

can come in and bring a petition, then their cohort friend company could come in and bring a petition, then another company associated in the same industry but not the same could come in and bring a petition. Under the requirements of the bill—I say to my friend in the chair and others—this is not going to reduce Government. This is not going to streamline the agency process. This is not going to lift the burden of regulation. It is going to create far more gridlock than we have had before because you are going to take a fixed number of employees with a shrinking budget, give them greater responsibility to answer petitions, greater responsibility to go to court, to the judiciary, greater responsibility to do risk assessment, greater responsibility to do cost evaluation. And there will be less people to do it.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. KERRY. This is an unfunded mandate. My friend from Ohio said this: "This is the mother of all unfunded mandates."

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, if my friend will yield, I have two questions. First of all, I have not seen the judicial review language. If it has been done, there may be some progress.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, the problem with this is, we are trying to write one of the most complicated pieces of legislation in none of the committees to which the jurisdiction falls. The committee to which the jurisdiction fell was the Governmental Affairs Committee. They sent us the Glenn-Roth bill at the time. It came out to us 15 to 0. So we did have a bipartisan consensus about how to approach this.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Not on the Glenn-Chafee bill.

Mr. KERRY. No, not Glenn-Chafee. I said Glenn-Roth. I said Glenn-Roth. And the only change between Glenn-Roth and Glenn-Chafee, I believe fundamentally, is the fact that the sunset is out and there is a minor change or two. But the other committee, the Environment and Public Works Committee that has jurisdiction, was completely bypassed. The Judiciary Committee, as everybody knows from the report, barely had an opportunity to legislate.

Now, what did we get? We got a bill written in back rooms, cloakrooms—who knows where—offices. It comes to the floor, and now we are trying to write legislation. So it is difficult when you are weighing the impact of each of these words to do it in an afternoon, with a Whitewater hearing and a Bosnia debate and all the other meetings that we go to. It is not a question of bad faith.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Will the Senator yield.

Mr. KERRY. Let us look at the rule-making petition process. Here is what it says:

Each agency shall give an interested person the right to petition.

So we are opening up to everybody in America the right to petition.

For the issuance, amendment or repeal of a rule, for the amendment or repeal of an interpretive rule or general statement of policy or guidance, and for an interpretation regarding the meaning of a rule, interpretive rule, general statement of policy or guidance.

There are 14 different things that somebody can come in and just petition, "I want this changed."

The agency is then required to grant or deny a petition and give written notice of its determination to the petitioner with reasonable promptness but, in no event, later than 18 months afterwards.

So all of these requests could come in. You have a fixed period of time to provide the answer. You have no additional personnel to do it.

The written notice of the agency's determination will include an explanation of the determination and a response—

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1996

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

VOTE ON MOTION TO TABLE AMENDMENT NO. 1803

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 2:30 having arrived, by previous order, the question occurs on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table amendment No. 1803 offered by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. FEINGOLD]. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUE] is necessarily absent.

I also announce that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BIDEN] is absent because of attending a funeral.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BIDEN] would vote "nay."

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

The result was announced—yeas 41, nays 57, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 313 Leg.]

YEAS—41

Abraham	Faircloth	Mack
Ashcroft	Frist	McConnell
Bennett	Gorton	Murkowski
Bond	Gramm	Nickles
Burns	Grams	Packwood
Campbell	Grassley	Roth
Chafee	Gregg	Santorum
Coats	Hatch	Shelby
Cochran	Hutchison	Simpson
Coverdell	Inhofe	Smith
Craig	Kempthorne	Stevens
D'Amato	Kyl	Thomas
DeWine	Lott	Thurmond
Dole	Lugar	

NAYS—57

Akaka	Daschle	Heflin
Baucus	Dodd	Helms
Bingaman	Domenici	Hollings
Boxer	Dorgan	Jeffords
Bradley	Exon	Johnston
Breaux	Feingold	Kassebaum
Brown	Feinstein	Kennedy
Bryan	Ford	Kerrey
Bumpers	Glenn	Kerry
Byrd	Graham	Kohl
Cohen	Harkin	Lautenberg
Conrad	Hatfield	Leahy

Levin	Nunn	Sarbanes
Lieberman	Pell	Simon
McCain	Pressler	Snowe
Mikulski	Pryor	Specter
Moseley-Braun	Reid	Thompson
Moynihan	Robb	Warner
Murray	Rockefeller	Wellstone

NOT VOTING—2

Biden Inouye

So, the motion to lay on the table the amendment (No. 1803) was rejected.

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 1807 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1803

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I send a perfecting 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 Kansas [Mr. DOLE] proposes an amendment numbered 1807 to amendment No. 1803.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

Strike all after the word SEC. and insert the following: "It is the sense of the Senate that before the conclusion of the 104th Congress, comprehensive welfare reform, food stamp reform, Medicare reform, Medicaid reform, superfund reform, wetlands reform, reauthorization of the Safe Drinking Water Act, reauthorization of the Endangered Species Act, immigration reform, Davis-Bacon reform, State Department reauthorization, Defense Department reauthorization, Bosnia arms embargo, foreign aid reauthorization, fiscal year 1996 and 1997 Agriculture appropriations, Commerce, Justice, State appropriations, Defense appropriations, District of Columbia appropriations, Energy and Water Development appropriations, Foreign Operations appropriations, Interior appropriations, Labor, Health and Human Services and Education appropriations, Legislative Branch appropriations, Military Construction appropriations, Transportation appropriations, Treasury and Postal appropriations, and Veterans Affairs, Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies appropriations, reauthorization of the Older Americans Act, reauthorization of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, health care reform, comprehensive campaign finance reform, job training reform, child support enforcement reform, tax reform, and a "Farm Bill" should be considered.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I had earlier offered a second-degree

amendment which listed a variety of issues that the new Republican majority feels should be addressed in this Congress. Then there was a motion made to table the underlying Feingold amendment, which was defeated.

I point out there were 41 votes in favor of the motion to table, therefore against the Feingold amendment. I think it is reasonable to assume that, if there were an effort to force this Democratic agenda item onto this—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will suspend. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I think it is reasonable to assume, given the outcome of the Feingold sense-of-the-Senate resolution, that any effort to, essentially, muscle this Democratic agenda item onto the Republican Senate would likely be greeted with a filibuster. But of course that was just a sense-of-the-Senate resolution. I suppose people can read into it whatever they choose.

The second-degree that the Republican leader has forwarded to the desk simply adds campaign finance to the whole litany of other issues. It listed a whole variety of things the Senate ought to be addressing and simply adds campaign finance to it. Those who feel campaign finance ought to be on the agenda of the 104th Congress surely ought to have no objection to the amendment now before us.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate? The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. Feingold. 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. DOLE. 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. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I rise in support of H.R. 1854, the legislative branch appropriations bill for fiscal year 1996.

The bill, as reported provides \$2.1 billion in new budget authority and \$2 billion in outlays for the Congress and other legislative branch agencies, including the Library of Congress, the General Accounting Office, and the Government Printing Office, among others.

When outlays from prior year appropriations and other adjustments are taken into account, the bill totals \$2.2 billion in budget authority and \$2.3 billion in outlays. The bill is under the subcommittee's 602(b) allocation by \$38 million in budget authority and less than \$500,000 in outlays.

I want to commend the distinguished chairman and ranking member of the legislative branch subcommittee for producing a bill that is substantially within their 602(b) allocation.

I am pleased that this bill incorporates most of the changes endorsed

by the Republican Conference last December and achieves the goal of reducing legislative branch spending by \$200 million from the 1995 level. It is important that the Congress set an example for the rest of the country by cutting its own spending first.

Another important feature of this bill is that it provides an increase of \$2.6 million over the 1995 level for the Congressional Budget Office to enable that agency to meet the new requirements that were created in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act passed earlier this year.

I urge the Senate to adopt this bill and to avoid offering amendment which would cause the subcommittee to violate its 602(b) allocation.

I ask unanimous consent that a table relating to spending totals be printed in the RECORD.

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

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH SUBCOMMITTEE		
(Spending totals—Senate-reported bill; fiscal year 1996 in millions of dollars)		
Category	Budget authority	Outlays
<b>Nondefense discretionary:</b>		
Outlays from prior-year BA and other actions completed		206
H.R. 1854, as reported to the Senate	2,130	1,981
Scorekeeping adjustment		
Subtotal nondefense discretionary	2,130	2,188
<b>Mandatory:</b>		
Outlays from prior-year BA and other actions completed	92	92
H.R. 1854, as reported to the Senate		
Adjustment to conform mandatory programs with Budget Resolution assumptions	-2	-2
Subtotal mandatory	90	90
Adjusted bill total	2,220	2,278
<b>Senate Subcommittee 602(b) allocation:</b>		
Nondefense discretionary	2,168	2,188
Mandatory	90	90
Total allocation	2,258	2,278
<b>Adjusted bill total compared to Senate Subcommittee 602(b) allocation:</b>		
Nondefense discretionary	-38	-0
Mandatory		
Total allocation	-38	-0

Note: Details may not add to totals due to rounding. Totals adjusted for consistency with current scorekeeping conventions.

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. Mr. President, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1854, the legislative branch appropriations bill. I especially want to thank Senator MACK, the subcommittee chairman, for his commitment to fund the Congressional Budget Office at a level which will allow the CBO to carry out the duties given them under the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995. The \$2.6 million appropriation included in this bill for CBO provides the necessary funding and staffing to allow them to perform the cost estimates required under the Mandates Reform Act without inhibiting their ability to perform their primary responsibilities. As the committee report stated, failure to do so would create an unfunded mandate within the Congress itself.

The Unfunded Mandate Reform Act of 1995 passed both Houses of Congress with the support of more than 90 percent of the Members in each body and

it deserves a commensurate level of fiscal support to fulfill its mission. It is important legislation that forms the cornerstone for the congressional reform that is taking place in the 104th Congress. Senator MACK was an early cosponsor of my mandate relief legislation and he never waived from his commitment to see it enacted into law.

