly funded and maintained with local resources, encouraging a public-private partnership that has become a model for other parks, using federal seed money to encourage local preservation and revitalize the economy.

I applaud the inclusion of additional funds for land acquisition in the Mashpee National Wildlife Refuge. A transfer of \$750,000 from another defunct Fish and Wildlife Service project was recently made to Mashpee. While my request for \$1.582 million for the acquisition, which was originally included in the fiscal year 1997 appropriations bill

passed by the Senate, was not fully funded in the conference report, I am pleased that two-thirds of our request was included in this legislation to secure this important natural resource.

Mr. President, with regard to one other parks and Interior component of this legislation that directly impacts my State of Massachusetts, I support the increased funding it contains for the John F. Kennedy National Historic Site. Although the site attracts 15,000 visitors during its brief open season—one-third of which are visiting from abroad and who consider the birthplace their primary destination—recent funding shortages have forced the JFK National Historic Site to eliminate school programs, and significantly reduced the number of tours that can be accommodated. The funding increase of \$57,000 will allow the hiring of one permanent park ranger and three seasonal park rangers to give tours, conduct school programs, and provide information services. The additional resources will allow the site to remain open for at least 9 months per year.

Interior Subcommittee and full Appropriations Committee Ranking Democrat ROBERT C. BYRD, Subcommittee Chairman SLADE GORTON, and their staffs have done a commendable job in addressing all the needs for funding within the constraints that have been imposed on them. I thank them for their help.

FISH AND OCEANS

Mr. President, I am pleased to support the Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary appropriations provisions in this continuing resolution and I want to especially commend the ranking member of the Commerce, Justice, State and Judiciary subcommittee, Senator HOLLINGS, for his work on this portion of the bill. The Appropriations Committee faced the daunting task of fairly distributing funding to a broad array of important programs, many of which are critical to our economy, our personal security, our marine environment, and international relations within a budget framework of extremely limited resources. While there are always some disappointments about specific programs and projects, I believe this portion of the bill is a balanced measure of significant benefit.

As the ranking member of the Commerce Committee's Subcommittee on Oceans and Fisheries, I am pleased that this measure provides funding increases to some key marine and coastal programs and at least assures the continuation of others.

The importance of a healthy environment to the citizens of this nation and to those living in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts is reflected in the bill's provision of \$1.85 billion for NOAA. NOAA is one of the Federal Government's premiere scientific research agencies, with responsibility for the stewardship of our living marine resources, operation of our National Weather Service and its environmental satellite system, management of our

National Marine Sanctuaries, the coordination of activities impacting the coastal zone, and the integration of a cooperative research program with universities through the Nation.

Of special interest to many citizens of Massachusetts are programs which help to protect and conserve valuable natural resources along our coastline. Just a few of the programs of national importance which are funded include the Coastal Zone Management Program, the National Marine Sanctuary Program, the National Undersea Research Program, the Coastal Ocean Program, and the National Sea Grant Program. Working in concert with each other, and with other Federal, State and local programs, these NOAA programs constitute part of the front line in defending the natural beauty and biologic diversity of our coastal resources. We all have come to recognize the important cultural and economic benefits of marine-related industries and recreational activities and I believe that strong support for these programs will help to ensure that these benefits will be passed along to future generations.

Of great importance to me and to my fishing constituents is the continued funding for the research programs targeted on the New England groundfish disaster. The Gulf of Maine Groundfish Survey, New England Stock Depletion Studies and Management of Georges Bank projects provide funding for scientists in the National Marine Fisheries Service [NMFS] to more carefully examine the causes of the groundfish fishery collapse and to identify ways to rebuild and manage these stocks so they return to healthy levels. This continued support is needed for the scientific and assessment efforts that form the basis for the difficult management decisions necessary to preserve fisheries while considering the needs of those whose livelihoods depend on fishing or on commerce in fish and fish products.

Massachusetts will also benefit from additional resources provided to NMFS. These programs include right whale research, the New England Fishery Management Council, Marine Mammal Protection Act implementation, habitat conservation, and fisheries enforcement. Additionally, the funding provided for Atlantic salmon, the Atlantic Migratory Pelagics Observer Program, and the aquaculture programs will continue valuable programs which provide both direct and indirect benefits to citizens of the Commonwealth. The health of living marine resources along the coast of the Commonwealth continues to be of great concern to my constituents, and I echo their sentiment both personally and as their representative in the U.S. Senate.

