

agency shall prohibit the installation of any computer game program not required for the official business of the agency into any agency computer equipment.

(4) PROHIBITION OF AGENCY ACCEPTANCE OF COMPUTER EQUIPMENT WITH COMPUTER GAME PROGRAMS.—

(A) Title III of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 is amended by adding at the end the following: "**SEC. 317. RESTRICTIONS ON CERTAIN INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY.**

"(a) DEFINITION.—In this section the term 'information technology' has the meaning given such term under section 5002(3) of the Clinger-Cohen Act of 1996 (40 U.S.C. 1401).

"(b) IN GENERAL.—The head of an executive agency may not accept delivery of information technology that is loaded with game programs not required for an official purpose under the terms of the contract under which information technology is delivered.

"(c) WAIVER.—The head of an executive agency may waive the application of this section with respect to any particular procurement of information technology, if the head of the agency—

"(1) conducts a cost-benefit analysis and determines that the costs of compliance with this section outweighs the benefits of compliance; and

"(2) submits a certification of such determination, with supporting documentation to the Congress."

(B) The table of contents in section 2(b) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 316 the following:

"Sec. 317. Restrictions on certain information technology."

(C) The amendments made by this section shall take effect 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 640. (a) The congressional ethics committees shall provide for voluntary reporting by Members of Congress on the financial disclosure reports filed under title I of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) on such Members' participation in—

(1) the Civil Service Retirement System under chapter 83 of title 5, United States Code; and

(2) the Federal Employees Retirement System under chapter 84 of title 5, United States Code.

(b) In this section, the terms "congressional ethics committees" and "Members of Congress" have the meanings given such terms under section 109 of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.).

(c) This section shall apply to fiscal year 1998 and each fiscal year thereafter.

SEC. 641. (a) A Federal employee shall be separated from service and barred from reemployment in the Federal service, if—

(1) the employee is convicted of a violation or attempted violation of section 201 of title 18, United States Code; and

(2) such violation or attempted violation related to conduct prohibited under section 1010(a) of the Controlled Substances Import and Export Act (21 U.S.C. 960(a)).

(b) This section shall apply during fiscal year 1998 and each fiscal year thereafter.

SEC. 642. (a) COORDINATION OF COUNTERDRUG INTELLIGENCE CENTERS AND ACTIVITIES.—(1) Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a plan to improve coordination, and eliminate unnecessary duplication, among the counterdrug intelligence centers and counterdrug activities of the Federal Government, including the centers and activities of the following departments and agencies:

(A) The Department of Defense, including the Defense Intelligence Agency.

(B) The Department of the Treasury, including the United States Customs Service.

(C) The Central Intelligence Agency.

(D) The Coast Guard.

(E) The Drug Enforcement Administration.

(F) The Federal Bureau of Investigation.

(2) The purpose of the plan under paragraph (1) is to maximize the effectiveness of the centers and activities referred to in that paragraph in achieving the objectives of the national drug control strategy. In order to maximize such effectiveness, the plan shall—

(A) articulate clear and specific mission statements for each counterdrug intelligence center and activity, including the manner in which responsibility for counterdrug intelligence activities will be allocated among the counterdrug intelligence centers;

(B) specify the relationship between such centers;

(C) specify the means by which proper oversight of such centers will be assured;

(D) specify the means by which counterdrug intelligence will be forwarded effectively to all levels of officials responsible for United States counterdrug policy; and

(E) specify mechanisms to ensure that State and local law enforcement agencies are apprised of counterdrug intelligence in a manner which—

(i) facilitates effective counterdrug activities by such agencies; and

(ii) provides such agencies with the information necessary to ensure the safety of officials of such agencies in their counterdrug activities.

(b) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this section, the term "appropriate congressional committees" means the following:

(1) The Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on the Judiciary, and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate.

(2) The Committee on International Relations, the Committee on the Judiciary, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 643. PERSONAL ALLOWANCE PARITY AMONG NAFTA PARTIES. (a) IN GENERAL.—The United States Trade Representative and the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Secretary of Commerce, shall initiate discussions with officials of the Governments of Mexico and Canada to achieve parity in the duty-free personal allowance structure of the United States, Mexico, and Canada.

(b) REPORT.—The United States Trade Representative and the Secretary of the Treasury shall report to Congress within 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act on the progress that is being made to correct any disparity between the United States, Mexico, and Canada with respect to duty-free personal allowances.

(c) RECOMMENDATIONS.—If parity with respect to duty-free personal allowances between the United States, Mexico, and Canada is not achieved within 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the United States Trade Representative and the Secretary of the Treasury shall submit recommendations to Congress for appropriate legislation and action.

SEC. 644. No funds appropriated by this Act shall be available to pay for an abortion, or the administrative expenses in connection with any health plan under the Federal employees health benefit program which provides any benefits or coverage for abortions.

SEC. 645. The provision of section 644 shall not apply where the life of the mother would be endangered if the fetus were carried to term, or the pregnancy is the result of an act of rape or incest.

This Act may be cited as the "Treasury and General Government Appropriations Act, 1998".

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. DOMENICI. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, before yielding the floor, I wanted to thank our hard working staff: Barbara Retzlaff, Tammy Perrin, Lula Edwards, Frank Larkin, and Pat Raymond. And in particular I wanted to thank our ranking member, Senator KOHL, for his advice and his leadership on this bill.

With that, I yield the floor.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1998

Mr. BOND. What is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business currently is S. 1034.

Mr. BOND. This is the Veterans Affairs, HUD, independent agencies appropriations measure?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs, Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, commissions, corporations, and offices.

The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1034) making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, commissions, corporations, and offices for fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes.

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill.

Mr. BOND. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I see that our colleague from Arkansas is present. He has a very important amendment. I invite the attention of all Members. We are planning on moving on this bill. There are a number of amendments, and we look forward to dealing with them expeditiously today. So we are open and ready to do business. We appreciate having the matters brought to our attention. As I said yesterday, we hope, if there are amendments or proposed colloquies, they will be brought to the ranking member and me so that we can give them our personal attention and continue the progress that

this body has been making on the appropriations measures.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

AMENDMENT NO. 944

(Purpose: To reduce the appropriation for the implementation of the space station program for the purpose of terminating the program)

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. BUMPERS], for himself, Mr. KOHL, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. BRYAN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. WELLSTONE, and Mr. FEINGOLD proposes an amendment numbered 944.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 70, strike lines 17 through 18, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "sion and administrative aircraft, \$3,826,500,000, to remain available until September 30, 1999. Provided, that of the funds made available in this bill, no funds shall be expended on the space station program, except for termination costs."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized.

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, this is the sixth year that I have stood at this desk and lamented the fact that we have become inured to projects which have massive cost overruns if it means a few jobs in our State or if it means you can cast a cheap vote and not pay a price for it back home.

Now, I have been here for 22½ years, and I have watched this body time and time again proceed continuously to vote for such things as the space station whereas if it were a secret ballot it would not get 25 votes. The facts and the evidence are absolutely overwhelming against going forward with the space station, and yet because of the issue of jobs back home, it is very seldom that anyone casts a vote against it.

Also, there is no political price to pay, even if you do not have jobs back home, hinging on going forward with the space station. There is no political price to be exacted against you for voting for something that people know very little about and have never honed in on.

My wife, Betty Bumpers, a woman I admire very much for her courage, started a peace organization in 1981, and I said, "What you have done is just assured your husband's defeat in the next election." She said, "Yes, and you men are going to get my children killed." And so I had to dance around that issue until I ran the next time fully expecting to be confronted by my opponent about my wife's activities in the peace movement.

Now, isn't it a strange dichotomy in America, that one has to be defensive about being for all the things that

would promote peace. That is how strange this place is at times.

Of course, Betty has been active in childhood immunizations all of her life, and all of my political life—she had started a program in 1972 to immunize all the children in my State, which had one of the lowest immunization levels of any State in the country. We immunized 300,000 children one Saturday. She was known then and is still known as the one of the foremost leaders in immunization programs in this country. I remember one day in 1973 some smart reporter said, "Senator, do you think your wife's activities"—he was referring to peace, of course—"Do you think your wife's activities are going to be a big detriment to you in your campaign?" I said, "Well, it will be among all those people who favor war and not immunizing children." And I never got asked another question about it.

