

from London to Melbourne. He has formed lasting friendships not just between individuals but also between organizations that have hugely benefited all concerned.

This April 28 he retires: at the top of his grade and the top of his form. He goes with the profound thanks of Liz, Tim, Tracey, John, Helen, and Maura for his friendship and his guardianship. And the great good wishes of all manner of New Yorkers for how well he has served us. Only Chuck Bennett would notice odd gestures on street corners and spot an epidemic on its way. Let us hope he returns regularly to New York, keeping an eye on things, and keeping in touch with those of us who love him so.

DR. RODNEY BELCHER

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, it is with great sadness that I rise today to inform the Senate of the tragic death of Dr. Rodney Belcher, an orthopedic surgeon from Arlington, VA, who was murdered in Kampala, Uganda, on March 13.

I was fortunate to have known Dr. Belcher. Seven years ago, shortly after I established the War Victims Fund, a \$5 million appropriation in the foreign aid program to provide medical and related assistance to war victims, Rod Belcher signed on with Health Volunteers Overseas. He had lived in Uganda before the civil war there, and the Agency for International Development sent him back to start a War Victims Fund program to assist people who had been disabled from war injuries. He and his wife Dawn had been there ever since.

There were tens of thousands of amputees, many victims of landmines, without access to artificial limbs. The Mulagro hospital and medical school, once the pride and joy of that country, were in ruins. There were not even basic medical supplies. There was not a single trained orthopedic surgeon in the country. The Ugandan Government was bankrupt.

Rod embraced that enormous challenge with enthusiasm, good humor, patience, and a deep, personal commitment to the Ugandan people. Over the years he won the trust and respect of the Ugandan Government, and of successive United States Ambassadors and the ambassadors of other countries who witnessed the impact he was having on the lives of so many people. He rebuilt the orthopedic clinic and trained every orthopedic surgeon in Uganda today.

When my wife Marcelle and I visited Uganda in 1990, Dr. Belcher took us around the orthopedic clinic. We saw what a difference the War Victims Fund had made, as a result of his efforts and the efforts of the Ugandans who worked with him. It was an experience that neither of us will ever forget. We saw what a difference this one American had made.

Since then I have often thought of that trip, and Rod Belcher became the

model for the volunteers that have been recruited for other War Victims Fund programs. He exemplified what we looked for in others. He had a warmth and gentleness, and a commitment to Uganda that was extraordinary.

Mr. President, on March 13, on his way to his office, Dr. Belcher was murdered when two men stole his car. He was shot in the chest and died right there.

It would be hard to conceive of a more senseless, horrible crime. Rod Belcher was a wonderfully generous human being who devoted his professional life to improving the lives of others. For the past 7 years he lived and worked in a country where getting even the simplest thing accomplished often required incredible ingenuity and persistence. Rod had both.

At his funeral, Dr. Belcher was honored by the Ugandan Vice President, the Minister of Health, the director of the hospital, the dean of the medical school, the American Ambassador, the British High Commissioner, and many others. The orthopedic clinic that he worked so hard to establish was formally named after him. The streets were lined with people who knew him personally or had heard of the American doctor who had done so much for the Ugandan people.

Rod Belcher will be terribly missed. But he leaves a legacy that anyone would be proud of. He gave the War Victims Fund its start, and for that I will always be grateful. And he leaves a core of trained Ugandan orthopedic surgeons who loved and admired him, who will carry on in his place.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is now closed.

BALANCED BUDGET DOWNPAYMENT ACT, II

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate H.R. 3019. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 3019) making appropriations for fiscal year 1996 to make a further downpayment toward a balanced budget, and for other purposes.

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill.

Pending:
Hatfield modified amendment No. 3466, in the nature of a substitute.

Reid amendment No. 3478 (to amendment No. 3466), to restore funding for and ensure the protection of endangered species of fish and wildlife.

Hutchison/Kemphorne amendment No. 3479 (to amendment No. 3478), to reduce funding for endangered species listings.

AMENDMENT NO. 3479

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Texas to the amendment of the Senator from Nevada is in order.

Mr. REID addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada is recognized.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair advise the Senator from Nevada when I have 5 minutes remaining of the 15.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator may proceed.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I have here a letter from the Evangelical Environmental Network consisting of a number of people, including Dr. Robert C. Andringa, president of the Christian College Coalition; Dr. George Brushaber, president of Bethel College and Seminary; Mr. Roger Cross, president of Youth for Christ/USA; Rev. Art DeKruyter, pastor of Christ Church of Oakbrook, and on and on with other religious leaders of this country.

The letter, written to all Senators, says, among other things:

This week the Senate will be voting on an omnibus appropriations bill that contains a subtle attack on God's handiwork. Buried in the legislation is a provision to continue the moratorium on listing plants and animals as endangered or threatened, under the Endangered Species Act.

Certainly there are scientific, economic, and medical reasons for saving endangered creatures, but for many individuals and congregations linked to the Evangelical Environmental Network, the moral and spiritual aspects are the more important. The Bible records "the everlasting covenant between God and all living creatures of every kind on Earth" and God affirms that covenant after using Noah to bring the creatures through the Flood and save their lives.

Mr. President, the letter continues:

If I am going to be in the right relationship with God, I should treat the things he has made in the same way he treats them.

The moratorium on listing species is nothing more than a back door attack. While we stand by and do nothing, this supposedly "temporary" measure may stretch over more than two years, with the cost of recovering species becoming greater and greater as time passes.

The moratorium was a bad idea when instituted; it is a bad idea today. . . .

Despite anti-ESA propagandists claim, neither law nor our environmental stance values plants or animals above people. At issue is not favoritism but just and moral treatment of all of God's creatures. God placed us here as stewards, not as exploiters, and we have no right to act in a callous manner toward any living creature.

With respect to the Endangered Species Act, we are compelled to speak out because this matter relates to the core of our faith and respect for God.

Mr. President, I have read only part of the letter, but the indication from these religious leaders is that the moratorium on the Endangered Species Act is wrong and it is immoral.

Mr. President, we have received letters from all over the country, not the least of which is a letter from a group of physicians. I talked about some of the things they said yesterday. But, in effect, what they say is that it is wrong to have this moratorium; it is wrong for health reasons to millions of people throughout the world.

This letter is signed by representatives of the Physicians for Social Responsibility, the National Association

of Physicians for the Environment, someone from the Pennsylvania Medical Society, the Massachusetts Medical Society, the Nevada Medical Society, the Vermont Medical Society, the Arthritis Foundation, AIDS Action Council, Harvard School of Public Health, Boston University, and on and on, Mr. President, with people from the medical community who say that this moratorium is not only wrong from a political standpoint; it is wrong from a moral perspective.

Mr. President, last night I went back to the office and asked my staff to look at some of the things we have received over our computer, over our e-mail network. We received—and I just at random picked a few—we received something from Basking Ridge, NJ, from a woman who says:

I implore you—

It is written to various Senators.

I implore you to support Senator REID's amendment.

This matter is of critical importance because:

Listing a species under the Endangered Species Act is not a trivial matter that can be delayed indefinitely. The moratorium on listing and critical habitat designations must be lifted.

The integrity of the ESA is extremely important to your constituents. Do not allow this Congress to weaken this important legislation.

That letter was from Merideth Mueller.

I received a letter from Minnesota from one Todd Burnside of Roseville, MN. He says:

The extinction of species and the degradation of the environment are things that future generations may never forgive us for.

I received also, Mr. President, a copy of an e-mail written to all Senators:

With all my heart I beg you to vote yes to REID's amendment to H.R. 3019, so that the awful moratorium to the ESA will end. I cannot express to you how angry and disappointed I am at this government for allowing for an ESA moratorium in the first place. This act completely goes against the needs of the country in terms of economics, morality, responsibility, and common sense. At a time when we urgently need solidarity on all fronts to protect what little we have left of the natural environment and to leave something for our future generations to cherish, and to stop the massive onslaught on our natural world, we as citizens need you to protect the environment, our home.

Mr. President, it is obvious what has happened here. The second-degree amendment calls for emergency listings only. We know that this will allow people to file all kinds of lawsuits to have emergency listings. We know that there were listings prior to this moratorium being pronounced. They should proceed in an orderly fashion.

What this second-degree amendment will do is force the Department of the Interior to defend numerous lawsuits to show that what they are doing is adequate. We need to get rid of this moratorium and get back to good science and good protection of the environment and these species. What is taking place now is an assault on good science and good government.

It also allows this body to simply not go forward with reauthorizing the Endangered Species Act. As long as this moratorium is in effect, there will be no further listings, and that is wrong. This moratorium, I think it is clear, is going to continue throughout this Congress with all we have to do with all the problems with the balanced budget and 13 appropriations bills, 5 of which we did not pass last year.

I think it is going to be extremely difficult to reauthorize this bill. This is a license to repudiate the Endangered Species Act. I think we as a country and we as a Congress should be ashamed if we allow this to happen. Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mrs. HUTCHISON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I have submitted an amendment to the amendment because I think it is most important that we keep the integrity of what we are trying to do to protect the endangered species. The authorization for the Endangered Species Act ran out several years ago. That is because of the ridiculous excesses that have been perpetrated on the private property owners in this country. So we called a moratorium on the old act so that we could reauthorize it, so that we could protect private property and protect the endangered species. And we want to have good science, we want to have cost-benefit analysis, we want to have economic impact analysis because, after all, Mr. President, there is no reason for people in the Northwest to have the entire timber industry shut down because of the spotted owl. There is no reason to have put people who had worked for generations in the timber industry there out of work and untrained to do other things.

In fact, Mr. President, you and I are paying \$250 million to retrain those people because we were protecting a spotted owl that could have been put somewhere else in a national forest to protect. We could have had it both ways if we had just used common sense, Mr. President. But we did not do that. And that is why it was necessary and why this Congress voted overwhelmingly to put a moratorium on the Endangered Species Act listing—not the preparation for listing, not the research, just the final listings—until we could have a reauthorization of the act that would put common sense into it, that would put people into the equation, because after all, people should be in the equation as well. I like to joke sometimes and say that the only endangered species not protected is *Homo sapiens*.

Now, Mr. President, it is time that we started putting common sense into this act. Let me talk to you about a few of the excesses that have caused us to be in the situation where we are, needing to do a drastic reorganization and reauthorization of this bill.

In Texas, my home State, there is a golden cheek warbler. Fish and Wildlife originally said they were going to set aside an area the size of the State of Rhode Island to protect a golden cheek warbler. Mr. President, we want to protect golden cheek warblers, but I think it is a little excessive to cause property values in that entire area to plummet to save this golden cheek warbler when we can do it with other means. Not only that, but what they said you could not do on your property is cut cedar. Now, cedar has a very bad impact on people's health. People have what we call cedar fever. People are miserable with cedar fever. So they cut cedar trees to keep people from having this very annoying sort of sneezing attack.

Well, in addition to that, even more important to the farmers and ranchers in the area, cedar absorbs water so that we lose the ability to use water downstream because the cedar trees are absorbing the water upstream. So it really is a hindrance and something that our farmers and ranchers need to deal with. One Travis County, TX, owner, Margaret Rector, invested in land 25 years ago to help her in her retirement years. In 1990, her land was worth \$830,000. After it was designated a golden cheek warbler habitat, its value plunged to \$30,000.

Mr. President, that is not a guess, that is an assessment on the county tax rolls in Travis County, TX. Mr. President, that is ridiculous. Next is the southwestern willow fly catcher in California. The Army Corps of Engineers built the Isabella Dam in Kern County, CA, to catch the runoff of melting snow from the southern Sierra Mountains to save it for use in the summer. It has saved millions in flood damage, increased the water supply, and it is the third largest food-producing county in the entire country now. But the listing in February 1995 of the southwestern willow fly catcher has put the dam's use at risk, fearing the reservoir will flood fly catcher nesting areas, a harm to the bird's habitat. Now Fish and Wildlife may force the Corps of Engineers to release water from the reservoir to protect the habitat that did not exist until the dam was built.

These are two examples, Mr. President. The jaguar in Texas. Mr. President, they have not seen a jaguar in Texas since 1948 when one wandered up from Mexico, they think, and it was cited as sort of an anomaly. Now they are talking about listing the jaguar as an endangered species in Texas, having not seen one since 1948, and it could cause restrictions on land use in 30 counties along the Rio Grande River.

Mr. President, that is why so many groups and private property owners—the American Farm Bureau is alarmed by what is happening with this Endangered Species Act. They are in total support of my amendment, which does the following. My amendment just says that we will protect the ability to have emergency listings. It has been said on

this floor that we might lose some of the very important endangered species. Well, we will not. With my amendment, we give the Secretary of the Interior the right to do an emergency listing so there would not be a danger of losing an endangered species on an emergency basis.

But, Mr. President, I think it is very important that we realize that the people who are holding up the progress on the reauthorization are also the people who are here wanting to lift the moratorium. I do not understand that. I do not understand why they would want to lift the moratorium on a bill that they have all said has problems. I have pointed out a few of those problems here this morning. Why would they lift the moratorium under the old act that they say has problems when they have the power to reauthorize and to protect everyone—private property rights, private property owners, and to protect the animals under the Endangered Species Act, as well? Why would we not do things the right way, Mr. President? That is my question here today.

Mr. President, how much time remains on my side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas has 7½ minutes remaining.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I yield the floor and reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I yield 4½ minutes to the Senator from Rhode Island, [Mr. CHAFEE].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island is recognized.

Mr. CHAFEE. I thank the distinguished Senator from Nevada.

Mr. President, what is wrong with the Hutchison amendment, the second-degree amendment? First of all, it maintains the moratorium on final decisions to list species through the end of this fiscal year.

Now, Mr. President, let us briefly review the bidding. Last March, the Senate approved a 6-month moratorium, a brief time out on listings under the Endangered Species Act. That was 6 months. That was extended another 5 months under the continuing resolution. Now, under this bill, the moratorium would be extended for another 7 months. That means that for a minimum of 18 months no work will be done toward conserving species that warrant protection under the Endangered Species Act, species threatened with extinction or destruction, and a lot of ground can be lost in a year and a half.

Now, Mr. President, the second point is that although the Hutchison second-degree amendment would allow emergency listings—the word “emergency” is in there—that is not an adequate or practical way to recover a species. Mr. President, you come up with emergency listing when the situation is really desperate. It is sort of a last-ditch effort to save a species, when the species is about to become extinct either through disease, or destruction by man in some fashion, or the last remnant of the habitat has been wiped out.

At this point, Mr. President, there is little hope of recovering the species. Recovery, after all, is the goal of the Endangered Species Act. That is what this is all about. If we do not want an Endangered Species Act, just let us say so. But we hear constantly on the floor of this Senate—when these amendments are brought up to really demolish the Endangered Species Act, it is prefaced by, “We are all for the act, we just want to make these corrections.” But this “correction,” so-called, really is devastating to the recovery of a species.

