seq.) and other applicable laws has not been completed and also shall include permits that expired in 1994 and in 1995 before the date of enactment of this Act.''

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, this amendment makes a correction in an amendment earlier adopted by the body on the part of the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. PRESSLER]. A confusion between himself and myself left out a couple of very important words. This makes that correction.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate on the amendment? If not, the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Washington.

The amendment (No. 570) was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 571 TO AMENDMENT NO. 420

(Purpose: A technical correction to clarify that funds proposed for rescission are from multiple prior year unobligated balances)

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Washington [Mr. GORTON] proposes an amendment numbered 571 to amendment No. 420.

Mr. GORTON. 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 23, strike lines 17–18 and insert in lieu thereof the following: ''Of the available balances under this heading, $3,000,000 are rescinded.''

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, this is a technical correction to a rescission with respect to the Kennedy Center here in Washington, DC. It does not affect the rescission. But it makes its meaning clear.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate on the amendment? If not, the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Washington.

The amendment (No. 571) was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 572 TO AMENDMENT NO. 420

(Purpose: To rescind $150,000 of the appropriation for the Office of Aircraft Service of the Department of the Interior)

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Washington [Mr. GORTON] for Mr. MURKOWSKI, proposes an amendment numbered 572 to amendment No. 420.

Mr. GORTON. 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 20, between lines 13 and 14, insert the following:

DEPARTMENTAL OFFICES

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103–332 for the Office of Aircraft Services, $150,000 of the amount available for administrative costs are rescinded, and in expending other amounts made available, the Director of the Office of Aircraft Services shall, to the extent practicable, provide aircraft services through contracting.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, this amendment is offered on behalf of the junior Senator from Alaska, [Mr. MURKOWSKI]. It rescinds $150,000 in administrative funds for the Office of Aircraft Services, and is at the request of the Senator from Alaska. It is a rescission in Alaska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate on the amendment? If not, the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Alaska.

The amendment (No. 572) was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 573 TO AMENDMENT NO. 420

(Purpose: To amend the Supplemental Appropriations and Rescissions Bill for the fiscal year ending September 1995)

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Washington [Mr. GORTON], for Mr. STEVENS, proposes an amendment numbered 573 to amendment No. 420.

Mr. GORTON. 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 81, after Line 18, add a new section as follows:

SEC. . (a) As provided in subsection (b), and Environmental Impact Statement prepared pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act or a subsistence evaluation prepared pursuant to the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act for a timber sale or offering to one party shall be deemed sufficient if the Forest Service sells the timber to an alternate buyer. (b.) The provision of this section shall apply to the timber specified in the Final Supplement to 1981–86 and 1986–90 Operating Period EIS (''1989 SEIS''), November, 1989; in the North and East Kuiu Final Environmental Impact Statement, January 1993; in the Southeast Chicagof Project Area Final Environmental Impact Statement, September 1992; and in the Kelp Bay Environmental Impact Statement, February 1992, and supplemental evaluations related thereto.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, this is an amendment in behalf of the senior Senator from Alaska, [Mr. STEVENS], and it has to do with legislative language relating to environmental impact statements. It is one that has been OK'd by both sides on the Energy Committee, as it does include authorizing legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate on the amendment? If not, the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Alaska.

The amendment (No. 573) was agreed to.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I thank you. I thank the Senator from New York.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY THE PRIME MINISTER OF THE ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF PAKISTAN, BENAZIR BHUTTO

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has the honor of welcoming the distinguished Prime Minister of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan, and I wish to bring her to the Senate floor.

RECESS

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order for the Senate to have 5 minutes in recess to greet and welcome this distinguished lady.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 4:08 p.m., recessed until 4:12 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. COATS).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I would ask the distinguished Presiding Officer if my understanding is correct that we are in a period when amendments can be offered, although several amendments—I do not know how many—have been set aside for this purpose; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct. Although it does take unanimous consent to set aside the pending

amendments before additional business can be ordered.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all the amendments necessary be set aside.

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

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I have a bit of a dilemma. I have been in Foreign Relations Committee meetings and other things most of the day. I am not aware of precisely what has happened on one issue which is of great interest to me and which I consider to be an outrageous invasion of the taxpayers money. It involves the 1995 appropriations bill containing $30 million that would be spent to build housing for Russian military officers.

My understanding is that there may have been some action to delete part of that $30 million. I will speak my opinion about this and then I will consult with the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, who is now on the floor, about whether my understanding is correct.

This program was begun, as I recall, in 1993 by President Clinton. In my judgment, it is a perfect example of how the United States conceives a bad foreign aid giveaway program, shrouds it in doubletalk to protect it, and then scrambles to spend the money when elected officials in Congress raise questions about it.

In April 1993, President Clinton met at a summit with Russian President Boris Yeltsin in Vancouver. At that time, Mr. Clinton proposed that the United States would pay—meaning the taxpayers of the United States would pay—to construct housing in Russia so that Russian troops occupying the Baltic States could be withdrawn to Russia.

Now, let me drag that by one more time—going to spend American taxpayers' money to build housing for Russian soldiers so Russian soldiers can go home.

The Clinton administration suggested this, as I understand it, on the grounds that no housing existed in Russia for these soldiers.

There is at least one problem with that logic. Instead of building housing in Russia, the United States is now giving Russian soldiers $25,000 apiece to go out and purchase an existing unoccupied house. Now I am in favor of home ownership and I wish the Clinton administration would support more home ownership right here in America. But this program, Mr. President, is absolutely outrageous.

In fact, what the administration is saying is that it is not a housing shortage that the Russian military has; it is a cash shortage. I think that question is going to be of great interest to a lot of America's taxpayers.

Well, the U.S. Government, as a matter of fact, come to think of it, has a cash shortage. The Federal debt, as of yesterday afternoon closing time, was over 4.8 trillion bucks. Everybody knows about the budget deficit. We have talked and talked and talked about it for years. Finally, when something is being done about it, you hear all the weeping and wailing and gnashing of teeth—''But you can't do that to this one or you are doing this to that one,'' and so forth.

So I want to see these political figures go home and try to explain their votes against cutting the Federal deficit.

The administration itself is struggling to fund a request for 77,000 new and improved housing units for American soldiers and their families. They do not have the money for it, but they are struggling to find it. But they have already found it for the Russian soldiers. The conditions in which many of the men and women who serve in the U.S. services—the Army, Navy, Marines, and all the rest—are required to live are circumstances that are an embarrassment. And yet we have money for $25,000 apiece for Russian soldiers for housing.

Finally, the question absolutely must be asked: why does the Russian military have a shortage of money? The answer is no further away than the evening news in various places where the Russians are still participating in mayhem.

This program to build housing for Russian soldiers is not essential and it did not get the Russian military out of the Baltic States. This program is nothing but a golden parachute for the Russian military—not the United States military.

Mr. President, while the United States plays real estate agent to the Russian military, they have time and resources to fight in other places they ought not to be fighting.

Let me ask the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee if any action on this outrageous allocation of money has been taken since I last heard.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

The Senator from Oregon is recognized.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I would like to respond to the Senator from North Carolina in terms of the ''provision in this bill,'' the conference report on H.R. 889, that is, the bill on military defense appropriations that we conferenced yesterday, and we are now about to face that conference report, it having passed the House.

A number of years ago when, I believe, President Bush was still President and made a trip to the Baltics, he found that even though the Soviet Union had ceased to exist in reality, that the Baltic Governments that had emerged out of that former Iron Curtain power base of the Soviet Union, that those occupation troops, particularly the officers within the occupation of the Baltics, were not going back to Russia, were not returning home. They were remaining in the Baltics. They were wearing their uniforms, and that gave the new Baltic Governments great concern as to the intentions, and what have you.

Upon a careful analysis, they found that the Russians were not returning home because they had no housing to return to. The housing market had just been totally demolished over the years, and they found better housing in the Baltics.

So in the first initial step, we had what was called a demonstration project, I suppose, a figure of about $6 million—I am recalling now, not precisely—but a single-digit figure was appropriated as a demonstration project to help the Russians produce housing, not just for those officers still in the Baltics but also to start a housing industry in that country that had had no housing policy to speak of.

Then following that, there was a commitment made, and that now carries over into the Clinton administration, within the Baltic reaches that after there is that skill that comes out of that demonstration project we had to find an incentive to get these Russian officers out.

So a voucher system was provided, $25,000 voucher value for housing in Russia. That has then proceeded to, as we know now, there being no officers left in uniform. Some have decided to make the Baltics their home, have taken off the uniform and are rooting in as citizens, not as officers.

There were a lot of questions raised about this whole policy to begin with but, nevertheless, it was felt to be a sound policy to pursue to assist our new government friends in the Baltics.

We had, in effect, a drawdown from a $100 million appropriation to what we thought was about $75 million unobligated funds in the pipeline. These figures are difficult, and we are not certain of these figures. We cannot precisely identify the total number, but we think it is around $75 million.

The House had rescinded all $75 million in their bill. We, on the Senate side, rescinded none. We kept whatever that figure—75—in the bill.

Mr. HELMS. That is what got my attention.

Mr. HATFIELD. Yes. Now when we went to conference, we engaged in a lot of discussion, a lot of debate, and then the questions were raised as to what is the precise figure in that budget. We have the State Department, we have other sources, that have yet to give what we consider satisfactory figures so that we can say exactly how much.