I do not mean to sound arrogant about being willing to stand up occasionally for something I strongly believe in, but occasionally I chastise some of my colleagues who could save the taxpayers billions of dollars and hasten the day we balance the budget, but who refuse to do it because there is no political accounting for voting for the space station, particularly now when the rover is roving around on Mars. As a matter of fact, I know this is pure coincidence, but if you want to go over to the Dirksen Building, it just so happens that, at the same time we are considering the space station and the entire space budget in the Chamber, NASA has a thrilling show in the Dirksen Building for all the Senators to see of the rover roving around on Mars sniffing rocks.

Let me say—and I have said this for 6 straight years—I favor the space program. I have never once lamented the fact that we have a shuttle program and that we have the ability to place all kinds of scientific and communications satellites in orbit. And in sending the rover to Mars, NASA is doing exactly what it should do, because that proves another point. We do not need a manned mission to do science on Mars.

Mr. President, almost all the scientists in the country, virtually every Nobel physicist, virtually every scientific group in America, opposes the space station. Unfortunately, they don't have enough political clout to fill a thimble. I admire them, I respect them, but the truth of the matter is, they have very little impact on this body or the House of Representatives on what they favor or don't favor.

One day on this floor, I said even Carl Sagan was opposed to the space station. Carl Sagan, whom I had known for several years—we weren't close friends, but I had been thrown in contact with him a few times—called to say that I had misstated what he believed. What he said was, "I believe the space station is a legitimate thing, a highly desirable thing, as a way station to get to Mars. But," he said, to follow

that up, something that I have always strongly believed, "it is not—it is not a wise expenditure of money if you are talking about scientific experiments to be conducted on the space station." That is one of the reasons the American Physical Society and so many other groups oppose the space station.

People around here are sometimes influenced by how somebody feels about it. I will tell you who strongly opposes going forward with the space station: The Concord Coalition, which was headed up by our now deceased, highly respected colleague, Paul Tsongas and by Warren Rudman, also our former colleague from New Hampshire. The Concord Coalition, Citizens Against Government Waste, the Cato Institute, the Progressive Policy Institute, the National Taxpayers' Union, and Citizens for a Sound Economy.

Then, in the scientific community, listen to this: the American Physiological Society, the American Society for Biochemistry and Molecular Biology, the American Society for Pharmacology and Experimental Therapeutics, the American Society for Investigative Pathology, the American Institute of Nutrition, American Association of Immunologists, American Society of Cell Biology, the Biophysical Society, the American Association of Anatomists.

Who comprises the American Physical Society? It is 41,000 physicists. Dr. Robert Park, a professor of physics at the University of Maryland at College Park, has testified time and again here about the folly of justifying the space station by alluding to the kind of scientific experiments they are going to do on it.

Mr. President, my amendment says we will terminate the space station at a cost of \$600 million and we will save \$1.5 billion to put on the deficit. Sometimes my staff presents me with some alternatives. "Why don't we say we are going to put this \$1.5 billion in savings into some other popular program?" I said, "I have been there and done that." I remember when I first got into trying to torpedo the space station, I would have transferred the money over to Veterans Affairs. That is usually an item that causes Senators to jump under their desks. If you are going to give it to the veterans, most people around here will look very cautiously before they vote no. But I didn't get any more votes than I have been getting since.

We have become so inured to cost overruns, we just simply cannot stop a big project once it is started. Only two things that come to mind that we finally did stop. One was the Clinch River breeder reactor, which incidentally was also my amendment. Howard Baker was majority leader. Maybe you think that wasn't an uphill battle. But the American scientific community began to rise up in arms, and the environmentalists threw a fit. So, finally we decided that we did not want to follow the breeder reactor method of generating electricity in this country and

we finally killed it after I spent 4 years standing at this desk, talking about the folly of that project. We had already started digging ground down in Clinch River to build it.

The other thing we terminated was the super collider. That's another one of my amendments. I guess the reason they happen to come to mind is that I happen to be the architect of killing both of them. The super collider, this massive hole in the ground in Texas, nobody really talked much about the science of the super collider. All they talked about was all the jobs it was going to create in Texas, which indeed it would have.

Let me just, while I am on the subject of jobs, point something out. The space station—if you want to make it a jobs program go home and tell the chamber of commerce that it costs \$140,000 for every job it creates. Take the same proposition to General Motors or anybody else: You come into our community and we will give you \$140,000 for every job you create. They will be standing on line from here to New York to try to take you up on that offer.

You think about the fact it costs \$10,000 to \$12,000 a pound for every pound of material we send to the space station. And now there is an estimate, if you have four astronauts on board, they can only devote 4 hours a day each to research-related activities. So, if you have four American astronauts, that's 16 hours a day that they could put into science. Do you want to know how expensive that is? Well, NASA says it will cost \$1,300,000,000 a year to operate the station. So, it will only cost the taxpayers \$230,000 for each hour the astronauts put in actually working on scientific experiments on the space station. Do you want to hear one better than that? The space station is to have a 10-year life and it will cost all-told about \$100 billion. Figure that one out: \$25 million a day is going to be the cost of keeping the space station up there.

Do you have any idea, when we sit in the Agriculture Committee talking about research, how we have to grovel and fight and scratch and claw for every dime we get for research? Do you have any idea what \$25 million will do? Do you know the National Institutes of Health can only fund one out of every four good scientific projects that are brought to them? And we are talking about honest to God research. Research on cancer, on AIDS, on arthritis—every conceivable kind of disease that afflicts mankind is handled through the National Institutes of Health, to which we give about \$13 to \$14 billion a year. And they can only fund one out of every four experiments. That is real science. You can book it. Do you know what real medical research could be done if we simply gave them the cost of one space shuttle flight? They could fund one out of every three proposals.

Last week I conducted a hearing on immunizations. There is going to be a

big to-do over at the White House tomorrow on the remarkable success we have had on immunizations. In a hearing last week it was revealed by some pharmaceutical companies, and the Centers for Disease Control in Atlanta, that we now face the possibility of eliminating measles worldwide, as we are about to eradicate polio worldwide. We now have new vaccines, even for children's earaches; even for dysentery. Last year we had 50,000 hospitalizations last year of children with dysentery, and 20 children died—but worldwide those figures are nothing. Worldwide, dysentery kills so many children—but not as many as measles. Does that shock you? Measles is still the biggest killer of children in the world; 1 million children a year die of measles.

At the hearing they told us about all these new vaccines. For example, for infants—put a little something in each nostril of the nose and they will never get flu. You can also use that in combination with another vaccine which, as I say, will keep them from getting dysentery.

I'll tell you what I'll do, I'll stand on my head on the top of this Capitol if you ever get anything even remotely close to those kinds of advances after you spend \$100 billion. For 6 years I have listened to Senators come over here, they are my friends and colleagues and I don't denigrate their feelings about it, but when you start asking, "What are the scientific experiments we are going to conduct?" "Well, we don't know. We have to get up there and find out what we are looking for."

It was Dr. Nicolaas Bloembergen, of Harvard, who made the best statement I ever heard about research on the space station. Incidentally, he is adamantly opposed to it. I'll come back to that. I'm going to take about 20 minutes just reading quotes from the top physicists, medical doctors, you name it, about the space station, before I sit down. Do you know what he said about microgravity research, which is the big thing everybody talks about; that is research you do in weightlessness? He said, "microgravity is of microimportance." That says it all. Why else would we be sending a station up there to do scientific experiments except it is a weightless situation?

Another great physicist whom I will quote in a moment said, "It is the worst place to do microgravity research with men on board or women on board." That is because, if you are looking for an experiment that requires weightlessness and you have people tromping around in the station and vibrating it, you lose the benefit. You would expect a 6-year-old to understand that.

Mr. President, let me just bring you up to date. In 1996, the General Accounting Office to do a report on the space station. It was not the most devastating report I ever read in my life, and of course I was looking for some-

thing that I might hang my hat on that just might jar this place into action. But there were really no bombs in the 1996 GAO report, except they predicted that unless certain things happened certain other very undesirable things were going to happen, namely unless the Russians came through with their part of this project the cost was going to skyrocket.

One Senator came to me in 1994 and said: "DALE, I think this cooperation with Russia is a tremendous idea. We can keep their space scientists busy and they won't be off in Iraq and Iran, building missiles for some of the rogue nations." And he said, "You know, we have to help the Russians all we can. They have big problems."