AMENDMENT NO. 1804 WITHDRAWN

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that amendment No. 1804 be withdrawn and the vote occur at 4 p.m. on amendment No. 1807.

So the amendment (No. 1804) was withdrawn.

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

Mr. DOLE. That will accommodate one of our colleagues on the other side and also permit the Senator from South Carolina to proceed with his amendment.

Mr. HOLLINGS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

AMENDMENT NO. 1808

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator wish to offer an amendment to the bill itself or to the pending amendment?

Mr. HOLLINGS. If there is no objection, to the bill itself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the pending amendment will be temporarily set aside, and the clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS], for himself, Mr. HATCH, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. ROBB, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. WELLSTONE, and Mr. KENNEDY, proposes an amendment numbered 1808.

Strike page 29, line 6, through page 30, line 20, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

For salaries and expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Technology Assessment Act of 1972 (Public law 92-484), including official reception and representation expenses (not to exceed \$5,500 from the Trust Fund), \$15,000,000: *Provided*, That the Librarian of Congress shall report to Congress within 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act with recommendations on how to consolidate the duties and functions of the Office of Technology Assessment, the General Accounting Office, and the Government Printing Office into an Office of Congressional Services within the Library of Congress by the year 2002: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, each of the following accounts is reduced by 1.12 percent from the amounts provided elsewhere in this Act: "salaries, Office of the Architect of the Capitol, Architect of the Capitol"; "Capitol buildings, Architect of the Capitol"; "Capitol grounds, Architect of the Capitol"; "Senate office buildings, Architect of the Capitol"; "Capitol power plant, Architect of the Capitol"; "library buildings and grounds, Architect of the Capitol"; and "salaries and expenses, Office of the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office": *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the amounts provided elsewhere in this Act for "salaries and expenses,

General Accounting Office," are reduced by 1.92 percent.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for just a moment?

Mr. HOLLINGS. I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to my colleague from Wisconsin without losing the right to the floor.

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

Mr. FEINGOLD. Thank you, Mr. President. I thank the Senator from South Carolina very much.

I just want to briefly comment on what we just resolved with regard to the campaign finance reform issue.

I am very gratified by the bipartisan vote, very strong vote, including 11 Members on the opposite side of the aisle, against tabling the sense-of-the-Senate resolution with regard to the issue of bringing up and considering campaign finance reform during the 104th Congress. It is one of the strongest bipartisan votes we have had on this floor during this 104th Congress.

Now the majority leader has suggested that as a perfecting amendment. In addition to a number of items that were originally in the Mack substitute that did not include campaign finance reform, they have now offered to include in that list—for the first time—campaign finance reform. It is something that should be considered during the 104th Congress.

Mr. President, this is precisely what we had hoped for, a vote by the Senate. I hope, given the fact that it is the majority leader's intention to support his own proposal, that we will have very, very strong bipartisan support to add that to the list.

This is a shift from earlier in the day when the proposal by the Senator from Florida listed many important items but did not include—in fact excluded—campaign finance reform.

So we are extremely pleased that we will have the vote, another vote in addition to the other one that we had, with the vote which was very strong, to indicate that before we leave here in the 104th Congress on a bipartisan basis we should reform this terrible system.

I again thank the Senator from South Carolina for his courtesy.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished colleague. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, this amendment is one to retain the Office of Technology Assessment. It first occurred over on the House side. The bill came out of the committee abolishing the Office of Technology Assessment but on the floor the House added \$15 million for its continuance, taking it out of the hide of the Library of Congress.

On yesterday, Mr. President, at the full appropriations committee markup, I offered an amendment. I was not quite prepared then, and I should be better prepared at this moment. Yesterday, I was not quite prepared because I wanted to present the amendment without cutting the Library of Congress. The fact of the matter is we

had a very close vote, and if I had had the proxies of absent Members, this amendment would not be necessary today. It would have been adopted in committee and on the bill at the moment.

Be that as it may, Mr. President, I have now clarified the provisions of this \$15 million. The President's budget for the Office of Technology Assessment is some \$22 million, and this continues OTA but levels a 30-percent cut, at a level of \$15 million, to be obtained from a 1.12-percent cut from the various legislative accounts—the Office of the Architect of the Capitol, the Capitol Building, Capitol Grounds, Senate office buildings, the Capitol Power Plant, the salaries and expenses of the Superintendent of Documents, the Government Printing Office, and a 1.92-percent cut out of the GAO. We thought, twofold; one, we could make that a little over 1-percent cut across the board, obtain the \$15 million, keep OTA in harness, and otherwise, Mr. President, have a study recommendation made by the distinguished colleague from Alaska, who is no longer but served with distinction as the chairman of the Office of Technology Assessment. His suggestion was that we have a study on how best to consolidate the various legislative or congressional services within this segment of the budget and save money.

There is no question that this amendment not only saves OTA, but it saves money. It is bipartisan. I offer this amendment for myself, Mr. HATCH, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. ROBB, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. WELLSTONE, and others who support this legislation. We have now solved the problem relative to the Library of Congress; Dr. Billington—and he is a good friend and an outstanding librarian—has been doing his homework.

Mr. President, I do not have charts or prepared statements. I agreed to limit my comments without charts so let me get right to the heart of the matter.

Back in the Nixon administration, they abolished the Office of Science Adviser, and at that particular time the various committees were crowding in saying we have to learn about this, we have to know about that. We always referred it to the Office of Science Adviser. We could depend on it; it had credibility.

They said, let us get together in a bipartisan fashion, which we did, with alternating between the House and the Senate as chairman, alternating between Democrats and Republicans. We have had quite a successful administration at the Office of Technology Assessment.

One way it saves us money is by having these distinguished boards, advisory panels, counseling the Office of Technology Assessment. They are comprised of college presidents, heads of the science departments from the institutes of technology, and others around the country who give outstanding assistance free of charge, counseling on the various technological questions.

If we go right to it, I think one of the principal objections is that the needs for these studies will not go away. If each committee crowds in on the technological needs for information from the General Accounting Office, obviously the General Accounting Office will go out and hire all of these people and meet themselves coming around the corner having in all probability expended more money.

Now, what is wrong? This crowd—and I guess I am in on it, too, because I get frustrated on figuring out where you try to save money. I have been through the exercise of freezes, the cuts of Gramm-Rudman-Hollings, a value-added tax allocated to the deficit and all the other attempts made to get us in the black. Unfortunately, in today's political climate, individual chairmen come around and say, "Well, I have got to eliminate something." And more or less, if this amendment passes, it would take away a Brownie point from their political resume.

It is easy to go campaign next year and say, "I am for economy, and I got rid of the Office of Technology Assessment. That is saving \$15 million." Come on. Two nights ago ABC reported on a particular misguided missile, \$4 billion. You never heard this crowd that is fussing about \$15 million—we took almost 2 hours in the Appropriations Committee trying to save \$15 million or trying to sustain the need to know of the Members of this Congress. But they do not talk about that \$4 billion.

Now, that is where the Congress ought to really be working. Do not come around here to get a Brownie point on a political resume about how we saved and got rid of the Office of Technology Assessment. That is good in the 20-second bite. They will not just say how much they saved and everything else of that kind. But instead they cry in frustration, "Well, if we can't cut this, where can we cut?"

I can give them a list. I voted this morning against the space station. I was former chairman of Commerce, Science, and Transportation. I do not like to vote against the space station, but I am trying to maintain the space program. And you see, you learn from experience. They came forward with the space station at \$8 billion. The next thing you know it was at \$17 billion. The next thing you know it was \$30 billion. We have had four revisions of cutting it back until all I think we are going to get is the booster or the thruster up in space and we'll call it a station before we get through.

Now they have a new angle—that it is a matter of comity with the Soviets and everything else. Fine business. If we were fat, rich, and happy, a space station could well be in order. But we are broke. This Congress and Government around here for 15 years now has been spending on an average of \$200 billion more than we are taking in. So we

are not paying our way, and we have to not just cut; we have to forgo.

Another one, AmeriCorps. I believe in voluntarism, but I expect it. We had it when we had Hurricane Hugo. I stood in the rain that weekend, and we counted up volunteers from 38 States that had come around to help us. The first plane that landed in Hurricane Andrew or whatever it was down there at Homestead was our plane that carried generators, clean water, and personnel. We had Spanish-speaking police officers, and you saw them at Hurricane Andrew in the recovery. No cost to Florida, we sent them down from Charleston.

The people of America believe in volunteering, and they will continue to work to help their neighborhoods. Oh, it is good to say on your resume I believe in voluntarism and I voted for AmeriCorps. But instead, I withheld my vote. So I have been saving the money.

So do not come around here saying, "Oh, if we cannot get rid of this." You are not getting rid of it. The need is there. What you are doing is eliminating the most economical approach, the most technologically adept approach to this technological need.

Now, that is the best statement I can make. I note that some of the other Senators want to talk, but I can mention some of the examples of where we save the Government not just millions but billions.

The distinguished Senator from Alaska, I do not know whether he can approach the floor. On yesterday, we talked about the spectrum auction, and that came out of the Office of Technology Assessment. And we put it up, and in the last 2 years now we have brought to the Government \$12 billion—not \$15 million, \$12 billion—from those auctions. So here is a money-making entity.

Those who are frustrated and say, "If I cannot cut this, where can I cut?" I cannot understand those who are committed to ignorance. We are trying to find out. We are trying to learn. We, who have been dealing with the Office of Technology Assessment, study very closely and look at their particular commitments. We just do not take anything and everything.

In fact, all of the requests made are bipartisan. They come from the chairmen and the ranking members of the committees themselves. We get way more requests than we respond to and cannot take on each and every question that would come. So it comes with a real need from the Congress itself. OTA has responded. It has done a professional job. There is no criticism in this debate about the quality of work.

I am not going to try to overwhelm you and bring all the studies and everything else. But we can get into a few of them. I am pleased—I have checked this amendment through with our distinguished ranking member, the Senator from Washington, and I will be glad to adjust it.