If you are only listing it as endangered when it reaches the emergency situation, then the cause is practically lost, in most instances, due to the destruction of the animal, bird or plant, or lost due to the destruction of the habitat that is so essential for the survival of that.

Furthermore, Mr. President, I point out that emergency listings are only temporary. Under the Endangered Species Act, they last for 240 days. You go in—it is not like a listing for an endangered species. It is an emergency situation. Normally, the Fish and Wildlife Service promulgates a final rule to list a species at the end of the 240-day emergency listing period.

Under the second-degree amendment that is presented, the Fish and Wildlife Service could not make a final rule to protect the species under the Endangered Species Act because you cannot do that. They have to go through a whole series of emergency actions—240 days, and then another 240 days. That is not the kind of situation that is really going to lead to the saving of a species. It is not going to permit long-term decisions to be made and expenditures of money, perhaps, for the saving of habitat.

So, Mr. President, I do hope the second-degree amendment will be tabled, as the distinguished Senator from Nevada will move at some period.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. REID addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, in the Endangered Species Listing Handbook published by the Division of Endangered Species, under Procedures Guidance for the Preparations and Processing of Rules and Notices Pursuant to the Endangered Species Act:

An emergency listing is a temporary measure, providing the Act's protection for only 240 days. It is only used in extreme situations of dire imminent threat to a species' continued existence.

Mr. President, there is going to be a flood of lawsuits if this amendment of my friend from Texas is not tabled. The listing moratorium must be lifted. The motion to table that I will make should be granted, and the listing moratorium must be lifted.

First, over 500 species are dangerously close to extinction along with their life-sustaining ecosystems.

Second, the moratorium on the listing process is a display of lack of faith

in the legislative process. Really, it is arrogance, because everyone knows that as long as this moratorium is in effect, there will be no endangered species reauthorization. It removes the incentive for opponents of the Endangered Species Act to reauthorize the act.

Third, it is argued that a time out is what was needed to get reform measures in place and better science procedures in the listing process. I have two responses. The first is that there is no time out for the species who may face habitat degradation and extinction. Finally, the science is irrelevant if a species has become extinct. My second response to a time out is that the show of good faith in reauthorization that my colleagues talked about last night and this morning would be the lifting of the moratorium and proceeding with the business of reforming the act.

Fourth, I received letters from 38 physicians, chemists, dentists, and others from around the country advocating the repeal of the moratorium. I read some of their organizations today. They state with clarity: “What is often lost in the debate over species conservation is the value of species to human health.”

They continue. “* * * [R]ecent studies have shown that a substantial proportion of the Nation's medicines are derived from plants and other natural resources. The medicines of tomorrow being discovered today from nature * * *.”

They conclude: “When a species is lost to extinction, we have no idea what potential medical cures are lost along with it.”

I have talked about the evangelicals and representatives of religious organizations. I have read in detail from their letters. They believe that this is a moral issue and not a political issue.

My response to the second-degree amendment is, among other things:

First, the amendment fundamentally maintains the listing moratorium. That is all it does. It fails to mitigate the devastating impact of the listing moratorium because it does not allow for a final determination of an emergency listing. This means that no real recovery can take place. It is a meaningless exercise in paperwork.

Second, the second-degree amendment only creates wasteful bureaucratic procedures and would be a heyday for lawyers.

Third, the Kempthorne amendment has agreed in the past that we should try to avoid emergency listings. This is directly in the offset.

Finally, Mr. President, there is no justification, no logic, to this inactivity when the net result will be a greater cost to the taxpayer, fewer management options, and, most importantly, greater increase in the likelihood of extinction.

The amendment is a superficial legislative ploy.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mrs. HUTCHISON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas is recognized, and the remaining time is 7 minutes.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. I had 7½ minutes the last time I asked.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seven minutes remain.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. I yield 5 minutes to the senior Senator from Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, I am very happy to be here to support my colleague from Texas. I think on this issue she is absolutely right. Let me explain why.

In 1973, we passed the Endangered Species Act. We have gone back periodically and rewritten that law, and in the last rewriting we put in a date by which the law had to be updated in order to still have force, a sunset provision. The logic of the sunset provision was to assure that periodically as situations changed, such as the power of the bureaucracy to expand the law beyond any limit anyone foresaw when the law was written, that by that date we were going to have to go back and rewrite the law or it was going to stop having any force of law. That act expired in 1992. This is 1996. For 4 years, we have had no Endangered Species Act because the law is sunset. Granted, we have continued to allow it to operate by providing funds for that purpose. But the whole purpose of sunset is to modernize legislation to reflect the new reality.

Then in April 1995 we took a time out. This time out basically said, "It has been 3 years since this law expired." We should not allow the Fish and Wildlife Service to continue to designate endangered species without any limit, without any congressional check, until this law is reauthorized. That was eminently reasonable. It was adopted right here on the floor of the U.S. Senate, and it became the law of the land.

Now we have an effort by Senator REID to go back and, in essence, to make the endangered species law a law that operates in perpetuity where there is no requirement that it be modernized and where it can simply continue to do things like the effort by U.S. Fish and Wildlife to designate 33 counties in central Texas as being affected by an endangered species called the Golden Cheek Warbler. In the face of widespread opposition in Texas, they backed off.

But the point is we have a right to say that when Congress wrote this law, it wanted the right to periodically review it. That time for review occurred 4 years ago.

I think the Senator from Texas, Senator HUTCHISON, has proposed a reasonable compromise that will allow emergency designations and allow us to rewrite this law and make changes that the American people clearly want but which will put the pressure on those whose viewpoint is a minority viewpoint.

This is not just about endangered species. This is about whether or not we are going to let a small group of people who do not agree with the mandate of the 1994 election ride roughshod over that mandate by extending a law which expired 4 years ago and by allowing bureaucrats to continue to not consider cost and benefits. Everybody in the Senate knows that if we rewrite the Endangered Species Act in this Congress, there are going to be dramatic changes in it.

If the underlying Reid amendment which Senator HUTCHISON has amended is adopted and becomes law, we will not rewrite the Endangered Species Act—and everybody knows it. As a result, even though the majority of the American people and the majority of the Members of Congress are ready to make the changes, even though the law has expired, we will end up continuing to expand the power of the Federal bureaucracy.

I want to urge my colleagues to support the Hutchison amendment.

Let me also say that, if the underlying Reid amendment is attached to this bill, I intend to oppose this bill and I intend to vigorously fight its adoption. I think it would be an absolute outrage if we went back now and eliminated the time out we declared in April 1995 on a law which expired 4 years ago.

I yield the floor.

Mrs. HUTCHISON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, how much time is remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas has 2 minutes and 11 seconds.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, the argument has been made in the Chamber that we might lose some very important endangered animals in America. I submitted an amendment to the amendment to make sure that that would not happen. We allow emergency listings if there really is a danger of losing any animal or any species that is under the old act.

Let us look at what the Reid amendment does. You have heard people on the other side argue that there are problems with the act, but nevertheless they are urging you in the Reid amendment to go forward under the old act which we acknowledge has problems, regardless of the fact that it costs people jobs, that it hurts the economies of many States, and that it takes away a fundamental constitutional right in this country, and that is the right to private property.

That is wrong. It would be ridiculous for the Senate to vote today to go forward, take away jobs, hurt the economy, and take away private property rights under an act which everyone has acknowledged has problems.

If we are sincere about doing what is right, if we are sincere about reauthorizing the bill with some common sense, with some protection for private prop-

erty, if we are sincere about making sure that private property rights and people's jobs have some part in the equation in the decisionmaking, then we should vote for the Hutchison-Kempthorne amendment. The Hutchison-Kempthorne amendment protects emergency listings. If there really is a danger of losing one of the endangered species, it protects that right.

However, what we must do is also protect the right of the people in this country. The jobs and the people who work for a living ought to have some protection by the Senate. If we vote for the Hutchison-Kempthorne amendment, their rights will be protected and we will also reauthorize the Endangered Species Act to protect the animals in our country as well. Let us do it right. Vote for Hutchison-Kempthorne.

I thank the Chair.

Mr. FAIRCLOTH. Mr. President, I first want to commend the Junior Senator from Idaho for his leadership on this issue. I know that reforming the Endangered Species Act is a critical issue to Idaho. It is a make or break issue for many of our constituents. I am certain that he will approach the reauthorization with the reasoned, commonsense perspective it desperately needs.

Mr. President, as a life-long farmer, I understand the value of wildlife. I have grown up with wildlife and protected it without government forcing me to. But also as a farmer, I understand the incredible burden being placed on private landowners and public resources to meet the mandates of this act.

The problem comes when the bureaucracy gets out of control and government hurts people in order to protect animals. That is precisely what is happening all around the country. And where it is not already happening, it will happen soon.

For instance, in North Carolina we have thousands of acres of valuable timberland which cannot be cut because the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service believes it may harm red cockaded woodpeckers. Some changes have been announced recently that should help matters some. But there remains a big problem back home. By any reasonable measure the government has seized the land of many of my constituents without offering them a dime of compensation.

Unfortunately, the bureaucracy and the environmental industry do not care about the reality outside of Washington. They seek to use the Endangered Species Act and the animals themselves as tools to create Federal land use regulations nationwide. The ultimate result being thousands upon thousands of overlapping habitat ranges for each and every bug, snail, and fly the bureaucrats think we need more of.

Mr. President, the important question is: What happens when virtually all land is home to a protected animal—what happens then?

This is a very serious question. It has happened in Idaho, Senator KEMPTHORNE's State. As he has shown the committee, virtually all of Idaho is regulated as home to some sort of government protected animal. Thousands of acres of valuable farmland have been locked off to protect an underground water snail called the brunei snail. This kind of thing is going to happen everywhere when the environmental industry gets its way.

I will oppose Senator REID's amendment because we need to restrain the bureaucracy that is now operating under a flawed law. A law that gives too little consideration for the livelihood and property of people, and too much for bugs, bees, and bureaucrats.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that each side have an additional 1 minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FAIRCLOTH). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. I yield my 1 minute to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I note that in the second-degree amendment it provides \$1 to the Fish and Wildlife Service to do the entire emergency listing. That shows you how serious the other side is about this whole proposition.

In other words, in the underlying bill, there was \$750,000 which was available for the downlisting and the other activities in connection with this program. And now they are saying that we are out to take care of this situation because there is an emergency provision, and in order to take care of it they provide \$1.

It seems to me that shows you how serious really the other side is in proposing this second-degree amendment. And so I hope that the Reid effort to table the Hutchison amendment will succeed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Texas.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I yield 30 seconds to my colleague from Texas and 30 seconds to my colleague from Wyoming.

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, I hope nobody is confused by the statement that was just made. When we took a time out in April of 1995, we did not take all the money away from the Fish and Wildlife Service. We left them the money to continue to trample on private property and the rights of citizens and to continue to fail to look at reason, responsibility, and cost and benefits. But we simply took away the right for them 3 years after the law had expired to continue to limit jobs, growth and opportunity in America. The only reason the Senator from Texas added a dollar in her amendment was because this is an appropriations bill and it was strictly a technicality. The Senators amendment does not reduce the \$750,000 available. So I hope no one is confused.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. THOMAS. I thank the Chair.

I rise in support of the Hutchison amendment. We have worked very hard now for almost a year and a half having hearings going on in the country, and clearly all of us want to have endangered species protection. But very clearly, it needs to be changed, and it needs to be upgraded.

We need to learn from the experience of the past 20 years. This is the way to do it. If we do not have passage of the Hutchison amendment, then we will not get to making the changes that need to be made. I fully support the Hutchison amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired. Under the previous order, the amendment will be laid aside and the majority leader is recognized to call up an amendment.

The Chair recognizes the majority leader.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 3480 AND 3481 TO AMENDMENT NO. 3466

(Purpose: To provide economic reconstruction funds to Bosnia-Herzegovina subject to compliance with the Dayton Accord's requirement for withdrawal of foreign troops)

(Purpose: To provide economic assistance to Bosnia and Herzegovina subject to certain conditions)

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I am going to offer two amendments on behalf of myself and the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee, Senator MCCONNELL. One amendment would prohibit the release of funds to Bosnia under this act until the Bosnian Federation is in compliance with article III of annex 1-A of the Dayton agreement which simply means that all foreign forces must leave Bosnia before funds for civilian implementation can be released.

I will also send to the desk another amendment on behalf of Senator MCCONNELL and myself which establishes several conditions for the use of the funds provided for civilian implementation projects in Bosnia. In my view, these two amendments should enjoy bipartisan support. As far as I know, there is no objection to the amendments, but I will offer the amendments and not ask for final disposition until everyone has had an opportunity to take a look at them.

I am pleased to cosponsor with the chairman of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee these two amendments to the Bosnia supplemental portion of the continuing resolution. I wish to address first the issues of offsets for this \$200 million in civilian implementation funding. I understand that this portion of the supplemental was designed as an "emergency" by the Appropriations Committee but was offset by the House. I hope that the conferees will ultimately offset this \$200 million request.

As we have seen over the past few months, the military aspects of the Dayton agreement have been the easiest to implement. It is the civilian side of the equation that poses the toughest

problems. Among them, facilitating the return of refugees, conducting free and fair elections, and establishing a professional civilian police force.

Indeed, the reports we are getting from Sarajevo have demonstrated that integrating the capital is more difficult than separating the various military forces. The military task is limited and clear, while the civilian task is wide-reaching and complex, with only vague lines of authority.

The United States has made a tremendous commitment of personnel and resources in Bosnia and Herzegovina. While many of us disagreed with the administration's decision to send troops to Bosnia, while many of us advocated a different policy, those American forces are now there, and therefore it is essential that we succeed. Our credibility and that of NATO is on the line. It is essential that we in the international community get Bosnia back on its feet. Otherwise, this risky deployment of thousands of American and NATO soldiers will be for naught. It will end up being a brief interlude in a long war. The challenges are immense. There are more than 2.5 million Bosnians who have been displaced from their homes. At least 60 percent of housing in Bosnia has been damaged or destroyed. Most Bosnian Moslems and Croats have no paying jobs and have been dependent on humanitarian assistance for nearly 4 years.

No doubt about it, the Bosnians need and deserve our help. However, there are problems that we cannot and should not ignore. First and foremost is the continued presence of Iranian military personnel in Bosnia and Iranian intelligence officials.

They pose a potential threat to our forces—but also to Bosnia's place in the international community. The McConnell-Dole amendment requires the President to certify that the Bosnians are in full compliance with article III of annex 1-A of the Dayton Agreement mandating the withdrawal of foreign forces, and to certify that Bosnian Government-Iranian Government cooperation on intelligence matters has been terminated.

It seems to me that through our actions today we can send two beneficial signals: That we are seriously committed to assisting Bosnia, but that the Bosnian Government's continued military and intelligence relationship with Iran must be halted.

