

Taiwan to the United Nations—that is reserved only for independent countries—that that ought to be done.

So, Mr. President, I do not plan to oppose this resolution, but if it is brought up tonight I will want to question the authors of it as to their intent with respect to the Shanghai communique. It is very important that the Shanghai communique not be departed from.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I wonder if I might ask my friend a question.

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I will yield to the Senator from Georgia for a question.

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

Mr. NUNN. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Yes.

Mr. NUNN. Is the Senator saying if we are going to consider a resolution on this sensitive subject that we ought to hear every word of exactly what we are doing, not do it at this hour of the night when people are not paying attention and understand what we say on the floor of the Senate?

Sometimes we do not take it seriously but other countries do. I have reservations about the way this resolution is worded. It is not what is in it. It is what is not in it. There is not much I disagree with, but it leaves out the whole history of the United States relationship with China, how it evolved under President Nixon, what happened when we normalized, the Reagan communique in 1982. All of that is left out of it. We are all concerned about what is going on in China, but we do not further the cause of stability and peace in that area of the world by ignoring what we have agreed to, by ignoring the history of President Nixon's visit, by ignoring the one-China policy which was adhered to not only by the United States when we said that we would respect China's view that that was their policy but also by the people on Taiwan. For years that is what has brought stability and prosperity to that part of the world.

If they are going to change that policy politically by Taiwan or certainly by military force by China, then we ought to oppose both. We ought to oppose it vigorously because that is going to cause turmoil in that part of the world for a long time to come.

So if the Senator from Louisiana is saying let us go slow, let us do not pass this tonight, I am with him. I think he is absolutely right. We are not going to solve anything. This is more heat than it is light. And we need to be very careful.

I would be glad to work with Senators on that side of the aisle in carefully wording and making sure we reflect the history, making sure we have an overall perspective, making sure we understand the U.S. agreements, what we have agreed to. We have not always

lived up to what we said we were going to do either. I think we all have deep concern about the dangerous situation developing there. We have deep friendship for the people on Taiwan and deep admiration.

So I would just ask the Senator, have I captured the essence of the point he is making here?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, the Senator from Georgia has captured precisely the point, precisely the point. It is not what it says. It is what it leaves out. It is a subtle shift of ground. It is the mood of abandonment of the Shanghai communique and its progeny that are the problem here, and I wish we would just take some time in committee, as the Senator from Georgia points out, to carefully word on a bipartisan basis a resolution that, yes, condemns the use of force in Taiwan; yes, reaffirms our commitment to a peaceful settlement of this problem but, Mr. President, one that, as the Senator from Georgia says, fully reveals the content of our policy with China.

We are in this soup right now with two carrier groups in the Strait of Taiwan because we acted hastily and treated the visit of Li Teng-hui as if it were simply a visit to the alma mater. I think we realize now that it was a whole lot more. It has gotten us with two carrier groups over there. That is what led to it.

And so, Mr. President, I say let us go slowly. I do not oppose what it says. But let us work it out so it truly reflects American policy.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I wonder if my colleague will yield for a question.

Mr. LOTT. Parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip is recognized.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I will yield to the Senator.

#### BALANCED BUDGET DOWNPAYMENT ACT, II

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, if I could get a clarification here, I believe that the Senator has indicated that there would be objection and we are not going to have a vote on this issue tonight, as I understand it, and we had announced to all the members 1½ hours or so ago that we would have a vote at or about 8:30. The distinguished Senator from Minnesota has been on his feet for probably close to an hour now seeking to get recognition to speak on an amendment that is the pending business.

Now, Mr. President, is that the—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is not the pending business. The pending business is the amendment of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. COVERDELL].

Mr. LOTT. Would the Chair repeat that?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business is the amendment of Senator COVERDELL of Georgia.

Mr. LOTT. I believe, Mr. President, it would be in order to ask for the regular order on the Grams amendment.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I wonder if I could finish my one question of the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LOTT addressed the Chair.

Mr. MCCAIN. Regular order, Mr. President.

Mr. LOTT. In order to wrap this up, I would yield to Senator DORGAN, and then I am going to yield to Senator MURKOWSKI. But I would like to get on with the business I told the Members we have.

Mr. DORGAN. I only want to amplify the point the Senator has made. The cloakroom indicated there was going to be a vote at 8:30 on an amendment that was pending. This is probably an appropriate time for a China debate here in the Senate, but I would certainly support the inclination of the Senator from Mississippi to get the regular order and move to the amendments that are now pending.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, would the Senator from Alaska like to—

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I would just like to ask my friend from Louisiana, with whom I share the responsibility on the Energy and Natural Resources Committee, and we work together, if, indeed, on page 2, line 23—

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, who has recognition at this point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip has the floor.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I would like for us to be able to wrap this issue up. I know the Senator has some more comments to make on it, but we did say the regular order would be the Grams amendment, I believe.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I thought there was a reference to Senator DORGAN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the majority whip wishes, the regular order will be the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota, Mr. GRAMS.

Mr. LOTT. I believe that is the order, Mr. President, and I would like to ask for that at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. HUTCHISON). The amendment 3492 is now pending.

The Senator from Minnesota is recognized.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 3492

Mr. GRAMS. I thank the Chair. I will not take a lot of time. I know everybody is in a hurry to wrap this up for tonight.

I think this is a very important amendment that I offered last night. It has a growing number of cosponsors as well. It is called the taxpayer protection lockbox amendment. I think it is very important because I think we have been talking about trying to get a budget together, spending authority for this Government over the next couple weeks, for a couple of months in order to avoid a shutdown.

I think it was a glaring example this last week, when we are talking about a

lockbox, we are talking about trying to save the taxpayers some money, when the President asked for over \$8 billion in new spending and he wants this Congress to come up with that much money.

There have been many amendments that have been offered that have cut spending trying to save the taxpayers some dollars. Those dollars have always gone for a savings and a cut, but it has never been a cut. It has never reduced the amount of spending for that year. Those dollars that are saved are always just shuffled off into another pot and somehow get spent before the end of the year.

The request that has been made by the President is supposed to come from new spending. In other words, there is even some estimated savings, savings that we are going to have if we pass a balanced budget. Since those dollars are out there floating, everybody is trying to get their hands on those projected savings dollars. In fact, we have a number of amendments pending on the floor that are asking for those same dollars to be spent over and over and over again.

So my objection is that this should not be a shell game for the taxpayers. We should not be using smoke and mirrors when it comes to the budget. If we are going to reduce appropriations or spending levels, they actually should be reduced. The taxpayers should see that benefit in a smaller budget.

Instead, all we do is move those dollars from one hand and we put them into another hand, and at the end of the day they are spent and the taxpayer is handed a larger bill.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Madam President, can we have order in the Chamber?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will come to order.

Mr. GRAMS. Just a couple of quick other notes. This is not the first time this idea has been introduced. The lockbox language has been adopted by the House three times already, by large votes, the latest vote, 373 to 52. Also, it has the support of a number of groups such as the Citizens Against Government Waste, Citizens for a Sound Economy, the National Federation of Independent Businesses.

Madam President, if we are going to be responsible for the taxpayers, we should get our house in order. If we are talking about saving some money, let us make sure we do save it and just do not play a shell game and put it in another pocket and spend it later.

Madam President, I will yield to the Senator from Missouri who had a comment.

Mr. ASHCROFT. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. GRAMS. Yes.

Mr. ASHCROFT. I think I understand what the Senator is saying here, and I think the point is this. When something comes to the floor here and we knock funding out of an appropriation, instead of that being available to reduce the debt—

Mr. WELLSTONE. Madam President, there are two Senators out here speaking on an amendment. They have a right to be heard. May we have order here?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senators who are having the caucus in the middle of the Chamber please repair to the Cloakroom?

The Senator from Missouri is recognized to pose a question to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. ASHCROFT. The Senator from Missouri thanks the Chair.

It is my understanding that what the Senator is saying is, when we strike something from an appropriations measure and we would reduce the amount of the appropriation, that currently that money is not reduced from spending, but it just becomes available for spending in other areas. Is that correct?

Mr. GRAMS. That is correct.

Mr. ASHCROFT. So all the efforts we make to amend spending measures here and reduce them just allow the diversion of funds to other sources?

Mr. GRAMS. That is correct. The taxpayer is under the belief that money is being saved in their name, but it is just being moved from one pocket and put into another.

Mr. ASHCROFT. The Senator's measure would say whenever we reduce a spending measure here by amendment, that the reduction would go into a special category which could only be used to reduce the deficit?

Mr. GRAMS. That is right.

Mr. ASHCROFT. So when we had an amendment to occasion savings, that would be real savings and not just a diversion to other sources?

Mr. GRAMS. That is correct.

Mr. ASHCROFT. It seems to me that some of the rules of industry ought to apply. One of the great rules of industry is that your system is designed to give you what you are getting. It may not be designed to give you what you wanted to get, but it is designed to give you what you are getting. We have been getting a lot of debt and maybe it is because we need to redesign the structure.

Mr. GRAMS. That is hopefully what this will do. It is the first step in trying to change the budget process.

Mr. ASHCROFT. That will be when we reduce the spending on the floor as a result of an amendment; instead of that money automatically just being diverted to other spending, it would go into a special category which could only be used to reduce the deficit?

Mr. GRAMS. And reduce our budget obligations for that fiscal year.

Mr. ASHCROFT. The second part of the Senator's measure is, I guess, related to revenues. If we project a certain amount of money that comes in as revenues and for spending, and then we get more money than that, the Senator creates another special fund, that if our revenues come in higher than projected, that money goes into a deficit-reduction account as well?

Mr. GRAMS. That is correct. Say our projected revenues will be \$1.6 trillion and because of the hard work of the American workers, it comes in at \$1.7 trillion, that additional \$100 billion really should benefit the taxpayers and workers of this country to pay off the deficit and not to be laid on the table for people to grab at it and spend it in different ways.

Mr. ASHCROFT. So the bonus would be to the next generation by having lower debt instead of a bonus being to politicians to have bigger spending?

Mr. GRAMS. That is correct.

Mr. ASHCROFT. So the two components are to change the system so when we amend the system and we amend a measure to reduce spending, the money goes into a special lockbox or fund for deficit reduction, and in the event we have higher-than-anticipated revenues, we sweep those revenues into deficit reduction instead of dumping them into a slush—a fund that can be appropriated for additional spending?