Do not tell me that we can give everything to GAO; we know GAO can do it. That is not true. I worked closely for years as chairman of the Legislative Appropriations Subcommittee, working with Elmer Staats and everything else. What we had to do was cut out all the term papers that were being made for high school graduates and everything over there. They will take on anything to keep the work going. Let us not do that. Let us keep the Office of Technology Assessment at an economical price and continue it and not abolish it in the political urge to get rid of something here.

I yield the floor.

Mr. REID addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, there is no one in the Senate I have more respect for than the junior Senator from the State of South Carolina. But having said that, I am not sure who would have won in the Appropriations Committee if all the proxies had been given. That is something we do not know. The fact of the matter is, this amendment was brought up before the Appropriations Committee in an effort to remove this, and that amendment lost.

Mr. President, I, for 6 years, served as chairman in the Legislative Branch Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee. And we went through some very rough times. In prior years, there was quite a bit of money to pass around in the legislative branch. There came a time when there had been cutbacks in Washington generally, and no place has it been focused more than in the legislative branch. So for my friend from South Carolina to talk about going into the black box where all these secret things are, or the A-12, we all know that we cannot do that here today. We are bound by what is in the Legislative Branch Subcommittee of Appropriations. That is all we can deal with. We cannot deal with A-12's, space stations, or black box matters. We have to deal with what we have in this very tiny little Appropriations subcommittee.

And what we have is the fact that we have to cut \$200 million from this subcommittee. This amendment will cut approximately—this—what has been done on the subcommittee level takes approximately \$22 million. It is a tremendous step forward to arriving at the goals we have to meet.

Mr. President, the Office of Technology Assessment is a luxury. It is something that would be nice to have if we had lots of money like we used to have. But we do not have the money that we used to have, and we have to look someplace to make cuts. The amendment offered in the Appropriations Committee took the money from the Library of Congress. Well, it is obvious that that has not sold very well. And now, there is an across-the-board cut, cutting things like the General Accounting Office.

Mr. President, if there has been one entity that has been hit hard in the legislative branch for the past 6 years, it has been the General Accounting Office. Last year, the General Accounting Office was hit with \$69 million in cuts. This next year, it is \$45 million in cuts. It has been cut back about 25 percent, and that is a significant cut for the watchdog of Congress. The General Accounting Office has saved this country billions and billions and billions of dollars. And they are now cut back to the point where they have significantly cut back on the work that they can do, the requests that we make to them that they can meet. The Office of Technology Assessment did 50 major reports last year, 50 major reports for \$22 million. Now, Mr. President, CRS, where the money was originally to be taken, an example of a different workload, CRS did 11,000 reports last year.

The work the OTA does can be done by other agencies. I have had the OTA do work for me. They do fine work. But we do not have the ability to have in our garage three Cadillacs. We have to start cutting back until we wind up with maybe two Chevrolets, or I should say a Ford and a Chevrolet, or maybe a Ford and a Chrysler, however you want to combine it. But, Mr. President, we cannot have three luxury automobiles anymore. All we can have is the General Accounting Office and all we can have is the Congressional Research Service, which the congressional staff depends on around here to meet the requests of constituents at home and Members of the Senate. Our staffs depend on the Congressional Research Service. They did not depend on the Office of Technology Assessment.

Now, Mr. President, I say that the work of the OTA can be done by other agencies. The General Accounting Office can do their work. They are not a bunch of accountants. They have scientists there. They call in scientific panels all the time. We have been told in this debate that they have distinguished boards, advisory panels. Well, that is not hard to copy. That is not hard to do. The General Accounting Office does the same thing.

It is interesting to note, in one of the most scientific matters we have had before this body in a decade, namely, the superconducting super collider, we did not see a word from the Office of Technology Assessment on the superconducting super collider—one of the most scientific measures brought before this body in the last decade. OTA did not write a report on it.

I repeat the words of the Senator from South Carolina: If we cannot cut funding for this agency, then we cannot cut funding for anything. If this is not fat and something that we do not need, then there is not anything we can do—\$22 million in this very tiny little subcommittee.

The proposed amendment attempts to keep OTA alive. We do not kill things around here; we just kind of choke them to death. What we are

going to wind up doing with all these budget cuts is having a significant number of entities, none of which work very well—OTA cutting at 25 percent. I respectfully submit to this body that the budgets in this Legislative Branch Appropriations Subcommittee are stretched to the near breaking point.

We have heard a lot about the Library of Congress and we should hear a lot about the Library of Congress. We have worked very hard to maintain the structure of the Library of Congress. The Senator from South Carolina indicated what they have done in the House is they said, "Well, we are not going to cut OTA. We will have the Library of Congress do it." What kind of way is that to do business; \$16 million out of the Library's budget? That is what they are going to go to conference on. That is the House's position. That is not the way to run Government. It is certainly not the way to run a business.

Mr. President, we cannot, in my opinion, having worked on this subcommittee for 6 years, continually cut these entities that make up this Legislative Branch Appropriations Subcommittee: The General Accounting Office, cut to the very core. The Government Printing Office cut, cut. We have significant security needs. We are doing our best to maintain those. This amendment will take from that.

I just do not think it is right that we have an entity that did 50 reports last year—CRS did 11,000, the General Accounting Office did hundreds and hundreds of reports. We all recognize there is no agency that we depend on more than the Congressional Research Service.

Mr. President, I respectfully submit, I repeat, that the time has come when we as Members of Congress have to make some decisions. We cannot have everything as we used to. We have to make some cuts. And we can only work with what we have. I repeat: We cannot go out and look at A-12 airplanes, black box matters. We cannot look at space stations. We can only look at what the law allows us to look at. That is this Appropriations subcommittee that deals with the things that run the legislative branch.

I call upon my colleagues to defeat this amendment. In the gesture of what we are trying to do around here, to make a more efficient Government, to save money, we are going to have to eliminate programs, we are going to have to eliminate entities and agencies around here. That is the only way we can do it. We cannot keep everything and take a little bit here and a little bit there. We have to start making major decisions. This is a major decision. This involves almost \$22 million a year.

Mr. GRASSLEY addressed the Chair. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I speak in support of the amendment of the Senator from South Carolina, Sen-

ator HOLLINGS. I am also expressing my support for preserving the Office of Technology Assessment. I am not here to make a case that it be preserved with a certain amount of dollars. I am not here to make a case that we maintain the status quo. I am not here to say that OTA can not function with less people. I am not even here to say that you ought to maintain the Office of Technology Assessment Board, and I am a member of that board.

I am here to say that OTA ought to continue or at least its function as a congressional aid ought to be maintained. We need OTA because it provides information so that we can identify existing and probable impacts of technological application. The application of technology impacts upon a lot of public policy that we make in the Congress of the United States.

We need to have a great deal of confidence in the information that is available for changes in public policy or the creation of public policy.

Before I ever came to Congress, Congress saw the need for this sort of information. By statute, OTA must secure unbiased information regarding the impact of technological application.

OTA is one of the few truly neutral sources of information for the Congress. In a very real sense, OTA is our source of objective counsel when it comes to science and technology and its interaction with public policy decision making.

There are plenty of places for information in this town, but so many of these sources of information come from the private sector—and there is nothing wrong with the private sector; there is nothing wrong with organizations protecting their own interests, even if it is in the area of science and technology. But if we do not have an unbiased source of information, then we have to rely on organizations with a stake in keeping alive programs that benefit their interests.

Special interests can fund research, that goes without saying. But it seems to me that Congress ought to have an independent source of information representing all interests in science and technology. Pretty much the same way that the subcommittee has made a determination that a lot of other agencies that it funds ought to exist because of their independence. The General Accounting Office is an example. The subcommittee this year decided that the General Accounting Office should get less money next year than this year and it that it ought to be streamlined and have staff reductions. But that respected organization is being maintained because the subcommittee felt that a postaudit agent, that is responsible to the Congress, should continue to exist.

It is not any different for science and technology. We ought to have an independent source of information, unbiased, not tied to any special interest. The information that OTA provides

comes to us and we use it to determine public policy that has a scientific or technological basis.

It goes without saying that except for a few professionals here and there, like a medical doctor or an engineer, there are not very many Members of Congress who are experts in technical and scientific issues. Of course, we have our personal staff and we have committee staff. But our committee staffs lack the time and the expertise to do in-depth analysis of these issues. OTA can do that.

Congress is not made up of a wide range of professional backgrounds. Two-thirds of the Senators are lawyers. Half the House of Representatives, I believe, is made up from the profession of law.

As I remind you so often, there are only a few of us in this Congress who are farmers. But I would not rely on my judgment on highly technical and highly scientific agriculture issues the same way that I can rely upon OTA when they do studies in these areas that are so essential to agriculture. It puts me in a much better position, and my colleagues in a much better position, to make decisions on agricultural policy based on science and technological based information.

Neither the Federal Government nor the private sector can do analysis geared to the particular interests of congressional committees. OTA can do just that. And it is the smallest and the least expensive congressional agency.

OTA is intimately interfaced with Congress through its bipartisan Technology Assessment Board. I am a member of that board and know something about the operation of it. The board does not need to exist just because I am a member of it.

It does not matter whether CHUCK GRASSLEY is a member of that board or not; you can eliminate the Board, if you want, but still keep OTA's function. There might be better ways to get the job done than the way it was originally set up.

OTA works closely with Congress through its bipartisan Technology Assessment Board. The Board is equally made up of Democrats and Republicans. I have served on this board since 1987 and I can certify the Board ensures compliance with statutory and procedural requirements for each OTA project. This is a unique governance for oversight purposes. Other agencies—like GAO—do not have this special bipartisan group overseeing their operation.

I want to assure all my colleagues that OTA resources are carefully managed in this bipartisan way, and I can certify that the OTA board carefully screens for—and most importantly, does not allow duplicate work. Projects are not self-generated; they are initiated at the request of congressional committees. The committees that have

requested the most studies are the Senate Commerce, Science and Transportation; Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee; Senate Environment and Public Works Committee; Senate Governmental Affairs Committee; Senate Agricultural, Nutrition, and Forestry Committee; Senate Armed Services Committee; Senate Finance Committee; Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee; and the Senate Committee on Indian affairs.