So the House made a proposal to the Senate that we reallocate $15 million out of the $75 million; leave, in a sense, a total of $60 million to be revisited at

a time when we can get that exact figure, which would probably be in the 1996 cycle, assuming this report passes now as a rescission package. Other discussions might be engendered out of the Foreign Relations Committee. We are not wedded on the basis of that program to say that is in place to last into the indefinite future.

Mr. HELMS. I hope it has no future.

Mr. HATFIELD. Because of the question of not only appropriations under the circumstance of today, but the policy issue itself.

All I can say, as the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, we are doing the minimal of what we can legitimately do and maintain commitments that are in process or already made, until we can get a more exact total figure of unobligated funds.

Mr. HELMS. But the Senator will not presume to permit any further commitments. Is that correct?

Mr. HATFIELD. We have no basis upon which at this time to make a statement to the future of this program, because every program today is under such careful review and scrutiny in terms of our budget deficit, in terms of our priorities. Obviously, these rescissions are only to reflect upon the current fiscal year anyway.

Mr. HELMS. I am not being critical of the Senator. I would hate to have his job as chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

It seems to me we have $60 million somewhere in limbo—it might be in the pipeline, it may have been committed without our knowing. There are so many ambiguities about it. How can we tie it up so there will be no commitment beyond what has already been made?

Mr. HATFIELD. Well, I think that the situation is such that when the House rescinded the total figure of unobligated funds, it sent a very, very strong message to the agencies themselves. I suppose it should send a message to the authorizing committee as well, which the Senator from North Carolina chairs.

We have a whole foreign aid bill under constant review. Nothing is a commitment very far down the road.

We are dealing with the problem right now in this appropriation bill report that is pending as to how to delineate between the Department of Defense pursuing and executing a humanitarian program as a police action program and as it relates to the defense of this Nation. In other words, there are those who say we should not be charging, in offsets, any of these incursions into Haiti, et cetera, et cetera, back to the DOD appropriations budget.

So we are engaged in a lot of issues here that are pretty cloudy at this moment. I do not think any part of this can be a statement of future commitment at all.

Mr. HELMS. Let me ask, if I may, will we have somebody on the Appropriations Committee staff try to explain to me specifically where the $60 million is, because I do not want to leave this unvisited before we pass this bill. Can somebody answer that?

Mr. HATFIELD. We can certainly do that. We have very excellent staff that can be supportive of your questions and responsive to your questions.

Let me just say in summary, we have no precise figures at this moment. We are dependent upon a couple of agencies from the executive branch of government to provide such figures. We do not keep the books in that sense. We are now at a level of commitment in this report that we feel will be sufficient to cover any current commitments, obligations, or pipeline. Until we can get that precise figure we cannot answer that part of your question.

I can answer your question in the sense, does this have any kind of a base of commitment for 1996, or 1997, and I could say on that, ''No, it makes no basic commitment for 1996.'' We will review 1996 in a totally different context.

Mr. HELMS. So, the Foreign Relations Committee, I assure the Senate——

Mr. HATFIELD. I want to make sure, as the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, that the Senator understands we are not trying to make policy in our committee when the policy committee that he chairs is in that position.

Mr. HELMS. The strongest policy part of any legislation are the dollars. That is what really counts.

I am not saying anything that the Senator does not know or believe himself.

I thank the Chair.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HATFIELD. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I ask for the regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The regular order is the Murkowski-D'Amato amendment to the D'AMATO amendment No. 427.

Mr. HATFIELD. I thank the Chair.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be set aside so I can send an amendment to the desk.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 574 TO AMENDMENT NO. 420

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS], for himself, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. BREAUX, Mr. GLENN, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. KOHL, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KERRY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. PELL, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, and Mr. SARBANES, proposes an amendment numbered 574 to amendment No. 420.

Mr. HOLLINGS. 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 9 of the substitute amendment, strike line 1 through line 23 and insert the following:

INDUSTRIAL TECHNOLOGY SERVICES

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103–317, $3,100,000 are rescinded.

CONSTRUCTION OF RESEARCH FACILITIES

(RESCISSION)

Of the unobligated balances available under this heading, $30,000,000 are rescinded.

NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION OPERATIONS, RESEARCH AND FACILITIES

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103–317, $25,100,000 are rescinded.

CONSTRUCTION

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103–317, $13,000,000 are rescinded.

GOES SATELLITE CONTINGENCY FUND

(RESCISSION)

Of the unobligated balances available under this heading, $2,5000,000 are rescinded.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, this goes to the heart of our work in the Appropriations Subcommittee of State, Justice, and Commerce whereby we want to support the overall amount of the rescission but to redirect it to less important financial requirements at this particular time. In other words, my amendment would restore current programs that have been found very effective for the NOAA coastal oceans program, $7 million to the NOAA climate and global change research, $1.5 million to the Under Secretary for Technology, and $24 million to the NIST manufacturing extension program for a total of $37.5 million in total restoration.

Those restorations are offset by $30 million from the unobligated balances in the NIST construction, $5 million in the unobligated balances in the NOAA construction, and $2.5 million in the unobligated balances of the NOAA contingency fund.

All of those construction funds and everything else are to be set aside not to be expended this year. Of course, the distinguished Senator from Texas,

chairman of our subcommittee, and I are just now completing our series of hearings for next year's appropriations. So we are not turning away in any context our dedication to the various requested construction commitments. But, in a word, what we are saying is let us not go for office buildings but rather for building jobs.

Let me go right to the heart of the connection between this amendment and the so-called Contract With America, which I welcome because this is a good tonic to come to town and stir everybody up and get us moving. Many elements of the contract are things that I have worked upon—the unfunded mandates, the balanced budget amendment to the Constitution, which I voted for already three times. I did not vote for it this time because I did not want to repeal my own law that puts Social Security off budget.

On that matter, I do not believe that we should just move deficits. Rather, let us eliminate deficits. I did not want to move the Government's deficit from the general Government over to Social Security. So when we were debating the balanced budget amendment, all they had to do is exempt the Social Security funds instead of repealing my section 13301 which says ''Thou shall not use Social Security funds'' in the estimates of the deficit and the debt. That was put in by Senator Heinz and myself back in 1990 and signed into law by President Bush.

With respect to the other parts of the contract, the line-item veto, is actually my bill, which was a compromise between the two rescissions initiatives by Senator MCCAIN and Senator DOMENICI.

So there is much with which we can agree. But I thought in coming to town here at this particular session in January that our purpose was to pay the bill, and create jobs—not to adopt a contract which does not in itself create a single job or pay a single bill. It has more to do with symbols than substance, more with procedures than actual production. Now we have an amendment before the body which actually produces jobs.

I am convinced, after the hearing we had this morning, that we will get a most sympathetic hearing from our distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, Senator GRAMM of Texas, because the two big elements of misgiving that I have heard expressed about the NIST programs of the Advanced Technology Program and the Manufacturing Centers is on the one hand, that this was industrial policy, Government picking winners and losers, and on the other hand, that this was pork, political pork. Let me address the first particular problem.

Of course, we make all kinds of industrial policies. This morning, with respect to product liability, we told industry just exactly what it can expect—less care in the manufacturing. Currently, we have the highest degree of care in the United States of America in its manufacturing. But what we did was put in all kinds of gimmicks and hurdles that hamstring the individuals right to a trial by jury and thereby significantly affects industry. But we will not go any further into that.

But we get industrial policy when we recommend a minimum wage, when we come forward and say we are going to have parental leave, when we say we are going to have to have plant closing notice, safe machinery, safer working place, Social Security, unemployment compensation, Medicare, Medicaid. You can go right on down the list. When we in a bipartisan fashion, which is the record, adopt those measures, we get into industrial policy. There has been a fetish around town amongst the pollsters putting out their pap about industrial policy, saying ''let the market choose the winners and losers rather than the bureaucrats and politicians in Washington.'' I agree with that.

But, while we make industrial policy all the time, my amendment supports an industrial policy chosen by industry. We ensure sound industrial choice by requiring the industry to come with 50 percent of the money at least in their pocket and also to go through a peer review system of the National Academy of Engineering and the overall Government peer review choice. That was brought out in specific by Mary Lou Good, Dr. Good, the undersecretary in charge of technology, a real expert; had been in charge of their research and development over the years and just had a perfect speaking knowledge about the various things to guard against and make sure it was the industry and not the politician choosing the winner and loser, so to speak.

And otherwise, we carefully designed the peer review to make sure that the Senator could not call and get a manufacturing center, the Secretary of Commerce could not call and get one, nor could the President, nor the White House minions call over and say, ''We want it.'' In fact, our absolute track record with this program under every administration has been one of just exactly that, of unbiased peer review.

I can tell you categorically we did have a little hesitation in the markup of our bill over the past few years because the distinguished chairman on the House side wanted one of these but we never would write it in. We said we are not breaking ranks and starting with these markups on bills and inserting anything like Lawrence Welk's home as one of these manufacturing centers.

Otherwise, consider the matter of pork. I must refer to the distinguished former Senator from Wyoming, Senator Wallop. He pointed out in reading an article year before last, or April 2 years ago, how the chairman of the Democratic Party had gone to the West Coast under the Clinton administration. He said, ''Look here.'' I read the article. The chairman of the party is saying categorically the end all and be all of Presidential—and I know the Senator from Mississippi is interested in Presidential elections. The end all and be all of Presidential elections is California. And, according to this article, this administration was going to send out Ron Brown, the Secretary of Commerce, and he was going to pour the projects to the State of California and we were really going to get on the move over here for our party.