Mr. GRAMS. That is correct.

Mr. ASHCROFT. If I might commend my colleague, I think this is the kind of structural change we need. We have been for the last three decades just amassing debt and passing on the responsibility to pay that to the next generation. It is high time we develop a technique and change the structure, which would provide that when we do have the discipline to cut a spending measure, that the cut goes to deficit reduction instead of just being diverted to something else.

I thank the Senator for proposing this measure, and I intend to support it. I think it is a major benefit, not only to us here but to the next generation.

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, I am pleased to join my colleague from Minnesota, Senator GRAMS, in supporting the Deficit Reduction Lockbox Act of 1995 as an amendment to the Omnibus Appropriations Act.

This is a simple amendment. Often Members stand on the floor and make that claim that this or that proposal is simple. Well, this is. For all the legislative language, it mandates that if any money is cut from an appropriations bill or if revenues raised by the Federal Government are in excess of budgetary projections, the money can only be used to reduce the deficit or cut taxes.

Often a Member will go to the floor to oppose a program or project. The Member will fight to eliminate this or that waste or abuse of Government spending. And from time to time, the effort will be successful and funding to some program will be cut.

But unfortunately, instead of using the money for deficit reduction, it is often used to fund yet another pork barrel project.

Madam President, when the Senator from Minnesota and I oppose earmarks and pork barrel funding, we are not taking such action so that the money can be used for some other pork

project. We are doing so because we want the money to be used for deficit reduction. We are doing so because of the budget crisis that our Nation faces.

The No. 1 dilemma facing the future of this country is not whether another bridge is built, whether a 13th swine research center is built, whether we do or do not study the effect on the atmosphere of flatulence in cows, or if we build another supercomputer to study the aurora borealis—it is this Nation's debt. What we must do is restore the fiscal integrity of this Nation and the only way to do that is to reduce the debt.

Two final points, first, I want to note that this amendment has been endorsed by Citizens Against Government Waste, Citizens for a Sound Economy, and the National Federation of Independent Business.

Second, this body has gone on record supporting lockbox language in the past. During consideration of the line item veto, the Senate adopted an amendment regarding the lockbox. The House has also passed lockbox language—adopting an amendment very similar to this one just last week. I would hope that we could now follow the House's lead.

This amendment will not alone solve this problem. But it is an important step in the right direction. Together with passage of a constitutional amendment to balance the budget and the line-item veto, a powerful body of legislation, we will do much to restore the integrity of the congressional budget process.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I am pleased to rise in support of the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. GRAMS], the Taxpayer Protection Lockbox Act of 1996. I commend the Senator on his amendment and am proud to be a cosponsor.

It only makes common sense: When the Senate or the other body passes an amendment to cut spending, with great fanfare about how fiscally responsible it is and how it will help reduce the deficit, we should make sure that the cut is, indeed, a cut. Many of us in both bodies have been frustrated by supposed spending cuts only to learn that the money supposedly saved becomes immediately available for spending on some other programs. That just shouldn't happen.

The Lockbox Act would be an invaluable help to honest budgeting. It would be a blow for truth in legislating. It would finally put an end to one of the gimmicks that has fed so much public cynicism about how Congress goes through the budget process.

This amendment is very similar to an amendment adopted by the other body, which was offered by Congressman MIKE CRAPO of Idaho. It is also similar to one title of a budget process reform package I introduced in the last Congress, the Common-Cents Budget Reform Act. Not only is this sound legislation, it also has a good Idaho pedigree.

I support Senator GRAMS in his offering of this amendment and I call on our colleagues to adopt it. It would remove, once and for all, one insidious way in which Congress in the past have cooked the books. A vote for the Lockbox Act is a vote for better government, more honest budgeting, and a more accountable Congress.

Mr. GRAMS. Madam President, I understand the yeas and nays have been ordered on this amendment.

Mr. DOMENICI addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield the floor? The Senator from Minnesota has the floor. Does he yield the floor? Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Madam President, let me say to Senator GRAMS, I share his concern about getting the budget under control, but I have to oppose this amendment because it violates the Budget Act and is subject to a point of order.

I do not choose to discuss the amendment very much, other than to say to the Senate that the way things work right now, the Budget Committee produces a budget resolution; it is voted on by both Houses and eventually becomes the budget resolution for both Houses. As far as domestic discretionary and defense discretionary spending, after that budget resolution is completed, the Appropriations Committee, under the leadership of the chairman, allocates to subcommittees the amount of discretionary money that is available for the entire year, and that total amount of money becomes a cap beyond which you cannot spend unless Congress declares an emergency for funds that would exceed the cap.

Let me give the Senate an example of how far we have come in just this year. By enforcing those caps, we will save \$21 billion in just the discretionary appropriated accounts. Without one nickel of savings in entitlements, we save \$21 billion.

What that means is that every bill that comes before the Senate is part of the cumulation of subcommittee allocations that equal the cap. We do not need another piecemeal cap, which means on the floor of the Senate we readjust the caps based upon what actions we take on appropriations bills. We took the action. This year the action is to save \$21 billion.

I understand there is a fervent desire—and I have great respect for it—to do even more than the formal binding caps that were established this year by the Republicans in both Houses, which save \$21 billion. I do not believe we should now establish another piecemeal approach to reducing the caps on the basis of individual votes on appropriations bills on the Senate floor.

The last time the House visited this item, they passed it by two votes. I believe the U.S. Senate has a far more reasonable and rational approach,

which is to send this proposal, this kind of change, to the committees of jurisdiction so you look at it in the context of the overall the budget process, not just this one piece.

Having said that, it is with regret that I must make a point of order under section 306 of the Congressional Budget Act. I make the point of order.

Mr. GRAMS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. GRAMS. Madam President, I want to say I have the deepest respect for the chairman of the committee, Mr. DOMENICI, and also the highest respect, of course, for the hearing process, but I would like to see a vote on this. So I move to waive the Budget Act, and ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to waive the Budget Act. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. LOTT. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. DOLE], the Senator from Kansas [Mrs. KASSEBAUM], and the Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS] are necessarily absent.

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. PRYOR] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that the Senator from New York [Mr. MOYNIHAN] is absent on official business.

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

The result was announced—yeas 36, nays 57, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 36 Leg.]

#### YEAS—36

Abraham	Grams	McCain
Ashcroft	Grassley	Murkowski
Baucus	Gregg	Nickles
Brown	Hatch	Pressler
Coats	Hutchison	Roth
Coverdell	Inhofe	Santorum
Craig	Kempthorne	Shelby
DeWine	Kohl	Simpson
Faircloth	Kyl	Smith
Feingold	Lott	Thomas
Frist	Lugar	Thompson
Gramm	Mack	Warner

#### NAYS—57

Akaka	Domenici	Leahy
Biden	Dorgan	Levin
Bingaman	Exon	Lieberman
Bond	Feinstein	McConnell
Boxer	Ford	Mikulski
Bradley	Glenn	Moseley-Braun
Breaux	Gorton	Murray
Bryan	Graham	Nunn
Bumpers	Harkin	Pell
Burns	Hatfield	Reid
Byrd	Hefflin	Robb
Campbell	Helms	Rockefeller
Chafee	Hollings	Sarbanes
Cochran	Inouye	Simon
Cohen	Jeffords	Snowe
Conrad	Johnston	Specter
D'Amato	Kerrey	Thurmond
Daschle	Kerry	Wellstone
Dodd	Lautenberg	Wyden

## NOT VOTING—7

Bennett	Kennedy	Stevens
Dole	Moynihan	
Kassebaum	Pryor	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote the yeas are 36 and the nays are 57. Three-fifths of the Senators duly sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion to waive the Budget Act is rejected.

The amendment of the Senator from Minnesota contains matter within the jurisdiction of the Senate Budget Committee but the pending bill was not reported by the Budget Committee. Therefore, the amendment violates section 306 of the Budget Act. The point of order is sustained. The amendment fails.

## AMENDMENT NO. 3508

Ms. MIKULSKI. Madam President, I rise in strong support of the amendment offered by Senator BOXER. This amendment will ensure that the District of Columbia can make its own decisions on whether to use locally raised revenues for abortion services.

I oppose the provision included in the bill as reported from the committee. Under the committee's bill, neither Federal nor locally raised funds could be used for abortion.

Frankly, I oppose any restrictions on funding for abortion services. But the language in the committee bill is particularly onerous.

Madam President, let me offer three reasons why the committee's language is objectionable, and why the Boxer amendment must be approved:

First, the language in the bill is an assault on the local prerogatives of the District of Columbia.

Second, it threatens the health of poor women.

Third, it is part of a wide ranging attack on women's reproductive rights.

Let me explain.

First of all, the committee's provision is an unwarranted intrusion on the District's sovereignty. It restricts the ability of the District to use its own, locally raised revenues for access to abortion.

No other jurisdiction is told how to use its own revenues. Every State can make its own decision on using its own funds to provide access to abortion for poor women.

Seventeen States, including the State of Maryland, provide Medicaid funding for abortion under all or most circumstances. That is their right. Thirty-three States have chosen not to use their funds for abortion. I may not agree with them on this point, but it is their right to make that decision.

The District should be given the same autonomy as the States to create its own policy about matters of public health. The Boxer amendment will assure that the District has that right.

Madam President, the provision currently in the bill tramples on the rights of women who live in the District, especially those who are poor and most vulnerable.

For poor women who cannot afford basic health care without Government

assistance, this denies access to abortion services. Poor women should have the same choices to terminate a pregnancy that other women have.

Finally, Madam President, the provision in the bill as it now stands is part of a disturbing series of assaults on women's reproductive rights.

Throughout the fiscal year 1996 appropriations process, we have seen one attack after another on women's constitutionally protected right to choose. I strongly oppose these efforts to chip away at women's rights.

I urge my colleagues to vote for the Boxer amendment. I would prefer to strike the entire provision, so that there would be no restrictions on either the Federal funds or locally raised revenue. But I recognize that is not possible given the current composition of this body.

So while it may be that we cannot strike the restriction on Federal funds, surely at a minimum we must protect the right of the District of Columbia to use locally raised revenues as it sees fit.