A few of my colleagues have said that the GAO can do the work that OTA currently does. I disagree. I do not show any disrespect for the General Accounting Office in regard to that. In fact, I have been a requester of help from the General Accounting Office and they do a good job. But the General Accounting Office is not equipped to do the highly technical and scientific work that is done by OTA.

Let me explain the backgrounds of the staff of the particular agencies. The General Accounting Office's staff, process, and traditions are primarily those of an audit and program evaluation unit. Only four percent of the GAO staff have Ph.D's, and few of these doctorates are in science and engineering. In contrast, 58 percent of OTA's staff has Ph.D's in these areas, and half of those hold degrees in hard sciences. The GAO has relied on prior or concurrent work of the OTA for scientific and technical aspects of the study.

It seems to me that speaks more to the point raised about what GAO can do and not do in this area than anything I can say. GAO relies on OTA for highly scientific and technological information.

As we continue moving into a highly technical world, we must ensure that we know how public policy impacts future trends and the reverse of that. OTA provides a very high level of expertise to help us understand these trends, while balancing the views of opponents and proponents of various courses of action.

OTA translates modern technical material for legislative and oversight purposes and gives us a heads up on important but complicated science and technology issues in areas like space, defense, and energy.

OTA's studies on energy crops, for example, are particularly important for farm States such as mine. Their study on the "Potential Environmental Impact of Bioenergy Crops" showed that energy crops, such as switch grass, could have net environmental benefits, rebutting the concerns of certain environmentalists.

This study and other studies they have done are going to be very helpful as we debate the farm bill and as we look for new crops to maintain the viability of the farm community. As the domestic supplies of oil and gas diminish and dependence upon foreign sources continues to increase, we will be looking for new ways, even beyond ethanol, for instance, to use farm products to fuel our machines and vehicles.

That is also an issue regarding the energy independence of our country, for national security purposes. OTA is doing very good work on renewable bioenergy fuels for transportation which can help us address our economic issues in rural America.

In addition, OTA helps the Congress make decisions that save the U.S. Government money.

I have some examples of where OTA actually helped us save money. OTA's study of the Social Security Administration plan to purchase computers saved \$368 million. OTA's cautions—a while back now, I might say—about the Synthetic Fuel Corporation helped to secure \$60 billion of savings.

Let me explain that to you. Many thought that it would take \$80 billion to do the work of the Synthetic Fuel Corporation. OTA testified that \$80 billion was an overestimate. In the final analysis, Congress put up only \$20 billion for the Synthetic Fuel Corporation. This saved the taxpayers \$60 billion.

OTA's studies of preventive services for Medicare have assisted legislative decisions for the past 15 years. Studies of pneumonia vaccines and pap smears that showed Medicare would save money by paying for these medical services for the elderly, and Medicare patients would save money. Both proposals passed as legislation.

OTA's work on nuclear power plants has played a central role in eliminating poorly conceived and burdensome regulations on the U.S. power industry.

I urge you to look very closely at the amount of money that is being spent on OTA. I urge you to look very closely at whether the number of people employed is the right number. I urge you to look at the administrative setup. I even urge you to consider abolishing the board of the Office of Technology Assessment, if you want. But I also urge you to look at the product of the OTA, and you will come to the same conclusions in 1995 that Congress came to when it was set up: that we need independent sources of information, particularly in science and technology, which we did not have and we will not have after this day if this is abolished.

I firmly believe, Mr. President, that OTA offers a unique and essential service for Congress, and I am very impressed with OTA's credible analyses of the developments in technology and related public policy issues. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment that preserves the functions of the Office of Technology Assessment.

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, "What's Good from Government." Now there is a topic you do not see often these days. Yet on May 15, 1994, this was the title of an article that appeared in Library Journal discussing the sixty-three finest government publications in 1993. Out of the 20 selected federal government publications that were honored, three of these reports were issued by the congressional Office of Technology

Assessment, including one called, "Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction: Assessing the Risks."

Here is what Keay Davidson, a reviewer in the San Francisco Chronicle had to say about the report on April 7, 1995:

For years, OTA has generated some of the most readable and useful reports imaginable about US research and its impact on social, political, military and economic policy. I always look forward to its reports, which are extraordinarily clear, thoughtful and well-illustrated—extraordinary considering that they come from a government agency. When's the last time you actually enjoyed reading a government document? Not long ago I was on a plane flight, completely absorbed by an OTA report on US efforts to control nuclear weapons and other "technologies of mass destruction."

The distinguished journal, Foreign Affairs reviewed another report in a recent series of OTA studies on nonproliferation and came to the following conclusion: "The Office of Technology Assessment does some of the best writing on security-related technical issues in the United States, as evidenced by this excellent volume."

Of course, this is not the first time that OTA has been recognized for excellence. The June 1989 issue of Washington Monthly featured a story on OTA, holding it up as a model for the rest of the government—over a picture of the Lincoln Memorial, the Washington Monument, and the Capitol, the cover of this journal declared, "At Last! A Government Agency That Works." Indeed, in the last 4 years, 24 OTA reports have been selected in national competitions as among the best government publications nationwide, even worldwide.

None of this acclaim surprises me. OTA has had a long and distinguished track record of publishing informative studies on nonproliferation issues. In 1977, OTA issued a 270-page book on Nuclear Proliferation and Safeguards that is still valuable reading. In a hearing on April 4, 1977, of the Subcommittee on Energy, Nuclear Proliferation, and Federal Services of the Committee on Governmental Affairs, I called this study a "landmark document" that "will make a substantial contribution to everyone's understanding of this highly complex and emotionally charged issue."

Highly complex indeed—I can say without doubt that halting the global spread of weapons of mass destruction is one of the most vexing problems that either the Executive or Congress has had to confront in modern times. The political and diplomatic problems of addressing this threat are bad enough. But the technological aspects of this problem are so complex that many public officials and citizens around the country have just given up—they need help to sort out the issues, weigh the stakes, and outline courses of action.

The OTA has responded to this need in a manner which brings credit not just to the agency, but to our system of government: I am proud that the U.S. Congress recognized the need for such

an agency 23 years ago. My purpose today, however, is to praise OTA for the specific work over the last few years on the subject of weapons proliferation. I urge all of my colleagues in the Senate and the House, even those who have called OTA "a luxury we cannot afford," to sample some of the following reports on weapons proliferation issues.

First, "Nuclear Safeguards and the International Atomic Energy Agency" OTA-ISS-615, June 1995, 147 pages (released this month; also available in a 22-page summary).

This report reviews the origins of the IAEA, describes its safeguards system in terms that non-specialists can easily understand, discusses numerous options for strengthening the IAEA safeguards system, and outlines other possible initiatives to strengthen the global nuclear nonproliferation regime.

Second, "Proliferation and the Former Soviet Union"; OTA-ISS-605, September 1994, 92 pages.

This report is essential reading for all who are concerned about twin problems of "loose nukes" and the "brain drain" following the breakup of the Soviet Union. The report documents specific problems with respect to weaknesses in national systems of nuclear accounting, controls over exports, and the ability to police borders.

Third, "Export Controls and Nonproliferation Policy"; OTA-ISS-596, May 1994, 82 pages.

Here the OTA addresses the contributions and limitations of export controls as a tool of nonproliferation policy. The study offers insights and technical details about the export licensing process, in particular measures to make this process more efficient and effective in achieving nonproliferation objectives.

Fourth, "Technologies Underlying Weapons of Mass Destruction"; OTA-BP-ISC-115, December 1993, 263 pages.

This report is a basic primer about the fabrication and effects of weapons of mass destruction. It is essential reading for anybody both for those who have official responsibilities to tackle this problem, and those who are simply curious about what all the fuss is about concerning these deadly weapons.

Fifth, "Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction: Assessing the Risks"; OTA-ISC-559, August 1993, 123 pages.

I have already discussed this award-winning above. If a reader has no background on proliferation issues and wants to read just one report for the clearest possible introduction to the subject, this is the report to read.

Sixth, "The Chemical Weapons Convention: Effects on the U.S. Chemical Industry"; OTA-BP-ISC-106, August 1993, 69 pages.

The Senate will take up ratification of the Chemical Weapons Convention later this year. An important topic in this process will be the costs to US industry from complying with this Convention. Given that the treaty will

cover controls over chemicals that are either produced or used throughout the nation, this study should be of great interest indeed.

If the publication of six major studies in less than two years is not enough to illustrate the productivity of this agency, critics might consider that OTA is well underway on yet another report in this series, this time on assessing US responses to proliferation after it has occurred.

Congress established OTA in 1972 after determining that, although the applications of technology are "increasingly extensive, pervasive, and critical in their impact," no Executive or Legislative branch agencies were capable of providing Congress with "adequate and timely information, independently developed, relating to [their] potential impact." In its 23 years, OTA has filled that need—and in an age when cost/benefit analyses will figure so prominently in evaluating Federal actions, I can think of no more greater need in Congress than for the types of skills and services that OTA offers today.

This is why the presidents of the National Academy of Sciences, the National Academy of Engineering, and the Institute of Medicine have warned that closing OTA will diminish the quality of advice to Congress. Representing the interests of over 240,000 electrical engineers nationwide, the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers calls OTA a "highly regarded and respected institution" that serves as an "irreplaceable asset" to Congress. The world's largest scientific organization, the American Association for the Advancement of Science, says that abolishing OTA would be a "strategic error for Congress" that would seriously harm the national interest.

OTA does not only prepare formal high-quality reports—Congress has repeatedly drawn upon the agency's in-house expertise to provide short-notice testimony, briefings, and replies to congressional questions on many high technology subjects on the policy agenda. Following the nerve gas attacks in Tokyo and the bombing of the federal building in Oklahoma City, for example, OTA staff were able to respond both promptly and comprehensively to repeated congressional questions.