Whales are one of the great symbols of the ocean and are closely associated with Massachusetts. Funding for North Atlantic right whale research is of critical importance this year. The North

Atlantic right whale is the most endangered of all mammals, with approximately 350 remaining in the world. Unfortunately, this year alone, seven right whales have died as a result of being hit by ships and other unknown causes. The funds provided in this bill will help to advance our knowledge of right whale behavior and habitat requirements and hopefully lead toward measures which will avoid the unacceptable level of mortalities experienced this year.

The Saltonstall-Kennedy fisheries grants programs is another important program for our Nation's coastal regions, providing funding for research to enhance fish stocks, develop new markets for underutilized fish species, and assess new fishing gear technologies. Often, Saltonstall-Kennedy grants are the only source of funds available to assist the fishing industry in its effort to adapt and diversify.

I am also pleased to see continued funding for the Coastal Zone Management [CZM] Program, particularly the funding for State grants. Just this past spring we reauthorized the Coastal Zone Management Act. The CZM program is a highly successful voluntary State-Federal partnership to protect, develop, restore, and enhance our coast for present and future generations. The program has proven to be very effective in enhancing coastal economies while minimizing the impacts of the increasing pressures of growing populations, environmental degradation, and conflicting uses of our fragile and finite coastal area.

NOAA's Coastal Ocean Program [COP] is a Nationwide science program conducting important interdisciplinary research on oceanographic problems, including ecosystem research on Georges Bank. The COP provides one focal point through which NOAA integrates and coordinates its research activities with other Federal, State, and academic programs. Through its comprehensive, proactive approach, the COP offers policy makers the best information available, providing them with the balanced perspective needed to promote economic growth while maintaining a healthy and sustainable environment.

I would like to commend the committee for its continuing support for the Sea Grant Program. This is a Program that builds bridges between Government and academia, as well as between research laboratories and groups in need of reliable information. It serves as a successful model for multidisciplinary research directed at scientific advancement and economic development by funding regional research, promoting technology, and enhancing public education and outreach services for the Nation's coastal resources.

I am also pleased to see continued funding for the Global Climate Change Program. This Program seeks to develop a clearer picture of the relative roles of various greenhouse gases in

causing global warming. The NOAA Program is an important part of the overall U.S. interagency effort to improve the science that is needed to make critical decisions about the future of our planet.

Another ocean Program very important to my State is the National Marine Sanctuary Program. Stellwagen Bank National Marine Sanctuary off the coast of Massachusetts is an excellent example of Federal activity that produces both environmental protection and economic enhancement. This marine mammal feeding area is popular with whale watchers and fishermen, and protection of the bank has received wide support—not only among my constituents but Nationwide. The funding provided in the CR will help to maintain this important national program, especially Stellwagen Bank.

Another program which is receiving well-deserved funding is the National Undersea Research Program [NURP]. This program consists of six centers where regional undersea research activities are conducted. Its funding also will cover the NURP share of the operating expenses for the ALVIN, the deep submersible research vessel based at the Woods Hole Oceanographic Institute.

The Fishing Vessel Obligation Guarantee Program is also administered by NOAA and was established to provide loan guarantees to the commercial fishing industry. The program was recently expanded to include aquaculture facilities, making the program the single most important financing vehicle for this rapidly expanding industry.

On global environmental issues, I have worked actively for an Antarctic Environmental Protocol, including the Convention on the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources [CCAMLR]. Additionally, the President soon will sign the Antarctic Science, Tourism, and Conservation Act, which I authored, which will implement the International Antarctica Treaty. Data provided by NOAA's Antarctic Marine Living Resources [AMLR] Program are critical to CCAMLR's implementation and I am very pleased that \$1.2 million has been provided to ensure the continuation of this critical work.

I compliment my good friend and colleague, Senator HOLLINGS, for his leadership in these oceans issues which he has successfully championed for years. It is my pleasure to serve with him on the Commerce Committee, where he served as chairman until 1995.

BOSTON HARBOR—CLEAN WATER

Mr. President, recently the Congress passed and the President signed into law the VA-HUD and independent agencies appropriations bill for fiscal year 1997. During Senate consideration of that bill, I expressed my deep concern that the Republicans refused to meet the President's requested funding level for a critical environmental protection measure, the project to clean up Boston Harbor. While the President held firm in his support for \$100 million

for Boston Harbor for 1997 as Senator KENNEDY and I urged him to do, by a party line vote the Republican conferees forced a funding reduction to just \$40 million.

However, the story did not end there. I continued to work closely with Senator KENNEDY in supporting the President's efforts to secure more funding for Boston Harbor. I wrote and spoke to the President, his Chief of Staff, Leon Panetta, and others in the administration many times over the past few weeks, urging them to increase funding for this environmental cleanup effort.