Not to do so violates the District's right to determine its own affairs. It is unfair to poor women who reside in the District. And, it is one more effort to undermine reproductive rights.

I urge support of the Boxer amendment.

## PRIDE

Mr. COVERDELL. Madam President, I would like to take this opportunity to commend the subcommittee chairman for his leadership and for his sensitivity to the alarming rate of increased drug use among our teens.

Mr. GREGG. I thank my good friend and share his concern about drug use among our youth.

Mr. COVERDELL. In my capacity as chairman of the Western Hemisphere Subcommittee for the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, I recently held a field hearing in my home State of Georgia about drugs. One of the witnesses, Dr. Thomas J. Gleaton who is the president of the Parents' Resource Institute for Drug Education or PRIDE, testified that we are on the brink of a national disaster. I frankly agree with him.

Dr. Gleaton testified that teen drug use peaked in 1979 when 55 percent of senior high school students reported using an illicit substance in the previous year; that level dropped steadily through 1992 to 25 percent. However, the shocking evidence over the past 3 years shows a rapid reversal. If current trends continue, drug use will pass the high mark of 1979, and we will have more high school seniors using drugs than are not. That, to me, is shocking.

One of the reasons I am sold on PRIDE's approach to this growing problem is its emphasis on parental involvement as a main deterrent to drug use among our children. A recent Barbara Walters interview with Colin Powell illustrates the power of parental involvement. Ms. Walters asked General Powell if he had ever used drugs. Gen-

eral Powell replied that he never used drugs because if he had, he would have had to answer to his mother.

I would ask the Senator if he, in his capacity as the chairman of the Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary Appropriations Subcommittee, would support using a portion of Office of Justice Programs funding to maintain the work of groups who seek to stop drug use among our children through grassroots efforts like PRIDE?

Mr. GREGG. The subcommittee shares the Senator from Georgia's belief that an important component in winning the war against drugs is putting an end to drug use among our youth. Further, the subcommittee would encourage the Office of Justice Programs to support grassroots efforts like the one described by the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. COVERDELL. I thank my friend and appreciate his support.

## MENTAL HEALTH BLOCK GRANT

Mr. DOMENICI. Madam President, I rise today to express my concern about the funding level proposed in this bill for the mental health block grant. While I am pleased that the bill retains separate funding for the Path Program, which provides critical services to homeless Americans with mental illnesses, the mental health block grant proposal is another matter. The Senate cuts the block grant by 18 percent, down to \$226.3 million, while the House proposes level funding at \$275.4 million.

Cutting the block grant is penny wise and pound foolish. The block grant is the primary Federal discretionary program supporting community-based mental health services for adults and children. States use the block grant to fund community-based treatment, case management, homeless outreach, juvenile services, and rural mental health services for people with serious mental illness. The block grant plays a particularly important role in States like New Mexico where we have numerous underserved areas where there is often inadequate access to many different types of vital health care services.

The block grant provides up to 39.5 percent of the Community Mental Health Services budget controlled by State mental health agencies. Although it constitutes a small portion of many States' overall spending on mental health, its impact on community-based services is undeniable.

The bill cuts block grant funds at a time when States are placing more emphasis on cost-effective community-based services. More and more States are closing or downsizing their State hospitals in an effort to save funds. The States are replacing those services with more cost-effective services at the community level. The block grant helps ensure that individuals who leave institutions have somewhere to go for treatment, and are not simply relegated to the streets.

According to the National Association of State Mental Health Program Directors, fiscal year 1993 was the first

time that State hospital inpatient spending equalled spending on community-based services. The mental health block grant played an important role in this transition, and I believe this trend will only continue in the future.

I understand very well the constraints facing the Appropriations Committee. But I believe the spending in the mental health block grant is cost-effective, and if the House is willing to provide level funding, it is my hope that the Senate can do so as well. I urge the committee to accept the House number.

EPA RESEARCH FACILITY, RESEARCH TRIANGLE PARK, NORTH CAROLINA

Mr. FAIRCLOTH. Madam President, I would like to ask the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Environment and Public Works, Senator CHAFEE, to clarify the intent of his amendment concerning funds to construct a new research facility for the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency at Research Triangle Park, NC.

I understand the chairman's concern that this proposed project be reviewed by the appropriate authorizing committees of the Senate and House of Representatives. However, I have a concern that if the Congress does not act in time for contracts to be awarded in this fiscal year, that the cost will escalate dramatically.

I believe that the distinguished chairman is aware of my 2-year efforts to lower the overall costs associated with the project. As such, it would be unfortunate to experience needless delay resulting in higher costs to the taxpayers. Does the chairman intend to schedule committee consideration of a resolution authorizing this project in the near future?

Mr. CHAFEE. I would be pleased to respond to the Senator's question. I am indeed aware of your successful efforts to lower the overall costs of this important project. It is not my intention to sacrifice these savings by delaying authorization. Instead, this amendment will preserve the Environment and Public Works Committee's authority to review and determine spending levels for the construction of Federal buildings.

With respect to committee consideration of a resolution authorizing the project, it is my intention to schedule a business meeting as expeditiously as possible. I am confident that we could consider a resolution well before the April 19, 1996, deadline established in the amendment.

Mr. FAIRCLOTH. I appreciate the chairman's response. I have one final question for the chairman. Will the prospective committee resolution allow for multi-year funding? That is, will the authorization permit incremental appropriations over the next few fiscal years for this project to be completed?

Mr. CHAFEE. Yes. Authorizations provided by committee resolutions approving construction of Federal buildings stand unless and until subsequently modified by the committee.

AMENDMENT NO. 3493

Mr. JEFFORDS. Madam President, I would like to take this opportunity to explain my vote today in support of Senator MURRAY's amendment to the Omnibus Rescissions and Appropriations Act. A year ago this body passed what had become known as the salvage timber rider. Given the threats this provision posed to the health of many valuable forest environments and the potential impacts of harvesting timber under suspension of environmental laws on fish and wildlife habitat, I opposed that amendment. Today, I supported Senator MURRAY's amendment for the same reason. Senator MURRAY's amendment offered our Nation a reasonable, well thought out, environmentally and economically sound alternative to current law on timber salvage.

Although many people feel that any timber salvage program threatens our natural resources, I believe our Nation needs an effective, environmentally sound timber salvage program that addresses the risks posed by persistent drought, disease, and insect infestation. Senator MURRAY has met the challenge of developing a reasonable and effective response to this issue.

I am supporting Senator MURRAY's amendment for several reasons: First, it repeals the previous salvage timber amendment; second, it institutes a temporary program that increases public participation in salvage timber sales; third, it mandates compliance with all environmental laws; and, finally, it requires a comprehensive study of forest health by the National Academy of Sciences.

I applaud Senator MURRAY for her diligence and hard work in bringing this amendment to the floor. Mrs. MURRAY developed an approach that garnered the support of a wide array of constituents, a formidable task on any issue.

Our Nation has reached a point where we can no longer tinker at the edges of the forest management system of our country. For both economic and environmental reasons, we need to create certainty in how our forests will be managed. I believe that Senator MURRAY's amendment is a positive step in that direction and will resolve what has been a difficult and unsustainable situation.

#### JOINT IMPLEMENTATION ACTIVITIES

Mr. BENNETT. Madam President, it has come to my attention that there may be a need to give the Environmental Protection Agency additional guidance and budgetary flexibility regarding their support for climate changes studies in developing countries and their contribution to joint implementation activities carried out by Federal agencies to reduce CO<sub>2</sub> emissions worldwide. At present, a total of \$8 million is appropriated for these activities in the Omnibus appropriations bill.

As I understand it, there is a development consensus that the United States

can achieve significantly greater CO<sub>2</sub> reductions and better value for dollars spent by supplementing that \$8 million with another \$4 million, drawn from the general allocations provided to the global climate account. CO<sub>2</sub> reductions accomplished under joint implementation activities accrue to the United States. I am not proposing that we incorporate this direction to EPA today, but I am suggesting that this is an issue that we should discuss prior to and during conference with the House, especially if this kind of programmatic flexibility will assure that we achieve our environmental objectives in a way that is most cost effective and which demonstrates the United States commitment to environmental protection.

#### TERMINUS OF THE NATCHEZ TRACE PARKWAY

Mr. COCHRAN. The Natchez Trace Parkway is nearing the end of construction on 445 miles of historic roadway through Mississippi and Tennessee. The parkway has been under construction since 1937 and only the final 20 miles remain to be completed along with an Intermodal Visitor's Center at the terminus in Natchez, MS, a cost-share project that combines Federal, State, and local funds.

The fiscal year 1996 Interior section of the Omnibus consolidated rescissions and appropriations bill contains \$3,000,000 for construction of the Natchez Trace Parkway. This \$3,000,000 is insufficient to complete construction of any of the remaining miles on the parkway and the National Park Service has indicated that the appropriated funds can be used for the cost-share visitor center project to be located at the terminus of the parkway. This transfer of funds will be a single appropriation to the National Park Service to be used for the construction of the visitors center.

I have worked on this project with my friend and colleague, Senator GORTON, chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on the Interior, and Senator BYRD, my friend from West Virginia and distinguished ranking member of the Appropriations Committee and ask them if they are in agreement that it would be acceptable for the \$3,000,000 provided for construction on the Natchez Trace Parkway in fiscal year 1996 to be used for the project at the parkway's terminus?

Mr. GORTON. That is correct. In providing these funds the committee is aware of the need to initiate construction of the Intermodal Center, and that providing these funds would fulfill the Federal commitment to this cost-shared visitor center project.

Mr. BYRD. I concur with the chairman and my friend from Mississippi that using these funds for such a project at the terminus of the Natchez Trace Parkway is a proper use of the appropriated funds, and that agreeing to this proposal at this time will not impose any outyear construction costs for this project on the Interior bill.

#### GENERIC RANITIDINE

Mr. FAIRCLOTH, Madam President, today the distinguished Senator from

Arkansas offered a statement with regard to patent litigation concerning an application filed with the FDA for generic ranitidine. In fact, that applicant has declined several opportunities to expedite this case. Moreover, the applicant has introduced a new counterclaim which will begin a new round of discovery, thereby significantly delaying the trial.

