

of Justice? Where is the Federal Department of Justice on these issues? Where is the proposal of the administration on these issues? We are asked to spend more taxpayer dollars, but I am not sure it is for a coherent, comprehensive way to deal with the overall issue. That is what I am suggesting. The States are doing a much better job and a much more aggressive job getting after this than we are. And an amendment is being suggested here to solve all those problems. Well, that is just not an accurate reflection of the facts, is it, Madam President?

So I urge, when we make a motion to table the amendment, once all time has been used or yielded back, that the Senate vote for the motion to table to permit us to continue to consider appropriations bills in this orderly fashion so that we can expedite their consideration and be fair to all Senators who offered amendments when the Senate considered the bill. I thank the Senators very much for their careful attention to this discussion.

Madam President, if all time has been used—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

Mr. COCHRAN. Then I move the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Iowa be tabled.

Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to table amendment No. 1057. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. WARNER] and the Senator from Alaska [Mr. MURKOWSKI] are necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced, yeas 28, nays 70, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 212 Leg.]

YEAS—28

Ashcroft	Gorton	Roberts
Brownback	Gramm	Santorum
Burns	Grams	Sessions
Coats	Hagel	Shelby
Cochran	Helms	Smith (NH)
Domenici	Hutchinson	Stevens
Enzi	Hutchinson	Thomas
Faircloth	Inhofe	Thurmond
Ford	Lott	
Frist	McConnell	

NAYS—70

Abraham	Campbell	Feingold
Akaka	Chafee	Feinstein
Allard	Cleland	Glenn
Baucus	Collins	Graham
Bennett	Conrad	Grassley
Biden	Coverdell	Gregg
Bingaman	Craig	Harkin
Bond	D'Amato	Hatch
Boxer	Daschle	Hollings
Breaux	DeWine	Inouye
Bryan	Dodd	Jeffords
Bumpers	Dorgan	Johnson
Byrd	Durbin	Kempthorne

Kennedy	Mack	Roth
Kerrey	McCain	Sarbanes
Kerry	Mikulski	Smith (OR)
Kohl	Moseley-Braun	Snowe
Kyl	Moynihan	Specter
Landrieu	Murray	Thompson
Lautenberg	Nickles	Torricelli
Leahy	Reed	Wellstone
Levin	Reid	Wyden
Lieberman	Robb	
Lugar	Rockefeller	

NOT VOTING—2

Murkowski	Warner
-----------	--------

The motion was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the adoption of the Harkin amendment.

The Senate will please come to order.

Mr. BYRD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia is recognized.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Chair please state the question that is now before the Senate on which we are about to vote?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment No. 1057, the Harkin amendment.

The amendment (No. 1057) was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the text of S. 1033, as amended, including amendment No. 1057, is substituted for the text of H.R. 2160, and the bill is read for the third time and passed.

The bill (H.R. 2160), as amended, was read the third time and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate insists on its amendment, requests a conference with the House, and the Chair is authorized to appoint conferees.

The Presiding Officer (Mr. ALLARD) appointed Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. SPECTER, Mr. BOND, Mr. GORTON, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. BURNS, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. BUMPERS, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. KOHL, Mr. BYRD, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. INOUE conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. COCHRAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. COCHRAN. On behalf of the distinguished Senator from Virginia, [Mr. WARNER], I ask unanimous consent, in accordance with paragraph 2 of rule VI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, that Senator WARNER be permitted to be absent from the work of the Senate for this morning to serve as a pallbearer in Warrenton, VA, for Robert Canard, a former farm employee and friend of more than 30 years. Bob and his wife Dorothy have long been considered members of the Warner family.

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

Who seeks recognition?

Mr. BIDEN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be able to proceed for up to 20 minutes as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Hearing no objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KYL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I had sought recognition before the Chair ruled on the unanimous-consent request. I wonder if I could engage in a colloquy, a brief colloquy, regarding the request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona may proceed.

Mr. KYL. I was prepared to begin a debate at this point on an amendment which I laid down yesterday, which my understanding was we were going to try to conclude prior to roughly the noon hour because of a request by two other Senators, I believe Senator MOYNIHAN and another Senator, to speak during that period of time.