Therefore, I am very pleased and very appreciative that the President and congressional Democrats were victorious in their attempts to secure more funding for Boston Harbor in this omnibus budget package. It contains an additional \$35 million for Boston Harbor, raising the fiscal year 1995 funding level to \$75 million. The residents of Massachusetts and the ratepayers of the Boston metropolitan area are well served by this action.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

I am extremely pleased to have secured another key provision for Massachusetts in this bill—language that will permit financing to go forward to revitalize the Fore River Shipyard in Quincy, MA. This provision was originally sought by Senator KENNEDY and me in the Commerce/State/Justice appropriation bill for fiscal year 1997, and was later modified by Majority Leader LOTT, who sought, not inappropriately in my view, to toughen up the language. In the case of the Quincy project, this language alteration will place a greater responsibility on the Commonwealth of Massachusetts to help underwrite the necessary financing. I am satisfied that the new language leaves enough discretion to the Maritime Administration so that a suitable arrangement can be reached that is both affordable and acceptable to the Commonwealth. This is a matter on which I, Senator KENNEDY, and Representative STUDDS have been working for over a year.

Specifically, section 1139 establishes the basis for the Secretary of Transportation to assist certain shipyards, including the yard at Quincy, by facilitating the extension of Federal loan guarantees for the reactivation and modernization of those yards and the construction of vessels by the yards. Significantly, this section has been carefully drafted to provide several layers of protection to the Federal taxpayer, and to ensure the State where a yard is located shoulders a degree of the financial burden of revitalizing the yard, and also a portion of the financial risk. For example, subsection (d) requires the State or a State-chartered agency where the yard is located to deposit into the Federal treasury the amount of funds needed to cover the percentage of the risk factor cost required by the Federal Credit Reform Act, and provides for the reversion of the funds to the State if no obligation

needs to be paid from the deposited funds. I fully expect that the percentage of the risk factor under this subsection will never exceed 12 percent for the Quincy project. It appears to me that a deposit from the State of 12 percent will be more than adequate to fulfill the requirements associated with the risk of default for a project of this nature.

This provision is significant to my State because the Quincy Shipyard project is the first of its kind. It is the first project to revitalize an inoperative shipyard and put it back into production as a State-of-the-art facility that will employ up to 2,000 workers in good jobs. This makes sense, because the proposal to revitalize the Quincy Shipyard will turn it into a shipyard on the cutting edge of technology and one which will produce vessels that will be in demand in the international marketplace for years—double-hulled oil tankers to carry petroleum safely around the world. The Federal Government's investment in the Quincy Shipyard will be repaid many times over through the jobs that will be created, and through the renewed position of American maritime leadership that the project will help us attain. Now that Congress has done its part, it is incumbent upon the Commonwealth, the city of Quincy, the Massachusetts Heavy Industries Corp., and the Maritime Administration to bring the project to reality.

I must note with disappointment that, despite the stalwart support of administration and Senate Democratic negotiators, House Republicans insisted on cutting the cap on the permissible guarantee for any one project from \$100 million to \$50 million. This would have constrained the project in Quincy. Fortunately, however, with identical legislation moving on a separate track, which now has been sent to the President for signature, we have overcome that last-minute partial hurdle.

I am pleased that the continuing resolution contains language expressing the support of House and Senate appropriators for Massachusetts Biomedical Research Institute [MBRI] and other biomedical research and innovation centers throughout the country that have received past financial support from the Department of Commerce. This language is specifically intended to continue the Federal Government's support for one institution in particular—MBRI. MBRI is familiar to some of my colleagues from other States because it has been a model for several biomedical research programs elsewhere in the country. Designed by the business and academic community of Worcester, MA, to nurture the transfer of biomedical technology from the laboratory into new business start-ups and the growth of those start-ups into job-creating businesses offering cutting-edge medical products, since its inception in 1986, MBRI has spawned 20 new firms in the biomedical industries—

firms that now employ over 2200 people.

I am proud that Democratic majorities in the Senate wisely chose to fund MBRI. I regret, however, that the new Republican majority again this year, as it did last year, has refused to fund MBRI directly. This year, it chose instead to instruct the Commerce Department to "provide support for * * * initiatives previously supported by [the Department] to * * * increase small business global competitiveness in biotechnology." Nonetheless, using this language, I will continue to work closely with the administration to maintain MBRI's vital services.

I am also pleased that the continuing resolution contains a provision with the effect of making the University of Massachusetts at Dartmouth a full member of the National Textile Center University Consortium, and directing the Department of Commerce to provide financial support to the University of Massachusetts at Dartmouth to sustain its activities as a member of the National Textile Center. This will help to ensure that the University of Massachusetts at Dartmouth can meet the research needs of Massachusetts textile companies and help revitalize textile manufacturing in Massachusetts.