To whom will Congress turn if the next explosion in an American city involves a weapon of mass destruction? Though the Executive can occasionally be helpful in providing information, there is no substitute for Congress having an independent, bipartisan source of expertise on exactly such technically-complex issues. I can assure my colleagues, I know where I would like to turn in the years ahead, to the Office of Technology Assessment.

I ask my colleagues to join me in saluting OTA for having performed its mission with dignity and professional excellence. This is not an agency Congress can do without.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President. I am in support of the effort to preserve the Congressional Office of Technology Assessment. The OTA, on whose board I currently sit, has been of profound and indispensable use to the Congress in the carrying out of its function of an independent source of complex, unbiased analysis of the technology issues facing our country today. I firmly believe that it would be short-sighted and unwise for us to eliminate entirely this agency, even as we strive to effectuate budget savings with the Legislative Branch.

The OTA was created in 1972 as a result of a far-sighted, bipartisan effort led by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations then ranking Member, Senator Clifford Chase of New Jersey. It evolved from the need to have objective, expert analysis to assist the Congress in assessing the potential effects of a nuclear war on the United States. Again in the late 1970's, the OTA conducted a more comprehensive and detailed study on the same issue. These two studies were among the first comprehensive unclassified efforts to provide realistic assessments of just what nuclear war might mean for the citizens of this and other country's. They proved to be extremely valuable in helping inform the Congress as we developed national policy in this area.

Since those studies, the OTA has proved itself time and again in hundreds of studies across the board spectrum of technology assessment. Throughout its tenure, it has become recognized around the world of its cogent, professional, and unbiased work. It would be foolhardy to shelve that expertise now in a blind effort to simply slash budgets.

I am thankful that under the amendment, another revered and invaluable congressional institution, the Library of Congress, will not be subject to budget cuts in order to spare the OTA. Both of these organization have an exemplary record of in their service to the Congress and I am glad that a mean has been found to adequately preserve the functions of both.

I am hopeful that my colleagues will join me in this effort to preserve a scaled-back OTA and in doing so, insure that the Congress will continue to be able to make informed, reasoned decisions regarding the complex technology issues that it will inevitably face in the future.

Mr. BENNETT addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, we are in an interesting time. I say that reminded me of the old Chinese curse, "May you live in interesting times." I have been through this kind of time in my private life, and I would like to share with you some observations there, as I then addressed the question of what to do about the Office of Technology Assessment.

I remember visiting with a CEO of a fairly large corporation, and he told me

of a very difficult experience that he had just been through in his company. He said, "I have just gone through the whole company, looked at everything, and ended up cutting back here, cutting back there, leaving a lot of blood on the floor, if you will, as I have had to clean up the company. And then I said to all of the employees who survived this exercise, this is it, this is as deep as we are going to cut, and you can all relax now because you have passed the test, and we have seen to it that everything that is excess, everything that is wasteful has been taken care of."

Then, he said to me, "I quietly in my own office went to my calendar, flipped the pages forward about 3 years, and wrote down, 'Do it again,' because I realized no matter how zealous we were in trying to keep from getting duplication and creating redundant services and getting too fat, no matter how hard we worked at it, in about 3 years time in our company we would suddenly wake up and discover we had too many people doing the same thing, and I would have this same kind of circumstance again."

We do not do that in the Federal Government. That is, we do not go 3 years ahead and write down, "Do it again." Instead, once something gets started, it continues, regardless of whether or not it has outlived its usefulness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We have a previous order to vote at 4 o'clock.

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

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

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call.

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

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

#### VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 1807

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRAIG). Under a previous order, the question is on agreeing to the amendment numbered 1807, offered by the majority leader, to the amendment numbered 1803. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUE] is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 91, nays 8, as follows:

#### [Rollcall Vote No. 314 Leg.]

##### YEAS—91

Abraham	Brown	Coverdell
Akaka	Bryan	Craig
Ashcroft	Burns	D'Amato
Baucus	Byrd	Daschle
Bennett	Campbell	DeWine
Biden	Chafee	Dole
Bingaman	Coats	Domenici
Bond	Cochran	Dorgan
Boxer	Cohen	Exon
Bradley	Conrad	Faircloth

Feingold	Kemthorne	Pell
Feinstein	Kennedy	Pressler
Ford	Kerrey	Pryor
Frist	Kerry	Reid
Glenn	Kohl	Robb
Gorton	Kyl	Rockefeller
Graham	Lautenberg	Roth
Gramm	Leahy	Santorum
Grams	Levin	Shelby
Grassley	Lieberman	Smith
Gregg	Lott	Smith
Harkin	Lugar	Smith
Hatch	Mack	Snowe
Hatfield	McCain	Specter
Heflin	McConnell	Stevens
Helms	Moynihan	Thomas
Hutchison	Murkowski	Thompson
Inhofe	Murray	Thurmond
Jeffords	Nickles	Warner
Johnston	Nunn	Wellstone
Kassebaum	Packwood	

##### NAYS—8

Breaux	Hollings	Sarbanes
Bumpers	Mikulski	Simon
Dodd	Moseley-Braun	

##### NOT VOTING—1

Inouye

So the amendment (No. 1807) was agreed to.

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

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

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

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

#### AMENDMENT NO. 1808

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I rise simply for the purpose of expressing the appreciation of this Senator—and I think I can speak for the Joint Committee on the Library—that the proposal pending by the distinguished senior Senator from South Carolina will not affect the Library of Congress. It has taken very severe budget cuts and budget freezes over the years. Its world function, its national role, and its indispensable service to the U.S. Congress would be in jeopardy were more to take place.

Our distinguished Librarian, Dr. James Billington, has made this clear in forceful, in cogent, and in concise terms. His argument has clearly prevailed.

I want to express my appreciation to the Senator for this purpose, and to state just incidentally my agreement—I am sure most of us will also agree that the Office of Technology Assessment has an important role. It has been here a quarter century. It was established for a role and it ought to continue. I simply want to make those comments.

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. DOLE. 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. DOLE. Mr. President, let me just indicate what I am doing here.

I am trying to determine whether or not we will go to S. 343, which is regulatory reform, which I had a right to do under the order. That is why I do not want to get bogged down with some other amendment because I need to give an hour or so, or some advance notice to the minority leader, Senator DASCHLE. Then there would be 1 hour of debate and then there would be a vote on cloture on S. 343.

Following that, we would, if cloture is not invoked, either move on to something else, or I assume somehow we get back to this bill, which I thought would take 2 hours. We started at 10 o'clock.

I want to accommodate the Senator if I can. Does he want to speak for 10 minutes or 15 minutes?

Mr. KENNEDY. Less than that. I know the Senator from Utah was addressing this issue as well. I am more than glad to either proceed or wait until after the Senator from Utah, and then at a time that the leader wants to gain control of the floor to make a request, I would withhold.

Mr. DOLE. If I could request that I be recognized at 5 p.m.

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

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I wanted to speak briefly—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. But I understood from the Senator from Florida that the Senator from Utah was in the middle of a statement. I will be glad to wait until after he concludes.

Mr. President, I will yield the floor, but before doing so, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senator from Utah concludes, I might be recognized.

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

Mr. BENNETT addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMAS). The Senator from Utah.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for his courtesy.

It is true I was in the middle of a statement when the regular order intervened and we had the vote. I do not have much more to say, but I was in the middle of making the point that every organization inevitably ends up growing more than it really needs to. There is an inertia—it is almost organic—in organizations that says we start this, which is a good thing, and it grows a little, and then we start another, which is a good thing, and it grows a little. And just like a plant, organizations need to be pruned back every once in a while. I have done it in my business. I know there are others here who have business experiences who have had to do this.

As we address this OTA circumstance, it is my feeling that this is what we have here. OTA in my belief has been a good agency. It has done good work. I hear the Senators talk about its work, and I agree. If you look at just the OTA, you would come to the conclusion that it deserves to remain.

At the same time, Mr. President, that OTA was doing its work, the Library of Congress was building a capacity to deal with technology issues. At the same time, the GAO was looking into many issues that were the same kinds of issues as OTA. And as we looked at this within the committee, I came to the conclusion that we have simply proliferated capacity in this area throughout the Government, that it is time to prune the bush.

Now, I am sorry personally for those who are connected with OTA that they are the ones who have felt the pruning shears and that the function will be transferred, if we continue with the actions recommended by the subcommittee, to other agencies. This is always a wrench for the individuals involved, and they say, with some degree of fairness, "Why me? I have done a good job. I have done what the Congress has asked me to do. I have produced a report that is of sound value. Why are you cutting back on me?"

Those of us who are in this position must look at the entire Government, not just one agency at a time. When we do that, we have to say to those who are feeling the effect of the pruning shears, if it were not you, it would have to be someone else because there is redundancy here.

We have the responsibility in the overall budget circumstance to do as the CEO I was referring to in my beginning remarks, go through and clean out the duplication and sharpen up the organization.

I realize this is not an exact analogy, but nonetheless it illustrates the point. I read a column recently where the columnist was talking about a television station that went off the air because of financial difficulties. They did not want to lose their license, so they said we in fact will keep broadcasting a signal while we work out our financial difficulties. They put on the air the picture of fish, tropical fish, and broadcast that 24 hours a day to keep their place. When they solved their problems financially, and they could go back to regular programming, they took the fish off the air and put on the regular programming. And what happened, Mr. President? They were deluged with phone calls complaining about the fact that they had canceled the fish.

It seems that once something gets started, it develops a constituency regardless of whether or not there are other options.

Now, I am not, as I say, suggesting in any way that the OTA is simply broadcasting of the fish, but they have developed a constituency that is appropriately calling for their preservation in an atmosphere when there are other facilities capable of doing this.

So painful as it is, Mr. President, difficult as it is to explain to the individuals who are doing a good job, I have come to the conclusion that as a total Government we have the capacity elsewhere to do what we have been doing in the OTA. It has become redundant because of what we have funded in the Library of Congress and in the General Accounting Office, and I support the subcommittee's report that says this is the place we shall prune.

I thank the Chair.

Mr. KENNEDY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I know that there are other Members who want to speak, so I shall not take much time.