We know that Iran provided military aid to Bosnia when the rest of the world refused to. I opposed the policy of refusing the Bosnians the means to defend themselves. The Congress opposed that policy. But, that is the past.

And now the Bosnian Government must make choices that will affect Bosnia and Herzegovina's future. Will Bosnia be part of Europe and the West or not? A continuing military and intelligence relationship with Iran clearly jeopardizes Bosnia's future as a pluralistic democratic state in Europe.

Looking further at developments within Bosnia, we need to make sure

that our economic assistance has a positive effect on the social, economic and political situation there and that other donors are doing their fair share. So, besides limiting U.S. aid to projects in the U.S. sector, the second McConnell-Dole amendment would add criteria including:

Prohibiting funds for the repair of housing in areas where displaced persons or refugees are refused the right of return due to ethnicity or political party affiliation;

Establishing, in advance, GAO audit access to the banking and financial institutions that will receive AID assistance;

A certification by the president, after 90 days, that the total U.S. contribution to reconstruction for this year, \$532 million, has been matched by a combined total of bilateral donor pledges.

These amendments do not address all problems related to the civilian effort in Bosnia, but they go a long way. For example, more congressional oversight and work will need to be done on the matter of civilian police and the international police task force which is partially funded in this supplemental. This week we saw houses being looted and burned in Sarajevo and a handful of international police are standing by and watching—because they have no arms and no authority. Another vital issue is that of arming and training Bosnian Federation Forces—which is critical to the long-term stability of Bosnia. That of course, can also only be achieved once the Bosnian Government ensures that Iranian military units are no longer on its territory.

Mr. President, helping Bosnia and the Bosnian people is the right thing to do. However, we must do so wisely—and these two amendments will ensure that U.S. dollars are spent prudently and in a manner that supports our broader goals. It is not only in Bosnia's interest, but in our interest, to have a Bosnia which is pluralistic, democratic, multiethnic and able to defend itself.

I certainly urge my colleagues to support these amendments, and I now send these amendments to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. DOLE], for Mr. MCCONNELL, for himself, Mr. DOLE, Mr. BENNETT, and Mrs. HUTCHISON, proposes an amendment numbered 3480 to amendment No. 3466.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

No funds may be provided under this Act until the President certifies to the Committees on Appropriations that:

(1) The Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina is in full compliance with Article III, Annex 1A of the Dayton Agreement; and

(2) Intelligence cooperation between Iranian officials and Bosnian officials has been terminated.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I do not know if anybody now wishes to speak on these amendments, but I wanted to offer the amendments. I think Senator MCCONNELL will speak after his hearing.

I yield the floor.

Mrs. HUTCHISON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Texas.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, is there a time limit on this amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no time limit.

Mr. DOLE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I believe I sent two amendments to the desk. I ask unanimous consent to lay aside the first amendment and call up the second amendment.

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

The clerk will report the second amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. DOLE], for Mr. MCCONNELL, for himself, Mr. DOLE, and Mrs. HUTCHISON, proposes an amendment numbered 3481 to amendment No. 3466.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 751, section entitled "Agency for International Development, Assistance for Eastern Europe and the Baltics," insert at the appropriate place, the following: "Provided further, That funds appropriated by this Act may only be made available for projects, activities, or programs within the sector assigned to American forces of NATO military Implementation Force (IFOR) and Sarajevo: *Provided further*, That priority consideration shall be given to projects and activities designated in the IFOR "Task Force Eagle civil military project list": *Provided further*, That no funds made available under this Act, or any other Act, may be obligated for the purposes of rebuilding or repairing housing in areas where refugees or displaced persons are refused the right of return due to ethnicity or political party affiliation: *Provided further*, That no funds may be made available under this heading in this Act, or any other Act, to any banking or financial institution in Bosnia and Herzegovina unless such institution agrees in advance, and in writing, to allow the United States General Accounting Office access for the purposes of audit of the use of U.S. assistance: *Provided further*, That effective ninety days after the date of enactment of this Act, none of the funds appropriated under this heading may be made available for the purposes of economic reconstruction in Bosnia and Herzegovina unless the President determines and certifies in writing to the Committees on Appropriations that the bilateral contributions pledged by non-U.S. donors are at least equivalent to the U.S. bilateral contributions made under this Act and in the FY 1995 and FY 1996 Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs Appropriations bills."

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I do not know of any other speakers, but there

may be requests from both sides of the aisle. I know Senator MCCONNELL wishes to speak briefly. He is now involved in a hearing. I ask the amendments be temporarily laid aside, and I yield the floor.

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

Mrs. HUTCHISON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Texas.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 5 minutes.

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

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I rise to speak on behalf of the amendments that have just been laid down by the majority leader and by Senator MCCONNELL of Kentucky. I think it is very important that we continue to keep in mind that the agreement that was made by the Senate, over my objection, frankly, that we would send the troops to Bosnia, nevertheless did include some very important points.

After the United States has expended so much to try to keep this peace agreement, it is most important that the agreement be kept in force, including the arming and training of the Moslems. That was a key reason that so many people on this floor voted to support sending the troops. It is most important that we get on with that part of the agreement. Otherwise, after all the money that we have spent trying to bring peace to the Balkans, the results will be short-lived, because if there is not some sort of parity there among the three parties, I think it will be difficult to keep the peace for a long term. The one chance that I think we have is if there is parity among the parties. So I hope the President will remember that part of the agreement that was made and get on with the other parts of the Dayton agreement that would give the best chance for this to be a successful mission.

So I am very pleased to support and ask unanimous consent to be added as a cosponsor of Dole-McConnell amendments.

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

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 3479

Mr. REID. Mr. President, very briefly, my friend, the senior Senator from Texas, in his closing remarks regarding the Reid and Kempthorne amendments, indicated that when the moratorium was originally placed that there was no

money involved. That factually is not so. Mr. President, \$1.5 million was rescinded at the same time that the original moratorium was passed.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 10 minutes.

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

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I rise in support of the Hutchison-Kempthorne proposal with regard to a final listing moratorium for the Endangered Species Act.

I think a lot about this issue because I have had to confront it frequently in my State of Mississippi. I have also heard of many instances in other States where major problems have been caused by the Endangered Species Act. I say this as one who voted for this act way back in 1974. I think, when we originally passed it. I thought we were passing an act that would be aimed narrowly at truly endangered species.

I was thinking about perhaps, you know, crocodiles. I was thinking about maybe white tigers. I was thinking about elephants. I had no idea the extent to which this law would be contorted and twisted and used by the bureaucracy to harass people who are trying to create jobs and provide economic opportunities.

There seems to be no end to the lengths bureaucrats will go to use the Endangered Species Act to take private and public property. I really think that common sense has been lost when it comes to this particular statute.

I do not think when I originally voted—in fact, I know that when I originally voted for this act, I had no idea that this would lead to the spotted owl situation in the Northwest. I had no idea that it would create a problem in my own State of Mississippi with species like the gopher tortoise or the ring-necked snake or the red cockaded woodpecker. I believe it never occurred to many of us who voted for this bill over 20 years ago that it would destroy jobs, cripple economic development, and put private property at risk. It has placed individual rights behind those of a ring-necked snake.

In my own State of Mississippi, we have had a real problem with the Forest Service because they want to set aside not a few hundred, not a few thousand, but 100,000 acres of timberland for the red cockaded woodpecker.

I thought that a lot of birds were involved. Unfortunately, I was wrong. As a matter of fact, it involved just three colonies. Then I thought, well maybe a colony represents a lot of birds. Unfortunately, I was wrong again. A colony is just two birds, one male and one fe-

male. My State of Mississippi will have a total of seven red cockaded woodpeckers in this 100,000-acre set-aside in the Chickasaw District of the De Soto National Forest. Seems a bit excessive, but all done in the name of the Endangered Species Act. And, guess what—the Forest Service wants still more acreage.

Most Senators can cite similar examples of unbelievable experiences and excesses with this law in their States. I think that there is a need to provide some commonsense protection for birds, fish, and plants, but a responsible balance must be reached because the Endangered Species Act is costing us millions of dollars. It is costing us thousands of acres. I think it is getting out of control. Many in this city talk about extremism by one side or the other on policy issues, and perhaps the bureaucracy's implementation of the Endangered Species Act has reached that stage.

It is time that Congress pull the Endangered Species Act back from the abyss and take a calm, reasoned look at it. That is what Senators HUTCHISON and KEMPTHORNE are requesting through their amendment. A narrow and limited pause for only one aspect of the statute.

That is what this debate is all about. Last year the Congress—not some alien group—this Congress put a hold on future listing of endangered species and the designation of critical habitat until the basic statute had been reauthorized. It should be noted that this statute is long overdue for a full review and reauthorization. The Endangered Species Act authorization and its appropriations expired in 1992. And, a pause would enable this Congress to work in a measured manner to correct the statute before more funds are spent and more economic turmoil can occur. The authorization process is the accepted method to establish and adjust public policy.

So why has it not been reauthorized? Because those that want to continue this abuse under the guise of protection are afraid that the American people will insist that the Congress apply common sense to this act. And so the debate has been stalled in the authorization committees making it impossible to bring it forward.

This leaves the appropriation process as the only legislative vehicle to address the issue. And to the credit of Senators HUTCHISON and KEMPTHORNE, they are not trying to gut or repeal the statute. Rather they are asking for a pause until the authorization work can be completed.

It should be noted that the committee with jurisdiction here in the Senate, through the efforts of Senator KEMPTHORNE of Idaho, and others, has made a valiant effort to move this authorization forward. But until it is reauthorized, we should not continue to act. Abuses that has been heaped upon many Americans as a result of this act should be stopped.

The underlying amendment by Senator REID would lift the moratorium accepted and adopted by this Congress last year. Senator REID would just take it away, saying that proper authorizations for public policies are unnecessary.

The second-degree amendment by Senators HUTCHISON and KEMPTHORNE would maintain the original moratorium, but with some changes. It would now only affect final listings and critical habitat designations. This means it will permit emergency listings to go forward if the well-being of a species is at significant risk. This is a major change because it will permit activities to go forward, but they just cannot take the final action. Again, I think that this is common sense and responsible.

There are very few areas where my constituents get absolutely livid at what is happening in America—but this is one. We have lost control of this act. Congress needs to rethink it. Congress needs to correct the problem. We can protect truly genuinely endangered species but we have gotten down to the area of subspecies—down to single blades of grass, this does not reflect our original intent. It appears that only Congress can refocus the basic statute that a bureaucracy has taken over.

So I urge my colleagues to take a serious look at what is going on across America, as well as what is being proposed here. We should not lift the Endangered Species Act moratorium without a proper reauthorization. Nor should we allow the abuses to continue.

We should support the commonsense proposal by Senator HUTCHISON. It is the right thing to do. It will give Congress time to do the reauthorization without impacting emergency listings. So I commend her for what she is trying to do. And I urge the adoption of the amendment by Senators HUTCHISON and KEMPTHORNE. I yield the floor, Mr. President.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COVERDELL). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I have sought recognition this morning to comment briefly about the significant amendment which was enacted yesterday adding funding for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, the subcommittee of Appropriations that I chair, and to say at the outset, again, my compliments to the distinguished Senator from Iowa, Senator HARKIN, who is the ranking Democrat on the subcommittee, for his tireless work and the work of his staff, as well as my

staff, in crafting that legislation in a bipartisan compromise. But I am very fearful that if the partisan bickering and the political credit-taking continues, we are going to jeopardize our chance to see that amendment as the cornerstone of this omnibus appropriations bill go through in the House of Representatives and be signed by the President, so that it becomes law.

We have seen political gridlock in Washington in the hours of the past many months of an unprecedented nature. We have seen the Government close down twice, and we have seen the American people recoiling in disgust at the kind of fighting for political advantage which is taking place in this city. I believe that it is a matter for blame to be equally proportioned, 50 percent on each side of this aisle.

I think that what the American people are looking for is to have an accommodation and to work out these differences of opinion so that we can keep the Government going and not have another shutdown, and work in the interests of the American people.

Yesterday, Senator HARKIN and I submitted a bill which we had worked on jointly in accordance with our responsibilities as chairman and ranking member of that subcommittee and on which we had reached a good-faith, bipartisan compromise. And there was a very, very strong vote in this body—84 to 16—an unusually strong vote on an issue which is as highly contested as that one was yesterday, or what would be expected. And 37 of 53 Republicans joined in supporting that expenditure, although there were many questions as to whether that was a wise approach in the overall matter, because we are looking for a settlement on the overall budget dispute. But those differences were laid aside in the interest of funding for education, for health, and for labor and plant safety, to get that done.

No sooner was the issue resolved on the Senate floor than we had back to usual political posturing—taking credit for what had been done in a very, very partisan way. Today's New York Times quotes one Member of the Senate on the opposite side of the aisle saying—and this is attributed—"Many of our Republican friends that have been reluctant to indicate their support for this, really fell over themselves to support this measure."

Well, that is not so, Mr. President. There has been a lot of Republican support for education—both on the subcommittee with Senator JEFFORDS being the leader for education funding, and Senator DOMENICI, as well as my own participation. When an amendment was offered on the other side of the aisle several weeks ago to add substantial money for education, it received 51 votes, and there were many on the Republican side of the aisle who joined there.

Then that Member is quoted going on to say, "They expected Republicans in the House to bridle at the agreement,

but they predicted that the overwhelming bipartisan support in the Senate for the White House stance on the issue would help them prevail in the final legislation."

Mr. President, I had hoped that would be the case, and I still hope that will be the case. But I am not so sure when we have this kind of political credit-taking by Democrats for what was clearly a bipartisan movement. It is a move headed by Senator HARKIN and myself. It is a move that received an 84-to-16 vote with 37 Republican Senators supporting the measure. If we are going to go back to politics as usual and a claim of credit by the Democrats, I think this is going to be a very, very hard matter to hold in conference. There have been some very key legislative proposals that have been defeated this year when somebody crow and takes credit in the political context before the ink is dry and before the bill is finally worked through a conference committee and is finished.

Another Member on the other side of the aisle was referenced in the Washington Times today saying:

Senator Arlen Specter, Pennsylvania Republican and coauthor of the amendment, "knows how politically vulnerable Republicans are on education."

That is not true, Mr. President. When a reference is made to what ARLEN SPECTER knows, the best source is ARLEN SPECTER. I do not believe that Republicans are any more vulnerable than Democrats on these volatile issues of public policy. I think the American people are coming to the conclusion that they ought to throw out all of the incumbents because of dissatisfaction for what is going on and the political infighting and political bickering which leads to gridlock.

When we work through a very, very tough, bipartisan amendment and accomplish the goals of adequate funding for education and do it in a way which protects the balanced budget concept, because there are offsets on all of these lines, I would ask for a moratorium on the political infighting and the political credit-taking so that we can get on with the business of the American people.