Over 30,000 people living in Massachusetts work in the textile industry. The 1,000 textile companies located within Massachusetts are mostly small-to-midsized companies whose unique research needs have been well served by the University of Massachusetts at Dartmouth. I am confident that the research activities at Dartmouth will be greatly enhanced by the designation of the University as a full member of the National Textile Center University Consortium.

I must, however, express my disappointment that the Republicans who control the Congress chose to provide for the inclusion of the University of Massachusetts at Dartmouth in the National Textile Center through a "direction" to the Department of Commerce, rather than through the express language which Senator KENNEDY and I had asked be included in the Commerce/State/Justice Appropriations Committee report. I am fully confident the Department of Commerce will provide to the University of Massachusetts at Dartmouth the full \$500,000 that is contained in the Senate Commerce/State/Justice Appropriations Committee Report.

I am disappointed that, once again, Congress decided to severely underfund the Advanced Technology Program, or ATP, at the Department of Commerce. The continuing resolution funds ATP at a level of \$225 million. While this is a welcome increase from the level contained in the Senate Commerce/State/Justice bill, this amount is significantly less than the President's budget request of \$350 million.

ATP provides matching funds for high-risk, enabling technologies with

commercial potential. To date, ATP has had a significant impact upon the development and successful marketing of new technologies by businesses in Massachusetts and across the Nation. More than 40 Massachusetts organizations have participated in 27 ATP projects. In Massachusetts alone, ATP has produced over \$110 million in public-private partnership funding to enhance Massachusetts businesses that are on the cusp of technological innovation. Furthermore, the impact of this program is one in which all Americans can take pride. ATP generates a return to the economy of \$6 for every dollar of program funding.

AMTRAK

I am pleased that Congress has decided to increase funding for Amtrak over the amount that was approved in the Transportation appropriations bill recently sent to the President for signature. This will permit the Massachusetts portion of the Lake Shore Limited to continue to operate for an additional 6 months. The Lake Shore Limited crosses Massachusetts from east to west with stops in Pittsfield, Springfield, Worcester, Framingham and Boston. Saving this train is especially important to the residents of the Berkshires and Western Massachusetts who depend on the Lake Shore Limited as their sole source of intercity passenger rail service. I strongly opposed Amtrak's decision to eliminate this service when the cuts were announced in August. We must now confront the more serious challenge of finding a permanent solution to preserve Amtrak service throughout Massachusetts. I intend to work diligently with Amtrak, the State, and congressional appropriators in the next Congress to ensure that the Lake Shore Limited can continue its present level of service.

I am also pleased that the omnibus bill increases funding for Amtrak's Northeast Corridor Improvement Project, or NECIP, by \$60 million over the amount that was approved in the transportation appropriations bill. The funds will finance much needed track maintenance and upgrades, and the electrification of the Northeast Corridor. This additional funding will greatly facilitate achievement of NECIP's goal to provide reliable, high-speed rail transport service between Washington, DC, and Boston, with the objective of achieving 3-hour service between Boston and New York.

SMALL BUSINESS

I am pleased that the Small Business Programs Improvement Act of 1996, which is included in the omnibus appropriations bill, includes legislation that I introduced earlier this year to end discrimination by the Federal Government against small business and also includes an amendment I sponsored that will provide fishermen access to SBA's disaster assistance program when fishing is prohibited because of a commercial fishery failure or a fishery resource failure.

Last year, Congress passed the Small Business Lending Enhancement Act of 1995 which lowered the maximum guarantee rate for SBA's section 7(a) guaranteed loan program. The legislation also lowered the guarantee rate from 90 percent to either 75 or 80 percent depending on differing circumstances, for SBA's Export Working Capital Program, which guarantees loans made by banks and other lenders who use loans to produce goods and services to export. However, financing for business loans through the Export-Import bank are still guaranteed at 90 percent.

My legislation that is as part of the omnibus bill restores the 90 percent guarantee for the Export Working Capital Program to assure that small businesses do not lose export opportunities just because they cannot get financing from banks. This change will have a minimal impact on SBA's credit subsidy rate and overall lending authority. However, it is crucial to small business exporters who need better access to financing. At a time when exports are a key component of continued economic growth, increasing the SBA guarantee will increase the amount of small business exports—which in turn will create jobs in Massachusetts and across the Nation.