Mr. President, I wish to just review for the Senate where we are on this issue of OTA. The issue no longer is the size of the budget. That issue has been basically agreed to. So this is not something that is in addition. This is not something that we are adding. The total amounts in terms of the budget have effectively been agreed to and that really is not before the Senate.

The issue that is before the Senate is whether we are going to retain the capability of OTA to deal with technological issues which can be helpful to the Congress and to the American people generally. That is only the issue.

So we have to evaluate now whether that can be done with the existing agencies, the Congressional Research Service, or other agencies, or whether it is best to try to hold together the capability that has been developed in OTA, to be able to give advice, counsel, and judgment to the Congress on matters of technology that we are going to face in terms of the future.

That is basically the issue. Now, I say to my good friend from Utah, the fact is we have had the expression of the American Academy of Sciences, the Institutes of Medicine, American Academy of Energy, and science advisers to Republican and Democrat Presidents alike. All are in agreement that this function ought to be maintained. They had an opportunity to say no, let us separate out OTA and let it go to CRS or let it go to other agencies; we do not believe that it will really make much difference in the ability of Congress to get this information.

They were asked that very question, and the most important, prestigious institutes that deal with the most complex issues of technology and new technology and advanced technology have recognized and respected OTA for being the center of excellence for technology, to advise us in the Congress and Senate.

So if the issue of the budget is out of the way, we have to ask ourselves what is in the best interests really of the Congress generally, the House and the Senate, and even the executive and the public because these studies are made available to the public, and what is really the best way to do it, because

you have to face the fact that we in the Congress are going to be faced with these technology issues into the future of this country—increasing technology, cutting edge technology, technology that is going to be at the heart of the American economy after the turn of the century and in many respects is there even now.

I can see in my own State with biotechnology, telecommunications, fiber optics, the wide range of new kinds of technology. And the question is, how does that impact the lives of the American people? And how will it affect that?

We do have a resource that is special, that has been recognized, not just by Members of Congress, but by the most prestigious, important and significant institutes that are dealing with these issues, that have made their judgment. And so whether it has been in those institutes or whether it is the CEO's of the top companies in this country that are devoting the greatest amount of their own resources in terms of technology that respect this expertise, whether it is the former science advisers under Republicans and Democrats alike, they have all come virtually to this conclusion: It is important to maintain OTA as an institute. Where it is going to sit and within the various framework of existing agencies is a matter of administration. And I think that could be worked out by reasonable individuals in the course of the conference with the House of Representatives.

But what we should not lose is that capability, that capacity, that kind of integrity which has been of value to this Congress on issues involving DNA, on new technologies in education, on the issues of polygraph. Their recommendations that they made to the Congress were later taken and put into law by Senator HATCH and myself. On instance after instance so many areas of important technology, OTA has been there. I have agreed with some of their conclusions, differed with others. I think every Member of the Congress realizes it really represents an extraordinary degree of knowledge and awareness and background and experience and really the best in terms of bringing evaluations of technology. It is an asset that we cannot afford to lose. And I hope very much that the amendment will be accepted.

I strongly support the amendment to maintain the Office of Technology Assessment as a valuable and needed arm of Congress.

OTA was created 23 years ago by the Technology Assessment Act of 1972. In the years since then, OTA has become a world-renowned source of information and analysis on current technology issues. It plays an invaluable role in helping Congress assess and apply scientific and technological advances for the benefit of the American people.

OTA's budget is currently \$22 million. Clearly, OTA is prepared to tighten its belt substantially along with the rest of the Federal Government. In fact, under the able leadership of Dr. Roger Herdman, OTA has already taken major cost-cutting measures on its own initiative.

But regrettably, the bill before us proposes to eliminate this needed and unique agency.

Each year, OTA prepares dozens of formal assessments, background papers and case studies on subjects ranging from adolescent health to nuclear disarmament. OTA's well-researched and carefully reasoned reports are must-reading in the committees of Congress that address scientific issues, and in the executive branch and private industry as well.

OTA enjoys the full support of the scientific community. The American Association for the Advancement of Science has called it:

Unique and highly respected . . . [a] model for legislative bodies around the world . . . Its demise would have serious negative impacts on Congress' ability to do its job well, and on the national interest.

The prospect that OTA might be abolished has also brought expressions of alarm from the National Academy of Sciences, the Institute of Medicine, and the National Academy of Engineering. It would be difficult to find any serious scientific organization that is not deeply concerned about the impact of this proposal on the quality of technology-related legislation.

The chief executive officers of Monsanto, Eastman Kodak, and many other Fortune 500 companies have expressed support for the agency. Science advisers to Republican and Democratic Presidents alike have endorsed OTA's preservation. These are not the reviews one would expect for an irrelevant or superfluous or unneeded organization. The experts outside the beltway know that modest funding for OTA is a wise investment for Congress and an excellent bargain for the Nation.

OTA's large impact on the legislative process is out of proportion to its relatively small size. Let me offer just a few examples:

In the wake of the Oklahoma City bombing, Congress debated a bill promoting technologies to help prevent terrorism and enhancing the ability of law enforcement agencies to apprehend those who commit such crimes. OTA had already laid the groundwork for this discussion. In July 1991 and in January 1992, OTA issued a pair of reports that evaluate technology for bomb detection and target hardening, airline passenger profiling, and other antiterrorism strategies. Not only were these reports helpful to those drafting counterterrorism legislation, but within days of the Oklahoma City bombing, OTA staff conducted in-depth briefings on the subjects for Members of Congress and their staffs.

During the floor debate on medical malpractice 2 months ago, OTA's land-

mark studies on medical negligence and defensive medicine seemed to be in the hands of every Member. Senators KYL, MCCONNELL, and others made much of OTA's conclusion that "the one reform consistently shown to reduce malpractice cost indicators is caps on damages." I was on the other side of that debate, but I had no cause to challenge OTA's credibility or impartiality.

OTA's study in the 1980's on polygraph testing is also a landmark document. It is recognized as the definitive review of scientific research on this topic. The report was used and cited extensively by the Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources, then chaired by Senator HATCH, during the legislative process that led to enactment of the Employee Polygraph Protection Act. That bill was signed into law by President Reagan in 1988.

OTA has been in the forefront of efforts to evaluate the cost effectiveness of medical technologies. It produced the first report documenting the health and economic benefits of vaccinating the elderly against influenza. Based directly on these findings, Congress included coverage for these vaccinations in Medicare, a step that has prevented thousands of deaths and saved millions of dollars that Medicare would otherwise have spent on hospital costs.

On the other hand, OTA documented in 1989 that cholesterol screening of the elderly would not be cost effective. That report was a major factor in the decision not to cover this screening under Medicare, saving the program substantial amounts.

In the late 1970's research on recombinant DNA was considered potentially dangerous and had aroused widespread public concern. More than a dozen bills had been introduced in Congress to halt genetic research. But OTA's 1981 analysis, "Impacts of Applied Genetics," helped to convince key Members of Congress of the economic potential of this emerging science. Today, biotechnology has expanded the boundaries of medicine, agriculture and commerce. The United States leads the world in this field, and OTA deserves a share of the credit.

In its report, "Building Future Security: Strategies for Restructuring the U.S. Defense Industry," OTA conducted a comprehensive analysis of defense technology and the Nation's industrial base. It proposed a major restructuring of the military industrial complex, in order to maintain defense capabilities during the transition to the post-cold-war economy, while meeting pressing domestic needs. The report has greatly assisted deliberations on this subject in both the legislative and executive branches.

There are many other fields in which OTA's influence has been substantiated. Its work on computer technology in the classroom has helped to shape important legislation on education. Over a period of many years, OTA has been deeply involved in Con-

gress' evaluation of the Clean Air Act. When the *Exxon Valdez* disaster occurred off the coast of Alaska in 1989, OTA's suggestions on maritime precautions were incorporated in the Oil Pollution Act of 1990.

These are just a few examples of timely and incisive OTA reports that have improved the quality of legislation.

Some contend that OTA's work can be handled by other congressional support agencies. I have the utmost respect for the Congressional Research Service and the General Accounting Office, but neither agency is equipped to take on the exceptionally challenging and specialized tasks of OTA. Although CRS and GAO existed 23 years ago, we recognized the need at that time for a smaller but expert agency with the specific mission of advising Congress on science and technology. That need is even greater today. It would be a tragic mistake to drain the reservoir of expertise that OTA has developed over the past 23 years, and try to reinvent it in some other congressional support agency.

Let's be clear. This is not a budgetary issue. The amendment proposes no new expenditure of funds, only that a very small portion of the money already allotted for the support agencies under this bill be used to preserve OTA. The sole question now is structural—whether we should keep OTA's expertise intact and centralized, or whether we should disperse OTA's responsibilities among the other support agencies and suffer the consequences.

One way or another, the work of technology assessment must go forward. It is simply a matter of common sense to keep intact the one agency that already knows how to do this job and meet the needs of Congress in this highly specialized field. Breaking up OTA in the name of streamlining Congress makes no sense.

It should also be emphasized that this amendment involves no cut in funds for the Library of Congress. The concerns of Library supporters have been completely addressed—the Library will not be cut.

In the years ahead, as we move into the 21st century, there will be even greater need to rely on OTA for impartial assessment of technology-related policies. The world of science and its impact on public policy are becoming more complex, not less. Technology is central to every aspect of American life, from biotechnology to law enforcement, from agriculture to education. It would be a serious mistake to limit our ability as a legislature to evaluate and respond to the scientific and technological challenges facing Congress, the Administration, and the Nation.

The Office of Technology Assessment has performed the task we assigned to it superbly. It continues to serve an indispensable role. It should bear its fair share of the current budget crisis—but it should not be abolished.

I urge adoption of the amendment.

Mr. HATCH addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah,

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I have been listening to my colleague from Massachusetts. As everybody in this body knows, we do not always agree. In fact, there are some that think we disagree quite often.