There is an old saying that "a lot could be accomplished in Washington, DC, if people were not too concerned about who got credit for what was being undertaken." I would say to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle that we ought to tone down the political rhetoric and we ought to get on with the business of the country. What we have hanging in the balance from the additional funding which we passed yesterday of \$814 million for title I school districts, which is very vital for education in America, is: \$182 million for school-to-work programs; we have some \$200 million for safe and drug-free school programs; we have some \$635 million for summer youth job training; we have very substantial funding for training for dislocated workers, a matter of enormous importance in America

today with a downsizing of American business. All of this is in jeopardy if we are going to go back to crass politics and political credit-taking and political bickering as usual.

I anticipate great concerns in the House of Representatives when they exercise their legislative discretion. In the United States, we have a bicameral form of government. We have the views of the Senate. We have the views of the House. I have great respect for what the House of Representatives has to say.

This kind of political bantering, political dialog, and political credit-taking is going to be very, very difficult to deal with, because I expect to hear all about it when we go to conference with the House of Representatives. They have their own points of view. They have their own constituencies. They are elected on a 2-year basis. They have certain commitments that they have made. This does not help the process at all.

So, it is my hope that the political rhetoric and the political credit-taking will be toned down as we move ahead to try to get this omnibus appropriations bill completed.

Mr. President, beyond this omnibus appropriations bill, it is my hope that the leadership and the Government coming from the President, the administration, and the leaders of the Congress will go back to the bargaining table and try to work out an overall global settlement. We are about to undertake now the appropriations process for fiscal year 1997. We are already scheduling the appearances of the Secretary of Education, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, and the Secretary of Labor for the fiscal year 1997 budget. It is a little hard to look to the next year's budget when we have not even completed this year's budget.

We were able to have this revenue-neutral on a tough vote for many Senators, Democrats as well as Republicans, because we offset it against expenditures which are available only on a one-time basis. There had been talk on a global settlement where we addressed the issue of entitlements and had savings there. There might be as much as \$10 billion available for the issues arising out of the Department of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education. If we are to find a way to have a budget which can be adopted for fiscal year 1997, again looking to the concerns of education, we are going to need a global settlement. If we have the same allocation, 602(b) allocation for my subcommittee, for next year as we had for last year when we go through the budget resolution, I do not know how it will be possible to find light at the end of the tunnel to add the kind of money which we added yesterday in the amendment. And we are looking to a very, very tough political season.

My thought is that, if the Congress of the United States and the administration cannot come to terms, it is not

only going to be bad public policy for the schoolchildren who very badly need the money which we passed in the Senate yesterday and hope we can get through conference, but what will happen in fiscal year 1997? It is not going to get any easier as we move from March into April, May through to October and November. So it is my hope that the people who have been negotiating on that overall budget global settlement will come to terms, or I think we are all going to have havoc to pay when we look to fiscal year 1997.

But first things first. Let us focus on the bill which is currently on the floor. Let us try to get the job done without rushing to take the credit.

Again, I thank my colleague, Senator HARKIN, for his outstanding work and leadership on this important matter and for setting a bipartisan tone which, if carried out by all Members in this body on both sides of the aisle, I think will lead us to sound public policy for the education interests and the labor interests, the funding of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education programs.

Mr. President, in the absence of any other Senator in the Chamber, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COVERDELL). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 3482 TO AMENDMENT NO. 3466

(Purpose: To provide funding for important environmental initiatives with an offset)

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, this morning, I send an amendment to the desk for myself, Senator MIKULSKI, Senator DASCHLE, Senator JOHN KERRY, Senator KENNEDY, Senator LIEBERMAN, and Senator LEVIN, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. LAUTENBERG], for himself, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. KERRY, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. LIEBERMAN, and Mr. LEVIN, proposes an amendment numbered 3482 to amendment No. 3466.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

(The text of the amendment is printed in today's RECORD under "Amendments Submitted.")

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, this amendment has a very simple task, I think a very important task, and that is to restore funding for a critical national priority, and that is the protection of America's environmental heritage.

There is broad support for protecting our environment. Americans across the

country want to drink clean water. They want to breathe clean air. They do not want to live near toxic waste sites that pose health risks to their families, regardless of whether they are urban or rural dwellers and regardless of the region of the country. Unfortunately, despite the public's commitment to environmental protection, this Congress has mounted a full-scale attack on our environment. The contract on America may not have mentioned the environment, but deep in the recesses of the presentation is a full-scale attack on our environment.

The contract on America does not have to mention it, but the signers of the contract appear committed to doing everything possible to gut environmental protection. First, the House of Representatives passed a series of riders on the EPA appropriations bill to essentially repeal laws protecting our air, our water, our land, and our families. Also in that legislation, EPA's budget, already underfunded, was cut by a third from the 1995 funding level, and more riders were added on the Interior appropriations bill.

One banned new listings of endangered species. Another rider essentially turned over the old growth forests to private timber interests. And then the House passed changes to the Clean Water Act. That bill dramatically weakened EPA's enforcement authority, wrote off the Nation's valuable wetlands, and included numerous other provisions apparently drafted not by legislators but by lobbyists for corporate polluters. Bills have also been introduced to cripple the Clean Air Act, to weaken our program for cleaning up toxic waste sites, and to exempt various industries from critical environmental regulation.

Another legislative proposal which passed the Senate would weaken something called the community right-to-know law. I am the author of that law, and it has been on the books for some time. It simply requires polluters to tell the public the truth about emissions that come from their place of business. It has been responsible for a 46-percent decrease in toxic emissions in 4 years. It has been a smashing success, as they say, and yet a rider to the omnibus regulatory reform bill would gut that law and allow any company to easily remove chemicals from the listing requirement.

As one can see, the list of congressional attacks on our environment goes on and on, and it is a source of great concern to millions of Americans. A poll, a Republican poll, commissioned by the Republican Party, by Linda DiVall, showed that only 35 percent of the voters would support a candidate who supported the one-third cut in EPA funding proposed by the House Republicans. Mind you, a Republican poll showed that only 35 percent of those who vote would be willing to support a candidate who supported this one-third cut in EPA funding. That is quite a revelation.

The same poll showed that while 6 out of 10 Americans say there is too much Government regulation, generally only 2 in 10 believe that the statement applies to EPA. The public, even those who consider themselves Republicans, do not trust their party on the issue of the environment.

In years past, I have been proud to work closely with many of my Republican colleagues to pass strong and effective environmental legislation. Frankly, I look forward to that opportunity this day. I know that there are Members from the other side of the aisle who care about the environment that we are leaving to our children and our grandchildren. We want to leave them the best, the cleanest available.

I wish to single out for commendation the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. BOND], chairman of the subcommittee on EPA and NASA and the Veterans Administration, who has made a serious effort to increase funding for EPA over the proposals that came from the House. He has had to deal with an inadequate 602(b) allocation from the Budget Committee. He has worked hard within these constraints, and he deserves real credit for that.

Unfortunately, despite his efforts and despite the efforts of the ranking member of this subcommittee, Senator MIKULSKI from Maryland, laboring hard to try to improve the funding, because of the inadequate funding in the Republican budget for almost all domestic needs, the funding in this bill for environmental protection is just not enough to do the job. And, although better than proposals from the House, the legislation would require real cuts in critical environmental programs. Compared to last year's budget, even after the enactment of the Republican rescissions bill, the bill before us would cut EPA by over 11 percent.

So, my amendment proposes to restore funding for the environment to bring EPA's budget back up to, essentially, last year's level after the rescission.

And, perhaps most importantly, the amendment will add \$365 million for States to fund sewage treatment and drinking water programs through State revolving funds.

Our State and local governments need these funds to meet Federal standards related to the control of sewage waste and to ensure safe tapwater. States leverage this money so its real value will be many times the amount appropriated. Yet the needs are enormous. Local governments need to meet Clean Water Act mandates that will cost over \$100 billion. So this is not the time to be stingy with aid. It is critical to many hard-pressed communities and to citizens who rely on safe drinking water coming from their taps.

In addition to the \$365 million to keep our water clean, my amendment includes various other provisions that will improve our environment. These include \$50 million more for the

Superfund Program to clean up toxic waste sites, and success and progress can be directly measured there. But what is going to happen as a result of the funding levels that we presently have is we will be shutting down work on sites that had begun, that show some promise for cleanup. That will grind to a halt.

We have \$62 million for environmental technology to do the research necessary to find different ways and more effective ways to treat the environment.

We have \$75 million for the Department of Energy included in here, for its excellent weatherization program which will provide weatherization grants for 12,000 homes, and give people a chance to protect themselves against the cold so they do not have to spend as much for fuel and also do not add to the consumption levels.

Mr. President, we have \$75 million for the National Park Service, to stop the degradation that is taking place in our national parks. The National Park Service needs money. It needs staff. It needs resources to keep these parks up to the level that makes them available and makes all of us proud about these national monuments.

There is also \$5 million to advance research for methyl bromide replacements. Methyl bromide causes nausea, headaches, convulsions, and ultimately death in some cases. Research in this area is badly needed.

Unlike the underlying bill, which provides funds on the assumption that Congress and the President reach some type of budget deal, this amendment has sufficient offsets so that we can immediately get on with our efforts to protect the environment.

First, the amendment includes legislation, proposed by the administration and adopted in the House reconciliation bill, that will improve the Federal Government's ability to collect delinquent debts. The Federal Government is owed almost \$50 billion in nontax debts. We simply have to do a better job of collecting them.

The other offset included in the amendment calls for the sale of Governors Island in New York harbor. This also enjoys broad bipartisan support and was included in the House reconciliation bill. Governors Island is no longer going to be used as a Coast Guard station as it has been for so many years. It is now deemed to be inefficient and unnecessary as a place for the Coast Guard. With these offsets, our amendment is budget neutral.

Our Nation has made enormous progress since the environmental movement was ignited by Earth Day in 1970. Environmental laws have made our water safer to drink, cleaned up our oceans and rivers, made the air cleaner, and protected our land from dangerous waste disposal practices. This is no time to turn back.

Because of our work, there have been measurable improvements in our air and our water. In 1975, 60 percent of our

waters—streams, tributaries—did not meet water quality standards. Today, only 40 percent fail that test. That is a remarkable improvement, and we can continue to build on that. But if we let it slip back, it does not take long for pollution to take over.

Thanks to our environmental laws there is now a generation of children in many parts of the country who have no conception about the terrible air pollution that spoiled our air not too long ago. Even our biggest cities have fewer days of unhealthy air pollution than they did 20 years ago, despite economic growth and population increases. Lead has been taken out of gasoline, which has had a significant positive impact on children's mental health. Today, ambient levels of lead are down 89 percent since 1984.

Sulfur dioxide concentrations in urban areas are down 26 percent since 1984, improving the ability of people with asthma and other respiratory diseases to lead normal lives.

Carbon monoxide levels are down 37 percent since 1984, largely due to cleaner cars and fuels, and more effective vehicle inspection and maintenance programs. These gains have come while the number of cars and vehicle miles has grown substantially.

Ozone levels have dropped since 1984, so 43 million fewer Americans now must breathe unhealthy ozone levels.

These advances occurred because this Congress passed the laws to make it happen, not in recent sessions, but over the years, and because we provided the funding to do the job. We made an investment in the environment and that investment has paid handsome returns. But now, if we back off on our commitment to the environment, successes of the past no doubt will be reversed in short order.

The environmental challenges of the future are substantial and in many ways more difficult than those of the past. We need to control emissions from many smaller businesses, something not easy to implement or to police. We will need to develop new technologies and we need to develop alternative approaches to controlling pollution. All of these require a real commitment of resources. That fact cannot be wished away or ignored.

We have heard it said many times that we need to balance the budget because we are piling debt upon our children. But what about the environment we are leaving to our kids? In my view, and the view of the American people, the environment simply must be a national priority. We can agree on balancing the budget and at the same time making certain that we provide a cleaner environment for our future generations. If we want to balance the budget we ought to find other ways to do it than restricting environmental cleanup activities.

This amendment would simply maintain funding for environmental protection at about the same level as last year's budget, after the rescission. I

think it is a modest and certainly a reasonable proposal. I hope my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will support it.

Mr. President, we all ought to agree here, and we will agree when we cast our votes, that the environment is a priority for those of us who can do something about it. We have to decide here and now what it is that we want to leave for our kids by way of environmental protection. Do we want them to be able to breathe the air without getting sick? Do we want them to be able to go to the water tap? Sales of bottled water in this country continue to escalate. I am sure, when the original settlers came here they never dreamed they could do anything else but drink the water that was naturally available, and now some 40 percent of the population is buying bottled water. We ought to be able to assure people that, when kids go to the tap to take a drink, they are not jeopardizing their health, nor is the ground they are playing on dangerous for their well-being.

Those are the decisions we are going to make with this amendment, Mr. President. I hope that all of our friends on both sides of the aisle, Republican and Democrat, will agree that while we can discuss budget priorities, at the same time we can agree that we want to send a message on a cleaner environment.

I yield the floor.

Ms. MIKULSKI addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I rise to join Senator LAUTENBERG and other of my colleagues in offering this amendment to restore critical reductions taken in the funding for environmental programs. I compliment the Senator from New Jersey for his steadfast advocacy on the environment, and I look forward to working with him on these important issues.

Mr. President, we in Maryland are budget weary. We have been battered by the budget, we have been battered by floods, and we have been battered by the shutdowns that have occurred. What has been so terrible about the shutdowns that have occurred is that they have shut down our ability to enforce America's vital, crucial environmental protection laws relating to Superfund, safe drinking water, clean water, to be able to help our people be in a safe environment and help local communities.

The full committee and the subcommittee chairmen, Senators HATFIELD and BOND, have taken important steps by restoring \$240 million in real money to this omnibus CR. This important effort, I think, will move us beyond this weariness that we have with shutdowns. I hope that at the end of this week, we have not shut down the Federal Government, we have not shut down the Environmental Protection Agency, and we have not shut down our ability to enforce public health and

safety, nor that we have shut down the funding to go to environmental contractors.

But the fact remains that despite the efforts of the chairman of the Appropriations Committee and the chairman of the Subcommittee on VA and EPA, this appropriation, this CR continues to be \$750 million below the 1995 level. It is the defunding of EPA. That is unacceptable to us on this side of the aisle, and it is unacceptable to the American people.

The American people want clean air, clean drinking water, they want contaminated and hazardous waste sites cleaned up, and they want their local communities to have the resources to provide wastewater and clean water to these communities.

The American people are absolutely opposed to efforts to weaken the environmental laws and are opposed to budget and staffing cuts that do that.

There was a recent poll that showed that 46 percent of the American people want no changes in either clean or safe drinking water.