I said: "That's right. But if we are going to send them \$200 million for openers, just to say they will be a part of the international space station, I say send it to them in economic aid or food. That is what they need. They do not need to be participating in one of the biggest boondoggles ever conceived. What they need is something to help their people with their infrastructure, build industry, feed their people."

So what has happened, as predictable as night following day, is Russia has reneged. We gave them close to \$200 million for openers to build the first section of the work they were supposed to do. We gave them that money.

They were supposed to build the service module. There are nine modules on this space station. They were supposed to build the third one, but a very important one, called the service module, and they have not been able to come up with all the money, nor are they likely to. I will return in a moment to some of the consequences of that.

But back to the GAO report. Congressman DINGELL and I asked the GAO to update their 1996 report. Here is the update, which we received last night and which anybody else who wants it can get this morning. Here is what the GAO update says. If there is anything people around here detest, it is somebody going around telling them, "I told you so," so I won't say it.

Listen to this:

The prime contractor's—

That is Boeing's—

cost and schedule performance on the space station, which showed signs of deterioration last year, has continued to decline virtually unabated. Since April 1996, the cost overrun has more than tripled.

Let me repeat that:

Since April 1996—

A little over a year ago—

the cost overrun has more than tripled and the schedule slippage has increased by almost 50 percent.

Does it not take nerve to come in here asking us to go forward with a \$100 billion project in the light of that?

Financial reserves are dwindling with up to 6 years remaining until on-orbit assembly of the space station is completed.

That is what we are looking at now. We still have 6 years to go before we

even get that sucker assembled in space:

... with up to 6 years remaining until on-orbit assembly of the space station is completed. NASA has already identified actual and potential resource demands that exceed the station's remaining financial reserves.

As the French say, here comes the piece de resistance:

NASA transferred \$462 million from its science budget to the space station development budget in fiscal years 1996 through 1998.

Why did NASA transfer \$462 million from its science account to the manufacturing of the space station? To cover the cost overruns. And the \$462 million comes out of the science budget. Either you are going to reduce the scientific experiments on this thing by \$462 million, or NASA is going to come back to Congress and say we need \$462 million more. Which do you think that is going to be? We all know what it is going to be, and this is just the beginning:

It is also planning to transfer another \$70 million in fiscal 1999 from the science fund to the station development budget.

Mr. President, NASA says that to assemble and build the space station, the cost will be \$17.4 billion, and within that are these scientific funds. They are taking money from Peter to pay Paul, but they are taking money out of the account that they say is absolutely essential to justify the space station, namely, the science that we are going to get. You can't have it both ways, or you can, too, in the U.S. Senate.

Congress approved the transfer of \$200 million this year. We approved a \$200 million transfer from the space shuttle. I just told you that they have transferred \$462 million from their science account over to the space station account. Now we are giving them authority to transfer money from the shuttle account, the manned space program that most people around here applaud, and are putting it into the space station. Why? To cover the cost overruns on the space station. It is the most traditional, time-honored shell game that any of us know anything about, and that is to cover the cost incurred because the Russians have been so late in coming up with their money.

There is another \$100 million pending in Congress for the year 1998. That is in the House bill; that is not in the Senate bill. But, in addition to allowing them to take \$200 million out of the shuttle fund and put it into the space station, now the House has said, "We will give you another \$100 million to transfer to the space station." This is actually outside the \$17.4 billion. The \$462 million in science funds is inside the \$17.4 billion and can only be classified as a whopping cost overrun.

This is one of the most interesting things that the GAO report said:

When NASA redesigned the space station in 1993. . . .

You remember, President Clinton looked at a whole list of them and finally came up with what was finally called International Space Station Alpha:

When NASA redesigned the station in 1993, it estimated that Russia, as a partner, would reduce program costs by \$1.6 billion because the station's assembly would be completed sooner.

It would be finished in June 2002 instead of September 2003, the proposition being that if the Russians came through, we would build it faster and, therefore, save \$1.6 billion.

Mr. President, those are not my figures, those are NASA's figures, those are NASA's statements. And this is what GAO said about it:

NASA has recently acknowledged that completion of the station's assembly would indeed slip to 2003. . . .

Fifteen months later than we have been told since time immemorial this thing would be finished.

While NASA has not acknowledged the 2003 date, they have yet to tell us what the new milestone will be. And the GAO says:

Consequently, most, if not all, of the reduced costs claimed by accelerating the schedule by 15 months would be lost by slipping the schedule by a similar amount.

In short, now we are back to the old time schedule, and the \$1.6 billion that NASA said they would save by bringing Russia into the program and, therefore, building it 15 months sooner than we would otherwise have built won't be saved.

NASA has not told us yet precisely when they expect to have this thing finished, nor precisely what a 15-month slippage at this point is going to cost, though I can tell you, based on the conversations I had with people who know more about this program than anybody else, it is \$2 billion.

Mr. President, I tried to torpedo the space station since the memory of man runneth not. I have tried in almost more times than there have been design changes, new partners, and new promises by NASA, and until this very moment, NASA is trying to con the Senate by showing this magnificent film about Mars over in the Dirksen Building and still smoothly promising that everything is running on target, on schedule, and the only reason we know that isn't true is because GAO has done two studies that contradict NASA 180 degrees.

We don't need a space station. The Mir is the seventh Russian space station. The Mir has been in orbit, how long? Eleven years. The Mir has been up there 11 years, and now it is in big trouble. I am not saying that is predictable. I will say this, and this is not to bash Russia—I believe in doing everything we can to help their economy and keep them viable—but their space program is not as sophisticated as ours. While I understand all the arguments for bringing Russia into this, I am not sure scientifically and from a safety standpoint it is good to do it.

But the point I wanted to make is, again, I have stood on this floor for 6 long years and said show me, tell me what are the scientific achievements Russia has achieved in 20 years of hav-

ing a space station in orbit. And I have been met by a deafening roar of silence. There are none. The only justification for a space station is as a way station to Mars.

Mr. President, look at this chart, and I will say that in 1984, Ronald Reagan, I think it was in a State of the Union Address, said we were going to build a space station—that was in 1984; that has now been 13-plus years—we were going to build a space station for \$8 billion and deploy it and operate it. That was the initial promise of the President. At that time, here were the justifications. Look at them.

It was going to be a staging base, presumably to go to Mars.

It was going to be a manufacturing facility. We were going to manufacture a new kind of sophisticated crystal in a microgravity atmosphere.

It was going to be a space-based observatory.

It was going to be a transportation node.

It was going to be a servicing facility, presumably for people on their way to Mars.

It was going to be an assembly facility, again, to assemble the parts of a space station to go to Mars.

It was going to be a storage facility.

And, finally, it was going to be a research laboratory.

You can see from my chart how many of those exist today. Seven of them have been torpedoed, and only one remains standing.

Go back to the original \$8 billion that President Reagan said it was going to cost. Here is an update on that. I tell you, I cannot keep the grin off my face as I go through these things. You just cannot believe it, you cannot believe it, and yet Senators will come in here and vote for this thing.

The President said \$8 billion. Here is what we spent on the Reagan plan—\$11.2 billion. That is gone. What we got out of that is so infinitesimal you might as well have thrown the money off the Washington Monument. It would have helped a few poor people.

So when Bill Clinton became President, he said this thing is out of control, we have to have another look at it. So we have a big design—a design-off I guess you would call it. And they look at dozens of plans over at the White House about what kind of a space station it ought to be.

Obviously, the first one was much too grandiose, going to be much too costly. So they come up with the International Space Station Alpha. And we are going to participate with Europe and Canada and Japan, and now of course Russia.

And here is what the construction cost was going to be between 1994 and 2002—\$17.4 billion. I have alluded to that figure several times already.

Now, anybody who believes that the construction and development of the international space station is going to be \$17.4 billion, you go ahead and vote for it. You have my permission. You

certainly will not lose my friendship, if you actually believe that. But if you actually believe that, you haven't got enough you-know-what to be a Member of Congress. But if you believe that, go ahead and vote for it.

The GAO had just gotten through issuing a report this morning saying that is nonsense. And here is the operating costs for 10 years, \$13 billion.