This legislation also includes an amendment which will provide fishermen access to disaster assistance under section 7(b)(2) of the Small Business Act's disaster assistance program if fishing is prohibited because of ocean conditions or a commercial fishery failure. Most fishermen are individual small business owners and consequently are very susceptible to severe economic loss or even economic failure in the event of fishery closures or declines. Fishing is a capital intensive industry composed primarily of individually owned fishing vessels. These small businesses are financially incapable of enduring even a short term fisheries closure.

This amendment allows the Administrator of the SBA, after the Secretary of Commerce has declared a commercial fishery failure or a commercial fishery disaster, to provide fishermen access to disaster assistance. I know how important it will be to helping maintain the commercial fishing heritage in Massachusetts, and it is for that reason I believed it was essential to include such a provision in this legislation.

The decline in the groundfish stocks off the coast of Massachusetts, and the subsequent Federal restrictions on fishing in Georges Bank, have resulted in significant economic hardship for Massachusetts fishermen. These problems in the fishing industry have driven many fishermen to the brink of economic demise. In many cases, having taken loans to purchase their fishing vessels, fishermen confronting a fishery collapse have lost their homes which they commonly use as collateral for their vessel loans.

I believe that we need to continue to implement fishery conservation and re-

building measures or the Massachusetts fishing industry will cease to exist. I believe the interim financial support the SBA can offer through disaster assistance will play an important role in keeping commercial fishing alive in Massachusetts and all Coastal States that from time to time experience the economic devastation associated with a fisheries natural disaster.

This bill also improves and expands the Small Business Investment Company Program which is crucial to the growth of small business and our economy. Small businesses need access to capital, and SBIC's have invested \$12 billion in over 75,000 small businesses and have helped to create one million new jobs. This bill increases the level of private capital needed to obtain an SBIC license from SBA, requires experienced and qualified management for all SBIC's, requires diversification between investors and the management team and increases fees paid by SBICs which will reduce the credit subsidy rate.

I want to thank Small Business Committee Democratic Ranking Member Senator BUMPERS and his staff, especially John Ball, for their assistance with this portion of the omnibus bill. I also would like to acknowledge the assistance of Chairman KIT BOND and his staff.

LAW ENFORCEMENT

Mr. President, this bill includes funding for a number of important anti-crime programs. I am encouraged that it contains language originally offered by Senator LAUTENBERG which will keep anyone who has been convicted of a domestic violence crime from owning a gun. I co-sponsored his legislation because simple common sense dictates that guns absolutely must be forbidden for those who abuse their spouses.

The Local Law Enforcement Block Grants Program provides funds to local communities to use as they deem necessary to reduce crime and enhance public safety. This allows localities to address community-specific crime problems using solutions that they have developed with added resources and flexibility. Due to Democrats' efforts, \$523 million is contained in this legislation, \$20 million more than provided by the Republicans.

I am proud of the role I was able to play in passing the Community Oriented Policing Services [COPS] Program in the 1994 crime bill. This program was developed to deploy 100,000 new police officers on the streets of our Nation by the year 2000. This bill continues the commitment to that program with funding of \$1.4 billion.

Both the block grants and the COPS funding have been widely and effectively used in Massachusetts communities, and crime statistics as well as local observation show that they are working to reduce crime. It is vital that they be continued.

EDUCATION

Mr. President, I am heartened that, despite the best efforts by some of my

colleagues on the other side of the aisle, it has been possible to include at least a minimally adequate level of funding in this bill for many key programs designed to aid this Nation's children. Democrats successfully fought to add money to the bills produced by House Republicans and the Senate Appropriations Committee. Unfortunately, the amounts still are not what this Nation ought to be providing for most of these programs and I urge Congress next year to provide sufficient resources to ensure that a floor of decency and hope is provided for all children.

Head Start provides comprehensive development services for low-income children and families, emphasizing cognitive and language development, physical and mental health, and parent involvement to enable each child to develop and function at his or her highest potential. I support full funding for this prevention program because it is cost effective—for the price of a single space in a juvenile detention facility, we can provide a full-day, full-year Head Start experience for five young people. Children that participate in Head Start are more likely to graduate from high school, earn more, and commit fewer juvenile crimes. That is why I supported the President's 1997 request of \$3.98 billion and am glad that due to Democrats' efforts, we will approve that amount, which is \$381 million more than the amount originally approved by the Republicans.

The Summer Youth Jobs Program offers work experience, supportive services, and academic enrichment to economically disadvantaged youth, ages 14 to 21. This important program addresses the severe problems facing out-of-school youth in communities with high poverty and unemployment. Cities and towns in Massachusetts depend on it, and I am glad it will be funded at \$871 million, the President's request—an amount that is \$246 million more than provided by the Republicans.