When we talk about the impact on these budget cuts, this has a tremendous impact not only on local communities and on public health and public safety, but it absolutely has a direct impact on business.

A recent study by the University of Maryland's Jacobs Center, which is a business evaluation center, said that businesses are concerned that cuts to regulatory agencies lead to delays in permitting, and poorly trained staff also lead to a delay in permitting, which is a delay to business.

In my home State of Maryland, good environment is good business. That is why we have been such strong supporters of the Chesapeake Bay Program and the cleanup of important rivers and polluted rivers, like Back River. So the American people do not want any more cuts in EPA, and neither do I.

This amendment restores \$738 million and puts us at 1995 levels. It is essentially a freeze on EPA, but it does restore funds to implement those important standards.

It also does something else. This amendment restores programs relating to the environmental technologies initiative. That is an initiative to spur, working with the private sector, new technologies, new products that we can manufacture in the United States and sell overseas.

Mr. President, these environmental cuts have a great impact on the United States of America and its citizens, but also this has a great impact on our national reputation. The world is coming to the United States of America for our environmental expertise in Government and its form of regulation, in terms of academia, in terms of its scientific research on the environment and in terms of a private sector that has developed techniques and products in manufacturing biotechnology to clean up the environment.

What we want to do in this legislation is to restore the Environmental

Protection Agency to do this. To keep the funding cuts, I believe, will have a devastating effect on American citizens and will be a loss of national honor, as well as a national opportunity to go global.

This national opportunity will enable us to take our environmental expertise that the world wants access to and to go around the world giving out information, ideas, science and actual products.

We talk a lot in this U.S. Senate about how we need to have good jobs at good wages. I believe the frontier to do that is in the field of environment, using the expertise of EPA, working with America's academic institutions, encouraging these new technologies in the private sector. If we do that, we will not only protect our environment, but we will also be able to create jobs and be able to have an important contribution internationally.

So I hope, therefore, that my colleagues will support the Lautenberg-Mikulski-Lieberman and Kerry amendment to restore these cuts to EPA. We believe we have sound offsets to be able to do it, and I believe then we can move this process forward.

Again, I thank the chairman of the full committee, Senator HATFIELD, and the chairman of the subcommittee, Senator BOND, for taking the first step by restoring the \$240 million. We look forward now to taking the next step to put EPA at the 1995 levels.

I thank the Chair and my colleagues for their attention, and I yield the floor.

Mr. KERRY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I thank the Chair, and I particularly want to thank the Senator from Maryland and the Senator from New Jersey, Senators MIKULSKI and LAUTENBERG, for their leadership and efforts to try to guarantee that we have a sensible environmental policy in this country.

What is really astonishing is that this is the 10th time this year that we are debating the environmental programs of this country, the 10th time we are debating the 1996 budget. We are now in the sixth month of the current fiscal year, and we are setting a historic first for the United States of America. In the 11 years that I have been in the U.S. Senate, never—never once—have we had to go into a succeeding fiscal year and still be debating the items of the last fiscal year.

I would say, without any question at all, that the responsibility that fell to the majority last year or the year before, when they won the election, has really not been discharged properly. I remember when we were in the majority, in the last occasion of 1994, all 13 appropriations bills were passed on time. Whatever compromises were necessary in order to achieve that, we understood the Constitution of this country, we understood the nature of the system.

What has really happened here in Washington in 1995 and 1996 is that a small band of radicals in the House of Representatives have fundamentally hijacked the Constitution of this country. In the name of ideological purity and of their particular point of view, they have disavowed the balance of power between the executive and the legislature. They have taken into their own hands their own definition of timing.

They are breaking the law, Mr. President. They are breaking the law. The law says that these bills will be accomplished by a specific point in time. They have not been.

So we are here for the 10th time debating where we are going. People will say, "Well, the President won't agree." Well, the President has the veto power. That is what the Founding Fathers gave him, and when the President has the veto power, and there is not a sufficient political force in the country to undermine whatever sustaining capacity there is in the Congress with that veto, then the President gets to have that balance.

The reality is, you are supposed to compromise. But that is not what is happening. I think it is very unfortunate for all concerned. I know that there are moderates on the Republican side, many in the Senate, who are uncomfortable with what is happening, who do not agree with it, who would rather see the Congress of the United States do its business. I think it is entirely inappropriate for the country to pay the price for this small group in the House of Representatives.

It is revealing that while a certain group of appropriations bills have made it into law, it is revealing that the bills that fund the agencies with primary responsibility for the environment and our natural resources, the Environmental Protection Agency and the Department of Interior, have not been signed into law. I think, Mr. President, that the fact that those particular bills have not been signed into law underscores the clash of priorities that is evidenced in the Republican approach to the funding of those bills and the Democratic approach.

The fact that the Republican leadership is still fighting for large cuts in environmental programs is, in my judgment, an indication that they are not in touch with the real concerns of the American people and their desire for clean air and clean water. The response from some will quickly be, "Wait a minute. Of course we're in touch. Being in touch means you balance the budget. We have shown that you can balance the budget." But you do not have to do it at the expense of these environmental programs.

So, in the final analysis, it really comes down to a fundamental confrontation between choices—the choices you make to balance the budget. And the choices that you make to balance the budget are the final evidence of your priorities and of your values.

That is why, Mr. President, I am here once again in this 10th series of efforts on the environment with Senator LAUTENBERG and Senator MIKULSKI and others, to speak in support of increasing the funding for specific environmental programs. What we are seeking to do is to add back over \$900 million for environmental programs at four Federal agencies—at the Environmental Protection Agency, at the Department of Energy, at the Agriculture and Interior Departments. It is our judgment that this money is critically needed in order to fully protect America's health and safety at a level that Americans have come to expect and that they believe is their right.

Mr. President, if we succeed in passing an omnibus spending bill, we are going to set the environmental budget for the EPA through the end of this fiscal year. If we pass a bill that includes environmental funding increases in this amendment, all we will have succeeded in doing is bringing us back to last year's level of protection. I think Americans need to understand that.

This is not a Democrat effort to try to add huge sums of money, even though many of us believe that in certain areas we ought to be spending more. This is simply an effort to hold our citizens harmless from a reduction below the level that we were at last year.

If, however, this amendment is defeated, Congress will have turned its back and turned the clock back on some 25 years of environmental gains. Ironically, for 19 of the last 25 years, Republicans were in charge of the EPA. It was Richard Nixon who signed into law the National Environmental Policy Act and delivered protection of the environment as a national priority. I think it is particularly ironic that after George Bush joined with us to help sign into effect the Clean Air Act, and after the many efforts of the last years that have been bipartisan, that we are suddenly thrown into this partisan clash over whether or not we can keep the funding at last year's level.

Regrettably, our friends on the other side of the aisle have made a different choice, and it is different from what most Americans are telling us that they want. I think almost every poll in the country has shown that Americans want to protect their environment: they want cleaner air, they want cleaner water, they want pristine rivers, they want our ecosystems protected, they want an abundance of species, plants, and animals, they want clean beaches and national parks, and they want public lands that are safe and they want them protected. They want cities with breathable air and industries and businesses that are willing to join in the effort to guarantee that these kinds of protections exist.

Unfortunately, Mr. President, you cannot reconcile that stated desire of the American people with the budget figures that we are being presented. So the central question in this debate is

really: What priority do you place on protecting the Nation's environment and natural resources and the health of our citizens?

I am confident that we are going to hear Senators on the other side of the aisle say, "I take no second seat to anybody in the country on protecting the environment." We will hear Senators say, "Let's not kid ourselves; nobody is against the environment. Nobody wants to have bad water," and so forth. It is fine to say that, Mr. President, but if you are in favor of cutting inspections, if you are in favor of cutting a community's ability to be able to provide that clean water, if you are voting for an amendment or a bill that reduces the commitment from last year, even though no American is asking for a reduction except for some companies, it is very hard to follow through and say, you are, in truth, voting for what you are talking about.

That is the real difference here. What are you voting for? What are you putting into the budget? What numbers do you really support? While the bill that is being brought to the floor is an improvement from the conference report, it is still a budget that is hundreds of millions of dollars below the level that most people in good conscience and good faith have decided is necessary in order to continue the level that we have committed to the American people.

In addition to that, Mr. President, the bill contains a series of legislative riders that cripple the EPA's ability to be able to protect the Nation's wetlands, which is precisely what some people want to do. They have never liked the wetlands protection. They want to develop wetlands, and they do not care about the standards. So they are intentionally setting out to cripple it. And it would also halt the Department of Energy's work on setting energy efficiency standards for appliances.

Mr. President, we have, as I have said before—but I think it needs repeating again and again—shown that you can balance the budget in 7 years without doing what the Republicans are choosing to do here. I hope that we will recognize that without restoring some of this funding, the cuts to the EPA are going to deal an extraordinarily harsh blow to efforts to be able to protect us.

I would like to bring it down to a local level, if I may, Mr. President, to my State of Massachusetts. We are trying, in this bill, to increase the State revolving fund by \$365 million over what the Republicans have provided. Every State will benefit. All cities in each of our States that are in need of new infrastructure will benefit by adding to the State revolving fund.

We have communities in Massachusetts, a community like New Bedford, for instance, about 100,000 residents, is building a sewer treatment facility that will cost more than \$200 million. It has to build this under Federal law. Yet the tax base is such that the citi-

zens cannot really afford to do that on their own. In the 1980's we had a partnership with the Federal Government where the Federal Government would provide anywhere from 55 to 75 percent of the money. That is not happening today. As a result, local communities are being harder and harder pressed to be able to try to live up to the standards that we have set at the Federal level. Because they are harder and harder pressed to do that, they get angrier and angrier over those Federal standards and begin to blame the standards themselves.

What happens here, you get caught in a vicious circle. People begin to lose their commitment to the standards and to wanting to clean up because they feel oppressed by them. The reason they feel oppressed by them is they are required to do things they do not have enough money to do. The reason they do not have enough money to do it is the Federal Government has pulled out of the partnership and taken away the help that was given in the 1970's and the 1980's. That happened, as we all remember, in 1982 when Ronald Reagan came along and stripped away title II of the Clean Water Act and left the mandate. All of a sudden the anger was directed at mandates.

Mr. President, we desperately need that kind of funding assistance. In a city like Fall River, a partner city to New Bedford, you have a similar sort of tax base, similar difficulties. You have a combined sewer overflow problem which the community desperately needs to be able to refurbish, rehabilitate the sewer overflows, 100-year-old infrastructure, a current population, and the current population is required to pay for the next 100 years. That is not fair. You have to try to spread that out.

Nowhere is that more felt, Mr. President, than in the city of Boston where we are living under a court order, Federal mandate, Federal court order, that you have to go ahead and clean up the harbor; at the same time, put in a secondary treatment facility for water, billions of dollars of expenditure. So the citizens of our State and city have seen a 40 percent increase in their water rates in the last few years. It has gone up to about \$618 per family and will go up to \$800. This drives out business, drives down the value of property, and most importantly, it is just impossible for the average family, already struggling on a lower income, to be able to pay these increasing costs.

Once again, what is the result? The result is people get angry at the mandate, even though it is a legitimate mandate that you have clean water. The result is we begin to lose the consensus in this country to be able to do these things.

Mr. President, in the 1970's and 1980's, many communities got money to the tune of 90 percent, 75 percent, 55 percent of their project being paid for by the Federal Government. In 1996, Boston has received a total of 18 percent

funding, contrary to the 55 percent, 75 percent, 90 percent of years past. Even President Bush saw fit to put \$100 million each year into our budget to help us with that. We desperately need the State revolving funds and those kind of commitments. That is an example of one State. That can be replicated all across this country. There are other communities in need of additional money.

Mr. President, there is another area that is a concern. That is the area of the funding for the cleanup of toxic waste sites. This bill provides an increase, for which we are obviously grateful, over the conference report which devastated this program. Our amendment would restore an additional \$50 million to the Superfund which is still several hundred million dollars below what the President of the United States has asked for. Now, while our amendment is not everything we would have liked, we believe what the Republicans are doing will slow the cleanups. It will continue to stall cleanup efforts in communities that have very, very patiently waited for Federal intervention.

Let me just share with my colleagues a story that I think underscores why this is so important. The toxic waste cleanups are critical to our ability to be able to provide the fundamental protection that our citizens are looking for. There was a young man in Woburn, MA, named Jimmy Anderson who got sick from a contaminated well in Woburn. He died from lymphocytic leukemia in 1981. His story underscores why this \$50 million is important. About 30 years ago, his mother, Ann, suspected that something was wrong and that their water was bad because it smelled bad. She went to authorities and said, "There is something wrong with our water." The authorities just said, "No, don't worry about it. It's OK. It will be all right." Then in 1972 her son Jimmy got sick. Despite her concerns, the wells that they were drinking from remained in use until 1979, when an environmental inspection that was triggered by a totally different event revealed that in those wells there were, indeed, high levels of toxins.

Eventually, other leukemia victims came forward. It turned out that between 1966 and 1986 there were 28 cases of leukemia among Woburn children with victims concentrated in the two sections that were served by those wells. Now, investigations revealed when they analyzed the water, that there were whole lagoons of arsenic, chromium, and lead that were discovered on a tract of land that had once housed a number of chemical plants, and from a nearby abandoned tannery that had left behind a huge mound of decades-old rotting horse hides that gave off a smell that commuters used to call the Woburn odor as they drove by.

I say to my colleagues, before we rush into adopting a budget that is

going to reduce the level of inspections and give us more Jimmy Andersons, why do we not just stop and think about what the environmental protection effort is trying to achieve and what it has achieved in its previous years. Jimmy Anderson's mother came to Congress to testify. This is what she said: "It is difficult for me to come before you today but I do so with the realization that industry has the strength, influence, and resources that we, the victims, do not. I am here as a reminder of the tragic consequence of uncontrolled toxic waste and the necessity of those who are responsible for it, to assume that responsibility."

Mr. President, in no uncertain terms, the budget that the Republicans are offering empowers those polluters and takes away the responsibility. The budget that we are offering tries to hold those people accountable and provide power to the victims.

I hope, Mr. President, that in the hours ahead we can find the same kind of bipartisan coalition that we found yesterday on education. This should not be a partisan issue. I regret that there are some who have stated their priorities different from other people's.

Finally, I hope we will rectify the legislative riders that open up more timbering, that create a greater imbalance in the relationship between our natural resources and the people of this country. There is nothing, frankly, more important, than education. This is part of our education effort. It is also part of our fundamental responsibility to the next generations. I hope we will add the money that is necessary.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the Lautenberg amendment. I also must point out to my colleagues that the partisan rhetoric that we are hearing about the environment is reflective of the fact that this is an election year. I have listened with great interest to some of the wild charges and political claims being made. I keep checking to find if it has anything to do with the measure before the Senate. I find, unfortunately, that it has to do more with somebody's campaign than with talking about the issues that are relevant to this bill.