Mr. President, do you know the cost of this program and the cost of all the 83 shuttles it is going to take to get it up there and supply it? The cost is going to be staggering. You know, the cost of gold is \$325 an ounce today. That is peanuts compared to what a pound of water will cost to supply these astronauts, just peanuts. It is like 33 times more to send a pound of water. Maybe not that much. I do not want to exaggerate too far. So here is your operating cost, \$13 billion.

Here are the shuttle flights needed to launch, service and use the station in space—\$50.5 billion. Mr. President, let me tell you something about that. At present, that is 83 launches that are going to be necessary to deploy it and supply it for 10 years after it is deployed—\$50.5 billion. That is calculated I think on the basis of the space shuttle, the flights running around \$475 million each.

I can remember when I used to get teary-eyed seeing that shuttle take off when they first developed it. Such a magnificent thing to see. One day somebody told me each launch cost almost \$500 million, and my eyes dried up almost immediately.

Here are just the related costs of the space station—\$1.9 billion on these shuttle flights. Let me tell you, if you believe that 83 shuttles will leave within a 5 to 7 minute launch window without a hitch over the next 15, 16 years, you vote for it, if you believe that every shuttle is going to go up without a hitch, rendezvous with the space station without a hitch, take the needed supplies to the astronauts, all of that, and every launch launched within a 5 to 7 minute timeframe, which is absolutely necessary. And if you do not make it within that 5 to 7 minute envelope, you delay the launch and the costs soar.

I have a chart here, Mr. President, about the cost of gold. I guess we can all relate to gold. Here it is. The present cost of the space station is estimated by GAO—incidentally, this is not DALE BUMPERS; this is GAO—\$94 billion. That is 25 times its weight in gold. And, as I said earlier, that is \$25 million per day of operation.

It is a jobs program. I said 140,000 jobs. Each job costs \$147,000. Three States—California, Texas, and Alabama—they get about 78 percent of all the money. The other 22 to 24 percent goes to virtually every other State. There are only a handful of States that do not have a little piece of the action. NASA is not stupid. They took a leaf out of the Pentagon's book. And they put those contracts into almost every

State. I think there is a little \$50,000 contract in Arkansas on the space station. That is just not quite enough to influence me. It provides no commercial value. And it costs \$12,880 to transport one pound of material to the station.

Mr. President, let me now go to what some of the scientists say about this project.

Before I do that, here is another little overrun. You cannot compute the cost on this—this is manhours—but I want you to think about this. In 1993, NASA said that the assembling of the space station would require about 311 hours of EVA—extravehicular activity. It is space walking. In 1993, they said it would take 311 hours of space walks to assemble it. Then they decided they miscalculated, and they moved it up to 434 hours. And then they decided they miscalculated it again, and in 1996 they said, "We miscalculated, and it's going to take 1,104 hours of space walking to assemble the station." And now, just very recently, believe it or not, 1 year from the time the first launch is supposed to occur, they say it is going to take 1,519 hours. NASA has only miscalculated by 500 percent the number of hours it will take to assemble the space station. And their calculations on everything else are running pretty close.

Mr. President, let me tell you what people who know a lot more about the science than I do are saying.

Incidentally, I watched Senator GLENN yesterday. He is not just one of my very dearest friends, he came to the Senate with me in 1975. He is one of the finest men—I think just the finest, most decent man I have ever known. We do not disagree very often, but we disagree strongly on this. We battle back and forth in the cloakroom about it.

He has circulated a brochure that ties the space station to research on aging. God knows, I ought to be interested in that. Well, ironically one space shuttle flight to the space station will cost almost as much as the entire \$454 million budget of the National Institute on Aging. One space shuttle flight would finance the National Institute on Aging for 1 year.

Now, you ask yourself, do you think you are really going to get anything about aging out of the space shuttle? What you are going to get is an expensive \$450 million, and you are going to get nothing. If you gave it to the National Institute on Aging, you at least have an outside chance of something happening.

Here are the editors of *Discovery Magazine* from May 1997, 2 months ago. Listen to this:

There is no use belaboring the point. Only the naive or the vested still maintain that there is any good pragmatic reason to spend the tens of billions of dollars it will take to complete what started out in the early 1980s as *Freedom* and now endures as the *International Space Station*. . . . Is it possible to imagine a technological undertaking so enormous that could garner less respect from the scientific community?

That says it all, but I am not going to quit.

Here is what Marsha Smith, who was interviewed in *Aerospace America* in June 1995, said I visited with her in my office yesterday. She is the brightest person in this country on this subject. She does not try to tint it one way or another. She just calls it like it is. She is not unalterably opposed to the space station, for that matter. But I say this simply to demonstrate publicly my intense and high regard for her.

I don't know of any breakthroughs that have come out of [Russian] space station programs in terms of new or cheaper-to-produce materials or scientific discoveries Mostly they have learned how to operate a space station for long periods of time.

Now, Mr. President, I again issue the call. What have the Russians got for 20 years of having the space station in orbit that is worthy of the name "scientific"?

Listen to what Tim Beardsley of *Scientific American* said in June 1996, a little over 1 year ago.

The value of biological and health research in orbit has been challenged by Elliott C. Levinthal, a former program director of the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency [that is called DARPA over at the Defense Department] . . . Levinthal, who has been a professor of genetics and mechanical engineering at Stanford University, asserts that no neutral committee handing out funds for basic research in biology would support microgravity studies.

And that is all the scientific justification you can find for the space station—microgravity research. Anything else obviously you can do here on Earth. As a matter of fact, you can do this in the shuttle. You can even do it in unmanned flights.

James Ferris of Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, in *Scientific American*:

Nothing has come out of microgravity research to convince me that a material can be fabricated in orbit that is going to be better than what you can make on Earth.

Why do we want to spend \$100 billion to manufacture something we can do just as well on Earth, and for a fraction of the cost?

Here is what the German Physical Society said. And incidentally, Germany is involved in paying for some of the costs.

Except for investigations carried out on humans themselves, all experiments in this area of research can be carried out unmanned, without loss of precision. This also applies to microgravity. Therefore it is improper [it is improper] to use microgravity as an effective argument in favor of manned spaceflight.

That statement was endorsed by the European Physical Society, all the physicists in Europe, the Physical Society of Japan—our physicists' counterpart in Japan—the Canadian Association of Physicists and the American Physical Society.

So, Mr. President, there you have it. International space station *Freedom*, partly being paid for by the Japanese, by the European Space Agency, by

Canada—forget Russia for the time being. And how do their physicists feel about it? There is the European Physical Society, the Japanese Physical Society, the Canadian Physical Society and the American Physical Society, and that takes just about every physicist in America, who says this is improbable nonsense. It reminds me of going to a doctor and saying, "Doctor, I have this hurting in my chest," and he x-rays me and says, "It looks to me like you have cancer." And I say, "Well, it may be, but I will go find a Senator to validate this. I'm not taking your word for it; I want to take the word of the U.S. Senate and see if I have cancer of the lung." That is not far off. The scientists all oppose the space station. Yet, as I said in my opening remarks, it is so impossible to convince the Senate.

Incidentally, when it comes to the American Physical Society, its spokesman in the past, as I said a moment ago, has been Dr. Park. Dr. Park said, in July 1993:

It is the view of the American Physical Society that scientific justification is lacking for a permanently manned space station in Earth orbit. We are concerned that the potential contribution of a manned space station to the physical scientist has been greatly overstated and that many of the scientific objectives currently planned for the space station can be accomplished more effectively and at a much lower cost on Earth.

Unmanned robotic platforms or on the shuttle. All he represents is 41,000 physicists in this country. He goes on to say, quoting Professor Nicolaas Bloembergen of Harvard—and I said earlier I thought he was a Nobel laureate, and he is, in physics—Dr. Bloembergen of Harvard, a Nobel laureate and physicist, summed it up bluntly in testimony before a Senate committee 2 years ago: "Microgravity is of microimportance."

How is it we know so much more here? After all, we are throwing \$2.1 billion of the taxpayers' money at this project every year, and you saw the figures and where we are headed—\$94 billion today, Lord knows how many billions ultimately.