Well, that there just tackled me from behind because it was not true at all. The Secretary of Commerce could not do it. But it was a tremendous misgiving on the part of Senator Wallop and others on the other side of the aisle, even though 14 Republican Senators and a task force for reconversion had gone on and endorsed this particular program. It took us several days, what we had previously passed almost by unanimous consent took us several days to pass, and then with an overwhelming majority we passed the authorization.

So I had to answer up to that matter of pork and make sure that everyone knew that this was as well administered a governmental program on the basis of merit that we have ever had.

Another question arose then. The Senator from Texas says, now, ''what is the cutoff date?'' Well, that is a good question because you would think in the global competition, the answer could be given ''when is the cutoff date for Germany, for Japan, for Taiwan?'' And all our competition that has been investing way more than this. They just pour in the research and development, and we are trying to catch up, since we do not have long-term investments here in the United States—it is everything short term with the Wall Street market. It is tough, tough to get these little, small, fledgling industries going because they go to the market seeking credit, but if it takes more than two-, three-, four-quarters, over a year to get a good return, they can put the money elsewhere. This is a quick turnaround society in which we live. And the others go for the long range and can lose some in the short term. Specifically, the Japanese this past year, 1994, took over an additional 1.2 percent of the automobile market, losing, if you please, losing $2.5 billion. Of course, they made it back in the Tokyo market selling cars in Japan.

We do not have that kind of policy, and we do not want that kind of policy. And we are not going to have that kind of approach to our problems here. But to try to stay alive in the competition, we very wisely, with the support of the competitiveness council, and President Bush in his address to the joint session of the Congress, agreed to come forward and resolve the National Institute of Standards into the National Institute of Standards and Technology, and on a peer review merit basis to start meeting this kind of competition.

We had a very, very thorough hearing about it this morning, and these offsets are not really going to hurt anybody

and certainly they will not diminish further our effort with respect to jobs.

In the other rescission bill, we have already knocked $90 million off the advanced technology program. We cannot afford, on these research centers, manufacturing centers, to knock another $24 million off of this.

Specifically, in agriculture, when the question was asked, when is the cutoff date? Well, Roosevelt started it in 1933 with price supports and protective quotas, and we still have it. In fact, we have embellished it with advertising and export promotion. They got over $1 billion selling California raisins and almonds and California wines and all these other agricultural products. Here, for the poor fellow, working in industry, trying to hold his job, nothing but this babble of free-trade nonsense, whereby we are blaming America's labor for a flawed trade policy.

There is no question in my mind; we have the most competitive industry worker, the most productive industrial worker in the entire world, but we have a silly, really nonpolicy of running around and acting like we are still on foreign policy and we have to sacrifice on the kind of relation in the Pacific rim, we have to defend them and we have to continue to give them all our jobs.

I can talk at length, but I see others waiting. I do not want to go too long, but I wish my colleagues to understand its fullest importance. That is why I did not want to agree to a time limit right here at the initial part of this particular amendment. If we had, Senator, the same number of manufacturing jobs as we had 25 years ago, we would add 10 million manufacturing jobs.

What am I saying? I am saying that in 1970, 25 years ago, 10 percent of the consumption of manufactured products in the United States of America was represented in imports. Now, over 50 percent of the consumption of manufactured products is represented in imports. If we had gone back to the 90 percent that we had of U.S. manufacture of this country's consumption of manufactured products, we would immediately add 10 million jobs.

What does that mean? Some of my friends here have talked today about foreign policy. I would like to get to foreign policy. What does it mean? It means that if you cannot have a strong manufacturing sector, said Mr. Morita—former chairman of Sony—in a particular seminar we attended in Chicago years back, if you cannot have a strong manufacturing sector, you cannot be a nation state. And the country that loses its manufacturing power ceases to be a world power.

What we are learning already in the WTO, I say to the Senator from Mississippi. We thought we had a consensus on who would be the president of the WTO—like Mickey Kantor would come in and say we are going to have a consensus. Oh, we are in charge. Consensus. Consensus. We got together on a consensus with the Italian as the choice. In fact, the poor fellow now—I happen to like him. They say he is a protectionist. OK, that is common sense to me. We have a high standard of living. We have to protect it. But the gentleman from Italy they said was totally unacceptable. We could not have him. We tried to get the man, Salinas, down in Mexico, and he bombed out. And then we ended up with the Italian, who is now going to be the president of the WTO. The second choice was Korea, and we are sitting around with our so-called consensus.

On our most important choice to be made we have already been rolled with WTO. When you lose your economic power, you lose your influence in foreign policy. The foreign policy, Mr. President, of this land is like a three-legged stool. You have as one leg the values of the country; your second leg of military power; and your third leg of economic power.

That one leg of values as a nation is strong. We sacrifice to feed the hungry in Somalia and bring democracy to Haiti. No one questions it or our military power, the military leg. We are the superpower. But when it comes around to the economic leg, Mr. President, I can tell you, here and now, that leg over the last 40 years, 45 years, has been fractured due to the special relationship that we had to give. We had to rebuild the capitalist economy the world around in order to contain communism. And bless it, the Marshall plan has worked. We have no misgivings about it. But now, with the fall of the wall, we have an opportunity here to repair that economic leg for America.

And this one little initiative here out of all the other initiatives has been the bipartisan move toward production and manufacture and strengthening that economic leg. That is what this particular amendment does. It could not be considered, incidentally, in the subcommittee. We tried, but we could not get a hearing, as the ranking member. Our subcommittee report was read out without a single one Senator on this side of the aisle ever having heard of it.

I wanted to have a chance to repair that and say, ''Look, set aside construction funds, money just hanging around not to be used in this fiscal year. Why rescind ongoing programs that we have in the several States on a merit basis that is one of the finest that we have ever got to try to help?''

I will speak a little bit further. I see other Senators wanting to be recognized.

I have the list of the industries here with respect to what we call the Advanced Technology Coalition, representing 5 million U.S. workers, 3,500 electronic firms, 329,000 engineers, and 13,500 companies in the manufacturing sector. They have endorsed this particular program.

And it is really down to the minimal basis, not near what we give to NASA and all its research in space, not near what we have in agriculture, not near what we have in alternative energy and in nuclear endeavors. Here is a fledgling little $300 million program that we are trying to keep alive, and some, I think, unknowingly, have cut it, because over on the other side there is a gentleman—incidentally, from Pennsylvania—who says we ought to not only get rid of this but get rid of the entire Department of Commerce.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. SPECTER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SPECTER. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I have sought recognition to comment briefly on the pending legislation. There appears to be some reason for optimism that we are in the final stages and will be completing action on this bill yet this evening.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Labor, Health, Human Services, and Education, our subcommittee faced a very major rescission package, as sent over by the House of Representatives, amounting to some $5.9 billion. While the full appropriations package addressed the rescissions of the House—with somewhat different calculations because FEMA, the Federal Emergency Management Agency, was deferred. The committee was able to shift priorities, so that the rescissions in our Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education was reduced to $3.05 billion.

We restored some $1 billion in cuts on education because it was our sense that the education funding should remain at as high a level as possible.

It is my own view, Mr. President, that education, as a national priority, is second to none. I come by that view from the experience with my own parents, both of whom were immigrants, who had very little education and therefore valued it very highly in our household. My father, Harry Specter, had no formal education. My mother, Lillie Specter, went only to the eighth grade when she quit school to help support her family on the tragic death of her father from a heart attack in his mid to late forties. But my brother, my two sisters and I have been the beneficiaries of the opportunity to share in the American dream with good educations. And that has been a point for which I have always worked hard to try to maintain the funding, supported by Senator HARKIN the ranking member of the subcommittee.

Senator HARKIN agreed with restoring these funds to education, and included in that was the restoration of funding of $371 million for drug-free schools. Mr. President, the drug problem in the school system is the intersection of education and violence. Funding for the program is supported by our subcommittee, supported by the full committee and supported, it appears, by the Senate. Perhaps even more money will be added back on drug-free schools which is a very, very high priority.

We also restored some $13 million for worker safety, for OSHA, where the funds had been cut. It is very, very important to have safety on the job.

Another key item was low-income home energy assistance for the elderly and poor. Principally, this vital program provides assistance for many Americans who earned less than $8,000 a year. For these low income or elderly without this important program it comes down to a choice, as the expression goes, between heating or eating.

The program also is very, very important, as a matter of safety. In a 3-month period in the city of Philadelphia, 11 people were killed, many of them children, in families which were using kerosene heaters because they did not have enough money for the regular fuel allotment. The committee has reinstated the program from the House cuts.

I think it is very important, Mr. President, to meet the target of balancing the budget by the year 2002, but I think it has to be done with a scalpel and not a meat ax. Traditionally, as the Founding Fathers articulated, the Senate is the saucer that cools the tea from the House of Representatives. The strength in our system is a bicameral legislature—that is a House of Representatives and a Senate—the models of most of the States in the United States, and it takes both of the Houses to work it out.

So I think we will come up in the Senate with a very sound bill. There have been negotiations, as has been announced on the floor, and it appears at this point that there will be add-backs on a number of the programs, which could, apparently, lead to less of a cut from the $3.05 billion.

But it appears that we will have had an appropriate allocation of resources and assessment of priorities and that we will take a good bill into conference. Hopefully, we can eliminate unnecessary expenses but, at the same time, retain the programs which are very important for America's safety net.

I thank the Chair and I yield the floor.