Geneva filed an ANDA for generic ranitidine tablets and notified Glaxo Wellcome in March 1994. Glaxo Wellcome filed a patent infringement suit in March 1994. Under the Hatch-Waxman procedures, the 30-month statutory injunction runs through September 1996. A trial date has not been set.

A trial court decision is not considered final if an appeal is taken. Thus it is highly unlikely that a final court ruling will occur prior to September 1996.

Even if the trial had already begun, it is unlikely that the trial and appeal could be completed by September. In an earlier patent infringement case against Novopharm with respect to the validity of the Form 2 patent, the trial court ruled in Glaxo Wellcome's favor in September 1993. Novopharm appealed the same month, but the appeal was not decided for 19 months, in April 1995.

Geneva had delayed the case. After their initial request for an expedited trial, Geneva has made little effort to expedite the proceedings, even after the district court in *Royce versus Bristol Myers Squibb* ruled that the FDA could approve ANDA's prior to the GATT-amended patent expiration dates.

Also, after the discovery schedule was set in January of this year, Geneva amended their original complaint to add a new action. Glaxo Wellcome has argued against allowing them to amend their complaint partially because it will open up the discovery process and further delay the proceedings, probably beyond the July 1997 patent expiration date for Zantac.

#### CROP INSURANCE

Mr. DASCHLE. Madam President, I rise to call attention to a serious problem facing our Nation's farmers. Currently farmers are required to purchase crop insurance coverage to be eligible for farm program benefits. The deadline for purchasing crop insurance has already expired for southern commodities and will expire Friday, March 15, for midwestern commodities. Under normal circumstances, these deadlines would not be a problem; however, the farm bill has yet to be enacted, farm program provisions have not been announced, and farmers are uncertain about what crops they can or can't plant and still be eligible for farm program benefits.

As you know, I have strongly supported a viable crop insurance program and have urged farmers to utilize important risk management tool. However, to require farmers to meet the

crop insurance closing deadlines without knowing what will be in the farm bill, what they can or can't plant, or whether or not they even have to purchase crop insurance at all does not make common sense to me.

Madam President, I would prefer to address this issue by simply extending the deadline to purchase crop insurance, but I understand it will be scored by CBO as and cost and thus require an offset.

Mr. COCHRAN. Madam President, my colleague raises a valid and important point. Farmers are in fact, facing uncertainty and a potentially serious situation concerning purchase of crop insurance for 1996. Many believe they are not going to be required to buy it; others may believe that they are already covered when, in fact, they aren't because the automatic extension of their 1995 policy won't cover all the crops they may plant in 1996. For example, a farmer who planted cotton last year and corn this year is not covered under an extension of his old policy. And, because the closing date has or soon will pass, he will not be able to purchase insurance.

I am pleased to report to the Senate that the conferees on the farm bill are aware of this issue. I hope my colleagues will work to see that this is addressed as part of the conference agreement on that bill by temporarily extending the purchase date for those producers who want to purchase insurance. We should not send a mixed message by allowing broad cropping flexibility, while remaining totally inflexible about insurance purchase dates for the 1996 crops.

I appreciate the designated Democratic leader for raising this important issue. I agree this is a problem and should be corrected.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 3513

Ms. MIKULSKI. Madam President, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by Senator COATS. The amendment would allow hospitals whose programs have not been accredited by the Accreditation Council on Graduate Medical Education [ACGME] to continue to receive Federal funds if the accreditation was denied because the program did not provide abortion training.

Let me share with you three reasons why I oppose the amendment.

First of all, if the amendment is adopted, the Congress will be imposing its judgment of what should be taught in OB/GYN residency programs over that of the medical professionals of the ACGME.

Second, the amendment would create a bureaucratic nightmare. If Federal agencies cannot be guided by ACGME accreditations in administering Federal programs, what standards will be used?

Third, under this amendment the number of physicians trained to provide abortions—a legal medical procedure—will continue to decline, jeopardizing women's health.

As my colleagues know, the ACGME is a private medical accreditation body

which sets the standards for over 7,400 residency programs in this country. The American Medical Association, the American Hospital Association, the American Association of Medical Colleges, the American Board of Medical Specialties, and the Council of Medical Specialty Societies are all a part of ACGME.

They are the medical experts who know what should be included in a complete medical training program. Earlier this year, the experts of the ACGME unanimously agreed that ACGME's standards should be modified to require that residency programs providing training in abortion procedures.

But, let me be clear. The ACGME recognized that people and institutions have strongly held beliefs on the issue of abortion. So, the ACGME ensured that these new standards do not compel any institution or person with moral or religious objections to abortion to participate in training. It respects the beliefs of individuals and of institutions. Under the ACGME policy, training programs with moral or religious objections are permitted to refer their students to other facilities to receive this training.

I believe the Congress should respect the medical expertise and judgment of the ACGME. Politicians should not be setting the standards for medical residency programs. That is the job of experts.

It is ironic that at a time when we see efforts to reduce the role of big government, proponents of this amendment seek to substitute the judgment of government for what should be the judgment of medical experts.

If this amendment is adopted, Federal agencies will face a bureaucratic nightmare. If Federal programs cannot rely on the ACGME accreditation in making decisions on funding medical education or other programs, what standard should they use?

Will the Government have to devise another Federal accreditation standard? Will the Federal Government require the States to set up new standards? It seems to me that either of these options results in more redtape for medical programs, more bureaucracy, and more government involvement in the private sector.

Do we allow residence programs to receive Federal funds if they have not had to receive any accreditation at all? This option would mean residency programs have not had to meet any quality of care standard at all. Surely that is not in the best interests of patients or medical institutions. And, surely that cannot be the intent of those offering this amendment. Yet, I fear that it could well be the result.

Let me make one further point, Madam President. There is a growing shortage of physicians who are trained in abortion procedures and willing to provide abortion services. This constitutes a serious risk to the health of America's women, for whom access to safe and legal abortion is disappearing.



In fact, in 45 States, the number of physicians who perform abortions declined between 1982 and 1992. Currently, in 84 percent of counties in the United States, not a single physician provides abortion services. At the same time, the number of residency programs that routinely offer training in first-trimester abortions has declined from 23 percent in 1985 to only 12 percent in 1992.

Abortion is legal in this country. But the constitutionally protected right to choice is endangered if there are no physicians trained in providing abortion services. It is essential that women who need abortion services have access to qualified and well-trained health care providers.

That is what the ACGME standards would ensure. That is why the Congress should not undermine the ACGME standards. That is why this amendment should be defeated.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE LOCAL LAW  
ENFORCEMENT BLOCK GRANTS

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, if I could I would like to engage the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GREGG] in a colloquy with respect to provisions in this bill which relate to funding under the Justice Department Violent Crime Reduction Programs, State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance Program. I am specifically speaking to the issue of the local law enforcement block grants. It is my understanding that in the case of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the authority to enforce felony crime statutes is vested solely in the Commonwealth Police Department. It is also my understanding that when the committee took up this provision that the committee did not intend to preclude the Puerto Rico Commonwealth Police Department, the only law enforcement agency with the authority to enforce our felony crime statutes, from being eligible for community policing funds. Is my understanding correct that the committee was unaware of this specific circumstance with respect to Puerto Rico?

Mr. GREGG. The Senator is correct, the committee was in fact unaware of these circumstances.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I would hope that the Senator would ensure that this matter is clarified when this bill reaches conference and the final conference agreement reflects that the terms and conditions of the local law enforcement block grants do not preclude the Puerto Rico Commonwealth Police Department from being eligible for community policing funds?

Mr. GREGG. Yes, I want to assure my good friend from Louisiana, that on behalf of the committee that we intend to correct this matter in conference.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I want to thank my good friend from New Hampshire for this clarification. I yield the floor.

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. Mr. President, the bill now before us in the 10th continuing resolution for this fiscal year. That is 10 times too many. We

should and could have done better. The American people have patiently endured two major Government shutdowns which severely disrupted their lives. Americans deserve to know that their Government will remain open, that it is not in danger of another shutdown. They deserve to know that agencies that perform important functions, and that affect all of our lives, are funded through the fiscal year 1996 year.

We are over 5 months into the fiscal year 1996. The fiscal year is nearly half over, yet we are still operating our Government in a piecemeal fashion. Five appropriation bills remain pending. These bills include funds for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, Veterans Affairs, Housing and Urban Development, and dozens of other agencies.

Rather than passing another stop-gap continuing resolution, we should complete action on the remaining appropriation bills. We should be working to avoid another Government shutdown. Hostage-taking and legislative blackmail is not the way to arrive at the kind of solution we need to solve our budgetary problems.

As you know, a number of the provisions of this legislation have been vetoed by the President or have drawn veto threats. The President indicated that insufficient funding for priority programs was a major reason for his vetoes.

When this bill arrived in the Senate it lacked over \$8 billion in funds for important programs. The President identified several high priority programs in the areas of education, crime, and the environment and called for \$8.1 billion to be added back to those programs. He also offered a number of suggestions to offset that spending; the administration's budget offsets come from potential savings in other areas of the budget, so that we can restore funding without increasing the deficit. However, rather than incorporating the administration's request, the committee responded by adding back only \$4.8 billion. On the face of it, this additional spending appears to be a move in the right direction. However, this money is not real; this money is contingent on future actions that may or may not occur. As a result, the President has threatened to veto this bill in its current form.

If we are to make real progress we need to get our priorities straight. In a recent poll, Americans stated that they were concerned about education, crime, jobs, and health care. Americans are concerned about earning a fair wage, about their children's education, and about their ability to live in safe and healthy communities. Spending priorities should reflect these priorities.

Domestic discretionary spending is being badly squeezed in this bill. However, domestic discretionary spending is not one of the major causes of the budget crisis the Federal Government is facing. Domestic discretionary

spending has not grown as a percentage of the GDP since 1969, the last time we had a balanced budget. Domestic discretionary spending comprises only one-sixth of the \$1.5 trillion Federal budget, and that percentage is steadily declining.

While I firmly believe that if we are to stay on track and balance the budget, every program needs to be reviewed for spending reduction. However, I believe that these reductions need to be made in a fair and equitable way. This bill, however, guts important programs upon which millions of working Americans depend.