I think there is an assumption, says one physicist, that any program that spends \$15 billion per year is bound to produce something that society can use, but few of NASA's claims stand up. Indeed, an interim NASA study of technology transfer which became public in January acknowledged that NASA spinoff claims were exaggerated. That is an in-house memo that NASA's claims were exaggerated, including such famous examples as Velcro, Tang, and Teflon. Contrary to popular belief, the study found NASA created none of these. They merely publicized them.

Here is what Carl Sagan said: "A space station is far from an optimum platform for doing science." And the Space Sciences Board said it "sees no scientific need for this space station during the next 20 years," and went ahead to say, "Continued development of Space Station Freedom . . . cannot be supported on scientific grounds."

Mr. President, I have two or three other scientists I will quote and then I will turn it back to the managers of the bill. Incidentally, I listened yesterday and I listened again today to all these gigantic, frankly, highly specious, spurious claims about how we will find a cure for this and a cure for that. If the doctors in the scientific community say that is hogwash, who are we to question them? Somebody to keep a few jobs in our State.

Here is what Dr. Rosenthal said on cancer research:

Statements have been made and published to the effect that vital cancer research would be done in space, and that is cited as a reason for supporting space station funding. We cannot find valid scientific justification for these claims and believe it is unrealistic to base a decision on funding the space station on that information . . . Based on the information we have seen thus far, we do not agree that a strong case has been made for choosing to do cancer research in space over critically needed cancer research here on earth.

That was David Rosenthal, Harvard Medical School, testifying on behalf of the American Cancer Society.

Dr. Shaun Ruddy, on behalf of the Arthritis Foundation:

Space station proponents have indicated that the Space Station . . . will provide a "first class" laboratory . . . We used to have "first class" laboratories in universities and medical schools across the country . . . Reports by the National Institutes of Health and National Science Foundation have indicated that over 51 percent of the biological laboratory research is deemed inadequate for the conduct of research . . . Furthermore, the National Science Foundation report estimated that the capital construction backlog is approximately \$12 billion . . . Should our priorities now be a "first class" laboratory in space, or correction of a longstanding deficiency in laboratories throughout this Nation?

Ms. MIKULSKI. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUMPERS. I am happy to yield to the Senator.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I bring to the Senator's attention that it is 12:10.

Mr. BUMPERS. I appreciate the Senator.

Ms. MIKULSKI. My question is, does the Senator wish to continue before we adjourn at 12:30?

Mr. BUMPERS. I apologize for going longer than I intended. I was having such a good time. As I told the Senator earlier, I do have a little thing I need to tend to during the noon hour. Let me just suggest I be permitted to leave while people on your side speak on the other side of this issue, and then perhaps we can rejoin the issue around 2:30 after the caucuses.

However, I understand there may be something else coming up.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I bring to the Senator's attention that at 2:15, the Senate will go to consideration of military construction. Upon completion of that, we will return to the bill.

Perhaps before the Senator leaves for his other Senate commitment, you and I can talk about that.

Mr. BUMPERS. I am delighted to do that. I am sure we can reach an agreement on a time certain to vote and even a wrap-up time for each side, if that is possible.

Ms. MIKULSKI. We would like very much to be able to do that for the Senator. We go to MilCon at 2:15 for 30 minutes, and from there we will first have a vote on MilCon. Then we resume consideration of the bill. At such time, I believe Senator WELLSTONE wishes to talk about compelling needs of veterans, and you have to be in an agricultural markup. We wonder if then around 4 o'clock, you could go to wrap-up and we could have a vote?

Mr. BUMPERS. Let me suggest we agree on this without getting a formal agreement. That we start on this again at 4 o'clock, and I promise, say, 15 minutes would do me to wrap it up, maybe 15 minutes on your side, and we could vote at 4:30.

Mr. BOND. If my colleagues will yield, first, let me enter into the RECORD a unanimous consent to go to the MilCon measure, so we will get that, and we can have that taken care of, and then I will speak with the proponent of the amendment, my ranking member, and I hope we can work out an accommodation acceptable to him.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—H.R. 2016

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at 2:15 today the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar 117, H.R. 2016, the military construction appropriations bill. I further ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments and the manager's amendment be agreed to, no other amendments be in order to the bill, there be 20 minutes for debate equally divided in the usual form, with an additional 10 minutes under the control of Senator MCCAIN. I finally ask unanimous consent that at the expiration or yielding back of time, the bill be read the third time, and the Senate proceed to a vote on passage of H.R. 2016.

I further ask unanimous consent that immediately following passage, the Senate then insist on its amendment and request a conference with the House, and the Chair be authorized to appoint conferees on the part of the Senate.

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

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. BOND. I further ask unanimous consent that Floyd DesChamps, a detailee from the Department of Energy, with the Commerce, Science, and Transportation Committee, be given access to the floor during the Senate discussions on the VA-HUD-independent agencies appropriations bill.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 944

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, if the ranking member will accommodate me, I will make just a few remarks in opposition to the amendment and then we

will attempt to establish a timeframe for further proceedings on this bill.

Mr. President, we have had a very eloquent statement by the Senator from Arkansas about questions that have been raised about the international space station. Needless to say, this question has been addressed time and time again on this floor. There are those scientists who have questions and objections. Nevertheless, the vast body, I think, of scientific knowledge and scientific expertise indicates that the space station is a tremendous opportunity for us to expand our knowledge not only about space but to develop new processes, new pharmaceuticals, medical advancements, and items that can be of tremendous benefit for us here on Earth.

Yesterday, for example, I note that the distinguished Senator from Ohio, our only space astronaut-Senator, talked at some length about the tremendous number of advances in scientific knowledge that have come from exploration in space. The bioreactor produces artificial human tissue potentially useful in treating colon and prostate cancer, production of kidney tissue and the cartilage tissue for implants. Fluid physics, which can be observed in space, help us understand the processes on Earth, such as how the soil behaves during earthquakes. There is research in microgravity to develop new pharmaceuticals and neurological research, important to patients with multiple sclerosis. The list goes on and on, and I will not go into that here because there are a number of other Senators who have expertise in this area who wish to be heard on the measure.

Let me say that the international space station will be a world-class scientific laboratory, with the unique feature of a near-zero gravity environment. While it is impossible for us to know in advance, all of the results of this scientific research, I think the vast body of scientific expertise believes that microgravity research will lead to new and pure pharmaceuticals, medical advancements, and the production of new materials for use here on Earth.

With the imminent demise of Russia's Mir space station, the international space station will be the only facility where these types of research can be permitted.

The international space station will also provide operational experience necessary for operating lunar outposts on Mars bases if and when the Nation should decide to proceed with such bold plans.

Moreover, Mr. President, the international space station is a hallmark of international cooperation between the United States and other countries. Europe, Japan, and Canada have been involved with the program since its inception, and the addition of Russia in 1993 enhanced the international participation. There is no greater symbol of the end of the cold war than the United States and Russia—arch rivals

in space for decades—working together to build a space station for the 21st century.

Despite the challenges the program has had to overcome in the past year—particularly the schedule delays resulting from Russia's failure to complete the service module on time—the space station partnership remains intact.

Russia has faced great financial troubles and uncertainties, and it is impossible to say that all these troubles are in the past. But this spring the Russian Government, though strapped financially, fulfilled its promise to provide 800 billion rubles, and NASA reports that work is progressing on the service module.

American taxpayers have invested significantly—\$19 billion—in the space station. We are now within a year of the first launch, which will provide the benefits and the scientific advancements into that research. Certainly, this is no time to give up on an experiment that offers such potential.

The shuttle-Mir program, the first phase of the international space station, is successfully underway. The experiments have led to improvements in the design of the international space station, and we have trained the crews. We are ready for tremendous scientific leaps, and I trust that a significant majority of our colleagues, on a bipartisan basis, will agree that the money we have invested has been a wise investment, not only for science, technology, and the exploration of the universe now, but for the developments in the scientific advances that will come tomorrow for our children and our grandchildren, who are fascinated by the opportunities of space. The exploration of this frontier can deliver tremendous benefits. This is not the time to abort the mission and say that we have gone nineteen-twentieths, or 95 percent, of the way toward the discovery of a new world and we are going to turn back now.

Mr. President, I hope that my colleagues will once again overwhelmingly support the continuation of the space station.

I yield the floor.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, this is, once again, a bipartisan agreement that we should continue to fund the space station *Freedom*. This dazzling scientific endeavor was created under the Reagan administration, sustained under the Bush administration, and maintained under the Clinton administration.