Mr. LOTT addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, on behalf of our leader, I would like to see if we could not get a time agreement now on the Hollings amendment. I understand Senator HOLLINGS has already had some time to speak and has indicated a willingness to enter into this agreement.

I ask unanimous consent that the time on the pending Hollings amendment be limited to the following: 20 minutes under the control of Senator HOLLINGS, 10 minutes under the control of Senator HATFIELD; I further ask that, following the conclusion or yielding back of the time, Senator DOLE or his designee be recognized to make a motion to table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. HOLLINGS. With no amendments to our amendment?

Mr. LOTT. That is fine. No amendment is mentioned here.

Mr. HOLLINGS. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, so ordered.

Mr. AKAKA addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. AKAKA. If it is in order, I would like to propose an amendment, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator suspend?

The Senate has just entered into a time agreement on the Hollings amendment.

Who yields time?

Mr. HOLLINGS. Can we temporarily set this aside so the Senator from Hawaii and the Senator from Pennsylvania could be recognized?

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, the Senator from Hawaii has an amendment he would like to offer. Could I inquire of the Senator from Hawaii, is this an amendment that has been worked out?

Mr. AKAKA. It is an a amendment that has been agreed to on both sides. I have spoken with Chairman SPECTER and he agrees with this amendment.

By unanimous consent, I wanted to offer the amendment.

Mr. LOTT. How much time does the Senator expect to take?

Mr. AKAKA. I will take 2 minutes.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, if my distinguished colleague from Hawaii would yield, I believe we will work that amendment through in the final package, so it would not be in order to offer it at this time.

But I understand the distinguished Senator from Hawaii would like to speak about it, which I think would be entirely appropriate to outline what we will accomplish. But structurally and procedurally, we will include that in the final managers' amendment, which will accommodate what the Senator from Hawaii wants to achieve.

Mr. President, while I have the floor, I had asked the distinguished assistant leader if Senator SANTORUM and I—and I cleared this with the Senator from South Carolina—might have 10 minutes for a brief presentation on a memorial to Jimmy Stewart in Indiana, PA, which will be coming up after the Senator from Hawaii finishes his remarks.

Mr. HOLLINGS. And without the time being allocated on our particular unanimous consent agreement.

Mr. LOTT. I am sure that would be fine. But after that, I know the leader would like for us to really begin to finish the debate on this amendment and other amendments that have been agreed to so we can begin to bring this to a conclusion.

But I believe we are going to have a couple minutes now for the Senator from Hawaii and then 10 minutes for the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Would the Senator from Mississippi wish to propose a unanimous consent request for this?

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I so make that request to have 2 minutes for the distinguished Senator from Hawaii to discuss an amendment that will be the managers' amendment, and 10 minutes for the two Senators from Pennsylvania on a subject relating to Jimmy Stewart, I believe.

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

Mr. AKAKA addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

DEMONSTRATION PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, I thank the leadership, and I thank my friend, Chairman SPECTER, for including it in his manager's report.

I have an amendment, which will be in the chairman's report, and it would restore partial funding for the $7.9 million rescinded from the Demonstration Partnership Program. My hope is this amendment is agreeable and that it will receive the support of my colleagues.

The DPP, administered by the Office of Community Services in the Administration for Children and Families of the Department of Health and Human Services, has a highly successful record of employing innovative approaches to increase self-sufficiency for the poor.

The program provides grants to community action agencies and other eligible entities of the community services block grant. The objectives of the DPP are to develop tests and evaluate new approaches for overcoming poverty, as well as to disseminate project results and evaluation findings so that successful programs can be replicated elsewhere.

I also want to inform my colleagues that there is agreement to offsets for this $3 million, and there is agreement by the staff on both sides of the Appropriations Committee.

Therefore, Mr. President, I urge the adoption of my amendment and thank Chairman SPECTER for including it in his report. I yield back any time remaining.

Mr. SPECTER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, rather than taking time now from the amendment of the distinguished Senator from South Carolina, Senator SANTORUM and I would like to amend the unanimous-consent agreement to take 10 minutes at the conclusion of the next vote.

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

Mr. SPECTER. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I yield myself sufficient time. The Senator from Connecticut, Senator LIEBERMAN, wanted to be heard. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator

from Virginia, Senator ROBB, be added as a cosponsor.

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

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I think it is fundamental that we all understand that this movement with respect to the development of our technology came about at the same time that we were trying to get conversion programs in the Defense Department, including start-up funding for many of the extension centers in this particular program. In fact, we actually got as NIST Director Dr. Arati Prabhakar, one of the top managers who had worked with Craig Fields over at DARPA, and NIST is now taking over the funding of 37 DOD-started extension centers that help small firms that are no less attuned to civilian purposes rather than to military purposes.

If this little amendment is knocked out, and some $25.6 million, is rescinded, as originally proposed in the bill, then what you have left is only $65 million to support a total of 44 centers, plus any new centers for other States. There is a cutoff period of 6 years also in this program that I forgot to emphasize. These centers come up with at least 50 percent of the cost to begin with and over the years we have an ever diminishing amount by the Feds and an ever increasing amount by the sponsoring State along with the industry. They take over these extension centers.

By way of comparison, it should be shown that this past year, where we had some $91 million in these centers and now, if we lose $25 million, we would end up with only $65 million. You can compare that to the $439 million budget this year of extension program of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, a figure that does include research or the cooperative education programs; to NASA with an aeronautical research and assistance budget of $882 million; and the Department of Energy, where there is another $3.315 billion for civilian energy research. And what we have is a very restricted program, run on a peer-review basis, of $91 million. We are trying to restore the proposed cut by using unobligated balances within the same NIST budget.

I also emphasize at this particular time, Mr. President, before yielding as much time as is necessary to the Senator from Connecticut, that I would like to read just one sentence from the 1992 Senate Republican defense conversion task force. This was a very outstanding group of some 14 Republican Senators, including the Senator from Kansas, now the majority leader, and many others here, without reading out their names. I read the language:

> The task force endorses two programs of the National Institute of Standards and Technology as important to the effort to promote technology transfer to allow defense industries to convert to civilian activities. These programs are the Manufactured Technology Program and the Advanced Technology Program.

That is exactly what we have been doing. This has been bipartisan from the very beginning. It has worked very well. There is no pork and there is no industrial policy with the Government picking winners and losers.

I yield as much time as he needs to the distinguished Senator from Connecticut. I do appreciate his support.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, the state of manufacturing in this country is mixed. On the one hand our manufacturing productivity is increasing, but on the other hand we are losing manufacturing jobs by the millions. Manufacturing which once was the life blood of our economy is bleeding jobs overseas. We need to provide the infrastructure that insures that manufacturing flourishes.

Some kinds of manufacturing have been experiencing a resurgence in the last decade. This resurgence has been dominated by big business, not by small and mid-sized businesses. I am worried about the 381,000 manufacturing companies of less than 500 workers, representing nearly 12 million employees. Taken as a group, these small and mid-sized manufacturers are the source of the largest number of new manufacturing jobs, and, they represent real growth for our economy. Perhaps most importantly, small and mid-sized manufacturers have become the foundation of our manufacturing industry.

Larger manufacturers are no longer self-sufficient. Outsourcing is more and more often the most efficient and competitive way to manufacture. Take the example of a Chrysler car. Typically 70 percent of the final product is manufactured by Chrysler itself, the rest is manufactured by a myriad of smaller suppliers. This web of smaller manufacturers have become the core of the manufacturing industry. When U.S. small manufacturers thrive, our manufacturing industry as a whole thrives, and our economy thrives. If our smaller suppliers are not competitive, they compromise the quality of the final product, or more realistically, they lose out to more qualified suppliers abroad. We have to decide how, as a nation, we are going to build our manufacturing infrastructure so that we do not lose these jobs and this potential for economic growth.

As I look at our manufacturing competitors, I am struck by how little we do to support this critical component of our economy. American big manufacturers have had the resources to undergo something of a long and painful rebirth. They have learned from their competitors how to modernize their manufacturing processes as well as their products. At one time, it was sufficient to provide new products in a wide variety. Then as more companies had products, being the company with the best price was the order winner. Then, all competitive companies had low prices, and the company with the highest quality products started winning the orders. Now, a company must supply high quality, low cost products, in a wide variety and deliver it exactly when the customer needs it. These demands are tremendous challenges for manufacturing, and unless you have state-of-the-art manufacturing practices, you cannot compete.

In the United States we are used to being the leaders in technologies of all kinds. Historically, English words have crept into foreign languages, because we were the inventors of new scientific concepts, technology, and products. Now when you describe the state-of-the-art manufacturing practices you use words like ''kanban'' (pronounced kahn' bahn) and ''pokaoke'' (pronounced po kai oke'). These are Japanese words that are known to production workers all over the United States. Kanban is a word which describes an efficient method of inventory management, and pokaoke is a method of making part of a production process immune from error or mistake proof thereby increasing the quality of the end product. We have learned these techniques from the Japanese, in order to compete with them.

In a global economy, there is no choice, a company must become state-of-the-art or it will go under. We must recognize that our policies must change with the marketplace and adapt our manufacturing strategy to compete in this new global marketplace. The Manufacturing Extension Program [MEP] is a big step forward in reforming the role of government in manufacturing. This forward looking program was begun under President Reagan, and has received growing support from Congress since 1989.