I just wonder if Senator SPECTER could be involved here and if we could quickly get an agreement. I am perfectly willing to accommodate the Senator from Delaware, but we need to get an agreement on how we are going to proceed here because I was going to conclude my part of this and then attend a committee hearing, which may not be possible if the Senator moves forward.

I ask the Senator from Pennsylvania what his intentions are.

Mr. SPECTER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SPECTER. I thank my colleague from Arizona for his inquiry.

If it is consistent with the scheduling of the Senator from Arizona, I suggest that we defer to the Senator from Delaware for a period of time for morning business.

Would that be acceptable to the Senator?

Mr. KYL. Would this mean we could take up my amendment at roughly 11 o'clock?

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I will attempt to keep this under 15 minutes, if that will help.

Mr. SPECTER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SPECTER. I ask unanimous consent that we proceed with the amendment by the distinguished Senator from Arizona at 10:45.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, that is certainly fine with me if it does not inhibit the Senator.

Mr. BIDEN. That is fine.

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

The Senator from Delaware is now recognized.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I thank the chairman of the committee, Senator SPECTER, for accommodating me and my friend from Arizona.

AMERICAN POLICY IN BOSNIA

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, having just returned from a trip to Bosnia, I would like to describe my impressions

and offer my views on American policy there, if I may.

As many of my colleagues will remember, and some would rather not remember, over the last 6½ years I have been bipartisan in my criticism and my critical statements about our policy toward the states of the former Yugoslavia. I began criticizing the Bush administration early in 1991 and continued to criticize the Clinton administration until September of 1995 when it finally carried out the airstrikes that I had called for 3 years earlier and subsequently lifted the immoral and illegal arms embargo on Bosnia as part of the Dayton accords.

Now, Mr. President, for the first time I find myself in general agreement with the direction of American policy. My change of opinion does not, however, reflect either complete satisfaction or complacency. We have reached a very critical point in our policy toward Bosnia, Mr. President, as all of my colleagues know. Resolute American action, combined with allied support and local compliance, can turn the corner. But I respectfully suggest, absent any one of those factors—resolute American action, combined with allied support and local compliance—we will not only not turn the corner; I believe we will return to the genocide and chaos that prevailed 6 years ago.

To that end, we can, Mr. President, and we must, in my opinion, act decisively to bring indicted war criminals to trial before the International Tribunal in the Hague.

We can, and must, Mr. President, induce the authorities in the Federation and the Republika Srpska to greatly expand the number of refugees returning to their prewar homes.

We can and must, Mr. President, ensure that the countrywide municipal elections in mid-September and the parliamentary elections in the Republika Srpska in October, are held and that they are free and fair.

We can and must, Mr. President, guarantee free access to electronic media for all points of view in both the Federation and the Republika Srpska. I hope that the agreement on the television transmitter reached yesterday with the Karadzic forces is a move in that direction. If they go back on the bargain, SFOR troops should reoccupy that transmitter and take it back.

We can and must continue to support the Republika Srpska's President Biljana Plavsic in her struggle against indicted war criminal Radovan Karadzic.

We can and must, Mr. President, ensure that the decision of the arbitrator on Brcko in March 1998 is accepted peacefully.

In short, Mr. President, a lot remains to be accomplished in the coming months. But it is critically important for the American people and for my colleagues in the Congress to be clear on one fundamental point: Contrary to what is frequently stated, there has been progress on the civilian provisions

of the Dayton accords, as well as on the well-publicized military side of the equation.

To guarantee that this progress continues and expands, the international community must not withdraw its entire military stabilization force after June 1998. The negative consequences of backsliding into renewed warfare in Bosnia would far outweigh the cost of a continued, if scaled-down commitment with no or much fewer American troops.

Let me then, Mr. President, discuss the current situation in Bosnia. First, the war criminals issue. The type of operation carried out in Prijedor in July in which British and Czech SFOR troops, supported by American forces, captured one indicted criminal and killed another indicted war criminal after being fired upon, must be repeated against Dr. Karadzic and General Mladic.