JOB TRAINING

One of the greatest concerns of public officials, nonprofits, and business groups throughout my State is that Congress is eliminating the summer jobs program for youth. This program trains young people for jobs that actually exist, teaches them about work habits, and keeps them off of the streets and out of harms—or troubles—way. Cities and towns throughout Illinois are telling me that young people count on these jobs, but that without funding at the \$635 million level, there will be almost no summer program.

Programs such as those that provide young people with summer employment and job training, train dislocated workers in new occupations, and provide a transition from school-to-work for the Nation's young people should not be pawns in a budget chess match. We should not hold young people, dislocated workers, and students, among others, hostage to our demands.

I am glad my colleagues supported the bipartisan amendment to restore funds—to provide opportunity for this Nation's workers and future workers. This amendment also restored funding for education the foundation for the future success of our Nation's youth.

EDUCATION

Mr. President, we are not living in a global economy, and education is the key to it. Education increases our productivity and competitive edge. It promotes our economy, raises the standard of living, and improves the quality of life for our people.

Education opens the doors of opportunity in American society. Today, access to quality education is more important than ever. The abilities to read and write are no longer enough: today, a student must also learn to speak the language of computers, and must learn about our changing, global, competitive economy.

The bipartisan amendment restoring funding for many important education programs was a step in the right direction. I urge my colleagues to help keep these additions in the bill when it goes to conference.

ENVIRONMENT

And I hope we can provide additional funding for essential environmental activities. In this area the bill is sadly lacking. Mr. President, time after time in poll after poll, Americans across the

country have supported and continue to support environmental protections. They want strong environmental laws. Americans want an environment that is safe and healthy. And they want their children and grandchildren to be able to do the same.

The cuts in the EPA budget now included in this bill will slow cleanup of Superfund sites, limited the power of the EPA to maintain safe drinking water standards, such as contamination by radon, and limit the EPA's ability to enforce laws that protect the quality of the environment. The EPA cannot sustain cuts of this magnitude and still do the job of protecting the public health.

These cuts in the EPA budget are part of environmental rollbacks some in this Congress have proposed, and that the American people simply do not support. Mr. President, I believe that jeopardizing the environment to achieve short-term budgetary benefits is simply wrong.

#### WOMEN'S PROGRAMS

While we have done a shameful job when it comes to the environment, we have done a few things right when it comes to protecting the lives and health of women in this country and around the globe. We have given the President the ability to lift the restrictions on international family planning and we have not included a House provision giving States the right to refuse Medicaid abortions for women in the case of rape or incest nor a House provision allowing medical colleges to be accredited without training OB/GYN's in abortion procedures.

I urge my colleagues to hold the line on these provisions. The striking of the first or the inclusion of the later two provisions would result in death and hardship for women in the United States and throughout the world.

It is crucial that we allow the President to lift the restrictions on international family planning funds. According to a consortium of expert demographers, the current funding restrictions will result in at least 1.9 million unplanned births and 1.6 million abortions. Eight thousand women around the world will die in pregnancy and childbirth and 134,000 infants will die. Our role should be to encourage families who are trying to make deliberate decisions about their ability to have and care for additional children. Our role should not be to punish these families by forcing them into dangerous or unwanted pregnancies.

We must prevent the inclusion of provisions allowing State governments to refuse to pay for Medicaid abortions in the case of rape or incest. The women who would seek an abortion prohibited by this provision are women living in poverty who have recently been the victim of a sexual assault by a stranger, a friend, or a family member. We have already placed enormous limits on the rights of poor women to choose to terminate a pregnancy, this provision brings us into the realm of the

horribly absurd. Rape and incest are not something any woman should ever experience. Being forced, by poverty, to carry a pregnancy resulting from rape or incest is horrific.

Finally, we must prevent the inclusion of a provision to overturn the requirements of the Accreditation Council on Graduate Medical Education (ACGME) that residency training programs in obstetrics and gynecology provide medical training in abortion. This is not a requirement that doctors perform abortions, but simply a requirement that a doctor know and understand all the procedures related to pregnancy and childbirth. Women's lives depend on the full knowledge and skill of their doctors. Providing the opportunity for physicians to learn all the tools available to save a woman's life is not too much to ask.

Mr. President, I believe that we need to move to a balanced budget. And we need to do it in a way that does not sacrifice the long-term goals of the American people to achieve illusory short-term cuts. We need a budget that restores fiscal discipline to the Federal Government. We need a budget based on the realities facing Americans. Most importantly, we need a budget for our future.

I believe that we can achieve that kind of budget, if we put aside partisan bickering and political point scoring, and if we get down to the work the American people elected us to do.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. LOTT. Madam President, we are working very diligently with the distinguished Democratic leader to try to work out an agreement for how we will proceed for the balance of the night and on Friday, Monday, and Tuesday. I think we are close to getting an agreement worked out here momentarily, so that Members will know what they can expect in terms of recorded votes, if any, tonight, or on Tuesday and Wednesday.

In the interim, while we are trying to get that wrapped up, we will go ahead and proceed with the Bond-Mikulski amendment. Our intent is to just have that offered and debated, and then if we can get an agreement, we will announce that to the Members how that one and others will be disposed of. When we get that agreement, we will notify all Members.

I yield the floor.

Mr. BOND. Madam President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Amendment No. 3532 offered by the Senator from Georgia, Senator COVERDELL.

Mr. BOND. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that that amendment be set aside.

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

#### AMENDMENT NO. 3482

Mr. BOND. Madam President, I ask that amendment No. 3482 to the committee substitute amendment, previously debated and set aside, be called up.

Mr. KERRY. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. BOND. I call for the regular order with respect to that amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative 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.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 3533 TO AMENDMENT NO. 3482

(Purpose: To increase appropriations for EPA water infrastructure financing. Superfund toxic waste site clean ups, operating programs, and for other purposes and to increase funding for the Corporation for National and Community Service (AmeriCorps) to \$400.5 million)

Mr. BOND. Madam President, I send to the desk a second degree amendment to amendment No. 3482 on behalf of myself and Senator MIKULSKI.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. BOND], for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI, proposes an amendment numbered 3533 to amendment No. 3482.

Mr. BOND. Madam 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 appears in today's RECORD under "Amendments Submitted.")

Mr. BOND. Madam President, it has been suggested that, in order to facilitate the consideration of these amendments, we ask for time agreements. I ask unanimous consent that there be 30 minutes allotted for the debate of this amendment with the control under the normal fashion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BOND. Thank you very much, Madam President.

This measure inserts a new title V adding funds for EPA and for AmeriCorps. The increase for EPA includes \$200 million for State revolving loan funds for wastewater and drinking water infrastructure, \$50 million for Superfund, and \$75 million for EPA operating programs. The amendment also removes the contingency requirement on \$162 million of EPA funds contained in title IV.

These additional funds are offset by debt collection legislation of \$440 million and rescissions of unobligated contract authority of \$48 million.

The amendment also increases funding for the AmeriCorps program by \$17



million, for a total of \$402.5 million. This increase is offset by a reduction in HUD property disposition funding, provides \$20 million to help HUD restructure and clarify its existing law for HUD block grants to New York, transfers \$30 million for additional drug elimination funding in HUD-assisted housing, clarifies existing law for demolishing public housing in Texas, clarifies the rent rules in HUD-assisted housing, and provides program direction to NASA for a new satellite.

Madam President, this second-degree amendment that my ranking member, Senator MIKULSKI, and I have submitted to the Lautenberg amendment reflects a great deal of effort. We have worked long and hard to come to an agreement in order for us to increase funding in this measure in a manner that is consistent with balancing the budget. We have insisted all along that additional funding be offset, and we have worked with my ranking member, Senator MIKULSKI, primarily. Today we had advanced additional funds for an offset of \$440 million, and we have found additional funding, and we have placed that in what we believe is the highest priority areas.

In January of this year, the administration, after vetoing this bill, came back and said that they wanted \$966 million added into spending in this measure for EPA in fiscal year 1996. We have added \$487 million in funding for EPA with additional offsets today. That amount, combined with the \$240 million in additional EPA funds in title I of the underlying amendment, means that we are able to fund, through offsets, \$727 million of the \$966 million requested.

I think this is more than a generous compromise. It is a good-faith attempt at resolving the fiscal year 1996 budget for EPA. I understand that the administration has not been able to agree to it. At least, today, for the first time, they talked with us, and I am grateful for that. But, most importantly, I think this represents a compromise that Members on both sides of the aisle can work with.

There are many, many items that were in this original bill that we have been able to increase. The amendment provides funding for the highest priorities for EPA, funding for the States' toxic waste site cleanups, and EPA core operating programs. Under this measure, EPA should not have to have a furlough or a reduction in force for a single employee. Enforcement spending would actually increase by over \$10 million. States would receive an 80 percent increase in their water infrastructure State revolving funds, and all Superfund sites posing real risk would receive cleanup dollars.

It has an additional \$300 million for water infrastructure State revolving funds, bringing the total amount to \$2.025 billion compared to \$1.2 billion available in fiscal year 1995.

Madam President, this provides money for State revolving funds. It in-

cludes \$50 million additional for the Superfund, and it provides funds to begin cleanups in every single toxic waste site which poses a real threat to human health for the environment, if the site is ready to go in the Superfund cleanup.

Madam President, the amendment before us today adds \$487 million in funding for EPA, with real offsets. This amount, together with the \$240 million in additional EPA funds in title I of the committee-reported bill, total \$727 million.

Madam President, this represents 75 percent of the administration's requested add-back list of \$966 million. This is more than a generous compromise and a good faith attempt at resolving the fiscal year 1996 budget for EPA.

Each of the items included in this amendment were requested by the administration in its January wish list to the Congress. There are no congressional earmarks or add-ons.

The amendment represents what we believe to be the highest priorities for EPA-funding for the States, toxic waste site cleanups, and EPA's core operating programs. The amounts provided prevent EPA from having to RIF or furlough a single employee.

Enforcement spending would actually increase by \$10 million over fiscal year 1995. States would receive an 80-percent increase in their water infrastructure State revolving funds over what they got last year. And all Superfund sites posing real risks would receive cleanup dollars.