HEALTH/HUMAN SERVICES/EMPLOYMENT

The National Institutes of Health [NIH] is the world's leading biomedical research institution. Our investment in NIH's research saves lives and reduces health care costs while creating jobs and economic growth in a global economy. In recent years, this research has produced major advances in the treatment of cancer, heart disease, diabetes, and mental illness that have helped thousands of American families. NIH supports over 50,000 scientists at 1,700 universities and research institutes across the United States. I am glad that funding for NIH is increased by \$819 million over fiscal year 1996, a 6.5-percent increase, bringing fiscal year 1997 funding to \$12.7 billion, which is \$332.6 million more than provided by the Republicans.

The Maternal and Child Health Block Grant provides funds to States to meet a broad range of enhanced, wrap-around health services, including personal health services; general population-wide health services, such as

screening; family support services; and integrated systems of care. About 16 million women, infants, children, adolescents and children with special health care needs will be served in 1997. Due to Democrats' efforts, \$681 million is approved, which is \$2.9 million more than provided by the Republicans.

The Substance Abuse Block Grant provides funds on a formula basis to States to support alcohol and drug abuse prevention, treatment, and rehabilitation services. Due to Democrats' efforts, this program will receive \$1.3 billion, which is \$125 million more than provided by the Republicans.

The Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program [LIHEAP] provides assistance to States to help low-income households meet the costs of home energy. It is crucial to New England States including Massachusetts. States have great flexibility in how they provide assistance, which may include direct payments to individuals and vendors and direct provision of fuel. In this legislation, LIHEAP is funded at the President's request level of \$1.3 billion and includes \$300 million in fiscal year 1996 advanced emergency funds. Due to Democrats' efforts, we were able to save this program from the House Republicans who eliminated it in their Labor-HHS appropriations bill.

Mr. President, I am disappointed that this legislation does not include any funding for the Homeless Veterans Reintegration Program [HVRP], which has been authorized for fiscal year 1997 by both the Senate and House Veterans Committees at \$10 million. HVRP is a successful job placement program that has put 13,000 homeless veterans back to work. A sizeable proportion of homeless people in this country are veterans; this should not be the case. The HVRP Program helps veterans on public assistance become productive, tax-paying citizens. It is so successful because HVRP provides grants to community-based groups that employ flexible and innovative approaches to help homeless veterans reenter the work force.

Furthermore, HVRP is cost-effective. It is estimated that it only costs \$1,200 per person placed in a job, which is equal to the cost of unemployment for 1 month. HVRP succeeds in breaking the cycle of poverty and homelessness by giving people the ability to work their way out. Instead of giving handouts, this program gives veterans the tools, skills, and training they need to be productive members of society. As a veteran of the Vietnam war, I believe that we owe this type of service, among others, to the men and women who so honorably served our country.

In my home State of Massachusetts, the New England Shelter for Homeless Veterans has helped over 6,600 veterans since opening its doors in 1990, and housed within the shelter is the Vietnam Veterans Workshop, which is one of the community-based organizations that provides job training and work placement. The program has trained

over 1,600 veterans, 72 percent of which are working citizens today. In the absence of earmarked appropriations for the coming year, I hope that the Departments of Housing and Urban Development and Labor will find some discretionary money to fund this important program.

Mr. President, I am pleased that the Labor-HHS title in the bill continues the Democrats' strong commitment to combat the AIDS epidemic. After 12 years of inaction and ignorance by Republican administrations, this country has moved decisively into a new era in the fight against HIV-disease. Working with President Clinton, Health and Human Services Secretary Donna Shalala, and the director of national AIDS policy, Patsy Fleming, the Democrats in Congress have pushed for increases in the Ryan White CARE Act of more than \$200 million over last year's level. We have nearly tripled the money going to States and cities affected by the AIDS epidemic through the previously underfunded Ryan White Program, and we have renewed our pledge to the States that the Federal Government will take seriously the critical AIDS Drug Assistance Program. In calling for these increases, I was pleased to work with the AIDS Action Committee in Boston and other groups across the Commonwealth of Massachusetts who serve on the front lines of the epidemic as care and service providers.

Caring for those already infected with HIV is only one piece of a comprehensive national response to the AIDS epidemic. In this legislation, we are finally providing enough funding to the Centers for Disease Control to undertake a serious campaign to prevent new infections. Democrats on both ends of Pennsylvania Avenue urged the appropriators to increase funding for the CDC's AIDS prevention programs by nearly \$33 million over last year's level to bring it to \$617 million for fiscal year 97. And we are providing a substantial increase to the National Institutes of Health for our top biomedical researchers to redouble their efforts to find a cure for this dread disease. We cannot set our sights lower than finding a cure to AIDS. To that end, in this bill, we are committing nearly \$1.5 billion to NIH research and retaining the Office of AIDS Research.