After conversations with leading American military officers in Bosnia, I am confident that such an operation is feasible. No American wishes casualties to occur, but if all other means fail, force must be employed and risk taken in order to arrest these war criminals. I am confident that the opportunity will present itself, and if it is seized upon, the operation will succeed.

Moreover, I suspect that after an initial angry response, most people in the Republika Srpska would be content to go about improving their impoverished lives, relieved of the plague of the authoritarian extortionists in Pale. Apprehension of the war criminals will not be a panacea for Bosnia's ills, but in my view it is a necessary precondition for the Dayton accords to have a chance of continuing to work.

I met with opposition leaders in the Republika Srpska. I met for well over an hour with President Plavsic. I met with a Russian military commander. I met with the American military. I met with the French military. In fact, I met with most of the major players in Bosnia during the time I was there. There is not anyone who will privately tell you that Karadzic and Mladic on the loose and continuing to run the Republika Srpska does anything, anything at all positive. As a matter of fact, all will tell you privately, and most will tell you publicly, that these two must be withdrawn from the scene. They will say it in different ways. They will say, "withdrawn, captured, tried and convicted," or they will say "driven out of the country."

But the bottom line is that nobody believes there is any possibility of the Dayton accords being fully implemented if, in fact, the most notorious of the war criminals continue to run the Republika Srpska like a thug operation, undermining free elections in the Republika Srpska within Bosnia and undermining Mrs. Plavsic. Now Mrs. Plavsic is no shrinking violet, is clearly a nationalist, and is not someone we would choose if we could invent a President for the Republika Srpska.

But she is, at a minimum, honest and not running the rackets. She has greatly undermined Mr. Karadzic's power by pointing out the corruption he has engaged in and how he is literally robbing the people of the Republika Srpska.

There is still 90 percent unemployment there. At least in the Federation it has dropped from 90 percent to 50 percent. As I will discuss in a moment, there is progress being made in the Federation, slow as it may be, but there is a gigantic impediment in the Republika Srpska, and his name is Karadzic, an indicted war criminal. I have met him in the past. I told him more than 4 years ago that he was—I will not precisely repeat what I said—but I said bluntly to his face that he was a war criminal and should be tried as one. He looked at me and resumed talking as if he were saying, "Lots of luck in your senior year. No problem; thanks for talking to me." This guy is a madman, and he is undermining the prospects of any peace for the people of Bosnia—Serb, Croat, or Muslim alike.

Over the last year, the government of the Federation, comprised mainly of Muslims and Croats, has slowly begun to take meaningful shape. New national, entity, and cantonal governments were chosen in the September 1996 elections and are starting to function. The Bosnian Presidency and the council of ministers meet in regular sessions.

In Sarajevo, I had a lengthy discussion with Kresimir Zubak, the Co-President of the National Government of Bosnia and Herzegovina, with many leading figures in the Federation administration and the Cabinet, and with nonnationalist Muslim and Croat opposition leaders.

No one attempted to gloss over the friction that persists, Mr. President. As a matter of fact, I invited a group—and I will submit the list of people we invited—of leading Muslims, Croats, and Serbs to a dinner the first night I arrived. The first comment made by, I think, Federation Vice President Ejup Ganic, a Muslim, was "Senator, we have not sat down at a table like this for 6 years. You have accomplished something all by itself just by getting 15 of us to show up."

I do not want to paint a picture here that things in the Federation are rosy and wonderful. They are not. But everybody agreed on two things: First, enormous progress was being made in the Federation; and second, it is absolutely essential for the international military force to remain in Bosnia after June 1998 to guarantee that progress will continue.

I made clear that a partnership is a two-way street. Politicians from all three principal religious groups in Bosnia must make redoubled efforts to carry out the terms of the Dayton accords, especially the return of refugees.

As Americans see evidence of increased success in civilian implementation, our willingness to stay the course in Bosnia will increase accordingly.

And, Mr. President, there is much evidence to support the view that positive change is already occurring. Approximately 150,000 refugees have returned to Bosnia from abroad and another 160,000 internally displaced persons have returned to their homes, including a few to areas where they will be a distinct minority.