The amendment includes an additional \$300 million for water infrastructure State revolving funds. This brings the total amount of State revolving funds available through this bill to \$2.025 billion—compared to only \$1.2 billion in available funds in fiscal year 1995. These funds enable States and communities to make significant progress in meeting their water infrastructure construction needs.

These funds are provided for both clean water and drinking water State revolving funds, to enable communities to build and upgrade water treatment plants to continue the progress which has been made to clean up and maintain the water quality of our rivers, lakes, and streams, and to provide safe drinking water.

The amendment includes an additional \$50 million for Superfund, bringing Superfund spending to the fiscal year 1995 level, and increasing the amount spent on actual cleanups—rather than overhead costs—by \$150 million. Even while I and others have very strong concerns about the way the current Superfund program works, additional funds are made available through this amendment to address real threats.

Let me say clearly that funds are available to begin cleanups at every single toxic waste site posing a real threat to human health or the environment if the site is ready to go in the Superfund cleanup pipeline.

The amendment would fund EPA's proposed new laboratory in Research Triangle Park, NC, a research facility which will help EPA improve the quality of its research so that decisions are based on sound science. This is not a pork project, Madame President. This project replaces a deteriorating facility inappropriate to conducting research.

The amendment would result in a total appropriation of \$6.44 billion for EPA—an increase of \$35 million above the amount of funding actually available to EPA in fiscal year 1995.

In addition, carryover funds of \$225 million would be available, making a total of \$6.7 billion available to EPA in fiscal year 1996. This is \$248 million more than what EPA had available to it in fiscal year 1995.

Madam President, this amendment does not provide everything on the administration's wish list because frankly, the administration's wish list is not about real environmental priorities. The administration's wish list is about pork-barrel projects and boutique programs. It is about continuing to provide funding for programs which do not afford opportunities to reduce real threats to human health and the environment.

Despite grave concerns about EPA's ability to manage and prioritize, we have been willing to provide more funds to the Agency's most important programs.

Madam President, I reiterate that this does not provide everything on the administration's wish list because, frankly, the wish list had things that were beyond our ability to fund and things that were not real environmental priorities. Some were pork barrel projects or boutique programs. But I think, thanks to the excellent work—and I emphasize the excellent work—of my ranking Member and the Senator from New Jersey who offered the underlying amendment, we have come together with a workable amendment. I hope all of us can support that.

I yield the floor.

Ms. MIKULSKI addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Madam President, I rise to support this bipartisan agreement to restore funds for the important environmental programs, including funding for National Service.

I want to thank my colleagues, Senator BOND and Senator LAUTENBERG, and their staffs as well as my own for all of their hard work in developing this agreement.

This is a compromise agreement. It provides an additional \$487 million for the core EPA programs. These programs are fully offset in this bill to keep EPA fully staffed so that enough people are there to get the job done to ensure clean rivers and drinking water and to clean up hazardous waste sites. The environment is a priority of the American people, and I think it is the priority of this Congress.

There was more that we wanted to do. There was more that I certainly

wanted to do in this bill, particularly in the area of the environmental programs. But they were not included in this amendment because we could not arrive at sufficient offsets.

One of the key programs that is not in this area, with great reluctance, is the cleanup of Boston Harbor; also, the cleanup of the Chesapeake Bay, which is in my own State. The programs that were included there that would have been important are also not included in this amendment.

We have consistently in the past supported the funding for Boston Harbor, and, as the chairman and ranking member of the VA-HUD know, I am committed to the cleanup of Boston Harbor and will continue to work to solve this problem.

In this legislation, Senator BOND and I have found efforts to find additional funds for EPA. Again, I thank him for his efforts to move the process forward to provide real money—not funny money—to deal with real environmental concerns. This additional \$487 million is an investment in that.

I also want to say thank you for the ability to provide additional money for National Service, which brings National Service to a total of \$4.5 million. This amount will fund 23,000 participants in the program. It restores funding for the Points of Light Foundation, and as part of the amendment, like the EPA funding, that is part of a bipartisan effort.

My colleague, Senator GRASSLEY, has worked with us on helping resolve many of our concerns. I want to thank Senator GRASSLEY for working with our former colleague, Senator Wofford, to address the very valid concerns and criticisms for National Service.

I look forward to working with Senators GRASSLEY and BOND to ensure that these valid concerns are addressed.

This amendment would ensure taxpayers get a dollar's worth of effort for a dollar's worth of taxes and address valid concerns about the program.

I believe this is the absolute minimum level this Congress should provide for National Service.

Even more should be done, but I recognize this may be the best we can do with the money available.

This amendment will increase funds for innovation and assistance by \$15 million to support demonstration programs involving national nonprofit and volunteer organizations and other agencies and provide another \$2 million of the Points of Light Foundation for a total of \$5.5 million.

This amendment also addresses valid concerns about the program's efficiency and accountability.

It eliminates grants to Federal agencies, makes improvements in the Corporation's grant review process, and requires a study of the Corporation by the National Association of Public Administrators.

Let me assure my colleagues I have a full offset for my amendment in the

FHA Multifamily Property Disposition program.

Let me tell you why I think it is so important to provide these funds and why we must continue to support National Service.

National Service meets compelling needs in our society. It provides opportunity for young people; it helps meet the needs of communities; and it cultivates the habits of the heart.

National Service provides opportunity by giving young people access to higher education and training. For many Americans, their first mortgage is their student debt. After graduation, many of them owe \$15,000, \$30,000, or even more. Through National Service, young people can work off some of their student debt.

Second, National Service meets compelling needs in America's communities. Young people serve their communities. For example in education, young people tutor children and teach adults basic reading skills.

They help protect public safety. For example, in my own state of Maryland, in Montgomery County, AmeriCorps volunteers operate a Community Policing program, where volunteers help control crime by running community education seminars and outreach projects.

In other communities, they patrol vacant buildings and teach conflict resolution skills. They help meet compelling human needs by distributing food to sick people and poor families.

They help address environmental concerns like restoring neighborhood parks, and helping communities recover from floods and disasters. After recent floods in Pennsylvania, AmeriCorps teams assisted the Red Cross to help 10,000 families devastated by that disaster.

Third, National Service teaches the habits of the heart. It is not a social program. It is a social invention designed to create the ethic of service in today's young people. It provides an opportunity structure so young Americans can receive a reduction in their student debt or a voucher for further education in exchange for full-time community service.

National Service is a movement toward community building, it is about neighbor helping neighbor, and it is about helping people who help themselves. National Service fosters the spirit of community in Americans, it brings people together and teaches a new generation that by working together it is possible to create a better world.

I urge my colleagues to take another step toward community building and encouraging habits of the heart by voting to increase the funds to National Service.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I rise to speak briefly on the issue of funding in the continuing resolution for the Corporation for National and Community Service and the AmeriCorps program.

As many of my colleagues know, for over a year and a half I have raised concerns about the costs of the AmeriCorps Program. Last summer, the General Accounting Office [GAO] issued a report that substantiated my concerns, finding that the average cost per participant is approximately \$27,000, with the Federal Government providing roughly \$20,000, State and local governments \$5,000, and the private sector providing only 8 percent of these high costs.

There is no question that these measurements are not in keeping with the goals and vision of this program as originally articulated by President Bill Clinton.

I have stated in testimony and in letters to the President and administration officials that I would be willing to support funding for this program if the administration would commit to several specific program reforms, most importantly, increasing the private sector match and decreasing the cost per participant.

It has been my desire to ensure the taxpayers' money is spent efficiently and to increase the number of young people who will be provided assistance to pay for college. To that end, I met several weeks ago with Senator Harris Wofford, the chief executive officer of the Corporation. Since that meeting, we have been engaged in negotiations on how to improve and reform the AmeriCorps Program.

I am pleased to state that I believe these negotiations have achieved real progress. While there are still points that need to be addressed, Senator Wofford has indicated in a letter to me his commitment to implementing meaningful program reforms, control costs and increase the private sector match, as I have strongly suggested.

It is for this reason that I am willing to support funding for the Corporation and, in turn, AmeriCorps.

As my colleagues know, I have never criticized the good work performed by the young people who participate in AmeriCorps. I have met with young people from my State who participate in the I CAN Program that allows young people at Iowa State University and several other colleges in Iowa to perform community service while attending college full time. There is no question these college students are a benefit to their community.

However, we should not forget the 3.9 million young people who do volunteer work in their community without compensation. These volunteers help form the backbone of community service in America.

As I say, my concern is not the work performed, but the costs to the taxpayer and the possibility that more young people could be provided assistance if AmeriCorps is reinvented. My hope is that the reforms that Senator Wofford and I have agreed to will help ensure that the program meets the original goals articulated by President Clinton.

It is my view that this President, any President, has the right to see an initiative, such as this, be given an opportunity. However, the initiative must remain in keeping with the President's original intent. And that has been my focus, to keep this program's costs and private sector match in line with the President's promises.

Let me assure my colleagues that no one should take my statements today to mean that I am ready to anoint the Corporation with garlands.

The Corporation has serious problems, most significantly in the area of financial management. A recent audit of the Corporation, contracted by the Inspector General, indicates that there is an immediate need for fundamental reforms in financial management at the Corporation.

In addition, the Corporation must now implement the reforms that have been proposed, as well as meeting the goals for per capita costs and private sector match that it will establish.

My colleagues can be certain that, just as I have with agencies such as the Department of Defense and the IRS, I will continue to aggressively watchdog the taxpayers' money at the Corporation.

Madam President, in closing, let me reiterate how pleased I am to have worked with Senator Wofford on this issue. I commend him for his sincere efforts to reform the program. There is no question that the Corporation has benefited from his commitment and the fresh perspectives he has brought as chief executive officer.

Let me note too, the work of Congressman HOEKSTRA who has been a true watchdog for the taxpayers on this program. As I stated earlier, I share his strong concerns about the financial management at the Corporation.

I also want to commend the work of the chairmen of the committee and subcommittee, Senators MARK HATFIELD and KIT BOND. I know it has been difficult to find funding for this program.

I especially want to thank Senator BOND. It has been my pleasure to work closely with him on this matter and appreciate all his efforts to address our mutual concerns that the taxpayers' money be spent effectively and wisely in this program.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Madam President, I join my colleagues, Senators BOND and MIKULSKI, the chairman and ranking minority member of the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Veterans, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies, on which I serve, in supporting an increase in funding for the National Service Program. This amendment provides \$403 million for the National Service Program in fiscal year 1996.