Mr. President, these funding levels are the clearest signal of the Democrats' commitment to fight a war on AIDS—and not a war on people with AIDS that characterized the Government's response during the 1980's and early 1990's.

FOREIGN RELATIONS AND AID

Turning to the foreign aid components of this bill, I think it is important to note that the overall funding is \$500 million less than what the administration requested. This decrease will result in programmatic cuts nearly across the board, resulting ultimately in the decreased ability of the United States to address global issues such as

famine, child nutrition, sustainable development and the environment. With respect to the last of those, I am deeply concerned that the bill provides only \$35 million for the Global Environment Facility. This is \$65 million below the President's request.

I am pleased that the omnibus bill incorporates the Humanitarian Aid Corridor Act which I cosponsored. This provision reaffirms the United States' commitment to the safe arrival of all U.S. humanitarian aid. It also provides \$95 million in aid to Armenia, an increase of \$10 million from the fiscal year 1996 level.

The bill also retains a provision, which I strongly supported, taken from the Senate-reaffirmed foreign aid bill, that would establish a new exchange program focused on legal reform in Vietnam. I would note that the Senate voted to retain funding for this program by a vote of 56 to 43. This program is in our long term interest; it is a means of bringing Vietnam into the larger international community while imparting our own values and norms, particularly in the economic arena.

As one who has cosponsored all of Senator LEAHY's bills on landmines, I am pleased that there is a \$10 million earmark for demining in this bill and a \$5 million earmark for assistance to the victims of landmines. There are over 100 million active, deadly landmines in 60 different countries around the world, killing and maiming approximately 26,000 people per year. Most victims are innocent children. These earmarks indicate the broad bipartisan support in Congress for devoting resources to clearing landmines, recognizing the integral role that demining plays not only in saving the lives of innocent civilians, but also in the rebuilding of communities.

Mr. President, by far the most egregious part of this bill that pertains to foreign aid is its treatment of international family planning programs. I am saddened and at the same time outraged that the House Republicans, in an undisguised way, tried to do as much damage as possible to population assistance. Their actions are mean spirited, punitive, and short-sighted.

This bill provides that no fiscal year 1997 funds can be used for population assistance until July 1, 1997—a full 9 months after the fiscal year begins. Beginning in July, the program will be funded at a rate of 8 percent of the annual appropriation each month. Mr. President, this is ludicrous. No other program in this entire appropriations bill is crippled in this way, and the unwillingness of the House Republicans to accept the Senate's position on family planning programs is disgraceful.

Mr. President, their tactics are simply illogical. By severing funds for family planning programs the Republicans are taking away the one tool that allows women in impoverished countries to choose not to have an abortion. Family planning does not mean abortion—it means quite the opposite. Those who continue to equate

the two should take a minute to look at the facts. Statistics, across the board, show that when women have access to family planning programs, the incidence of abortion decreases. Those who continue to equate the two should also read the laws. Federal law prohibits the United States from funding abortions abroad. The U.S. Agency for International Development has strictly abided by that law. For the House Republicans to slash funding for international family planning programs on the premise that they do not want U.S. tax dollars funding abortions can only be described as illogical and wholly unwarranted.

By denying people access to family planning worldwide by slashing funding for those programs, there will be millions more unintended pregnancies every year, close to a million infant deaths, tens of thousands of deaths among women and—let me emphasize to colleagues who oppose permitting women to choose abortions in the case of unwanted pregnancies—over one million more abortions.

These programs provide 17 million families worldwide the opportunity to responsibly plan their families and space their children. They offer a greater chance for safe childbirth and healthy children, and avoid adding to the population problem that affects all of us.

I am unwavering in my conviction that international family planning programs are in America's best interest. Funding for these programs is an investment in our future and an investment that will save the lives of thousands of women and infants. I will continue to fight for what is moral. The House majority needs to start acting responsibly on an issue that will affect generations to come.

On matters pertaining to foreign policy, the bill offers mixed news. It provides \$892 million for contributions assessed on the United States as a result of its membership obligations to the United Nations and other international organizations. While this figure is an improvement over the levels in the House-passed bill and the Senate-reported bill, it is still \$110 million less than the administration's adjusted request. This means that the administration will lack the funds to pay arrearages and that we will fall into greater debt at the United Nations. I strongly believe that we must press the United Nations to make administrative, financial, and management reforms, but continued failure to pay our contributions will only serve to undercut our ability to achieve those reforms. The bill provides a somewhat more reasonable level for peacekeeping, \$352.4 million, but, it, too, falls short of the administration's adjusted request of \$377 million.