Meanwhile, the Train and Equip Program, led by private American military instructors, retired military, is molding a Muslim-Croat defense force for the Government of Bosnia guaranteeing the Federation's security in the future. Agreements on the Federation force structure and command have been reached, and over 300 million dollars' worth of military equipment has been procured.

Remember, Mr. President, the big problem was initially that we could not get the Muslim and the Croats in the Federation to agree to a joint military command. They would not train together. Now we have a joint military command. Muslims and Croats are sitting in the same classrooms. The officer corps and the enlisted men are all training together. There has been solid progress.

In Hadzici, west of Sarajevo, I visited the headquarters of the Train and Equip Program and spoke with the Federation's Minister of Defense and his deputy, with the commanders of the Muslim and Croat forces, and with soldiers of both armies. The cooperation is excellent, and their American trainers had high praise for their eagerness to learn and their aptitude.

In the Federation, joint police forces are being formed, including in the city of Mostar, site of the worst warfare between Muslim and Croats.

Within the framework of this modicum of stability, the economy is beginning to revive. Real gross domestic product has nearly doubled since 1995. As I mentioned, unemployment has dropped from 90 percent to 50 percent. Corruption, though, remains a major problem.

Nonetheless, if there is continued security, political progress, and international technical and financial assistance, the Federation, I believe, can be a going concern within a few years.

One of the nonnational opposition leaders with whom I met, Stjepan Kljucic, an ethnic Croat, offered the opinion that the Federation had to be better than the Republika Srpska politically, economically, and morally. Making an intriguing historical parallel, he continued that the Federation should become Bosnia's West Germany against the Republika Srpska's East Germany, even attracting guest workers from the latter as the economic disparity between the two entities widens. In this way, he felt, the two halves of the country could eventually grow together.

Whatever the validity of this vision, conditions in the Republika Srpska are already quite different from those in the Federation because of Mr. Karadzic's heavy hand. The Bosnian Serb member of the tripartite Presi-

dency, Momcilo Krajisnik, an ally of Karadzic, has refused all but minimal fulfillment of the Dayton provisions. As a result, the international community has withheld most of its development aid from the Republika Srpska.

The economy there remains in shambles with less than 10 percent of the work force gainfully employed. In the midst of this misery, Dr. Karadzic—it is hard to even call him a doctor, but he is a doctor—and his cronies ostentatiously flaunt the wealth they have amassed through smuggling and protection rackets.

It is no wonder, then, that Mrs. Plavsic's anticorruption message has struck a chord with wide segments of the population in the Republika Srpska. I met with her for an hour and a half in Banja Luka. We must not have any illusions that President Plavsic, who loudly supported Serbian ultranationalists and ethnic cleansing during the war, has suddenly become a Jeffersonian Democrat. She is, however, a realist who understands that the Bosnian Serb entity is in danger of total disintegration unless it rids itself of the lawlessness, corruption, and warped religious hatred of the Karadzic gang and begins to cooperate with the West.

In all likelihood, by seizing the Banja Luka police headquarters, SFOR prevented a coup d'etat against Mrs. Plavsic last month. Our support of her police forces and television journalists may be turning the tide against the thugs in Pale, at least in the western part of the Republika Srpska.

Since two-thirds of the population of the Republika Srpska lives in the western part of the entity, there is a good possibility that President Plavsic's supporters can win control of the Parliament in next month's election. If that occurs, we should be able to leverage the promise of reconstruction assistance to induce President Plavsic to begin to cooperate on refugee returns.

Moreover, a lively antinationalist Serbian opposition exists in the Republika Srpska. In Banja Luka, I met with three of its leaders—Miodrag Zivanovic, Mladen Ivanic, and Milorad Dodik. They feel that democracy is unstoppable and that Mrs. Plavsic, of whom they have been sworn enemies, is only a transitional figure whom they will support during this election as a step toward genuine democracy.

Actually, the beginnings of refugee returns are already occurring, including some into areas controlled by other religious groups. I visited two such sites, one in the zone of separation near the critical northern town of Brcko, the other in Vogosca, a suburb of Sarajevo which was returned to the Federation as part of the Dayton settlement.