I voted in support of establishing this program in 1993 because it gives young people a chance to serve their communities and earn education awards to finance their education. Currently, there

are over 450 participants in Colorado's AmeriCorps programs who are engaged in serving low-income communities, tutoring at-risk youth, mentoring students, helping young people stay out of gangs, and providing health services in rural areas.

The Corporation for National Service sponsors important service programs for native Americans nationwide. Current activities in this area include improving safety on reservations, constructing community facilities, improving access to medical services for low-income elders, tutoring students, and reducing violence among young people. The Ute tribes in my State and over 20 other tribal organizations throughout the country are benefiting from the National Service Program.

The Corporation also is working with the National Coalition for Homeless Veterans. Dedicated individuals are serving homeless veterans by providing them access to health care, substance abuse treatment, and training to seek jobs.

It is my hope that the Corporation for National Service continue and expand its support under this amendment for programs assisting those in our communities that need it the most and continue to build bridges with programs assisting veterans, tribal organizations and at-risk youth.

Mr. PRESSLER. Madam President, I rise tonight to comment on this amendment, offered by Senators BOND and MIKULSKI, to provide, among other things, additional funding for the Environmental Protection Agency. I am a cosponsor of this amendment because it includes funding that is very necessary to the people of Watertown, SD. This amendment would provide \$13 million for the reconstruction of a wastewater treatment facility in Watertown, SD.

The city of Watertown has worked for more than 10 years to overcome Clean Water Act violations. Now, the city is facing an expensive lawsuit, fines of up to \$25,000 per day, and the high costs of restructuring the wastewater treatment plant. I have worked closely with Watertown's Mayor Brenda Barger, who is seeking a reasonable settlement to the lawsuit with the EPA.

The city of Watertown's innovative/alternative technology wastewater treatment facility was built as a joint partnership with the EPA, the city, and the State of South Dakota in 1982. The plant was constructed with the understanding that the EPA would provide assistance in the event the new technology failed. The facility was modified and rebuilt in 1991 when it was unable to comply with Clean Water Act discharge requirements. Unfortunately, the newly reconstructed plant still was found to violate Federal regulations. That is why the city now faces a possible lawsuit by the Federal Government, and fines of up to \$25,000 per day.

The city of Watertown, under the very capable guidance of Mayor Barger,

has entered into a municipal compliance plan with the EPA. Under the agree plan, Watertown should achieve compliance by December 1996. However, without Federal assistance, Watertown will be unable to complete the reconstruction by the date set forth by the EPA. In addition, the compliance plan does not address the issue of the onerous civil and administrative penalties that continue to accumulate against the city.

Under the law, Watertown could accumulate an additional \$14 million in penalties before the treatment facility is able to comply with the Clean Water Act requirements.

Madam President, I don't know of any cities in South Dakota that can afford those kinds of penalties.

Watertown is working hard to comply with the law. However, to succeed, Watertown needs the constructive cooperation of the Federal Government. The funding in the amendment offered by my friend from Missouri reflects the kind of constructive cooperation needed. As I said, it would provide \$13 million to the city of Watertown to rebuild Watertown's wastewater treatment facility.

Madam President, this project is necessary for the health and safety of the people of Watertown. Already this year, the city has increased consumer water rates from \$9/month to \$16/month in order to fund the water treatment facility reconstruction project. The city is prepared for additional rate increases in order to cover a portion of the total project cost of \$25 million.

The city also has worked diligently to secure a variety of available funding sources, including an allocation of \$1 million from the State of South Dakota. Additionally, the city of Watertown has committed to a local match of \$8.25 million. This Federal appropriation of \$13 million would enable the city to complete construction on the water treatment facility in a timely manner, as required by the EPA.

Madam President, I believe the merits of this project are clear. Construction of this facility would allow the city of Watertown to provide its residents with a safe water supply which complies with the Clean Water Act and thus ensures that the environment is protected.

I have enjoyed working with Senator BOND, chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee that provides funding for the Environmental Protection Agency, and Senator MIKULSKI, the ranking member on that subcommittee. I know I represent the citizens of Watertown, SD, when I say thank you for your commitment to securing this funding. This is a great first step. As I said, this is a constructive effort. I sincerely hope that the EPA will show the same constructive, cooperative spirit to the people of Watertown.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, in closing let me briefly state my support for the amendment offered by Senator MIKULSKI on AmeriCorps. While I

believe the Appropriations Committees has provided sufficient funding for the Corporation, I recognize the desire of the administration and Senator MIKULSKI to see a small increase in the amount of funds provided by the committee.

I believe this amendment is a good compromise that will allow the VA/ HUD bill to proceed and be signed by the President.

The amendment contains a sense of the Senate that I have worked on with Senator KASSEBAUM stating that the President should expeditiously nominate a CFO for the Corporation and that the Corporation should make implementation of financial management reforms a top priority.

In meeting with accountants from Arthur Anderson, who conducted the independent audit of the Corporation, they stated that the appointment of a CFO was the single most important thing that needs to be done to begin the effort to get the Corporation's financial house in order.

The amendment also allows the Corporation to spend up to \$3 million for implementing financial management reforms.

Finally, I am pleased that in conjunction with this amendment, the Corporation has agreed that they will set aside \$10 million for an education-awards only program that I have advocated. Under this new program, the Corporation will provide only educational awards to young people who perform community service. These funds could help up to 4,000 young people pay for college.

Madam President, I want to recognize Senator BARBARA MIKULSKI for her work. She has been a strong advocate for AmeriCorps. Earlier this fall, I said that I thought there would be funding for this program. I made that statement in part because of the confidence I had that Senator MIKULSKI's determination would win the day. Certainly, she deserves a great deal of the credit for the funding contained in this bill already and all the credit for the passage of this amendment.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Madam President, I will now yield the floor but reserve the remainder of whatever time our side might have.

Mr. McCAIN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona is recognized.

Mr. McCAIN. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays on this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 3509 WITHDRAWN

Ms. MIKULSKI. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that an amendment that I have pending on National Service be withdrawn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. It is withdrawn.

So the amendment (No. 3509) was withdrawn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time? The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BOND. How much time?

Mr. McCAIN. Thirty seconds.

Mr. BOND. Thirty seconds.

Mr. McCAIN. Thirty seconds.

Mr. BOND. I yield a minute to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. McCAIN. I am not real familiar with this amendment. I just saw it. I am not sure we need \$200 million for State revolving funds or \$50 million for Superfund, \$75 million—\$162 million in funds offset by unobligated airway trust fund contract authority. I did not know that was unobligated.

All this is another increase in spending. That is really all this is about. I think it is time it came to a stop, and at least I would like to be on record as being in opposition to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. LAUTENBERG addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I ask the Senator from Maryland if I can have 5 minutes.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I yield the Senator from New Jersey 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURNS). The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I may not need 5 minutes, Mr. President, but I thank my colleague from Maryland.

This is a compromise piece of legislation. If you see lots of people concerned about what it is that we have in front of us, these are legitimate concerns for both those who support and those who object to this compromise. The amendment that is being offered, as we heard from the distinguished Senator from Missouri, includes \$487 million for environmental programs instead of the roughly \$900 million that was proposed in the original amendment. Unlike the earlier amendment, this amendment does not include a provision designating the proposed funding as emergency spending.

Mr. President, clearly this amendment does not increase the budget for environmental programs as much as I believe is needed. However, under the circumstances, with earnest exchanges of view, we arrived at what was a middle ground. While having been so active on matters of environmental cleanup including Superfund and clean air and others, clean water, it distresses me that we could not get more to do the environmental job that many of us here would like to see done. I am pleased to see that there is \$50 million more for Superfund cleanup. It is a program that needs to be continued. And even as we choose to examine it, to reform, to make reforms where necessary or where possible, still in all this is a program that has value and should be continued.

In the final analysis, there is a major concern, major disappointment in this

amendment, that concerns the Boston Harbor cleanup. Boston Harbor was an environmental disaster because of the inability to contain the pollution, the contamination that flowed into that body of water. It caused enormous increases in costs for those who use the drinking water in the area because of the costs invested thus far in trying to get it to a satisfactory condition.

Senator KERRY and Senator KENNEDY have worked very hard for a number of years to get the kind of funding that is essential to continue this job. And I hope, Mr. President, that as we consider this amendment there will be opportunities to reevaluate some of the decisions that we are making this evening. There will be a conference with the House.

The biggest deficiency in this bill is the lack of a clear-cut commitment to expend funding to clean up Boston Harbor. And again, other than that, we have fashioned a compromise—not one that is satisfactory to those who are most anxious to get the environment cleaned up to the fullest extent possible, but we do face a budget crisis here. We are interested in balancing the budget. We are interested in doing what we can with the limited resources that we have. This compromise amendment, I think, does just that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair informs the Senator from New Jersey that he is in charge of the time which is remaining, which is 10 minutes and 18 seconds on that side, and 5 minutes and 11 seconds for the majority.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I may need.

I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to some basic principles which we had to follow in this bill. This bill, the VA-HUD, Independent Agencies, which includes EPA, space, FEMA, and others, took a 12 percent this year. There was no way we could continue to fund these special projects each Member had in specific cities.

Now, some people would call them pork projects, but, frankly, these are all very important, necessary environmental projects designed to clean up our waterways and other vital elements of the environment. The Environmental Protection Agency estimates that there are approximately \$100 billion of infrastructure needs for clean water and safe drinking water in the country today.

What we have tried to do is to say, we are not going to appropriate, in this bill, specific sums for specific projects, because there is no way that we can know how to rank \$100 billion of needs throughout the country. We have set up State revolving funds, loan funds that will revolve and provide assistance to communities, and be paid back to help other communities within that State. That is why we have worked hard to put additional dollars into the revolving fund.

We have been advised by the Under Secretary for EPA that we need to

reach a level of \$10 billion on the clean water fund, so that the projects can be dealt with. We are trying to get money into those revolving funds. We cannot appropriate funds for specific projects and that is why there has been much disappointment in my own State. There are major cities that want to have funds appropriated directly to them.