My colleague from Massachusetts has just denounced the fact that we are breaking the law because there has been no appropriation for veterans, housing, environment, and space—the main subject areas of the subcommittee I chair. Well, I can tell you, Mr. President, quite simply why there has been no bill passed and signed by the President. It is because the President vetoed the bill that we presented to him that was within the budget allocation and passed by both Houses of Congress.

I can tell you, also, that beginning last November when we sought to work with the White House to find out what would be acceptable, what we need to do to accommodate their interests, we were stonewalled, absolutely

stonewalled. Leon Panetta came and said, "Well, the only way we can sign this bill is to spend \$2 billion more." This was at a time when the President was stating that he was for a balanced budget. However, he was asking that we break the budget by \$2 billion. He vetoed the bill and said we need \$2.5 billion. No longer the original \$2 billion.

Mr. President, how much is enough? How much is enough? How far do they want to break the budget? I have fought hard on this bill, and I believe we have fought responsibly to raise the amount of money appropriated for vital environmental cleanup efforts, and within the appropriations available to us under the budget agreement, we have done a good job.

(Mr. ASHCROFT assumed the chair.)

Mr. BOND. In this measure before us, we have added additional funds and we have put in a provision that if the President will agree to sign a balanced budget amendment that would make the budget balance in 2002, there will be even more money available for what I regard as a high priority, and that is environmental cleanup.

My friend from Massachusetts said, "You are supposed to compromise and negotiate." Well, on that matter, I agree with him 100 percent. But let me ask my colleagues, Mr. President, if we are supposed to negotiate and compromise, if we are supposed to come to an agreement with the White House, how do you do it when they do not show up? This Chamber is essentially empty. But this Chamber is just what I have had in attempting to deal with the White House—nobody. I have talked to the Agency head, Administrator Browner. I have talked to Ms. McGinty in the White House, head of the Council for Environmental Quality. I have talked to the Vice President. I have talked to OMB director, Alice Rivlin. I said, "We want to compromise and work with you to make sure we meet the objectives of the programs funded by this bill." We do not have a bill, Mr. President, quite simply, because the President has chosen the political tack. His political advisers say it is far better to veto and throw hot rhetoric than to sit down calmly and negotiate.

I hope the time has come when we are ready to negotiate, because I believe we have made great progress in the environment in past years. I want to see that continue. I believe the bill before us will continue that progress. I will be happy to work along with the leadership on this side and the leadership on the other side of the aisle to come to a reasonable compromise that keeps us on our budget goal of balancing the budget, so we do not put the burdens of our debt on future generations, but which will meet the objectives that are funded in this bill in the environmental area.

Let me return to the Lautenberg amendment. The Lautenberg amendment is about pumping up the rhetoric

and the polarization surrounding environmental issues. I must say that the supporting remarks are completely in that vein. It is not about ensuring that limited dollars are spent on EPA programs and activities which most effectively reduce risk to human health and the environment.

The Lautenberg amendment includes funding for the administration's entire wish list for EPA, totaling \$726 million. I would like another billion dollars, too. It is always nice to have that. Maybe the stork or the tooth fairy will bring it. I am sure we can spend more money well. But it is not possible, unless we reach other agreements that will lead us to a balanced budget, that we can accomplish that goal and put additional sums in.

There are additional sums in this measure introduced and presented by Senator HATFIELD, which will provide more funding when we come to an agreement on a balanced budget. The offsets proposed in the Lautenberg amendment are phony. They are being used in the other Democratic leadership amendment to be offered to the bill. How many times can you trot out that same old ghost of imaginary cuts? Imaginary cuts are a great offset, but they make awful thin soup because there is nothing there.

As chairman of the VA-HUD subcommittee, I have worked very hard to fund EPA adequately within the very constrained budget allocation available to the subcommittee. The bill before us today increases EPA's budget by \$402 million above the conference level, including \$240 million within title I that would be available upon the passage and the signing into law by the President of this bill, and another \$162 million in title IV of the bill, the contingency section. We can spend the \$162 million if we reach a broader budget agreement.

The total for EPA is \$6.1 billion. This, I believe, represents a good-faith effort to meet the administration's concerns, even though they are not willing to discuss those concerns with us or present us with an honest prioritized list of needs and wants.

We have made these efforts because we are concerned about the environment. We have made these efforts, and we have taken these steps because Members of this body on both sides of the aisle are interested in protecting the environment. This is a bipartisan issue.

The arguments about the Republican opposition to the environmental cleanup are absolute hogwash. It is embarrassing that we have to answer those inane charges on the floor of the Senate. It is appalling to me that someone would come down and make those assertions. But they have been made, and they are nonsense. They do not deserve further discussion.

The additional funds in title I, which are funded within the subcommittee 602(b) allocation, are provided for State revolving funds, for the Superfund and

the enforcement activities, all of which were included on the administration's wish list. As a matter of fact, they were the first ones mentioned by the Administrator of EPA when I asked her to set priorities—assistance to the States for water infrastructure construction, toxic waste cleanups for sites posing real and immediate risks, and funding to ensure that there are no employee furloughs or RIF's. Reductions to ongoing contractual support are high priorities.

Let me be clear. The amount provided in title I—that is not subject to contingency. The only contingency is that it be passed by the Congress and signed by the President. This appropriation ensures that the EPA does not have to fire or furlough a single employee. And the enforcement budget is increased, Mr. President, by \$10 million over fiscal year 1995, in a year when total funds available for commitments by this subcommittee were reduced by 12 percent from the preceding year.

We have held EPA at a higher level and even increased the enforcement budget. In addition, this legislation recommends another \$162 million in title IV, the contingency section, for additional State revolving funds operating programs and a new laboratory facility in the North Carolina Research Triangle Park, where EPA space is sadly deficient.

This legislation recommends a total of \$6.1 billion—just \$300 million, or 4 percent, less than the total fiscal year 1995 actual spending level in a bill that is 12 percent overall below. Where did we have to cut? We had to choose priorities. We cut earmarked water and sewer projects—the pork that Members love to bring home. Bringing home the bacon is unfortunately a sport that is still popular around here.

Last year's appropriations contained some \$800 million in these bringing home the bacon projects. This bill all but eliminates such earmarks.

I note that the Senator from Massachusetts, a staunch defender of the amendment that is being offered, would see funding for his State to go up by another \$75 million. Certainly it does enhance one's enthusiasm for an amendment. But I will address that part later.

H.R. 3019 provides \$1.825 billion for State revolving funds. This includes an increase of \$100 million over the President's request of \$500 million for drinking water—State revolving funds to be distributed by a formula based on need—a formula based on need and not a formula based on who can offer an amendment. It is a formula for which we hope the Environmental Protection Agency and State agencies will use good, sound science and prioritizing in determining where the money needs to go.

In fiscal year 1995 the States received only \$1.235 billion in revolving funds. This year's bill ensures that States will receive \$1.725 billion, and an additional \$100 million if title IV spending is re-

leased; that is, if the President agrees on a balanced budget. That would be an increase of almost 50 percent. The occupant of the chair and I have served as Governors. We know where the pedal hits the metal and where the rubber hits the road, which is in the States where they actually do the cleanup. In Washington we talk about it and we pontificate about it. It is the States that have to do the cleanup. It is the States that take care of the needs of their communities. It is the States that take care of the environmental risk to their citizens. And we increase that money by 50 percent in this bill.

I note that it is especially ironic that the pending amendment seeks to add back pork barrel sewer projects. This is not environmental protection so much as old-fashioned parochial political pork. That is what is involved here.

In addition to the State revolving funds this legislation fully funds State agency grants. We have recognized that the States have been assigned burdensome responsibilities by the Federal Government to protect and clean up the environment. We have tried to provide sufficient funds for them to do that despite the budgetary constraints under which we must act.

Despite very serious concerns with the Superfund program—and there are serious problems with that program, Mr. President, and everybody in this body knows there are problems with it and reservations about putting a lot of money into a program which virtually every one agrees needs to be reformed—the legislation before us actually recommends \$1.263 billion for Superfund, \$100 million more than the conference agreement. This appropriation would result in an increase in the dollars spent on actual cleanups in fiscal year 1995 and would provide level funding for enforcement activities.

The Senator from Massachusetts and other proponents of this measure have talked about the slowdown in Superfund. Slowdown is synonymous with Superfund. That is what Superfund has become—a tremendous slowdown project. It has had some tremendous benefits. It has had tremendous benefits for the lawyers who file the lawsuits and argue over who is going to be responsible. The more money we put in the Superfund the more fees we generate. This is a litigation machine. This is a lawyer's dream. The law provides more dollars for lawyers and too little for cleanup. We cannot just throw more and more dollars at it without changing the law.

If we are serious about the Superfund and toxic site cleanups—and we must be—then we have to reform the program. We are working to reform the Superfund Program so that the money in Superfund goes to what people thought it ought to, and perhaps think it still goes to; that is, cleaning up the sites.

Mr. President, many of the recommendations included in the committee reported bill for EPA were made by

the National Academy of Public Administration. This is a nonpartisan organization which was asked by my predecessor, my Democratic colleague and ranking Member, Senator BARBARA MIKULSKI, to undertake a report on reforming EPA 2 years ago. I want to say once more for the Record that Senator MIKULSKI has been a leader in promoting environmental progress and using the best management and the best science to do so, and the work that was done at her request in the National Academy of Public Administration, I think—in common forums away from the political diatribes on the floor and on the hustings—is recognized as the way we should go to make sure that we deal with the threats to health and the threats to the environment from toxic waste.

We followed the recommendations in this bill of the National Academy of Public Administration. They were presented to Congress almost a year ago, and they said turn over more responsibility to the States; turn over responsibility to the States which have developed capacity over the past 25 years to manage environmental programs. Do not step on their efforts, if they are doing a good job. If they are not doing a good job, Mr. President, there is every reason to have a Federal agency which says, "You are not doing a good enough job." If we in Missouri were polluting the air of Illinois, polluting the water of Arkansas or Mississippi or Louisiana, the national agency should step in. But if we are doing the job in Missouri in cleaning up the environment to standards set on a national basis to protect the national health and well being of the environment, then we ought to give the States the flexibility to do it.

According to NAPA, "EPA should revise its approach to oversight, regarding high-performing States with grant flexibility, reduced oversight, and greater autonomy."

That sums it up. This is what we have tried to do through the appropriations bill. We have even included authority for EPA to begin issuing block grants for maximum flexibility. We have tried in this bill to get EPA to focus on the areas of highest risk to human health and the environment, and to reduce spending for the time being on those programs which produce less bang for the buck, either in terms of the cleanup progress or the risk that they are dealing with. Rather than spending time organizing press conferences and news events, I believe that EPA should follow the recommendations of NAPA to get its own house in order. Despite EPA's claims to support NAPA's recommendations, we have seen little in terms of real change.

As I have mentioned before, Mr. President, I have been trying unsuccessfully—I have been waiting for 5 months to forge a compromise with the White House within the allocation available to my subcommittee. Since last November I have placed phone

calls, I have written letters, and I have held hearings—nothing, zip, nothing. Unfortunately, the White House seemingly has decided that portraying me and those on this side of the aisle as antienvironment is a better political strategy than compromise. My phone calls have not been returned. My letters have not been responded to.

I held a hearing on January 26. EPA administrator Carol Browner refused to admit there can—and, indeed, must be—priorities within the EPA's budget. The Administrator, when I asked her for her priorities, claimed that the entire \$966 million of add-backs demanded by the White House were critical, including earmarks for sewer construction, the pork barrel part of it. Is there anything that is more important than the environment? When you cannot set any priorities you do not have any priorities. If you refuse to prioritize, to live within a budget, then you do not have any idea of what you are trying to do.

Two weeks ago, I held a second hearing on EPA. We heard from former EPA Administrator Bill Ruckelshaus, State environmental commissioners, EPA Science Advisory Board members, and others. These witnesses confirmed the importance of setting priorities and reordering spending to achieve the most gains for the environment with the available dollars. These witnesses recognized that spending was not unlimited and there must be management discipline to ensure we allocate resources effectively.

Unfortunately, instead of attempts to compromise, we have seen nothing but incendiary rhetoric from the administration. Two weeks ago, EPA Administrator Carol Browner, at a press event staged by House Democrats, stated that the Republican budget would force her to choose between setting drinking water standards for cryptosporidium and controlling toxic water pollution in rivers, lakes, and streams.

There is not a shred of truth in that. I think cryptosporidium and controlling toxic water pollution are top priorities. How come she cannot see that? How come she wants to put pork-barrel projects and corporate welfare projects in a budget and say that those are equal in priority? They are not establishing any priorities. If they give us some priorities, we will work with them. Let us talk about things that really can clean up the environment.

The appropriation for EPA does require EPA to begin to set priorities—a novel concept. The National Academy of Public Administration, the General Accounting Office, EPA's own Science Advisory Board, and other experts who have testified before our committee recognize that EPA should begin to do it, but in no way does it force the sort of tradeoff that the Administrator described.

Let me get to one of my favorites. I am sure you read or heard or saw on TV about the President's campaign

event in New Jersey. Oh, that was a bell ringer. The political pundits and spin masters must have been rubbing their hands together in glee. He attacked Congress as being antienvironment. He accused the Congress of shutting down cleanup at a Superfund site in Wallington, NJ. He pointed out that right next to the site was a school and children were in danger. Why? It was because the Republicans in Congress wanted to subject these children to the dangers of toxic waste.

We listen to a great commentator named Paul Harvey back in our part of the country, and he says, "Now let me tell you the rest of the story." Well, the rest of the story gets pretty interesting because what he did not say, what the President did not say was that EPA chose—not Congress, EPA chose—to slow down the work at that site. We gave them the dollars and told them: You set the priorities. You prioritize your cleanup dollars to put them into the areas which pose the greatest risks to human health, and do that first.

Why did we do that? Why did we do that, Mr. President? Because we had a GAO study of existing Superfund cleanup actions. This study showed that 32 percent of the sites reflected an immediate threat to human health and the environment, and those are under present or current land uses; 15 percent would not pose any risk to human health in any event; 50 percent would pose a threat to human health only if they changed the land use.

Therefore, if you went into an industrial site where they had had manufacturing and transportation and did not clean it up and set up a kindergarten playground or a day care center, that would pose a risk. So you do not do that. Fifty percent of them pose no risk to human health under the current land use. And unless you brought in kids and had them eating the dirt, there would be no human health risks—15 percent, no human health risks. Only 30 percent of the taxpayer dollars were being spent on human health risks.

So we told EPA: Go out and spend your money where there is a human health risk. You have more than enough money to do that.