In the Brcko area, rebuilding is proceeding under the skillful direction of the U.S. supervisor, Ambassador Bill Farrand, and the protection of the local American SFOR contingent, based nearby in Camp McGovern. I might add that I was amazed at how high the morale was in Camp McGov-

ern and how greatly impressed I was by Brig. Gen. Mark Curran and Lt. Col. Bill Greer, the two senior officers, who were doing a phenomenal job there.

Hostility in Brcko lies just below the surface, as shown by the riots organized by Karadzic loyalists less than 2 days after I left the city. The soldiers from Camp McGovern handled that potentially explosive situation with consummate professionalism, and I am confident they will continue to do so.

I will digress briefly at this point, Mr. President, to mention that an important feature of SFOR are the Russian troops under the command of General Clark, the SACEUR, the [Supreme Allied Commander Europe]. At Camp McGovern, I met with the commanding officer of the Russian SFOR airborne brigade who was enthusiastic about the cooperation with our forces and totally supportive of our action.

To return to refugee resettlement, unlike the palpable hostility in Brcko, in the Sarajevo suburb the situation was peaceful. There I saw Muslims, Croats, and one or two Serbs who were returning to rebuild their devastated homes under an imaginative program run by the United States Agency for International Development in cooperation with Catholic Relief Services.

Mr. President, it is worth underscoring here that not only are our magnificent Armed Forces under the inspired command of Gen. Eric Shinseki playing the largest single role in SFOR, but our United States Government development specialists have won universal respect among the Bosnians for being the international community's most efficient providers of assistance.

As a matter of fact, one of the Bosnian Serb opposition leaders said to me in Banja Luka that the Europeans are incapable of solving Bosnia's problems. By way of contrast he characterized the Americans as "not always sensitive but very efficient." That is just what I would like us to be—"not always sensitive but very efficient."

In summation, where do I see Bosnia and Herzegovina heading if the United States and our allies stay the course? Personally, I would like to see a multiethnic, multireligious society reemerge like the one that existed in Sarajevo before the war. I fear, however, that too much blood has been shed and too many atrocities committed for that to happen in the near future.

More realistic, and politically feasible, is the development of a multiethnic state, most likely in the form of a confederation with a good degree of decentralization.

My sense from this trip is that the ardor has cooled in the Republika Srpska for union with Serbia, since President Milosevic is regarded as a betrayer of the Serb cause and as a figure totally incapable of providing the basic material prosperity that the Bosnian Serbs so desperately crave.

Unreconstructed Croat nationalists in Herzegovina may still long for union with Croatia, but as the leadership changes in Zagreb, the new government there will be more intent on integrating with Western Europe than on annexing provincial bandits.

In short, for the first time in years, developments are moving in the right direction. As I have outlined, much hard political and economic work remains to be done, most of it by the Bosnians themselves. The United States and its allies can, and must, provide the framework for the Dayton accords to be fully implemented.

I do not minimize the cost to the American taxpayer of our efforts. Neither, however, can I underestimate the cost of a failure of the Bosnian operation. In the near future, I will indicate in some detail what I think the costs would be to the United States if, in fact, Bosnia were to erupt once again. Suffice it to say now that not only would all that has been accomplished go up in smoke as fighting reignited, but a failure in Bosnia would signal the beginning of the end for NATO, which is currently restructuring itself to meet Bosnia-like challenges in the 21st century.

Therefore, I call upon the Clinton administration immediately to begin discussions with our allies about creating a post-SFOR force after June 1998. For months, I recommended a combined joint task force with our allies, which the Senate overwhelmingly advocated in July in the 1998 defense authorization Bill.

The question of whether American participation in a post-SFOR force will be limited to air, naval, intelligence, and communications support with a rapid deployment force in reserve in Hungary, or also might include a greatly reduced ground contingent can be resolved in these negotiations.

The immediate priority is to begin the negotiations now—to make clear to all parties in Bosnia that, if they cooperate, the security framework will continue for a limited time—and to make clear to the skeptics that the new NATO can and will be the driving force in the European security architecture of the 21st century.