What we have done instead is to appropriate money for the State revolving funds. The States will make low- or no-interest loans to communities—to cities, to counties—to take care of their needs. When that is paid back it will enable others to carry out their projects.

Mr. President, it is not nearly as exciting, it is not nearly as glamorous as having an appropriated sum targeted to one city or another. We think, based on the best analysis we have made and on the scientific, professional advice, that the State revolving funds will allow the States to assist communities on a revolving basis.

Again, this bill is not all that we would like. There are many other things we would like to do. But it is paid for. It is paid for with real offsets. It is within the budget and I think it is a major contribution to continued environmental progress, but progress in a way that moves responsibility and authority back to the States, decision-making back to the States.

That is why I ask my colleagues to vote for it.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, how will quorum time be charged if we go into a quorum call?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. To whatever side asks for the quorum.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I ask unanimous consent during the quorum call time be charged equally to both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I have to point out that I object to that since we are almost out of time and I would like to reserve 1 minute at the end.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the time be charged to neither side during the quorum call.

Mr. KYL. Objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, how much time does either side have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair advises we have 1 minute and 23 seconds for the majority; and the opposition has 10 minutes, 18 seconds.

Ms. MIKULSKI. But there is no opposition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Somewhere or another we used up 4 minutes and 28 seconds.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, are we supposed to keep talking because there are other discussions underway? Is that right?

Mr. DOMENICI. Yes, very important discussions.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum and ask it be charged to the minority side.

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

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McCONNELL. 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. McCONNELL. Mr. President, there is a pending amendment, is there not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. McCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent it be laid aside temporarily.

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

#### AMENDMENT NO. 3527

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, there is an amendment at the desk, No. 3527. I ask it be called up for immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. McCONNELL], for Mr. HATFIELD, for himself, Mr. DOLE, Mr. McCONNELL and Mr. LEAHY, proposes an amendment numbered 3527.

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

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

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

Mr. McCONNELL. Yes.

Mr. FORD. The Senator does not intend to ask for a rollcall vote on this one? It has been agreed to on both sides. There will not be a rollcall vote. It will be by voice.

Mr. McCONNELL. I say this amendment is jointly sponsored by myself, the majority leader, Senator DOLE, the minority leader, Senator DASCHLE, and Senator LEAHY. It provides \$50 million for emergency antiterrorism assistance for Israel. This is the program announced by the President from Jerusalem yesterday, and will provide funds to procure goods, provide training and/or grants in order to support efforts to help eradicate terrorists in and around Israel.

As might be expected given the shortness of time involved in preparation for this proposal, specific details are lacking and therefore the amendment includes notification language, so that the Congress can exercise adequate oversight for a program before the money is spent.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, on behalf of the President, Senator DOLE, Senator HATFIELD, Senator McCONNELL, Senator LEAHY, and I are offering an amendment to provide \$50 million in antiterrorism assistance to Israel.

All of us in the United States Senate have been shocked and saddened by the

rash of terrorist bombings that have occurred in Israel. The four attacks from February 26 to March 4 have killed 58 people bringing terror and grief to Israelis and, for the moment, putting a halt to the peace process. One tragedy is compounded by another.

In the days since the bombings, both Israeli and Palestinian security forces have moved against the terrorists. I am pleased the Palestinian authority has moved to round up more than 600 Hamas members and raid mosques, businesses and schools owned by militants. Its arrest of three senior members of Hamas' military wing over the weekend is further evidence that it is taking seriously the need to confront Hamas' terrorist threat.

Despite these encouraging signs, however, I share Prime Minister Peres' view that these steps, while a good beginning, are clearly not enough. Chairman Arafat and the Palestinian authority must continue their efforts to root out the terrorist threat in its entirety. Finally, the United States must also contribute to the antiterrorism effort, for, without U.S. assistance, hopes for a lasting peace in the Middle East could be in serious jeopardy.

The images of the bombs' victims lying in Jerusalem's streets, of young girls at their friends' funeral, will haunt us indefinitely. The pain and loss of the victims' families and the people of Israel will always remain.

Mr. President, I can think of only one thing that could worsen the tragedy of these bombings, and that would be for these extremists to be successful in their effort to permanently derail the peace process. The Israeli people have suffered greatly through each of these bombings. While their patience must have its limits, we cannot allow the terrorists to achieve their ultimate objective.

This amendment addresses those concerns. It will assist Israel in its effort to combat terrorism. It will also add to the momentum for peace in the Middle East that was aided by President Clinton's initiatives and the resulting "summit of the peacemakers."

I hope Israelis will derive some encouragement from the international community's condemnation of the attacks as well as from Wednesday's summit. I am hopeful, as well, that this unprecedented summit will demonstrate to the terrorists that the international community stands united against them and their despicable acts.

It is unfortunate that Syria, among others, did not attend the summit, but the list of countries, including moderate Arab nations, that participated in this historic conference is most impressive: Egypt, Jordan, Kuwait, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates, Yemen, Bahrain, Algeria, Morocco, Oman, Qatar, Tunisia, Canada, Russia, Britain, France, Germany, Japan, Italy, Ireland, Norway, Spain, Turkey, and the United States.

This extensive list of participants clearly represents the international

community's continued commitment to the Middle East peace process. And, again, it is a sign to the Israelis that they are not alone in their battle against terrorism.

President Clinton should also be commended for establishing an international counter-terrorism alliance involving espionage agencies of several nations. I am hopeful that this initiative will help ensure that terrorist threats will not be tolerated.

This bipartisan amendment is important because it, in concert with the summit in Egypt, puts the Senate squarely in support of Israel and squarely on the side of urging the Palestinians and the Arab states, with support from the United States, to move forcefully against the terrorist threat. I hope we will send a strong, united message of support for it.

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

The amendment (No. 3527) was agreed to.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote and I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time? There being no Senator seeking recognition, in my capacity as a Senator from the State of Montana, I suggest the absence of a quorum. 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.

#### UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, after a lot of efforts, I believe we have a unanimous-consent request that will be fair to all and will give us a way to get to a conclusion on this legislation.

The majority leader feels strongly that we need to get this work completed. I think this will help us get there. So I ask unanimous consent that all remaining amendments in order to H.R. 3019 must be called up and debate concluded by 12:30 p.m., Tuesday, March 19, and that the votes occur in the order in which they were debated beginning at 2:15 p.m., Tuesday, March 19, and, following the disposition of the amendments, the Senate proceed to third reading and final passage of H.R. 3019, as amended, all without intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DASCHLE. Reserving the right to object—I have no objection.

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

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, for the information of all Senators, there will be no further votes tonight, Friday or Monday; however, if you have an amendment to the omnibus appropri-

tions bill, under the previous agreement you must debate your amendment Friday, Monday, or Tuesday morning. I want to emphasize it seems to me that is more than fair. I know some Members have commitments on Friday or on Monday or on Tuesday, but surely they do not have commitments all of those days. So I think this will give us ample time to debate it. The votes will occur beginning at 2:15 on Tuesday.

Also, Senators should be on notice that the Senate is expected to debate the small business regulatory reform bill tomorrow under a brief time agreement and that a vote will occur on Tuesday, also, on the small business regulatory reform bill.

There could be other votes on Tuesday in relation to cloture on the White-water special committee and possibly a cloture vote with respect to the product liability conference report. Therefore, Senators should be on notice that a number of votes are expected to occur on Tuesday, March 19.

Further, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at 9 a.m., Tuesday, the Senate resume the Boxer and Coats amendments regarding the abortion issue, and that there be 2 hours 45 minutes of debate to be controlled in the following manner: 1 hour under the control of Senator COATS, 30 minutes under the control of Senator BOXER, 1 hour under the control of Senator SNOWE, and 15 minutes under the control of Senator MURRAY, and that following the conclusion or yielding back of time, the amendments be laid aside to occur in the voting sequence beginning at 2:15 on Tuesday; and following the debate on the Coats and Boxer amendments, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate then resume consideration of the Murkowski amendment No. 3525.

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

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I want to thank the distinguished Democratic leader for his efforts to get this agreement. I think it is fair. We do have some other efforts we are still working on, and certainly we are going to work in good faith to fulfill all that we have discussed tonight. I yield to the distinguished Democratic leader.

Mr. DASCHLE. I thank the acting majority leader for his comments and for his leadership in bringing us to this point.

The distinguished Senator from California had a misunderstanding about when the Coats amendment was going to be debated and has informed me it would be of great help to her if she could have 15 minutes in this debate. I wonder if we might modify the unanimous consent agreement to provide her with that opportunity.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that our previous agreement be amended to provide 15 minutes for Senator FEINSTEIN of California to be involved in this debate.

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

Mr. DASCHLE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I only want to complete my thought in urging colleagues to use the time we have available to us on Friday and Monday. We have 2 full days here. There is no reason why we ought not be able to use them to the fullest extent possible. Everyone now knows what the amendments are. They ought to be laid down and debated. We ought not lose the time we have available to us on Friday and on Monday.

So I urge my colleagues to come to the floor in the next 2 days to get that work done.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, did we get an agreement on the unanimous-consent request for the 15 minutes for Senator FEINSTEIN?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We have agreement.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I would like to join the Senator from South Dakota in urging Members to come and be involved in this debate. We have a lot of work to do next week on very important legislation. Members need to understand that we cannot do the work we have to do on Tuesday, Wednesday, and part of Thursday or part of Tuesday. So please be prepared to come to the floor and debate these issues on Friday and Monday, be prepared to work the full day on Thursday, too.

#### UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT—SHORT-TERM CONTINUING RESOLUTION

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate receives from the House the short-term continuing resolution—and it is the identical text of what I now send to the desk—the legislation be deemed agreed to and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

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

Mr. LOTT. Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. DOMENICI. I want to ask a question of the acting majority leader.

Mr. President, I ask the distinguished acting majority leader, on the calendar that we had previously agreed to on Monday, we were to take up as the first order of business the Grazing Reform Act. It was prescribed to be on the floor Monday and Tuesday. Might I ask, is it the intention of the leadership that we proceed to that immediately after the business which has just been described?

Mr. LOTT. It would be our intention, I say to the Senator from New Mexico, to proceed to that issue when this other is considered.

Mr. DOMENICI. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I delightfully yield the floor.

Mr. NICKLES. 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.