So either one of two things, Mr. President. Either EPA decided that the Wallington, NJ, site was not posing a risk to human health, which would have been a vitally important factor that reporters could ask the President about at his news conference. Or if there was a real risk to human health and EPA had staged the slowdown to give the President a political forum. One of two choices. Maybe EPA will tell us which. Did they allow the President to hype as a risk something that was not a risk, or did they slow down funding for something that really was a risk in order to give the President political gain and political mileage?

Whichever answer, it is not very pleasant. It is not something that I

think the people of America would tolerate. If there is a risk to human health, we said we will give you the money; go forward and clean up those risks first. Prioritize them. EPA has a little trouble focusing on the priorities. It is about time they did.

The amount of spending provided in the current continuing resolution and in the conference agreement is the same as the fiscal year 1995 level for actual Superfund cleanups. That is \$800 million. And the bill before us today would increase the Superfund cleanup budget by an additional \$100 million, as I have already indicated. We have told EPA they have to prioritize Superfund cleanups—something they have never done in the past—and it needs to be based on real threats to human health and the environment.

If the Wallington, NJ, site where the President staged the press event meets EPA's own risk-ranking process, there is money and that site should receive cleanup funding this year under the terms of the bill before us today.

The Lautenberg amendment continues the misinformation campaign of the White House. It seeks to add more funds for programs we have already increased in this bill. It seeks to add funds for programs which are not high priorities such as the environmental technology initiative.

The environmental technology initiative has funded private sector conferences on energy efficiency lighting. In the past, they have funded studies on how large corporations can save dollars. That is a great idea if they save dollars by energy efficiency, but for a large corporation, I think that they probably ought to be willing to fund that themselves. We have heard in the past about studies to control and study bovine emissions and many other areas that may be of scientific interest, although not of great personal interest, I would say.

We add back money for funds for enforcement. We have already increased enforcement spending over the fiscal year 1995 level.

Now, perhaps most amazingly, the amendment seeks to add funds for Boston Harbor when this bill already has \$25 million. We did accede to the request of Governor Weld of Massachusetts to continue funding it at a lower level because of the magnitude of the problem and the fact that they have to have some funding as we phase down the availability of dollars. But Boston Harbor has received almost \$600 million over the past several years, even while such earmarks are not authorized and are unfair to thousands of communities which do not receive such largesse.

Surely, it cannot be a priority to move one site above every other site in the Nation. We have said that we are making funds available to be allocated on the basis of need, on the basis of sound science. If that, in fact, is such a need and sound science requires it, then money will go there.

But, as indicated by the Senator from Massachusetts, there are lots of

requests in lots of other areas. I have had many, many Members tell me about the very difficult situations they face in their States. They have talked about water system supplies, and I said, "Yes, I understand that." And we have not done a good job in the political process of determining which of those projects has the highest priority need in terms of science, in terms of human health, and in terms of the environment. So we put the money into State revolving funds, we put the money into programs where it will be allocated on the basis of sound science, where it will be allocated on the basis of how much danger is posed. That is how the money should be allocated.

I believe we can establish decent priorities. Mr. President, if the Lautenberg amendment goes to a vote, I will oppose it because I believe in this bill there is adequate funding for EPA within the constraints imposed by the needs to balance the Federal budget. I think it is time for EPA to begin prioritizing and instill management disciplines to ensure Federal funds are spent effectively on environmental protection activities.

There have been encouraging words. I have been approached by the Democratic leadership. I have had a conversation with my ranking member and colleague, Senator MIKULSKI. They have indicated that perhaps we can reach a compromise with the administration. And if the administration does not want to play, we will reach a compromise with the Senate Democratic leadership on what we are going to do. I am tired of guessing what the priorities of the administration are.

We are more than willing to work in a reasonable manner to allocate the funds that are available and to make sure the EPA and the State agencies have the funds they need to move ahead as we work on reauthorizing and changing Superfund and other programs. If the administration is serious, if the Democrats are serious, in case they have lost my telephone number, my phone number is 224-5721. I have left a lot of messages. They have probably been erased from the e-mail screens by now, but I can be reached by fax or by message from the cloakroom. I will be waiting for a call.

This is serious business. It is time that we end the partisan charges that I think have been totally unwarranted, and talk about how we can pass a measure which actually provides funding within the budget constraints to do the vitally important environmental cleanup and enforcement work that the people of America have a right to expect.

Mr. President, because we are hoping there will be further discussion of this, we have conferred with the minority side and I have not heard objection. I therefore ask unanimous consent that this amendment be temporarily laid aside.

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

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, seeing no other Member seeking the floor, I now suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be dispensed with.

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

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending business be set aside so that I might speak for no more than 5 minutes on the preceding Lautenberg amendment.

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

Mr. LIEBERMAN. I thank the Chair. First, I ask unanimous consent that Senator LEAHY of Vermont be added as a cosponsor of the Lautenberg amendment.

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

Mr. LIEBERMAN. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the Senator from New Jersey to restore funding for the Environmental Protection Agency, the Department of Energy, the Department of the Interior, and the Department of Agriculture.

Senator LAUTENBERG and others have discussed the critical programs of environmental protection that would be funded by the amendment in some detail. I want to touch very briefly on a few of the key aspects of the amendment, particularly the provisions related to funding for technology.

First, Senator LAUTENBERG's amendment adds back a modest amount of funding for environmental technology, \$62 million, for a total spending on environmental technology of \$108 million. Unfortunately, the continuing resolution includes only \$46 million for spending in this critical area.

Funding for the President's Environmental Technology Initiative, which is known as ETI, is slashed from his request by 92 percent to only \$10 million. Mr. President, the failure of the continuing resolution to provide adequate funding for environmental technology is, in my opinion, very shortsighted. A small amount of funding on these programs can yield enormous savings for our regulated industries while providing superior protection for all of our citizens.

During the current debate on environmental protection, we often hear what at first appear to be conflicting messages. Some in the electorate clearly want less of the overly bureaucratic, heavy-handed command-and-control approaches we have turned to too often in the past to protect our environment. Those folks want new solutions that rely more on the marketplace. They have a good point.

On the other hand, it is clear that the public's commitment to protecting the

environment has remained very strong, and understandably so. I was pleased that at a meeting with my staff recently, representatives of the Connecticut Business and Industry Association affirmed their support for strong environmental protection laws.

Of course, that should not be surprising. Folks who run our businesses, who are citizens, are as concerned as anyone else about the quality of the air they and their families breathe and the water they drink or swim in. They want to be good citizens, good corporate citizens, of our community.

What the conflicting messages tell me is that we have to be smarter in our approaches to environmental protection, not weaker. That is precisely what the Environmental Protection Agency is working toward in its Environmental Technology Initiative.

The program is developing and promoting new approaches to regulation and new technologies that will increase our efficiency, cut costs, expand exports, and produce a healthy, productive environment for our citizens. Under the Environmental Technology Initiative, EPA is working with the States to streamline permitting processes and to ensure that the permit approval process does not penalize those companies that are willing to try new, cheaper solutions involving technological improvements in order to control pollution. The National Academy of Public Administration's report on improving EPA's programs, mandated by the Appropriations Committee, emphasized the need to eliminate regulatory and policy barriers hampering use of new technologies.

Mr. President, 63 percent of the funds proposed by the President for the Environmental Technology Initiative would be spent on programs to promote just this kind of permit flexibility and other regulatory innovative practices. These are the type of programs that the Connecticut Business and Industry Association and other businesses are telling us they want to help them meet their environmental responsibilities in a more efficient manner.

During the last Congress, I worked with colleagues on ways to promote these new, more cost-effective environmental technologies. I learned that the single most significant barrier to investment in these new technologies is that many of EPA's regulations inadvertently lock in the old, existing technologies.

Under the Environmental Technology Initiative, EPA is working now to develop regulations that correct this mistake, that do not lock in any one existing technology. They are working at EPA with State and nonprofit and Federal laboratories to test and verify the performance of these new, promising technologies. We need to make sure that this verification program can be expanded.

EPA is investing in other programs that make good economic and environmental sense. One of the most success-

ful environmental programs has been the market-based program to reduce emissions contributing to acid rain. Studies show that this very exciting new program is yielding enormous health benefits while costing the industries regulated by the Clean Air Act at least \$2 to \$3 billion less than estimated at the time of enactment of the law. ETI, the Environmental Technology Initiative, is investing in programs that will expand market-based approaches. And that is exactly what the Lautenberg amendment would support.

Over the long term, improvements in environmental technology, particularly when it comes to pollution prevention, are critical to the ability of American companies to compete. Not only do new technologies reduce compliance costs but they improve competitiveness by leading to greater efficiency. Saturday's New York Times had an exciting article about the success of the paper industry in vastly reducing its discharges of contaminated water into rivers or streams and in the process saving huge amounts of water and energy while still increasing production. Those companies have found that this approach provides a competitive advantage.

ETI is working in partnership with industry to develop these cleaner technologies. For example, it is working with industry to reduce toxic emissions released by metal finishing processes used by more than 3000 metal finishing facilities nationwide. One of these projects already is reducing the use of chromium. Another project aims to slash the time EPA takes to approve new technologies that prevent dangerous contaminants such as cryptosporidium from entering our drinking water, and other technologies that will disinfect the water as well as provide quicker confirmation of drinking water safety.

In other words, at the most basic level, the development of innovative environmental technology will enable us to maintain strong environmental protection at dramatically lower cost. Involving Federal and State agencies such as EPA as partners in this effort is important because these agencies should have a good sense of the regulations that may be promulgated in the next decade. Working in partnership with the Federal Government is the best way to focus technology development on areas where the economic and environmental benefits will be the greatest. Involvement in technology development will also help increase awareness by EPA and other regulatory agencies of what is or is not possible from a technology development standpoint as they develop regulations.

ETI is also working with industries to promote the exports and diffusion of U.S. technologies throughout the world. There is an enormous market for these technologies and U.S. companies should lead. In Connecticut, the environmental technology industry—a

\$2 billion industry according to recent reports—has become a major exporter.

Mr. President, the second provision in Senator LAUTENBERG's amendment that I want to discuss briefly is the add-back for funding for the so-called Partnership for the New Generation of Vehicles. That is sometimes referred to more familiarly as the clean car initiative. This is an extremely important and innovative program that has transformed a traditional adversarial relationship between industry and Government—in this case the auto industry—into a relationship that is built on common goals and has produced a broad-based cooperation. The goal of the program is to develop an attractive, affordable, mid-sized car, much like the Ford Taurus, Chrysler Concorde, or Chevrolet Lumina, which achieves up to 80 miles to the gallon. It is mostly recyclable, accelerates from zero to 60 miles per hour in 12 seconds.

The occupant of the chair can remember our youths together, when how fast you could go from zero to 60 was truly a measurement of one's status in life. This car is aimed to hold comfortably six passengers and to meet all safety and emissions requirements and to cost about the same as comparably sized cars on the showroom floor.

This would be a revelation. Up to 80 miles per gallon. The program is really a win-win program. Government is working as a partner with industry to protect our environment. At the same time, it is stimulating new technologies that lead to increased competitiveness for American industry in the fiercely competitive international automobile marketplace.

The clean car initiative not only protects the environment, but also jobs—high wage jobs—for our work force. This program is cost shared. Industry is pulling its own weight. Government funding is used in long term precompetitive research and development. And there is clear progress being made toward the program's goals. One representative of the partnership told Vice President GORE last year: "By the end of 1997, we will narrow the technology focus. By 2000, we will have a concept vehicle. And by the year 2004, we will have a production prototype." He added: "This is not just about jobs. It is not just about technology. It is not just about the environment. It is also about a new process of working together, for both industry and Government, in ways that have not been attempted before."

Again, the Lautenberg amendment pluses up the money available for this program. It is a very, very cost-effective investment of public funds.

Mr. President, I want to comment briefly on several other provisions in Senator LAUTENBERG's amendment. I strongly support the restoration of funding for the State revolving fund under the Clean Water Act. SRF money is critical for Connecticut and particularly Long Island Sound.

The SRF program espouses the virtues that the majority has been emphasizing this Congress—it provides low interest loans to States to meet community based environmental needs and offers flexibility in how money is spent. For example, Connecticut has received \$170 million in Federal funds and has committed over \$1 billion in State funds since 1987 to improve sewage treatment plants.

In Connecticut, clean water is not just an environmental issue—but an economic issue. Long Island Sound, for example, generates approximately \$5 billion per year for the local economy—through fin and shellfish harvest, boating, fishing, hunting, and beach-going activities. The commercial oyster harvest is a great example. In 1970, Connecticut's once thriving shellfish industry was virtually nonexistent. Today, its \$50 million harvest has the highest value in the Nation. This improvement is due in large part to required improvements in water quality.

Our work on cleaning up Long Island Sound, however, has a long way to go. Health advisories are still in effect for recreational fish consumption, and disease-causing bacterial and viruses have been responsible for numerous beach closures. Connecticut still needs hundreds of millions of dollars to perform needed improvements on public sewage system, which continue to be the largest source of pollution for the sound. The total estimated cost of upgrading the outdated plants is estimated at \$6 to \$8 billion.

I am also very concerned that the comprehensive conservation and Management plan for Long Island Sound will be curtailed without adequate SRF funding. Through this plan, representatives from EPA, New York, Connecticut and other local governments have joined forces with businesses, developers, farmers, and environmentalists to work cooperatively to upgrade sewage treatment plants, improve stormwater management and control non point source runoff. A reduction in SRF funds will limit each State's ability to assess local conditions and move toward more site-specific and flexible watershed protection approaches.

Inadequate funding of the SRF delays needed improvements in Long Island Sound and in other greater water bodies in this country—improvements that have enormous economic, recreational and environmental benefits. That is why I support the additional funding in Senator LAUTENBERG's amendment.

Finally, I want to express my strong support for the modest additions to the funding for climate change. I was pleased to be a cosponsor of an amendment offered by Senator JEFFORDS to restore a significant amount of funding for EPA's ozone depletion and global climate change programs. But I think it is critical that a minimum there be no decrease in EPA's programs from fiscal year 1995 enacted levels. Adequate funding for DOE's climate change programs is also critical.

Mr. President, the new scientific assessment by the world's leading scientists concludes that the best evidence suggest that global climate change is in progress, that the temperature changes over the last century are unlikely to be entirely due to natural causes, and that a pattern of climate response to human activities is identifiable in observed climate records. The assessment concludes that the incidence of floods, droughts, fires and pest outbreaks is expected to increase in some regions. For example, we are experiencing a continuing rise in average global sea level, which is likely to amount to more than a foot and a half by 2010. To bring that home to Connecticut, sea level rises of this magnitude along the coast could result in total inundation of barrier beaches such as Hammonasset Beach, which is probably our most popular State park, and destruction of some coastal property.

The President's global climate action plan is modest. It commits the United States to reducing greenhouse gas emission to 1990 levels by the year 2000. This is a modest step because our efforts at stabilizing emissions is different from stabilizing atmospheric concentrations. Constant annual emissions will still increase the total concentration of greenhouse gases and heat-trapping capacity of our atmosphere.