I thank my colleague from Arizona for his indulgence. I thank the President for the time.

I yield the floor.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR,
HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES,
AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED
AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS
ACT, 1998

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1061) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes.

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill.

Pending:

Kyl amendment No. 1056, to increase funding for Federal Pell grants, with an offset from fiscal year 1998 funding for low-income home energy assistance.

Mr. SPECTER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, yesterday I had announced our hope to be able to conclude this bill by this evening. Senator LOTT was on the floor when we were talking about scheduling and I discussed it briefly with our distinguished majority leader, and also with Senator HARKIN, the ranking Democrat, and asked that anybody who intended to file amendments to let us know by the close of business yesterday, or in any event no later than noon today. We have been advised of a number of possible amendments. I believe it is possible to work some of those out. Others will have to go to votes.

But I would restate at this time our urging anybody who intends to file an amendment to contact us by noon today so that we may proceed. There is one item which may not be completed by the close of business today, and that relates to the funding on testing which is now proposed by the administration.

There was a statement in the media by Congressman WILLIAM GOODLING of Pennsylvania, chairman of their authorization committee, of his intention to oppose funding. And there was comment that a similar prohibition may be offered on this bill.

Yesterday I was contacted by the Secretary of Education, Richard Riley, who urged support of their program, and we had a discussion. After sleeping on it I decided it would be a good idea to have a hearing on the subject, which we have put into effect for tomorrow morning at 9 o'clock, with the concurrence of Senator HARKIN and also our chairman of the appropriations committee, Senator STEVENS. So, if that amendment is offered, that one item of business might most appropriately be concluded tomorrow morning. But aside from that one item, it is my hope that we will be able to finish action on this bill this evening.

I thank my colleague, Senator KYL, for offering his amendment yesterday.

I yield the floor so that Senator KYL may proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

AMENDMENT NO. 1056

Mr. KYL. Thank you, Mr. President. I appreciate that.

I also appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Delaware preceding this. I think he makes very cogent points on a different subject.

Mr. President, I don't think the yeas and nays have been ordered on my amendment. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. KYL. Thank you, Mr. President.

At this time, let me explain the reasons for my amendment to increase Pell grant funding. I submitted a statement for the RECORD yesterday. But I would like to discuss it in a little bit more detail today.

There is particular reason for us to take this action which would bring us closer to the administration's request and into line with the recommendation from the House of Representatives. It seems odd to me that the Senate would not be willing to support Pell grant funding at the same level as recommended by the Appropriations Committee in the House of Representatives. This amendment would conform the Senate funding level to the House funding level, and there is a particular reason for this amendment coming up. That is, a problem that was created in a previous law with respect to two different groups of students that are funded. I would like to discuss that in a little bit more detail.

First, let me note the numbers. This amendment would provide an additional \$528 million for the Pell Grant Program. It would boost funding to the level recommended by the House Appropriations Committee. The Pell grant funding would go from \$6.91 billion to \$7.438 billion. The offset is from the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program, which I will discuss in just a moment.

The Pell grant funding amendment, as I said, is intended to finance changes in eligibility—that is, to correct problems that have arisen as a result of the current law phaseout of certain independent students at income levels that are lower than those for dependent students. Like the House bill, this funding level is contingent upon the authorization committee providing authorization.

We have letters from both the chairman and ranking members of the House and Senate authorizing committees indicating that should the additional funding be approved they would work for that authorization to be established.

It is also my understanding that the administration is in agreement with the House of Representative numbers with respect to the Pell grant funding.

So I think we ought to put at least as high a priority on Pell grants as the President and the House of Representatives in this version of the Labor-HHS bill.

Here is the problem that was created. In the Higher Education Amendments of 1992 we established a separate allowance for independent students without dependents—dependent students, not dependent students—dependent students who do not themselves have dependents.

The problem is, the separate allowance established under the 1992 act. It creates a substantial disparity among these groups of students very much to the disadvantage of the independent students without dependents. The proposed change in eligibility which the