With respect to funding for international exchanges, the bill provides only \$185 million. In the last 2 years, the Republican Congress has succeeded in cutting funds dramatically for ex-

change programs. I believe that this is a mistake. Exchanges, particularly the Fulbright program and other academic exchanges, are one of our most effective instruments of foreign policy.

I am pleased that at the end of the day, House and Senate negotiators agreed to provide the President with his adjusted request of \$41.5 million for the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. The challenges in the area of arms control and nonproliferation are increasing, not decreasing in the more complicated world that pertains after the breakup of the former Soviet Union. To make deep cuts in the ACDA budget, as was contemplated by the Senate appropriators, would have seriously undermined our national security interests.

DEFENSE

Providing a sufficient national defense is one of the bedrock responsibilities of our Government to its people. I stand behind no Member of this institution in my commitment to an adequate defense. But I do not believe a gold-plated defense serves our Nation's interests, and I know without doubt that the tax dollars we spend for weapons and armies beyond those our armed services chiefs believe are necessary result in shortchanging our people in other vital ways, both now and in the future.

Despite a number of component decisions that appear to me to be carefully considered and justified, the defense and national security portion of this omnibus bill demonstrates the inability of this Republican-controlled Congress to make tough choices when it comes to defense. While the budget negotiators used approximately \$1 billion in defense spending to offset antiterrorism efforts funded in this bill, the bill still contains \$9.3 billion more than the Pentagon's budget request. Illustrative of the flawed decisions that contributed to this distressing overrun is the Ballistic Missile Defense Program. Certainly one is not vulnerable to the charge of failing to prepare for a ballistic missile threat by supporting the Pentagon's and administration's request for \$2.9 billion for their BMD effort. Indeed, I strongly support the vigorous research and development effort to enhance our technical capabilities to spot, track, intercept, and destroy intercontinental ballistic missiles and their warheads, and I have been a consistent supporter of programs to develop and field theater ballistic missiles.

Unfortunately, the Republicans cannot recognize when they have had enough of a good thing. They insisted on spending an additional \$885 million for ballistic missile defense.

The absence of the spending discipline with respect to defense and national security that the Republicans adamantly insist be directed toward domestic Government services is the cause of this legislation's single greatest flaw—an unsupported and unsupportably high aggregate appropriation for defense.

CONCLUSION

In summary, Mr. President, the negotiators labored mightily. Thanks to the fortitude of President Clinton, his Chief of Staff, and other administration negotiators, and Democratic congressional leaders and appropriators, this product passes the smell test, and manages to pass muster. I voted for it, disappointed that it fails in so many ways to provide what I believe our Nation should be providing, but cognizant that it could have been far worse. That definitely is not the measure to which I believe we should aspire. But in the final days of the 104th Congress, I believe it is the best anyone could have expected. As we look to November, we also look with great hopes to the 105th Congress and the opportunity it will afford to come to terms again with the way in which our budget reflects our national priorities and values. I hope we will do better next time.●

DRS. JOHN AND WINONA VERNBERG

● Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, South Carolina has been dealt a double blow by the retirement of two leaders who have dedicated their professional lives to the public good. Drs. John and Winona Vernberg have been the University of South Carolina's power couple in the areas of public health, science, and the environment.

This beautiful couple has been together for nearly 50 years and has been serving the public just as long. They met in the Navy Hospital Corps at the end of World War II, and embarked on stellar careers in academia afterwards at Duke University and then at the University of South Carolina. John became a Guggenheim Fellow, both won Fulbright-Hayes Fellows, both won the Russell Award for Research in Science and Engineering, both received the William S. Proctor Prize for Scientific Achievement, and Winona was named Woman of the Year in 1980 by the University of South Carolina.

While their academic work has been top notch, they have not confined their activities to the classroom or laboratory. Winona became dean of the School of Public Health at USC in 1978, and within a year it was accredited. She has made that school an active, leading institution. It has 10 times the staff and 30 times as many students as when she took over. It has taken on the environmental health questions of our times in an interdisciplinary way and with an eye to the future. More recently, the university has recognized her management skills and longstanding contributions to the institution by naming her acting provost.

While Winona has been dean of the School of Public Health, John has been dean of the School of the Environment and head of the Baruch Institute at the University. We in South Carolina have a treasure in the coastal ecosystem, and John and Winona have worked in concert to understand it, to teach others, and to protect it. Diverse research