Now, why have three Presidents of the United States all supported space station *Freedom*? They have done it for several reasons. One, because it accomplished significant science in space. Second, it is a model for what the new world order will look like in which no one nation dominates space, but each nation is best at what it best can do. The United States of America, Canada, Japan, Europe, and now the Russian involvement does show what the space program of the future will be. It will be

multilateral, multinational cooperation for multiple gains.

Mr. President, I would like to speak more on why I support the space station *Freedom*, but I note that on the floor is the Senator from Arizona. It had been our agreement to let him speak before the conference.

I want to say, before we break for the party conferences, that there is no break in bipartisan support for the space station. We are going to ensure that the space station does produce sound science, have maximum international cooperation and, once again, make both our Nation and the world proud of what we do. I will have more to say about the space station and why I am an enthusiastic, unabashed, and unrelenting sponsor of this later on this afternoon.

In the meantime, as a courtesy and collegiality to move our bill, I yield the floor now and look forward to resuming my comments on the space station later this afternoon.

Mr. MCCAIN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, the Senate is making unprecedented progress in considering the appropriations bills for fiscal year 1998. We have completed action on five spending bills, with the expectation that we will finish at least five more prior to the August recess. I must congratulate Chairman STEVENS and Senator INOUE, as well as the subcommittee managers of the bills, on their efficient management of these measures on the floor. On this bill, I want to congratulate my colleagues from Missouri and Maryland, Senators BOND and MIKULSKI, for the outstanding job they have done on this legislation.

I don't intend to unduly delay the Senate in completing consideration of the pending appropriations measures. But I want to ensure that, in our haste to act on these important spending bills, my colleagues are fully aware of the funding recommendations that are contained in this bill.

I don't enjoy returning to the Senate floor for the sixth time in a little over a week to talk about the wasteful spending in these bills.

Mr. President, this is a very important measure. It provides \$40 billion to fund programs for our Nation's veterans, who have served their country and need and deserve our respect and attention. It contains \$25 billion for our Nation's housing needs, including low-income housing programs, housing assistance for native Americans, low-cost mortgage assistance, housing for the elderly, and much more. It provides funding for our space program, programs to protect and restore the health of the environment, disaster assistance, and the activities of many other agencies. This bill totals over \$90 billion.

Yet, at the same time we are struggling to balance the budget and adequately fund necessary Federal programs, I find it somewhat disheartening that the committee spent so much time and effort to identify and protect Members' special interest items.

Mr. President, I have here a nine-page list of earmarks in this bill and the accompanying report—nine pages of set-asides for specific institutes, centers, projects, and even museums. These projects have not been considered in the normal process of prioritizing among competing requirements. They have simply been earmarked to receive funds because a Member of this body wanted to bring it home.

I ask unanimous consent that at this time this nine-page document of objectionable provisions in the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

OBJECTIONABLE PROVISIONS IN S. 1034, THE FISCAL YEAR 1998 VA-HUD APPROPRIATIONS BILL

BILL LANGUAGE

\$10 million of HUD funds earmarked for housing demolition and replacement at Heritage House in Kansas City, Missouri.

Earmark of HUD funds for an economic development test program, including at least one Native American area in Alaska.

\$40 million earmarked for the Economic Development Initiative within HUD, "to finance a variety of efforts, including those identified in the Senate committee report", namely:

\$2.5 million for enlarging Scarborough Library at Shepherd College in West Virginia.

\$2 million for brownfield activities in Baltimore, Maryland.

\$2 million for economic redevelopment of Ogden, Utah.

\$2 million to renovate Albright-Knox Art Gallery in Buffalo, New York.

\$400,000 for a regional landfill in Charles Mix County, South Dakota.

\$2.5 million for a construction project related to Bushnell Theater in Hartford, Connecticut.

\$2.5 million for exhibit and program development at Discovery Place in Charlotte, North Carolina.

\$600,000 for the West Maui Community Resource Center in Hawaii.

\$1.5 million for renovation of Paramount Theater in Rutland, Vermont.

\$1 million for Lake Champlain Science Center in Burlington, Vermont.

\$2 million for renovation of Tapley Street Operations Center in Springfield, Massachusetts.

\$2 million to develop abandoned industrial sites in Perth Amboy, New Jersey.

\$2.5 million for New Mexico Hispanic Cultural Center.

\$400,000 for Riverbend Research and Training Park in Post Falls, Idaho.

\$2.5 million for University of Missouri for a plant genetics research unit and the Delta Research Telecommunications Resource Center.

\$2 million for Cleveland Avenue YMCA in Montgomery, Alabama, to build a cultural arts center.

\$1 million for Covenant House in Anchorage, Alaska.

\$7.1 million of HUD funds previously earmarked for an industrial park at 18th and Indiana in Kansas City, is instead earmarked

for rehabilitation and infrastructure development associated with the Negro Leagues Baseball Museum and the Jazz Museum at 18th & Vine.

\$150 million of EPA funds earmarked for construction of high priority water and wastewater facilities in the area of the U.S.-Mexico Border, including \$50 million for grants to Texas for improving wastewater treatment for colonias.

\$15 million of EPA funds for grants to Alaska to address drinking water and wastewater infrastructure needs of rural and Alaska Native Villages.

\$82 million of EPA funds earmarked for grants to construct wastewater and water treatment facilities and groundwater protection infrastructure as specified in the report, namely:

\$7 million for Burlington, Iowa.

\$7.15 million for Lake Tahoe, California.

\$5 million for Richmond and Lynchburg, Virginia.

\$7 million for Ashley Valley, Utah.

\$1 million for Ogden, Utah.

\$4 million for Jackson County, Mississippi.

\$50,000 for Kinloch, Missouri.

\$1.2 million for Las Cruces, New Mexico.

\$5 million for Virgin Valley Water District, Nevada.

\$2 million for Epping, New Hampshire.

\$4.3 million for Queen Annes County, Maryland and Pocomoke River, Maryland.

\$6 million for Bingham County, Rupert, and Rosell and Homedale, Idaho.

\$5 million for Missoula, Montana.

\$1.7 million for Essex County, Massachusetts.

\$3 million for Milton, Vermont.

\$5 million for Fayette and Fallowfield Township, Pennsylvania.

\$6.3 million for Pulaski County and Kingdom City, Missouri.

\$8 million for Abbeville, McCormick, and Edgefield Counties, South Carolina.

\$3.3 million for Jackson, Washington, and Cleburen Counties, Alabama.

REPORT LANGUAGE

Veterans' Administration:
Earmarks and directive language:

\$12.4 million add-on for a patient privacy/environmental renovation project in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

\$900,000 add-on for the National Veterans Cemetery in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma.

Directs the VA to proceed expeditiously with the expansion of the Jefferson Barracks National Cemetery in St. Louis, Missouri.

Directs the VA to move expeditiously to complete the third floor of the Jackson, Mississippi regional VA office. Sufficient funds are included in this appropriation for the completion of the third floor should the VA be ready to proceed in fiscal year 1998.

Directs VA to give priority consideration to construct a new dietary complex and boilerplant at Southeastern Veterans Center in Spring City, Pennsylvania.

Words of encouragement and support:
Urges or encourages the Veterans' Administration to consider establishing or expanding Community Based Outpatient Clinics in Vermont, West Virginia, Pennsylvania, and southern and western Maryland.

Urges additional funding to start up and test the coal-fired incinerator at the Lebanon, Pennsylvania VAMC.

Urges VA to consider procuring a mobile clinic to be operated from the Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania VAMC.

Language supporting a joint VA-DOD effort through the Joslin Diabetes Center in Boston, Massachusetts to apply methods to improve detection capability for those prone to diabetes.

Encourages the VA to continue the VA-DOD Distance Learning Pilot Program to

transition clinical nurse specialists to the role of nurse practitioners, which is established at the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences at Bethesda, Maryland.

Urges the VA to continue the demonstration project involving the Clarksburg, West Virginia VAMC and the Ruby Memorial Hospital at West Virginia University, with funding up to \$2 million.

Urges VA to provide adequate support for seven-site National Center for Post Traumatic Stress Disorder.