But I have to say he is right on this issue. I have watched what OTA has done for the whole time I have been in the Congress. And I have to tell you, if you are going to shift that burden to CRS or some other support group, you are going to spend more money than you spend on OTA and you are not going to have the congressional benefits that come to Congress as a whole that you get from OTA. As a matter of fact, we have all kinds of Ph.D.'s at OTA. Over half, 58 percent of OTA staff hold doctorates. And all of the support people that are volunteers from outside are the greatest scientists in the world—at least from this country—who also support OTA. And that is a benefit you cannot quantify because if we had to pay for all that what it is really worth, we could not afford to pay for it.

So there is a lot to this. I do not think we should make the mistake of cutting OTA yet. I am the first to admit that we have to make cutbacks here. I think OTA has to suffer its fair share. So I am not arguing for 100 percent of OTA's budget. I wish we could because I think it is working over the long run, because this is the one arm of Congress that does give us, to the best of their ability, unbiased, scientific and technical expertise that we could not otherwise get where most everybody has confidence in what they do.

Mr. President, I support the amendment offered by Senator HOLLINGS to restore some funding for the Office of Technology Assessment [OTA] during the next fiscal year.

Mr. President, my support for this amendment should not be confused with a failure to recognize the very difficult task the Legislative Branch Subcommittee is faced with this year in making its share of budget reductions. There is no question that Congress must contribute its share to deficit reduction, especially in light of the budget resolution we have just passed. I commend the managers of this bill on what they have been able to bring to the floor.

However, I am concerned about one of the rationales used to justify the elimination of OTA. I do not agree that there is no longer a need for OTA. On the contrary, I believe that Congress' need for technical scientific analysis will increase.

As our economy becomes increasingly complex and technologically oriented, Congress will require, more than ever, an ability to effectively analyze technology in making policy decisions. The question is, Mr. President, can another support agency do the work for which OTA has become recognized? Some of our colleagues believe the answer is a simple yes.

I respectfully disagree.

Fifty-eight percent of OTA's staff hold Ph.D., half of which are in the hard sciences. No other agency can make this claim. Nor can any other agency make the claim that it has the ability to call upon a network of in excess of 5,000 technical experts from all over the country who provide the best information available on science- and technology-related topics. Nor is there the level of scrutiny and review placed upon any other support agency from the time a request is made to the time the product is officially released in final form.

The product expected from OTA and the type of review that this small, specialized agency is mandated to undergo produces what I believe everyone in this body would agree is desirable: thorough, objective, and accurate analysis.

Relying on other, existing agencies to fulfill this mission asks these organizations, whose specialty is a highly specific quick turnaround study, to expand capability to do more comprehensive assessments in areas for which they may not even have in-house expertise.

Let me state this another way: The primary mission of OTA is not to do studies for immediate use by the Congress. OTA's charter is to be more forward-looking, more comprehensive, and more technical.

With fewer than 5 percent of Congress' membership having technical training, we cannot afford not to have this capability. Needless to say, I would not be making this argument if the proposal were for a legal research office.

This brings me to the budget implications of this amendment. And, let me state strongly for the record that I absolutely agree that reductions have to be made everywhere. I do not advocate that OTA be restored to 100 percent of its current level. OTA, like all other federally funded agencies and programs has to absorb its share of the necessary reductions.

My distinguished colleague from South Carolina, Senator HOLLINGS, has done an excellent job in finding the necessary offsets so as not to disrupt the overall budgetary outlays already contained in this bill and in the budget resolution. He has gone the extra mile to make sure that these offsets are germane, that they are fair, that they are cognizant of the concerns that have been expressed by the affected agencies whose budgets will further be reduced by this amendment.

But I have to say, for example, under the House proposal, the Congressional Research Service would be required to provide the entire \$15 million outlay for the continuance of OTA's functions, a burden that is understandably quite overwhelming and, quite frankly, unfair to the Library of Congress. CRS's burden under the House proposal takes on added significance when you know time has been taken to ensure that the

structural changes required by the provision will maintain the integrity of both support agencies.

In contrast, the Hollings amendment not only maintains OTA's independence, but it does not require any additional budget outlays be taken from the Library of Congress, as stipulated in the chairman's mark. This provision also eliminates the additional need to make the House-required structural adjustments that would create an even greater burden upon the Library of Congress.

Now, we recognize the reality that the structural adjustments will be necessary as overall budget outlays shrink over the next several years. The Hollings amendment stipulates that the Library of Congress undergo an evaluation of how the services of GAO, OTA, GPO, and CRS can be consolidated by the year 2002. This is a responsible approach under the circumstances. That will allow us time to ensure that the services provided by OTA can be most effectively maintained over the long term while recognizing that inevitable structural and budgetary changes will continue to be necessary for the years to come.

All I can say is that, as a conservative who believes that we have to cut back, who believes we need to reach that balanced budget by the year 2002, having served with OTA and understanding the interworkings of OTA and having watched what they have done for all the 19 years I have been in the Congress, I have to say it would be a tragedy for us to cut it out completely. And I do not think you could find any other area of Government that will provide the services that we need that OTA provides. And Heaven knows, in this very complex world, this complex present time, we in Congress have got to have that kind of equity at our beck and call. OTA has provided it for us. And I hope that folks will vote for the Hollings amendment.

Therefore, Mr. President, I commend Senator HOLLINGS for his leadership on this amendment, of which I am pleased to be a cosponsor.

I encourage all of my Senate colleagues to support this important measure.

Mr. STEVENS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I served on the Office of Technology Assessment Board from January of 1974 to January 1992. Since it was established, OTA has completed 721 studies to date. During the period I was there, 18 years, I obtained board approval for four studies that addressed Alaska's needs.

For instance, we had one study that addressed our rural village sanitation problem in Alaska. We had another that addressed the technical feasibility of transporting some of our very abundant fresh water from Alaska to California, which had been suggested to alleviate water shortages there. It did not prove to be economically feasible.

We had another one concerning the technological considerations of generating power in very remote arctic villages. And another was the review of oil production challenges in an arctic environment.

There were three others that touched my State in that period of time. One addressed the *Exxon Valdez* disaster; one for oil and gas development in deep water, and in arctic waters in particular; and another one, addressing nuclear waste in the former Soviet Union. They were not particularly at my request, but I did support them.

I want the Senate to know that in my time on this board I became convinced that this is a shared staff. And I have often referred here on the floor of the Senate to the benefits derived from this shared staff in the Office of Technology Assessment. Not only do we share staff, but by virtue of the professional staff we have in the Office of Technology Assessment, they attract onto Washington boards and panels the leading experts of our Nation, if not the world, in the development of new technology.

I think that without this OTA, what will happen is—and now I am speaking in my role as the chairman of the Rules Committee—that we will face increasing demands from individual committees for funds to hire people to do the same thing that the OTA does. The only difference is we will have, as we did before OTA, several committees exploring the same subject with people who are not the experts of the country and without the basic experience of the OTA in framing the issues for review by Congress.

As I came over here today, I picked up from the edge of my desk some of the OTA reports that I have reviewed over the years. This is "Critical Connections, Communications for the Future, A Summary," prepared for the Congress in January 1990. It addressed, as my friend from South Carolina mentioned, the frequency spectrum problem. It was this summary that got me thinking about frequency spectrums. And for three Congresses, I asked Congress to change the policy of dealing with the spectrum that the FCC has under its jurisdiction in our airwaves.

They used to have a policy of having a lottery when a block of frequencies from the spectrum was available. It was announced, and people filed an application. It was literally a lottery. There was a drawing. And for \$20 you got a slice of the spectrum that could be worth anything from nothing to \$1 billion.

I felt that this summary would convince anybody that this system of disposing of a very valuable commodity, if maintained in the future, was wrong. It led to, as the Senator from South Carolina has stated, action finally in 1993 by the Congress. Last year we received \$12 billion for the sale of units of the spectrum. We have OTA to thank. At least the people who have paid any attention to what is done with OTA's

work understand where the credit belongs.

Here is another one, March 1992, "Global Standards, Building Blocks for the Future." I keep that on my desk and find it interesting.

"Finding a Balance: Computer Software, Intellectual Property and the Challenge of Technological Change."

They have another one that I keep and I think other Senators might be interested in it. It is dated June 1993: "Advanced Network Technology."

They went into another background paper at our request: "Accessibility and Integrity of Network Information Collections." That was later in 1993.

Incidentally, one of OTA's members referred me to this. It was a cover story of the fall issue of *Up Link*. Anyone who wants to catch up with what we are talking about should read "Digitally Speaking," a very interesting article.

All I am telling you is, Mr. President, and Members of the Senate, that this entity has led us to become aware of and become interested in and to try to utilize developing technology to meet the needs of the United States. I know of no other way we can get that except through shared staff.

The House has access to OTA. The Senate has access to it. We have equal representation on this body, Republicans and Democrats, and we always have, since its inception, without regard to which party controlled the House or the Senate.

Now we face a challenge to the very existence of OTA, and I am compelled to rise and say I think that OTA is a misguided target. I do believe, as the Senator from Utah said, we can make reductions in the expenditures by OTA. We have made a 15-percent reduction in the staffs of every committee in the Senate. There is no reason why we could not make a 15-percent reduction in OTA, and that was the intent.

But now we face a question of obliteration of the OTA. I want to tell the Senate that I believe the studies that I have seen by OTA have been at the request of a Senate committee or a House committee or by individual Senators, but none of them goes through without approval of the OTA board. None of them go through without a majority of the vote of three Members of each party from each House.

This is a very restrained board in terms of committing money of the United States. I have not agreed with some of the studies, and the record will show I voted against some of them. I voted against some of them because I did not think they involved the assessment of technology. They involved trying to pursue the application of technology. But if we keep to the subject and restrict the OTA to what it was intended to do, it is one of the most valuable entities I have found in the Senate to get access to material that is current about technology.

We are entering an era now of technology expanding at an explosive rate,

the likes of which the world has never seen. We are going to see developments—and I saw AMO sitting here a while ago, our good friend Mr. HOUGHTON from the House. Talk to him sometime about fiber optics and how it came about that we have that concept now in the world.