The focus of the MEP is one that historically has been accepted as a proper role of government: education. The MEP strives to educate small and mid-sized manufacturers in the best practices that are available for their manufacturing processes. With the MEP we have the opportunity to play a constructive role in keeping our companies competitive in a fiercely competitive, rapidly changing field. When manufacturing practices change so rapidly, it is the small and mid-sized companies that suffer. They cannot afford to invest the necessary time and capital to explore all new trends to determine which practices to adopt and then to train their workers, invest in new equipment, and restructure their factories to accommodate the changes. The MEPs act as a library of manufacturing practices, staying current on the latest innovations, and educating companies on how to get the best results. At the heart of the MEP is a team of teachers, engineers and experts with strong private sector experience ready to reach small firms and their workers about the latest manufacturing advances.

Another benefit of the MEP is that it brings its clients into contact with other manufacturers, universities, national labs and any other institutions

where they might find solutions to their problems. Facilitating these contacts incorporates small manufacturers into a manufacturing network, and this networking among manufacturers is a powerful competitive advantage. With close connections, suppliers begin working with customers at early stages of design and engineering. When suppliers and customers work together on product design, suppliers can provide the input that makes manufacturing more efficient, customers can communicate their specifications and timetables more effectively, and long term productive relationships are forged. These supplier/customer networks are common practice in other countries, and lead to more efficient and therefore more competitive, design and production practices.

The MEP is our important tool in keeping our small manufacturers competitive. We are staying competitive in markets that have become hotbeds of global competition, and we are beginning to capture some new markets. More importantly, companies that have made use of MEP are generating new jobs rather than laying off workers or moving jobs overseas. These companies are growing and contributing to real growth in the U.S. economy. For each Federal dollar invested in a small or midsized manufacturer through the MEP, there has been $8 of economic growth. This is a program that is paying for itself by growing our economy.

Let me share with you some examples of success stories from the MEP. When the Boeing Co. told Manufacturing Development Inc. or, MDI, it needed to meet Boeing's stringent D1–9000 quality standards, or risk losing Boeing's business, MDI Vice President Michael Castor knew the company needed help. The 30-person sheet metal fabricator located in Cheney, KS, depended on its work with Boeing, its largest customer. The company called the Mid-America Manufacturing Technology Center, an extension center in Kansas, which provided MDI employees on-site training in statistical process control and helped MDI secure a State job training grant that paid for half of the training costs. MDI not only received certification by Boeing and retained its largest customer, but it also estimates that it will achieve a 50 percent reduction in scrap, reduce rework by 25 percent, and realize an annual savings of $132,000.

Another example is HJE Co. Inc., a 4-person manufacturer of gas atomization systems in Watervliet, NY. HJE produces ultrafine metal powders from molten metal. These powders are used, for example, in solder and braze pastes and dental alloys. When Joe Strauss, founder of HJE, first came to the New York MEP he had lots of good ideas and some sketches and rough drawings. The New York MEP helped him turn those ideas into blueprints of manufacturable parts, and helped him find machine shops to make the parts. Strauss spent 6 months getting assistance and learning how to become a world class manufacturer. After learning to use them with the help of the MEP, Strauss eventually purchased his own computer-aided design and manufacturing equipment and software. Now HJE is one of only four companies of its kind in the world and the only one in the United States. Joe is now used as a materials expert for others who seek help from the New York MEP. HJE, by the way, is expanding and moving into new areas in manufacturing.

These are just a couple of examples. There are many others.

Each MEP is funded after a competitive selection process, and currently there are 44 Manufacturing Technology Centers in 32 States. One requirement for the centers is that the States supply matching funds, ensuring that centers are going where there is a locally supported need.

The appropriated funds for fiscal year 1995 would allow the Commerce Department to fund over 30 more centers, to further cover manufacturing areas in the country. The funds are required to grow the program and reach the States that still need them. Not only are the appropriated funds needed to grow the program, but to maintain the centers that were once covered by DOD funds. Historically, the DOD has covered the cost of some manufacturing extension centers because of its vested interest in maintaining a strong defense manufacturing base. DOD funding of the MEP has been a casualty of the defense cuts as defense dollars become tighter.

In conclusion, I urge my colleagues to support the Manufacturing Extension Program. The MEP provides the arsenal of equipment, training, and expertise that our small and mid-sized manufacturers need to keep them in the new global economic battlefield. The investment is in our future economic health, in high wage jobs for our workers, in the American dream. Investment in the education of our small and mid-sized manufacturers is investment in our future.

Mr. LOTT addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. LOTT. First, I would like to remind everybody what is the base bill here. This started out being a bill that was going to pay for disaster aid that is needed for California and perhaps in other areas.

It also has rescissions. These are reductions in spending from this year's fiscal budgets throughout the Government to try to reduce the deficit, try to pay for the disaster aid, and to try to begin to move toward controlling our rate of growth. That is the basic premise that we are starting from here.

When we have all these amendments—although some of them are very justifiable, good, small amounts of money, they just keep growing. For a week now, I have seen lists floating around here with add-backs here, add-backs there, many of which I like. When we check into it, usually it is an add-back on top of a very large program already.

Second, this amendment, I understand, has four components, at least part of which there is support for, and an agreement could probably have been worked out to support it.

I understand that Senator GRAMM from Texas, chairman of the State, Justice and Commerce Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, had indicated he could go along with some of these. But it adds back money in these areas: $26.5 million in the manufacturing extension partnership program; adds back $1.5 million from salaries and expenses of the Commerce Department's Technology Administration; it adds back funding of $5 million in funding for NOAA coastal ocean program; and it adds back $14 million in the climate and global change research area.

Some of those sound pretty good, but in each case it is an add-back on top of money that was already there.

The central issue here is the funding for the manufacturing and extension partnership program and the fact that it has been growing so rapidly. Funding for this unauthorized program increased dramatically over the past few years. For instance, this program did not exist until fiscal year 1991. In that year, the funding was $11.9 million; then it went to $15.1 million; and then $16.9 million; then $30.3 million; in this fiscal year it jumped to $90.6 million. Even with the rescission or the cuts proposed in this bill, we still would have had a doubling of the program. The Senator noted that there is still $67 million, I believe, that would be left. It is projected this program would go up to $146.6 and keep going up.

This is a new program that has grown like top seed. Maybe the plan is over the years to bring it down and maybe bring in private-sector funding. That is all well and good. The fact of the matter is it has been doubling and tripling in recent years. That is why on this side, on behalf of the chairman of the subcommittee and the chairman of the committee, our urging to the Members is that they vote to table this amendment, because if we do not do it here, there will be another one that will add money, and another one will add money, and we think we have to control the rate of growth and not start a long process that will add back additional spending to this bill. I yield the floor.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, right to the point. We are not adding back $26 million of the $24 million, and we are not adding back $14 million, but $7 million on the climate and global change research. I want to correct those figures.

I wanted also to include, Mr. President, the point made that it does restore not only the manufacturing extension but the NOAA coastal ocean program, the NOAA climate and global

change program and the Undersecretary for Technology Office, and it shows the United States-Israel Bilateral Science and Technology Agreement continues.

Right to the point about growing: We transferred from the Department of Defense at the request of the Republican Coalition for Defense Reconversion. These programs did not grow. It was just really transferred as more applicable to the civilian side than the military side. That is why we have that amount in there.

It certainly has not grown just like export promotion in agriculture, which I am sure my distinguished colleague from Mississippi supports, which is over 1 billion bucks.

Talking about rescissions—now, just with the atmosphere or environment of frustration of amendments coming and going, I can say categorically, Mr. President, we could not offer an amendment all last week. I tried to. What we had was a fill-up-the-tree kind of approach and we had to take the amendments, and we had no votes. We sat around here for 3 days with no votes on amendments. My amendment has never been considered in subcommittee. Rolled in the Appropriations Committee as if we had considered it. And it only takes from other programs unexpended balances, rather than eliminate viable programs endorsed on both sides of the aisle that are not growing like topsy.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a letter from the president of the Advanced Technology Coalition, with the encompassing endorsement.

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

ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY COALITION,
Washington, DC, February 9, 1994.

Hon. ERNEST F. HOLLINGS,
U.S. Senate, Russell Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR HOLLINGS: On behalf of the Advanced Technology Coalition, we want to express our strong support for the Senate version of the National Competitiveness Act, S.4.

We believe that the bill deserves bipartisan support. We ask that you vote for the bill when it reaches the floor in the very near future. Its passage is essential to strengthening the ability of our companies and members to compete in the international marketplace; in short, S.4 means jobs and will contribute to our nation's long-term economic health.

Combined, the Advanced Technology Coalition represents 5 million U.S. workers, 3,500 electronics firms, 329,00 engineers, and 13,500 companies in the manufacturing sector. The Coalition is a diverse group of high-tech companies, traditional manufacturing industries, labor, professional societies, universities and research consortia that have a common goal of ensuring America's industrial and technological leadership.

The members of the Advanced Technology Coalition have invested an enormous amount of time working with both the House and the Senate in developing and refining the National Competitiveness Act. The Coalition believes that its views have been heard by Congress and reflected in the bill.

In short, we believe that S.4 will promote American competitiveness and enhance the ability of the private sector to create jobs in this country. We hope that you will play a leadership role in ensuring its passage. We would be happy to sit down with you or your staff to discuss the bill in greater detail.