Language expressing continuing support for the establishment of a partnership with a private, not-for-profit research and treatment center that could deliver new cancer therapy to veterans; directs the VA to expedite efforts to establish such a partnership, and mentions that Garden State Cancer Center in New Jersey is internationally recognized in this field.

Urges the VA to provide support for a cooperative program with the Diabetes Institute of Norfolk, Virginia to develop protocols for the diagnosis and treatment of diabetic neuropathy.

Language noting the need for expanding the columbarium at the National Memorial Cemetery of the Pacific in Hawaii, and urges the VA to allocate necessary funds, estimated at \$1.5 million for this project.

Urges favorable and expeditious review of the construction applications for State veteran homes in Cameron and Warrensburg, Missouri, which would require \$13.2 million and \$13.6 million in federal funds.

Requests the VA to thoroughly and expeditiously consider applications for cemetery sites for Springfield and Higginsville, Missouri, which would require almost \$4 million in federal funds.

Housing and Urban Development:
Set-asides from Community Development Block Grant funds for a variety of projects and activities in various locations:

\$2 million for revitalization of Los Angeles, California.

\$1 million for science and mathematics programs at Morgan State University in Baltimore, Maryland.

\$2 million for expansions of the Business Development Center at Hofstra University in New York.

\$1 million for St. Louis University for community development program in LaCleda Town, Missouri.

\$1 million for University of Colorado Health Sciences Center.

Environmental Protection Agency:
Earmarks for a myriad of add-ons:

\$8 million to establish up to five university-based research centers to address the most pressing unanswered questions involved in the air particulates field.

\$2 million for Water Environment Research Foundation cooperative research program.

\$3 million for American Water Works Association Research Foundation.

\$1.75 million for National Jewish Medical and Research Center for research on the relationship between indoor and outdoor pollution.

\$2 million for Lovelace Respiratory Institute to establish a National Environmental Respiratory Center coordinate research on airborne particulates.

\$1 million for Center for Air Toxic Metals at Energy and Environmental Research Center.

\$1 million for Texas Regional Institute for Environmental Studies.

\$1 million for Institute for Environmental and Industrial Science.

\$1.5 million for Johns Hopkins University School of Hygiene and Public Health to establish a National Center for Environmental Toxicology and Epidemiology to study the effect of urban toxics on human health.

\$1 million to establish the Center for Estuarine and Coastal Ocean Environmental Research at the University of South Alabama.

\$1.5 million for Integrated Petroleum Environmental Consortium.

\$3 million to continue a demonstration project involving leaking fuel tanks in rural Alaskan villages.

\$250,000 for the Nature Conservancy of Alaska for protection of the Kenai River watershed.

\$3 million for the Southwest Center for Environmental Research and Policy.

\$1 million for the Sacramento River Toxic Pollutant Control Program.

\$500,000 for continuing of the small water system cooperative initiative at Montana State University.

\$500,000 for a small public water system technology center at Western Kentucky University.

\$2 million for the New York City watershed protection program.

\$750,000 for the Chesapeake Bay program to initiate a small watershed grants program to implement the cooperative tributary basic strategies.

\$1 million to continue the sediment decontamination technology project in the New York-New Jersey harbor.

\$500,000 for the Treasure Valley, Idaho, hydrologic project.

\$2.5 million for King County, Washington, for a molten carbonate fuel cell demonstration project at the Renton wastewater treatment plant.

\$800,000 for the National Center for Vehicle Emissions Control and Safety to establish an On-Board Diagnostic Research Center.

\$500,000 to continue the Small Business Pollution Prevention Center at University of Northern Iowa.

\$500,000 to continue the Compliance Assistance Center for Painting and Coating Technology.

\$200,000 to complete cleanup of Five Island Lake.

\$500,000 for the Ala Wai Canal watershed improvement project.

\$400,000 to continue the Maui algal bloom project.

\$100,000 for the Design for the Environment for Farmers Program to address the need to develop and adopt sustainable agricultural practices for the fragile tropical ecosystems of the American Pacific.

\$1.5 million for the Lake Champlain management plan.

\$600,000 to complete the solar aquatic wastewater treatment demonstration in Burlington, Vermont although the report language goes on to state that "The Committee does not intend to recommend funding for additional solar aquatic wastewater treatment demonstrations in view of EPA's assessment that this technology does not appear to offer any economic advantages over conventional technologies."

\$1 million for the Alabama Department of Environmental Management to coordinate a model water/wastewater operations training program.

\$150,000 to establish a regional training center at the Kentucky Onsite Wastewater Center.

\$550,000 for the Idaho water initiative.

\$1 million for Lake Weequeahic cleanup.

\$1.75 million for the Three Rivers watershed protection demonstration project in Allegheny County, Pennsylvania.

\$1.25 million to design an innovative granular activated carbon water treatment project in Oahu.

\$500,000 for a small public water system technology center at the University of Missouri-Columbia.

\$2 million for a Missouri Watershed initiative at the Food and Agricultural Policy Research Institute.

\$500,000 for a study of dioxin levels in the Ohio River basin.

\$300,000 for the California Urban Environmental Research and Education Center.

\$1 million to continue a wetlands-based potable water reuse program for the city of West Palm Beach.

\$700,000 for the Long Island Sound office.

\$2 million for the University of Missouri Agroforestry Center to support a floodplain initiative.

\$300,000 for the Northeast States for coordinated air use management.

Directive language:

Language directing EPA to consider testing ground water remediation technology developed by the International Research Center for Groundwater Research.

Language directing EPA to fund the water quality testing program along the New Jersey and New York shorelines at no less than current levels.

Language directing EPA to conduct a feasibility study for a potential pilot project to demonstrate innovative alternatives to the existing haul-water drinking water and honey bucket human waste disposal systems in the Northwest Arctic Borough.

Language directing EPA to assess whether the Edison Laboratory should be replaced and, if appropriate, to include funding in the FY 1999 budget submission.

Words of encouragement and support:

Language urging EPA to give strong consideration to funding a proposal by the Hawaii Institute of Tropical Agriculture and Human Resources to further the commercialization of agriculturally based environmental remediation technologies.

Urges EPA to give priority to soil aquifer treatment research program for indirect potable reuse of highly treated domestic wastewater being conducted in California and Arizona.

Encourages EPA to undertake a demonstration project at North Dakota State University comparing satellite data to field-gathered data on farming practices in the Oakes irrigation test area in southeast North Dakota.

Urges EPA to support the Houston Air Excellence and Leadership program which seeks to identify ways in which air pollution control policy can be targeted toward the most dangerous pollutants.

Directs EPA to strongly consider funding a proposal by Fort Scott, Kansas for additional tertiary wastewater treatment via a constructed wetland which will improve the Marmaton River.

Urges EPA to give careful consideration to the establishment of a Small Public Water Systems Technology Assistance Center at West Virginia State University and the University of New Hampshire.

Urges EPA to look at the sister lake partnership between Lake Champlain Basin and Lake Orchid in the former Soviet Union as a model for its own program.

Language stating that funding within the National Estuary Program should be provided to Sarasota Bay, Buzzards Bay, and Massachusetts Bay.

Urges EPA to provide support to exploring new ways to control zebra mussels in Lake Champlain.

Urges EPA to provide assistance to the city of Gainesville, Florida, for an innovative stormwater management project to protect the Floridian aquifer from stormwater runoff.

Urges EPA to support the Sokaogon Chipewewa community's efforts to assess the environmental impacts of a proposed sulfide mine project.

Language stating the Committee would entertain a future budget request by EPA to construct a solid oxide fuel cell/gas turbine

power system demonstration plant at EPA's Fort Meade research facility.

Language stating that EPA should provide adequate funds to continue the Dover Township, New Jersey, cancer cluster studies.

Urges EPA to provide \$3 million from the border infrastructure fund to El Paso for use in its Rio Grande environmental monitoring program and \$2 million for the federal share for construction of the Jonathan Rogers plant.

Federal Emergency Management Agency:

Words of encouragement and support:

Recommends FEMA consider using the State of Maryland's western Maryland flood task force as a model for work in other states in identifying disaster mitigation opportunities, and states that FEMA should work with the State of Maryland to fund mitigation measures identified by the task force.

Urges FEMA to continue efforts, in cooperation with the National Institute of Building Sciences and the University of South Alabama, to establish a universal methodology capable of predicting damages and loss of life caused by natural hazards.