The President's plan relies on voluntary, public private partnerships which are based on building a consensus between business and Government. It does not rely on command and control regulation. If these types of innovative alternatives are to be the basis of our future approach to environmental protection, it is critical to support the programs now in existence.

I also strongly support the additional funding for the Department of Agriculture's Stewardship Incentive Program. This program provides financial and technical assistance to private nonindustrial forest land owners to manage their forest land for timber production, wildlife, recreation and aesthetics. It is an important non-regulatory incentives program for preserving wetlands and endangered species across the country that has widespread support, including the Connecticut Forest and Park Association.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I rise today in support of the amendment offered by Senator LAUTENBERG and Senator MIKULSKI.

We have to balance the budget, and everyone has to sacrifice a bit. The new Congress does deserve some credit for trying. But it has gone about the job in the wrong way.

It wants to give new tax breaks to wealthy people and corporations. And to do that, Congress has threatened a back-door tax increase on rural America through higher water rates, and threatened the creation of good jobs by turning its back on critical research and development in environmental

technologies. This amendment will help set things right.

STOPPING THE BACK-DOOR WATER TAX

First, we will help small towns and rural communities meet their obligations without slapping folks with higher water bills.

How do we do that? Well, we provide money for the State revolving loan funds. These help communities and water systems treat their sewage and provide safe drinking water. Without this fund, these communities still have to keep the water safe. But they can only do it by raising water rates, sometimes through the roof.

With this amendment, small towns can keep their drinking water safe while keeping water rates low. Without this amendment, many just can not do it. So if Congress does not pass the Lautenberg amendment, the 25 million Americans who get their water from a small drinking water system could see a back-door tax increase through higher water bills. That includes virtually everyone in rural America.

PROTECTING HIGH-WAGE JOBS

Second, by adopting this amendment we will protect high-wage jobs that make our country cleaner, healthier, and more competitive.

We do it by restoring money for the Environmental Technology Initiatives [ETI] at the Environmental Protection Agency. Through this program, companies and local governments can participate in research and development of new technologies.

In Montana, small businesses like Yellowstone Environmental Sciences in Bozeman and public-private partnerships like the Western Environmental Technology Office in Butte are some of the most innovative players in addressing our Superfund problems. They are also some of the most promising sources of high-wage jobs for the future.

Elsewhere in America, the ETI Program is verifying the performance of new technologies that are suitable to the special cost and performance needs of small drinking water systems.

It is helping to reduce dangerous toxic emissions released by the metal finishing processes used by over 3,000 metal finishing facilities nationwide.

It is speeding up approvals of new analytical methods which can rapidly determine the nature of contamination at toxic waste sites, and make cleanups faster.

The ETI is a great example of how Government and the private sector can cooperatively advance technology while protecting the environment.

CONCLUSION

So we need to balance the budget, but we need to do it the right way. This amendment keeps us on the path to a balanced budget while setting the priorities straight. It will protect good jobs and prevent Congress from imposing a large back-door tax on the average family's water rates. It will help make sure our country is the clean, healthy Nation our children deserve.

I urge support for the Lautenberg-Mikulski amendment.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I would like to take a moment to speak in support of the pending amendment, particularly for restoring operating funds for the National Park Service. Without these funds millions of Americans will not realize the full majesty and spectacle of our national treasures.

The \$72 million restoration provides funding to manage the operational needs of our national parks. At its current level of funding the Park Service is merely treading water with respect to maintaining facilities. Additional funding provides for much-needed improvements and repair of our national treasures. This would also represent a boon to local economies as more visitors will be able to make use of upgraded parks. The proposed offset offered in the amendment ensures no additional taxpayer money will be spent. As some would seek to keep level funding in the face of increasing costs and demands, I think you now see sentiment throughout America that recognizes the need to stop irreparable damage being done to our national heritage. This funding restoration is necessary to ensure the future of a strong, accessible National Park System.

As you know, I have been a strong advocate of promoting and strengthening our national parks. Minnesota is home to a truly wondrous area, Voyageurs National Park—the crown jewel of the north. This unique water-based park is a pristine wildlife habitat where one can see wolves in the wild, bald eagles soaring overhead, and fish breaking the water in pastoral settings. Voyageurs provides Minnesotans the opportunity to explore this national treasure by boat, snowmobile, floatplanes, skiing, or hiking. Last summer I had the privilege of boating in the park and I don't believe I've ever been so thrilled with the beauty of nature as I was on that trip.

I want to see more people visit and enjoy this spectacular resource. As with other national parks, this cannot happen without adequate operating funds, money that will preserve and enhance the beauty of jewels like Voyageurs. I have fought to maintain the carefully managed multiple use nature of Voyageurs, to address water level problems, to achieve better safety for boaters, and at the same time benefit fish spawning and wildlife habitat.

Northern Minnesota has a rich history of individuality; the proud people of this area have worked the land and provided for their families through toil and sweat. Maintaining and improving facilities at Voyageurs, ensuring the multiple-use nature of the park, will allow more people to come and enjoy it, bring more jobs to the local economy, and lead to economic development. Northern Minnesota deserves it and I will work to make it happen.

Some of my colleagues are all too often willing to turn back the environmental clock, to say get rid of Govern-

ment regulation, to go back to the days of unregulated extraction and exploitation of our lands. I say we cannot go back, we must preserve nature's wonders for generations to come. We cannot back down from the gains we've made in protecting our great heritage. This must be a shared responsibility, one that accounts for the needs of the many and the few.

When Congress voted to establish Voyageurs, we said yes to preserving this wonderful and pristine resource for all Americans. We said no to future lakeshore development, to building homes and putting up private property and no trespassing signs. We made a decision to provide multiple use recreation in a natural setting, free of development, free of timbering and free of the threat of losing this resource. Now we have to invest in this resource to ensure that all Americans and their children will experience our National Parks.

We often say that someone has good common sense, but we are losing sight of what constitutes common sense—or what makes sense. It makes no sense to risk the loss of this treasure. Common sense should compel us to guard and protect our parks. Once we walk away—once we fail to provide adequate funding, it is too difficult to recover what we have lost.

We must continue to support the gains we've made with respect to our national parks. We must maintain and improve the treasures we have set aside. We must make them accessible to all, to share the splendor of nature.

Take some time, come to Minnesota, enjoy the beauty of Voyageurs. I promise you my friends, once you've experience the wonders of our northern jewel, you will support full funding for our national parks and you will help to ensure their beauty for generations to come.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I am pleased to be a cosponsor of the amendment before us.

Americans have a core belief in protecting the environment, regardless of party affiliation. They may differ on the means to achieve conservation and protection of our natural resources, but they are in agreement that we cannot squander or waste this precious heritage. In this regard, we are the envy of the world. Few other nations have approached protection of the environment in such a comprehensive fashion. Our parks, our drinking and waste water systems, and our pollution prevention efforts are envied around the world.

Some seek to rewrite our environmental laws through the budgetary and appropriations process, rather than through the more deliberative process which gave us those laws. It is surely true that many of these statutes could be improved. In fact, I have introduced legislation to amend the Clean Air Act because I do not believe that it addresses adequately the matter of interstate transportation of air pollution. I

have supported various bills to amend the Safe Drinking Water Act, the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act. And, as my colleagues are aware, I support improving and reforming the Federal Government's rulemaking process. However, I vigorously oppose wholesale changes in the bedrock protection principles underpinning these laws. Americans will not and should not accept such changes.

We have made huge strides in reducing pollution of the laws Congress, States, and local governments have crafted over the years. Our emissions of most toxics have been declining, recycling has become an accepted waste management strategy, and we're working hard to develop cleaner, more environmentally sound products and manufacturing processes. All of these trends have occurred while economic growth continues and exports rise.

There is a new approach to business and management catching on in the United States. Industries, businesses, and even governmental units, are carefully reviewing their production, procurement, and usage practices to root out waste and so become more competitive here and abroad.

Many experts say, and in some cases I agree, that we have already required and adopted the easy, most cost-effective pollution control technologies. From here on out, we have to focus more carefully on refining our laws to provide flexibility to the regulated community and ensure that benefits of any required investments in pollution prevention and control outweigh the costs. This is a difficult balancing act, but if we can carefully review the basic environmental status and very carefully adjust them we will further the goal of cheaper, but equally effective protection. The Federal Government can and should be an active participant in helping those regulated to develop technologies and processes that can meet these cost-effective criteria.

This is the direction that the Congress and the Clinton administration, and the Bush administration before it, have begun. EPA's resources are now being spent more often on common-sense pollution prevention efforts that provide environmental protection and flexibility.

But, rather than continuing that process, the bill seeks to cut items that are important priorities for environmental protection and conservation. Punitive cuts in Endangered Species Act activity, in Land and Water Conservation Fund matching grants to States, in Superfund, in environmental technology development, in wastewater treatment grants to States, in energy conservation and so forth don't add up to a balanced careful approach.

On a Michigan note, I must continue to express my opposition to the bills' reductions in the National Biological Service and its transfer to the U.S. Geological Survey, primarily because of its impact on research at the Great Lakes Science Center. And, I oppose

the inclusion by reference of the conference report language accompanying the vetoed Commerce, Justice, State bill, which proposed transfer of the Great Lakes Fishery Commission to the Department of Interior.

Industry leaders, business managers, and local elected officials, have internalized the public's unquenchable desire for continued progress in environmental protection. That is a real revolution.

Now, we are halfway through the fiscal year for which this omnibus bill is providing funds. The uncertainty of funding has caused widespread havoc among local governments, businesses, and States. The stop and start approach harms good, solid planning and jeopardizes public and private sector jobs. It does not make any sense to do things this way.

Most Americans do not have the luxury of time necessary to fully monitor how things are being handled here. They don't know who to blame for the holdup of wastewater treatment grants or education loans. But, they are tired of the infighting and want it to end.

Americans want our laws fixed to relieve unnecessary burdens or gross inefficiency. But, they will not surrender what they know to be theirs—the right to clean air, clean water, and a safe environment.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I strongly support the Lautenberg amendment to the Omnibus Appropriations Act. It gives the environment the high priority it deserves, by restoring some of the most serious cuts proposed in the pending bill.

We need to do all we can to see that the Nation's priceless environmental heritage is passed down from generation to generation. This amendment offers Republicans and Democrats alike a chance to give the environment the priority it deserves.

It restores needed funds for programs to improve the safety of our Nation's drinking water supplies, and helps protect our lakes, rivers, and coastal areas from harmful pollutants.

It maintains the Federal Government's commitment to provide needed assistance to communities struggling to meet the requirements of the Clean Water Act.

It gives States and localities the support and flexibility they need to bring their water systems into the 21st century.

In particular, the amendment will restore \$190 million for the Clean Water Act's State revolving fund, which offers a vital source of Federal assistance for wastewater projects across the Nation.

The cost of implementing clean water mandates has put an extraordinary burden on families and businesses in thousands of communities.

In Massachusetts, the cost of these mandates has resulted in water and sewer bills that exceed many of my constituents' property taxes. Low-income families have had their water

shut off because they were unable to pay their soaring bills. Some families are now paying \$1,600 a year for water and sewer service, and the rates will continue to rise through the end of the decade.

In the communities of Fall River and New Bedford, businesses that use water-intensive processes—particularly textile companies—are considering leaving the State, because the projected rate increases will put them at a competitive disadvantage. To add insult to injury, these communities are also plagued by double-digit unemployment, and have not yet recovered from the ongoing economic recession.

Congress has a responsibility to help ease the burden of their rising water and sewer rates by providing additional support for the State revolving fund.

The Lautenberg amendment also adds \$75 million in clean water funds for the cleanup of Boston Harbor. This addition will bring Federal assistance back to the \$100 million level of annual support recommended by President Clinton and President Bush as well, and provided each year by Congress over the past several years.

Over the course of the past decade, the cleanup of Boston Harbor has received strong bipartisan support. Democrats as well as Republicans have recognized the crushing financial burden on the 2.5 million ratepayers in the area to meet the \$3.5 billion in federally mandated cleanup costs.

State funds have been essential as well in bringing relief to these ratepayers. In addition, the Massachusetts Water Resources Authority, which oversees the cleanup of Boston Harbor, has successfully worked to reduce the costs of the project.

But continuing Federal assistance remains vitally important for this ongoing project, which still has several years to go before completion. The project has passed some important milestones already—it has reduced harmful metals dumped into the harbor from 3,000 pounds per day in 1984 to 500 pounds per day in 1993. It has reduced the number of harbor beach closings by 70 percent over the last 4 years. But much more remains to be done.

At the \$100 million annual level, Federal assistance meets just 18 percent of the total Boston Harbor cleanup costs—far below the Federal share provided in the past for many other clean water projects throughout the United States.

Finally, the Lautenberg amendment will also restore \$175 million to the State revolving fund under the Safe Drinking Water Act. This fund will, for the first time, provide Federal assistance to States and localities to improve their public water systems and ensure the safety of their drinking water supplies. Many communities urgently need this assistance to comply with Federal law and build new water treatment facilities, develop alternative water supplies, and consolidate small systems.

The creation of this revolving fund received the unanimous support of the Senate last November, by a vote of 99 to 0. The Lautenberg amendment will help make that commitment real and bring relief to cities and towns across America.

Communities across America will benefit from this amendment. This Congress should not go down in history as the anti-environment Congress. I urge the Senate to give this amendment the overwhelming bipartisan support it deserves.

I thank the Chair. I yield the floor.

WHITEWATER DEVELOPMENT CORP. AND RELATED MATTERS—MOTION TO PROCEED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 1 p.m. having arrived, there will now be 1 hour equally divided on the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed to Senate Resolution 227.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, with the time to be equally divided between the sides.

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

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURNS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, for the past 16 days our Democratic colleagues have used the Senate rules to block consideration of a resolution to provide additional funds, funds for the Whitewater special committee. That is simply wrong. The Senate has a duty to get the full facts about Whitewater.

The Democrats are filibustering, for 16 days now, to prevent the Senate from voting on whether or not to provide additional funds for the Whitewater Committee.

So that the record is clear, we must understand how much we are asking for. We are asking \$600,000. In addition, I have agreed to allow us to have a vote to curtail the committee's investigation to 4 months. They have said they wanted to negotiate with us. We are willing to negotiate. We have heard nothing except what is almost contemptuous because it says we would have to conclude our public hearings by April 5. That is silly.

The majority is committed to getting all the facts about Whitewater. It is now clear that our Democratic colleagues simply are not.

Let me ask the question: If Whitewater is much to-do about nothing, as the White House claims, why are Democrats afraid of the hearings? Why are they afraid to let them go forward? What are they afraid of? What does the White House want to hide from the American people? You cannot say it is much to-do about nothing, and then oppose having the hearings.