Sincerely,

See attached list of associations, professional organizations, academic institutions and companies:

American Electronics Association (AEA).
National Association of Manufacturers (NAM).
The Modernization Forum.
Microelectronics and Computer Technology Corporation (MCC).
Honeywell, Inc.
National Society of Professional Engineers.
Business Executives for National Security.
IEEE-USA.
Semiconductor Equipment and Materials International (SEMI).
Institute for Interconnecting and Packaging Electronics Circuits (IPC).
Wilson and Wilson.
American Society for Training and Development.
Catapult Communications Corporation.
Dover Technologies.
Texas Instruments, Inc.
Columbia University.
Motorola.
Intel Corporation.
Cray Research.
Electron Transfer Technologies.
Electronic Data Systems (EDS).
American Society for Engineering Education.
U.S. West, Incorporated.
Electronic Industries Association.
Tera Computer Company.
Southeast Manufacturing Technology Center.
Convex Computer Corporation.
Association for Manufacturing Technology.
Semiconductor Research Corporation.
American Society of Engineering Societies.
AT&T.
Hoya Micro Mask, Inc.

Mr. HOLLINGS. I also ask unanimous consent we print a letter from President Clinton, an endorsement.

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

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, DC, March 28, 1995.

Hon. ERNEST F. HOLLINGS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR FRITZ: Thank you for your concern about the technology investment programs we have built together over the past two years. Your steadfast support of the Advanced Technology Program (ATP), the Technology Reinvestment Project (TRP), and related technology investment efforts has been indispensable in educating the new Congress as to their economic and national security value, and countering proposed legislative actions that threaten their existence.

These programs are a high priority to me and I will continue to fight for them. I have expressed strong opposition to the cuts to TRP and ATP in H.R. 889, and I am working to see that an acceptable bill comes out of conference. And, as you know, I have indicated that I would veto H.R. 1158 in the form passed by the House; the cuts to key technology programs are among the serious problems that I have with the bill.

Our technology investments in partnership with industry, while a small part of our entire federal R&D portfolio, make essential contributions to national security and economic growth. Together with TRP and ATP, initiatives such as the High Performance Computing and Communications program, the Partnership for a New Generation Vehicle, the Manufacturing Extension Partnership, Challenge Grants for Technology in Education, Information Infrastructure grants, and the Environmental Technology Initiative provide the necessary seed money for exciting, rewarding education for our children, productive jobs for our working people, and a better quality of life for all of us in the twenty-first century.

I have asked Laura D'Andrea Tyson, chair of the National Economic Council (NEC), to lead a team composed of senior officials from throughout my Administration to continue to build support for these vital investments in the nation's future. We want to work closely with you to protect our technology investments.

Sincerely,

BILL.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I rise to speak regarding a technology/NOAA amendment for myself, and Senators THURMOND, BINGAMAN, BREAUX, GLENN, GRAHAM, LEAHY, LEVIN, KENNEDY, KERRY, KOHL, LIEBERMAN, KERREY, MURRAY, PELL, ROCKEFELLER, and SARBANES.

There are many rescissions in the Commerce, Justice and State chapter of this bill which I am not pleased with. There are four particular rescissions in the Commerce Department section of the committee reported bill which my amendment would restore—the National Institute of Standards and Technology Manufacturing Extension Program, the Office of the Under Secretary of Technology, the NOAA Climate and Global Change Research Program, and the NOAA Coastal Ocean Program. These rescissions total $37.5 million and my amendment proposes $37.5 million in alternative rescissions in their place. My amendment is fully offset, dollar for dollar.

OFFSETS

The offsets in this amendment are quite simple, and they are all from other Commerce Department appropriations accounts. We propose rescinding $30 million from the unobligated balances in the NIST construction account. There are currently $195 million to such unobligated balances. Most of this amount is set to go on contract. But several projects have been held up due to environmental concerns and delays, and this rescission should have little impact on the agency being able to move ahead with modernization of its priority laboratories. This account has never been authorized, and there should be no reason why this rescission is not acceptable to the managers of the bill.

Second, we have recommended two rescissions of prior year unobligated balances from NOAA. We have recommended rescinding $5 million of unobligated balances from NOAA's construction account. Since fiscal year 1992 Congress has appropriated over $9 million for above standard costs for a

new environmental research laboratory. The principle construction costs for this facility are the responsibility of GSA. The construction of this facility has been held up by a number of environmental and community concerns.

Finally, we have proposed rescinding $2.5 million of prior year recoveries within the GOES Satellite contingency fund. This is a one-time appropriation account that Warren Rudman and I established in 1991 to ensure the GOES Satellite Program continued. The program got back on track, and the first GOES-next satellite is now in orbit—these unobligated funds are no longer needed.

So each offset is based on good financial management. We have identified prior year appropriations that are not required or not needed at this time. Our proposed restorations, however, continue priority NOAA and technology programs that should not be cut.

RESTORATIONS

Our amendment provides restoration of appropriations for four programs:

Technology programs: With respect to the Commerce technology and competitiveness programs. The committee bill rescinds $26.5 million from the NIST Manufacturing Extension Program—from Manufacturing Technology Centers—and it rescinds $1.5 million from the Office of the Under Secretary of Technology, Mary Good.

No. 1, Office of the Under Secretary for Technology: I find it hard to believe that this Senate would want to cut Under Secretary Mary Good's office. She is the finest Under Secretary for Technology we have had. She is the kind of leader that we had in mind when the Congress passed the 1988 Trade Act. This cut would make her either lay off her staff or terminate valuable projects, like the Commerce Department's share of the United States/Israel Science and Technology Agreement. When I was chairman, we annually exceeded the Bush and Reagan budget requests for this office. I was requested to do so by Republican members of this committee, and I was happy to do so. Further, I cannot understand why we would want to prevent the Under Secretary of Technology from following through participating in a technology and science agreement with our allies, the Israelis.

So, first, our amendment restores funding for her office and prevents any reduction to the U.S./Israeli science and technology agreement.

No. 2, Manufacturing extension: Second, the House bill and the committee-reported bill currently cuts the NIST Manufacturing Technology Centers by $26.5 million. Our amendment would restore $24 million of this program, and leave a rescission of $3.1 million.

The Manufacturing Extension Program now supports 44 centers in 32 States. Most were started with defense conversion [TRP] funds but have now been transferred onto NIST's budget. These centers provide hands-on technical support to small to medium-sized manufacturers to help them upgrade equipment, improve production processes and save jobs. They are cost-shared with States and are competitively awarded. This is a merit-based program—neither the President nor the Secretary of Commerce, nor members of Commerce—can earmark these centers. Each center is tailored to the industrial characteristics and needs of the area in which it is located. So the center in Philadelphia, is different from the center in Albuquerque, NM, which is different again from the manufacturing extension center in Rolla, MO.

Now there are two specific impacts from the rescission proposed in the committee reported bill. First, NIST will not be adding as many new centers as we intended when I fought for these funds in conference last year. And I should note that NIST informs me that they expect applications to come in from many States.

Second, some of the 37 centers that were started with Defense appropriations will have to begin phasing out operations—because NIST will lack the funding to take over the Federal portion of their operational support.

This is an effective program that has always been bipartisan. I remember when former Vice President Dan Quayle traveled to the Great Lakes Manufacturing Center in Cleveland, OH. He praised their work and was particularly impressed with their role in keeping an automotive part manufacturer in business. General Motors told the small firm to cut costs or they would contract with a Mexican firm. The NIST manufacturing center designed machinery to automate and modernize the firm's operations—and the company prospered and added even more jobs in Cleveland. In fact, there is a picture of the Vice President in the entrance to that Great Lakes Manufacturing Center.

NOAA OCEAN AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS

No. 3, NOAA, Coastal Ocean Program. Third, my amendment restores $5 million to the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's [NOAA] Coastal Ocean Program. The Coastal Ocean Program was established as a agency-wide initiative to focus the capabilities of all NOAA line organizations to deal with coastal and oceanic issues of national concern. Examples include fisheries research in the Bering Sea off Alaska and the Georges Bank off Massachusetts, New Hampshire and Maine; and estuary and ecosystem studies in Florida and the Chesapeake Bay. The Coastal Ocean Program is merit-based and employs competitive peer review. The program was recently praised by the National Research Council.

The House rescission, which the committee reported bill agrees to, eliminates half the Coastal Ocean Program's funding! This would result in a loss of ongoing field and laboratory work and it would impair NOAA's ability to attract quality scientists and oceanographers. Many coastal ocean projects would have to be terminated or severely curtailed.

No. 4. NOAA Climate and Global Change Program. Finally, our amendment would restore $7 million for the NOAA Climate and Global Change Research Program. Specifically, we would seek to restore cuts that the committee reported bill, which cuts twice as much as the House bill from this program, would require in the research and understanding of the role of the oceans in climate change.

NOAA's Climate and Global Change Program is a competitive and peer-reviewed program of scientific grants geared toward improving our understanding of long-term changes in the oceans and atmosphere.

This is a quality program that increasingly is paying off by allowing NOAA to have more accurate long-term weather forecasts. We used to think of a wet side to NOAA and a dry side or atmospheric side of NOAA. The Climate and Global Change Program is breaking down these artificial barriers by proving that the oceans hold the key to global climate and weather.

A case in point is NOAA's program to monitor and forecast El Nino events. El Nino is an interannual change in the air-sea conditions of the tropical Pacific that can cause torrential rains, droughts and major shifts in ocean conditions. For example, during a 1983 El Nino, 600 people died in South America, and Peruvian economic losses due to severe weather and poor fishing were estimated at $2 billion. In the United States, the west coast and Gulf of Mexico were hit by major winter storms that led to beach erosion, flooding and mudslides. Increasingly, NOAA's climate and global change research is correlating severe weather events and the temperature of the equatorial Pacific. The Program plays a key role in efforts to develop El Nino predictions that could improve planning and preparation for such events, thereby saving hundreds of lives and preventing millions in economic losses.