Urges FEMA to support the Pittsford, Vermont, Fire Academy effort to expand training to rail and toxic material accidents, as recommended by the Committee in prior years.

Encourages FEMA to support the Coastal Region Development Center's efforts to develop a new model plan for southeast Georgia and other coastal states for hurricane evacuation mitigation preparedness.

National Aeronautics and Space Administration:

Earmarks and directive language:

Earmarks an additional \$10 million for Origins ATD for additional astronomy test beds that contain significant investment by U.S. institutions; directs that, in selecting the new sites, one site permit search from the southern hemisphere for candidate stars which show clear evidence of planetary systems, and a second site use a large ground-based interferometer that demonstrates new adaptive optics and nulling interferometry technologies essential for the direct detection of Earth-like planets of other stars.

Directs NASA to use \$15 million to fund up to five consortia to develop specific regional applications with the use of EOS data; each consortium much include academic institutions and end users as partners and demonstrate a value-added application of EOS data to a regional problem of significant consequence.

\$20 million increase earmarked for the bantam flight demonstrator.

\$1.5 million earmarked for MSE-Technology Applications, Western Environmental Technology Office.

\$2.5 million for a science learning center in Kenai, Alaska.

\$500,000 for the Discovery Science Center, Santa Ana, California.

\$2 million earmarked for continuing development of a national prototype space education curriculum by the Center for Space Education at the Bishop Museum, Honolulu, Hawaii.

\$5 million for facilities enhancements at the Stennis Space Center.

Words of encouragement and support:

Commends the efforts to the Stennis Space Center in commercial remote sensing and encourages that these activities continue.

Urges NASA to use a portion of the \$10 million earmarked for the next generation internet initiative to develop new internet technologies to improve interconnection to areas such as Alaska and Hawaii; also recommends Montana as an appropriate participant area in the next generation internet initiative.

National Science Foundation:

Earmarks and directive language:

\$40 million to support a competitive, merit-based initiative, which may include one or more university-based research center, to enable the development of a U.S.-led public/private research initiative supporting research into plant genomes

\$25 million earmarked for an incoherent scatter radar, which the Committee directs be used only to construct the radar collocated with the Department of Defense ionospheric research site (i.e., the HAARP project in Alaska)

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, what concerns me most is the growing practice of earmarking funds for a myriad of projects in the report language but then incorporating that report language by reference in the bill itself. For example, on pages 32 and 33, the bill language states:

Of the amounts made available under this heading, \$40 million for the Economic Development Initiative (EDI) to finance a variety of efforts, including those identified in the Senate committee report, that promote economic revitalization that links people to jobs and supportive services.

The report identifies 17 separate projects, in specific amounts and at specific locations, totaling nearly \$30 million. The effect of this bill language is to require HUD to spend three-fourths of this economic development money for these particular projects without any assessment of the relative needs of the communities which would benefit from these projects compared with many other American communities. This is a very bad practice, Mr. President. It is one of the worst that I have seen in a long time.

Another section of the bill incorporates a similar list of earmarks into the bill language. On page 62, the bill reads:

... \$82 million for making grants for the construction of wastewater and water treatment facilities and groundwater protection infrastructure in accordance with the terms and conditions specified for such grants in the report accompanying this Act. . . .

It just so happens that the only terms and conditions contained in the report are earmarks for particular projects for the entire \$82 million set aside in the bill. Again, this is backdoor earmarking and it's the worst form of pork barrel spending that I have seen in a long time.

As I have said, this bill also contains earmarks for museums, particularly, \$7.1 million for the Jazz Museum and the Negro Leagues Baseball Museum in Kansas City, MO.

The bill also earmarks \$150 million for water and wastewater facilities along the United States-Mexico border. While this earmark could conceivably benefit my own State of Arizona, I cannot understand why we cannot, instead, provide funding based on need and established criteria, rather than setting aside millions of dollars for certain States or areas of the country.

The report is replete with earmarks. One of the most interesting reads as follows:

\$600,000 for the final year of funding for the solar aquatic wastewater treatment dem-

onstration in Burlington, VT, to be cost-shared by the participants.

Get this, Mr. President:

The Committee does not intend to recommend funding for additional solar aquatic wastewater treatment demonstrations in view of EPA's assessment that this technology does not appear to offer any economic advantages over conventional technologies.

So we are going to spend \$600,000 more on a project where, in EPA's assessment, the technology doesn't offer any economic advantages over conventional technologies. It seems a little bit ridiculous to me.

Mr. President, I won't go through the nine-page list I mentioned, but there are some fascinating earmarks in here. I will tell you, it's really interesting. Here is \$1 million for renovation of the Paramount Theater in Vermont. It urges or encourages the Veterans' Administration to consider establishing or expanding community-based outpatient clinics in Vermont, West Virginia, Pennsylvania, and southern and western Maryland. You are going to have to help me out here, Mr. President. Why not in Maine, California, or Texas? Instead, it is encouraging the VA to establish expanding community-based outpatient clinics in Vermont, West Virginia, Pennsylvania, southern and western Maryland. The only thing I can say is in common there is that they are low-growth States. Why would we not want to establish or expand outpatient clinics in high-growth States—Nevada, California, Texas, or Arizona? I don't know. I don't understand.

Mr. President, we don't want to do these things. I think, as I have said on many different occasions, it doesn't help us with the American people, and we waste millions of taxpayer dollars on projects that serve our own narrow interests rather than those of the Nation at large. It makes it harder for us to whittle away at the \$5.3 trillion debt.

I yield the floor.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I know the order was for the Senate to adjourn at 12:30. I now ask unanimous consent that there be a period for morning business, in which Senator ASHCROFT be permitted to speak for 5 minutes.

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

The Senator from Missouri is recognized.

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to proceed as in morning business until the completion of my remarks.

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

THE RIGHTS OF MAN

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, last week, my friend TIM HUTCHINSON, the Senator from Arkansas, took the floor to lend his voice to a growing chorus of disapproval over the state of United States-China relations. I commend him for his actions. While his efforts to pass a sense of the Senate resolution

against most favored nation status for China were unsuccessful, his actions were the very essence of what it means to be a leader. He set out to achieve noble aspirations, and then dedicated his energies to achieve those objectives. Leadership is ascertaining noble objectives and working hard, intently and sacrificially. Such efforts push us toward our highest and best. The highest and best to which Senator HUTCHINSON called us is an end to which we must all aspire.

Teddy Roosevelt said it this way:

Far better is it to dare mighty things, to win glorious triumphs, even though checked by failure, than to take rank with those poor spirits who neither enjoy much nor suffer much because they live in the gray twilight that knows neither victory nor defeat.

Twenty-two Members of the Senate had the courage to say that the tainted flow of Western currency into China must end, not because the exchange of goods between sovereign nations is injurious, but because we have in China today a ruthless regime that does not deserve unfettered access to United States markets, a regime whose brutal repression at home betrays its intentions abroad.

America is a place that has cared always for what Thomas Paine called the "rights of man." The United States has always been a country that gave no quarter to tyranny or tyrants. Teddy Roosevelt put it a bit differently, cautioning that America must not become "an assemblage of well-to-do hucksters who care nothing for what happens beyond."

But, Mr. President, does not the vote on the Hutchinson amendment suggest that Teddy Roosevelt's worst fears are being realized? For the message being sent from China today is as unmistakable as it is disturbing. Beijing believes that life is cheap and cheaper still when that life opposes the authoritarian rule of the Communist Party.

The State Department, in its most recent human rights report, states that "all public dissent against the party and government was effectively silenced" in China. "No dissidents were known to be active at year's end." Beijing has used imprisonment, exile, and summary execution to quiet the voices of those who cry for freedom.

China's 1982 Constitution guarantees the freedom of speech, the press, and religious belief. And yet, the hollowness of that document becomes more apparent with every passing day. Chinese authorities routinely resort to torture, the denial of due process, forced confessions, prison labor, and extrajudicial killings to crush Chinese citizens who stand up for liberty and defy Beijing.

As Nina Shea notes in "The Lion's Den," China has more Christians in prison because of religious activities than any other nation. This morning's New York Times detailed a State Department report due to be issued today—and I have a copy of it here—which is sharply critical of Beijing's efforts to suppress religious worship. The