Mr. President, again this amendment is fully offset. I urge its adoption.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, this amendment, offered by the Senator from South Carolina, deserves strong support from this body. I am a cosponsor of the amendment for a very basic reason. Our amendment will restore funding for what's called the Manufacturing Extension Partnership [MEP] Program— a vital network of facilities dedicated to a strong manufacturing base in this country. With vision and a lot of hard work, the Senator from South Carolina has turned a very basic idea into a very powerful, invaluable reality.

It seems incredibly stupid to cut funds from a program that has the track record of this one. The name says it all—manufacturing extension. That means that because of this program, the small- and medium-sized businesses

of this country have place to contact, to call, to visit where they get the latest there is to know about how to make products and turn a profit. Cut the funds, eliminate these centers, and cut off the businesses of our country from what they cannot get anywhere else.

Forty-four manufacturing extension centers now operate in 32 States. The centers are sharing expertise, information, and advice to smaller- and mid-sized companies that want to manufacture products and want to stay in business. This extension network has been so successful that other States are waiting In the wings to get centers of their own, and to link hundreds and even thousands of the businesses in their State to a central repository of people and expertise steeped in the state-of-art in manufacturing and technology. Anyone who knows what the Agricultural Extension Service did in this country to help farmers learn about the latest techniques for irrigation, for farming, for keeping their costs down, understand this model now applied to manufacturing very well.

These manufacturing extension centers play a role that cannot and will not be duplicated by any single part of the private sector. They play a truly public role, because their only client is the public interest. They share information and ideas among businesses. They learn what works on 1 factory floor, and help 20 more businesses avoid reinventing the wheel by learning from the first. They spread manuals, training guides, information across their States—with the latest findings and ideas on how to run and fix equipment, make products efficiently, organize and train a work force, and make profits.

We all know how information and know-how spread in places like Silicon Valley and Cambridge, MA. Extension programs tie the rest of the country's small manufacturers into these and other hubs of new technology, and allow even the smallest firm to share in new ideas and equipment in a way that enables businesses across the country to prosper.

In West Virginia, this is the program responsible for drawing together two facilities, the West Virginia Industrial Extension Service at West Virginia University and the Robert C. Byrd Institute for Advanced Manufacturing at Marshall University. The program is called the West Virginia Partnership for Industrial Modernization [WVPIM].

Because of this effort, the hundreds of small businesses in my State have a place to go for help and expertise that would not be there otherwise. In Huntington, WV, there is the story of Wooten Machine Co. Because of the help that this company got from the Institute for Advanced Manufacturing, Wooten went from making parts manually to computerizing their operation. Now they are talking about hiring more people.

They are not alone. Stinson Manufacturing in Alta, WV, went from a 4-person operation to one that now employs 28 people and has annual gross sales of more than $1 million, again with the help of the Robert C. Byrd Institute.

This is not just about tying together the resources in just one State. Mr. President, there is a tremendous advantage in being part of a national network of centers planted in different States. With the help of this network, West Virginia firms are staying on top of the innovations and techniques that are being collected from thousands of small- and mid-sized firms throughout the country. Larger firms will always be able to keep up with modernization, they have the staff and resources to do that. But if this unique network of manufacturing centers shrinks or dies off, the losers will be the small firms in our States.

Nationally, there are almost 400,000 small- and mid-sized manufacturers that employ less than 500 people apiece—these manufacturers account for over half our national manufacturing output. Nearly 12 million people, in all 50 States, work at these small- and mid-sized firms.

Mr. President, in the global marketplace, firms of any size must master modern technologies, management techniques, and methods of work organization. The exciting part of progress is that you don't have to run a business in Chicago or Detroit or New Orleans to be the best maker of an auto-part, a computer chip, a machine tool. You can be in remote parts of Montana or West Virginia or South Carolina. But you do have to be linked to the information that is necessary to keep up with the advances breaking out every day.

Our Nation's overall economy requires thousands of small- and mid-sized firms keeping up at breakneck pace with what works in design, production, marketing, training, and all kinds of other practices.

Mr. President, the American people know what it will mean to our Nation's long-term economic survival if we do not keep making products and being the best at manufacturing. We have to build things to survive in this increasingly competitive global marketplace. The Manufacturing Extension Partnership is the best, most efficient way to advance this cause.

I also ask unanimous consent that a Dear Colleague distributed by myself and several colleagues on the importance of this effort be reprinted immediately after this statement.

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

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, DC, March 23, 1995.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: Tomorrow, Friday, March 24, 1995, the Senate Appropriations Committee will mark-up the many rescissions passed by the House of Representatives as part of the Disaster Relief Supplemental Appropriation.

One item included in the House package is a $26.5 million rescission from the Manufacturing Extension Partnership—that amounts to 30 percent of this current year's appropriated funds.

We believe Congress should continue its history of bipartisan support for this unique network of assistance dedicated to equipping small-and-medium-sized businesses and their employees to maximize their potential in manufacturing and for growth.

The MEP centers exist in most states, and play an essential role in diffusing and sharing the state-of-the-art ideas, lessons, and methods that businesses in all of our states—especially when they're not in metropolitan centers—would not otherwise obtain.

To help you think about the vital role of the Manufacturing Extension Partnership, we offer you the following:

10 KEY FACTS ABOUT THE MANUFACTURING EXTENSION PARTNERSHIP—AND WHAT'S AT STAKE FOR THE BUSINESSES AND ECONOMIES OF YOUR STATE

1. The Manufacturing Extension Partnership (MEP) is based on the basic, proven idea that a strong manufacturing base is essential to this nation's economic strength and future. Manufacturing employs almost 19 million Americans, representing more than 20 percent of the private sector workforce and accounting for almost a fifth of the U.S. GNP over the last 40 years.

2. Small manufacturing firms, with less than 500 employees—the primary customers of the MEP—contribute more than half of total U.S. value-added in manufacturing and employ almost two-thirds of all manufacturing employees, approximately 12 million Americans.

3. America's small manufacturers know their challenge lies in being able to learn about and adopt modern manufacturing equipment and "best practices," and overcoming various barriers to change, including geographic location or even isolation, awareness, information, finance, and regulations. These are the smaller companies across the country being assisted by manufacturing engineers at MEP extension centers run by local, state, and non-profits.

Median size of MEP's client companies is 50 employees; median sales of a MEP's client companies is $5.4 million; median age of MEP's client companies is 26 years.

4. The Manufacturing Extension Partnership is industry-driven, and market-defined. It builds on and magnifies existing state and local industrial extension initiatives and resources. Centers are managed and staffed by experts with private sector manufacturing experience.

5. The MEP Centers are awarded funds using a rigorous, merit-based competitive process.

6. MEP and its Centers focus services on activities where economies of scale do not exist in the marketplace, and on only those firms which demonstrate a commitment to their own growth and development.

7. The small amount of federal dollars available for MEP leverages substantial resources in state and local governments, as well as the private sector.

8. MEP is committed to performance measurements which focus on the bottom-line economic impact for client companies. This program has shown a rate of return of 7-to-1 for the federal government's investment, with concrete benefit in increased sales, cost savings, and jobs for small manufacturers.

9. Companies using MEP centers are becoming more competitive and are improving their long-term prospects for growth. Their goal is to retain existing jobs, create new high-skilled jobs, and contribute broader economic benefits.

10. Manufacturing Extension Centers are in 32 states, and one of them could be yours. But even if your state is still without a center, eliminating funds from the Manufacturing Extension Program will mean giving up on the goal of a modern, national network to provide irreplaceable technical assistance to our businesses and workforce.

In conclusion, our point is: ''fiscal year rescissions undermines manufacturing strength''

The proposed $26.5 million rescission for the Manufacturing extension Partnership would weaken the emerging, nationwide network of extension centers—co-funded by state and local governments—that provide small and medium-sized manufacturers with technical assistance as they upgrade their operations to boost competitiveness and retain or create new jobs. The rescission would reduce funding available for establishing new centers around the country. Approximately 10 new centers could be funded in FY 1995, rather than the planned 36 centers. Reducing the number of new centers would slow the delivery of MEP services to large regions of the United States—and many thousands of small companies.

We urge your support for his important endeavor. For further information, please contact Laura Philips at 4–9184 in Senator Lieberman's office or Ken Levinson at 4–7515 in Senator Rockefeller's office.

Sincerely,

JOE LIEBERMAN.
JOHN GLENN.
JAY ROCKEFELLER.
JEFF BINGAMAN.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I speak today in support of the Hollings amendment to the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act. The amendment would restore programs that are important to the people of Massachusetts and the entire country. I would also like to note that offsets for each of these programs is provided so the total amount of the rescission package is not affected.

NIST's Manufacturing Extension Program [MEP] is vitally important to small businesses in my State. MEP supports our Bay State Skills and University of Massachusetts technical assistance programs for small- and mid-sized Massachusetts companies. The House bill rescinds $26.5 million from this program and the Senate bill retains this rescission. The Hollings amendment would restore the entire amount rescinded from the MEP Program.

The second program addressed in the amendment is the NOAA Coastal Ocean Program [COP], a nationwide science program that is conducting very important interdisciplinary research on oceanographic problems. As part of the COP, a major field study is presently being conducted of Georges Bank as part of the U.S. Global Ocean Ecosystems Research Program [U.S. GLOBEC]. The main objective of the study is to understand the physical and biological processes that control the abundance of populations of commercially important marine animals. The House and Senate Bills rescind $5 million of COP's $11 million in fiscal year 1995 funding—40 percent of the budget. The rescission is harmful not only to U.S. marine science but also to resource management decision-making which depends on the results of this science. The Hollings amendment would restore the $5 million rescission in the NOAA operations, research and facilities account for the Coastal Ocean Program, resulting in retention of $11 million in funding for this year. As an offset, the amendment would increase the rescission in NOAA construction account from $8 million to $13 million. This would decrease the construction account from $97 million to $84 million. NOAA supports this change.

The final program that the amendment addresses is the NOAA Global Climate Change Program. This program seeks to develop a clearer picture of the relative roles of various greenhouse gases in causing global warming. The Senate bill rescinds $14 million of the $78 million in fiscal year 1995 funding. The amendment would restore $7 million of the rescission for this critical program. The offset would come from the NIST construction fund and the GOES construction fund.

I compliment the distinguished Senator from South Carolina for his leadership in these oceans and technology issues—which he has championed for years. It is my pleasure to serve with him on the Commerce Committee, where he was recently chairman and is now the ranking Democrat.

I join with him to prevent shortsighted cuts in these beneficial programs that exemplify the kind of nationally important work government can do so well and I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 6 minutes and 40 seconds.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I retain the remainder of my time and yield time to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, very briefly I just wanted to respond to my friend from Mississippi and say we are at a time when, obviously, we have to make some tough choices, a lot of tough choices. There are a lot of rescissions in this bill to cut spending and I am going to support most of them. But it seems to me this is one that does not make sense because of the numbers I cited, which is $8 in economic growth for every $1 we spend in this program.

I have to tell my colleague, I know we all hear different messages from our people back home. When I am in Connecticut there is one question that I think is most on people's minds, resonating throughout the State, and I think, throughout the country. The question is: ''Can you do something in Washington to protect my job, to keep my job secure?'' se If people have lost a job, as too many people in my State have, because of manufacturing downsizing, the question becomes: ''What can you do to help me get a new job?''

I know some of the old industries in our State which have downsized, some have even closed, are not going to expand in the near future. The only answer here is to grow the economy. There are tax policies I will look forward to supporting that will encourage capital formation and help make that possible.

But it seems to me one of the best things we can do is to create manufacturing extension centers that will reach out to the small- and mid-size companies to help them grow and help them create jobs. This is a program where I feel we make a mistake by cutting a single dollar because this is a program that gives a lot of people out there—people who are worried about their futures—some hope that there is a new and a good job, a high-paying job, around the corner.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, the Senator from Mississippi should understand, this does not add back. It does not add back one red cent. It is offset within the same budget for unexpended construction funds that are sitting there.

I am here going along with the original premise and the continuing premise of rescissions. That is the basic premise. This amendment is in conformance. It does not add back. It readjusts allocations under the same budget from construction—whether you are going to build office buildings or you are going to start building jobs.

How much time do I have remaining, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 3 minutes and 40 seconds.

Mr. HOLLINGS. I retain the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I think we have made our points. We will be prepared to yield our time and go to a vote if the Senator would like to. I think we only have a total of about 5 minutes or so left. How much do we have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi has 6 minutes remaining. The Senator from South Carolina has 3½ minutes.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I will go along with the suggestion of the distinguished Senator from Mississippi. What happened, two or three Senators wanted to be heard, but we only have 3 minutes if they got here.

Is it the point to yield the remainder of our time, make the motion, get the yeas and nays? Is that it?

Mr. LOTT. Yes, sir.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Very good.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I yield the remainder of my time.

Mr. HOLLINGS. I yield the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been yielded back on the amendment.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I move to table the Hollings amendment and 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.

VOTE ON MOTION TO TABLE AMENDMENT NO. 574 TO AMENDMENT NO. 420

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is now on the motion to table the amendment of the Senator from South Carolina. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

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

The result was announced—yeas 43, nays 57, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 129 Leg.]

YEAS—43

Abraham	Gorton	McCain
Ashcroft	Gramm	McConnell
Bennett	Grams	Murkowski
Bond	Grassley	Nickles
Brown	Gregg	Pressler
Campbell	Hatch	Roth
Chafee	Hatfield	Santorum
Coats	Helms	Shelby
Cochran	Hutchison	Simpson
Coverdell	Inhofe	Smith
Craig	Kempthorne	Thomas
Dole	Kyl	Thompson
Domenici	Lott	Warner
Faircloth	Lugar	
Frist	Mack	

NAYS—57

Akaka	Feingold	Lieberman
Baucus	Feinstein	Mikulski
Biden	Ford	Moseley-Braun
Bingaman	Glenn	Moynihan
Boxer	Graham	Murray
Bradley	Harkin	Nunn
Breaux	Heflin	Packwood
Bryan	Hollings	Pell
Bumpers	Inouye	Pryor
Burns	Jeffords	Reid
Byrd	Johnston	Robb
Cohen	Kassebaum	Rockefeller
Conrad	Kennedy	Sarbanes
D'Amato	Kerrey	Simon
Daschle	Kerry	Snowe
DeWine	Kohl	Specter
Dodd	Lautenberg	Stevens
Dorgan	Leahy	Thurmond
Exon	Levin	Wellstone

So the motion to lay on the table amendment No. 574 to amendment No. 420 was rejected.

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

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate on the amendment?

Mr. HOLLINGS. I urge adoption of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the adoption of the amendment. Is there further debate?

The amendment (No. 574) was agreed to.

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

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. WELLSTONE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

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

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, may we have order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Minnesota suspend?

The Senate is not in order. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I do not believe they can even hear you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senate please be in order?

The Chair advises the Senator from Minnesota that under the previous order, at this time, the Senators from Pennsylvania were to be recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. DOLE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, if the Senator from Minnesota would just give us about 5 minutes, then we will come back to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I thank the majority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

The Senate will be in order.

Mr. SANTORUM addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

THE JIMMY STEWART MUSEUM IN INDIANA, PA

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, Senator SPECTER and I rise today to honor a native son of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania who is going to be honored next month in Indiana, PA—the birthplace of Jimmy Stewart—with a museum that is going to open right about half a block away from the birthplace of Jimmy Stewart.

Many of us have been working long and hard on this museum, trying to get a suitable museum for a man like Jimmy Stewart.

Jimmy Stewart asked, when the people of Indiana, PA, went to him and asked to do a museum for him, that it not be anything fancy; that he wanted it to be very modest. He did not want the University of Indiana, PA, to have a big museum dedicated to him. He wanted something very simple.

In fact, he refused to have anyone from Hollywood participate in any of the fundraising. He said he wanted it to be something from the community and not anything that was generated with a lot of money and a lot of fanfare; that that would make him feel uncomfortable.

So the people of Indiana, PA, have set about the process of raising the money locally and secured the third floor of an old house, just a very small amount of space. Mr. Stewart donated the artifacts for the museum, some of his personal memorabilia. And, in fact, he still has several old friends who have been sort of shepherding this cause along.

I am rising today with Senator SPECTER to pay tribute to him and to the people of Indiana, PA, a little town in western Pennsylvania; a town that, frankly, has had some tough times of late. In fact, Indiana County has the highest unemployment rate of any county in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

But they pulled themselves together and are putting together this really fine and lovely and modest tribute to Jimmy Stewart.

The man is an incredible man in America. He is an actor who has appeared in 71 films. Obviously, we all know the famous films that he has been in. Who has gone through a Christmas holiday without seeing the brilliant George Bailey part that he played and that we all can identify with as someone who has gone through some tough times and been able to face those tough times, and the spiritual role that he played in that movie.

I can still relate to him as I watch ''Mr. SMITH Goes to Washington,'' and the role he played as a U.S. Senator in fighting for what the people of his State called for.

He has been an inspiration not only on the movie screen, but he has been a tremendous inspiration as a war hero. He was assigned to the Army Air Corps, rising from private to bomber pilot, to commander of the Eighth Air Force Bomber Squadron. He, himself, flew 21 missions over enemy territory, including Berlin, Bremen and Frankfurt. By the time it was over Over There, James M. Stewart would be known as colonel, and he would be later decorated with an Air Medal, The Distinguished Flying Cross, and the Croix de Guerre. All told he accumulated 27 years of service in Active and Reserve Duty, even attaining the rank of brigadier general.

On May 20 in Indiana, PA, we will be celebrating Jimmy Stewart's birthday and the opening of the Jimmy Stewart Museum. And, in so doing, we really do honor a great American, someone who takes life in stride and who is just a wonderful example of the goodness that is in America.

I just want to read a couple of quotes from Jimmy Stewart that I found to be amusing and somewhat typical of the man. He said once:

> Jean Harlow had to kiss me, and it was then I knew that I'd never been kissed before. By the time we were ready to shoot the scene, my psychology was all wrinkled.

On his experience in the military and in the war:

> I always prayed, but I didn't really pray for my life or for the lives of other men. I prayed that I wouldn't make a mistake.

And finally, when he was flying a plane back for the Army, he ran into engine trouble while flying a tour of duty in 1959, but managed to bring his plane to a safe landing. He was quoted after he got out of the plane:

> All I could think of was not my personal safety, but what Senator Margaret Chase Smith (who was then chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee) would say if I crashed such an expensive plane.