We are looking at technology. We are at the edge of a precipice, Mr. President. The precipice is one that we can fall down into a chasm or we can analyze the way to get across that chasm into a future that is so bright you can hardly imagine it.

I was talking to some of my interns today, and they asked me about what we are going to do in my State when the oil runs out, what happens to our State, supported primarily by oil revenues. I remarked to them about Mr. HOUGHTON's company. Who would have thought in the days gone by we would take grains of sand from a beach and turn it into the most capable means of conveyance of communications known to man.

When it comes down to it, we have used technology in this country to stay ahead militarily, to stay ahead economically, to meet the needs of our people, and yet here we are about ready to do away with the one entity in the Congress that tries to collate and analyze and deliver to Members of Congress credible, timely reports on the development of technology.

I believe, more than most people realize, that we are changing the course of history in this Congress, but this is not one of the hallmarks of that change. This entity ought to be out in the forefront of that change, and it will not be unless it is properly funded and maintained. I support this amendment.

Mr. MACK addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. MACK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the recognition of Senator DOLE at 5 p.m. be postponed for 15 minutes.

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

Mrs. MURRAY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I rise in support of retaining the Office of Technology Assessment. I support the agency and hope that my colleagues will consider it favorably.

OTA is a unique and valuable asset of the Congress. For many years it was also unique to the United States; but within the past few years, it has been used as a model by many democratic nations for establishing their own technology assessment organizations.

OTA is a small agency with 143 permanent employees and an annual budget of \$22 million. The agency analyzes science and technology issues in depth for the Congress. It provides Congress with objective, nonpartisan reports and offers options for Members in dealing with related public policy issues. Its

studies are initiated by full committees of the Senate and/or House and are approved by the Technology Assessment Board, TAB, which oversees the agency. That Board consists of six Senators and six Representatives, equally divided by party.

OTA is a first rate scientific organization. Its retention has been supported by the National Academy of Sciences, the American Association for the Advancement of Science, the American Physical Society, Dr. Sally Ride, and a host of important companies, such as TRW.

OTA is unique on the Hill because of the bipartisan Technology Assessment Board. No other support agency has such a mechanism to ensure balance between the interests of both Houses and of both parties. This structure is instrumental in keeping the work objective and balanced, as well as acting as a priority-setting mechanism for the work that is conducted, ensuring that it has broad interest. It enables Congress to leverage OTA's limited resources to greatest effect.

OTA works almost entirely on a bipartisan basis, doing major projects requested by both chairmen and ranking minority members. Since 1980, 79 percent of OTA reports have been requested on a bipartisan basis.

OTA is unique to the Hill in that no such bipartisan organization could exist in the executive branch. For many years, the party holding the majority in Congress did not control the White House. That is again the case. Many of us find OTA's independent, bipartisan analysis very helpful under these circumstances; we do not have to rely on the information and analysis supplied by the executive agencies. Furthermore, over the years, OTA has developed an excellent working relationship with executive agencies—based in part on their bipartisanship, in part on their impartiality, and in part on their professionalism. No other congressional entity elicits this type of cooperation from Federal agencies.

I want to illustrate this with an anecdote. A few years ago the National Institute of Justice at the Justice Department was at odds with industry over standards and testing for police body armor, known as bullet-proof vests. They consulted with Republican and Democratic staffs of the Senate Judiciary Committee to try to break the impasse, but the committee realized it was dealing with technical issues beyond its depth. Finally, the NIJ suggested—and the committee readily concurred—that the problem should be turned to OTA. OTA's reputation for impartiality would give it the credibility to solve the problem, which it did.

OTA leverages its core staff by making extensive use of outside advisory groups, workshops, contractors, reviewers, drawn from both Government and the private sector, here and abroad. Unlike many other agencies, the OTA process ensures that OTA gets

extensive input from outside the beltway. Every year, over 5,000 experts help us better understand the complex issues that we need to understand to legislate effectively. But unlike some executive agencies or institutes like the National Academy of Science, OTA does not impanel groups that get together to deliver wisdom while the staff merely writes what they say.

In OTA assessments, it is the staff that writes the reports. They listen to advice, get outside review, and eventually pass products through the TAB to certify that they are unbiased. Outside experts and stakeholders do not write the reports. They provide guidance and advice and collective expertise often well beyond OTA's. But OTA staff filters and assimilates this, uses it in conducting analyses, and seeks further review.

OTA's work differs from other congressional support agencies because its work is based only in the science and technology area; the information is not readily available for look-up in the immediate scientific literature; it is not an audit of a current issue or a project of costs. The indepth process and review of the issues is unique only to OTA, and the scientific and technological expertise of OTA's staff facilitates this approach. With the budget reductions other congressional support agencies are making, it is unrealistic to assume they could pick up OTA's work.

I come from a region that understands that high technology is the area of the future that will provide us the jobs and information that we need. That is what OTA is all about. It does not get information from here. It goes all the way across the Nation to my State to help establish the policies and procedures we need in this Senate. It has been highly reliable, and I think it would be a grave mistake for this Congress to lose it.

I did hear one of my colleagues say that we need to consolidate. Who would not agree in this time of budget cuts? But I remind my colleagues that in the Hollings amendment he requires the Librarian of Congress to report to Congress within 120 days on how they could consolidate the OTA, GPO, and GAO. I think that amendment looks to their recommendations, which I think is reliable. We need the agencies to tell us how they can be efficient and reach those goals. I remind my colleagues, also, that I have heard some say, "If we cannot cut here, where can we cut?"

This bill in front of us cuts \$200 million. It shows where effectively we can cut. I remind everyone that OTA is cut by 25 percent in this amendment. This is a very important agency to me. I hope we do not lose it this year, because I think we will see what the future brings us, and that technology and science is even more critical in the years to come.

Mr. MACK. How much time do we have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. I believe until 5:15, which is approximately 10 or 11 minutes.

Mr. MACK. I ask the Senator from South Carolina how much additional time he would need?

Mr. HOLLINGS. As the distinguished Senator from Florida knows, I do not need very much time. I am trying to respond to a request that we have on this side to vote around 5:45. Is that agreeable?

Mr. MACK. I must say to the Senator that I was under the impression that he and I would be the last to speak on this issue, and I had asked for a delay of recognition of Senator DOLE until 5:15, with the intention of having a vote at 5:15. I understand that it would be the intention of the Senator to delay his vote until 5:45.

Mr. HOLLINGS. I have a request on this side by the leader here.

Mr. MACK. Then at this point, I will suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MACK. 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. MACK. Mr. President, this debate has gone on for some time now with respect to OTA. I will attempt to make my comments brief. While it was mentioned a moment ago that OTA is unique to the Hill, or to the Senate, it is not unique, though, in what has happened to it.

The Office of Technology Assessment was begun, I believe, in 1972. The idea was that it would be a small cadre of individuals, to make some decisions, would gather information together as to what scientific and technical data is available and provide that to Members of the Congress.

We now have an Office of Technology Assessment that has 203 people, with an expenditure of over \$23 million annually. Again, those folks have said that we need a counterbalance to the administration. Well, it is interesting that the administration has something like just under \$5 million in its budget for its science advisor, with 39 people.

Another point I will make is that I was called by a number of people asking me to reconsider the proposal to eliminate the Office of Technology Assessment. One of those individuals that called me said, "Frankly, after I found out what was going on at OTA, I thought it was a small cadre of individuals, a small tight-knit group that would get this information out to Members of the Congress, and I found they had \$23 million for their budget." He said, "That should not be."

There is a sense that if we eliminate OTA, somehow science and technology in America will come to a crashing halt. Again, earlier today we heard about the significance of a grain of sand, if you will. A grain of sand has

turned out to be a very significant item on this planet, which is, in essence, responsible for the computer. Is it not interesting that the computers we deal with today, somehow or another, magically occurred without the Office of Technology Assessment in the Congress of the United States?

During our committee hearings, we had testimony and review of a number of documents. Again, this is the Office of Technology Assessment. Here is a report entitled "Understanding Estimates of National Health Expenditures Under Health Reform."

I make the claim that, frankly, that has very little to do with the Office of Technology Assessment.

There is study after study where there is duplication, where we basically—when I say duplication, I mean duplication in the sense of the outside, where we can turn to America and ask them for information that is available. We do not need to spend \$23 million in a year in order to bring that about.

Another point: I think that probably one of the most significant scientific debates or debates about technology that we have had in the Congress in years is the issue of the super collider. Interestingly enough, there was no report from OTA on the super collider, again, one of the most significant new technologies that the Congress was considering.

There are those who say that now that we have the budget battle out of the way, this is really not an issue about whether we will cut \$200 million; it is a question of where.

Mr. President, I refer to a chart behind me showing the history of GAO's full-time equivalent. We began the process in 1993 to reduce the staff and the size of GAO. It has gone from 5,150 down to 3,865 as proposed under this bill. It is going to go further as a result of what we do in 1997, and what is proposed in this bill as well. This amendment says we ought to go further.

Chuck Bowsher, the Comptroller General of the United States, was not happy to learn that over a 2-year period we would reduce his budget by 25 percent, but he worked with us. We asked him the best way to go about it, and we worked out a plan. We will cut \$68 million from GAO this year. Now, with this amendment, GAO will be asked to cut an additional \$7 million out of their budget.

This is the wrong way to do it. Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment. This is only the beginning of the debate. Imagine, here it is, the first appropriations bill, we have suggested eliminating the OTA, an agency, in essence, which we believe is not necessary because we believe we can get the information from a whole series of sources. And we are hearing stories here on the floor of the Senate that basically say if we eliminate OTA, we will end the technology revolution in America. Mr. President, that is impossible because the technology revolution in America is driven

in the private sector, not in Government. I yield the floor.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I understand we are trying to terminate debate on this particular amendment and then the leader wishes a vote on another matter.

Let me thank Members for the bipartisan support and the experts that we have heard in the debate, especially the distinguished ranking member of our committee, who has studied it closely. We made the cuts. We were using a \$22 million figure. The distinguished chairman now of that subcommittee says it is \$23 million, so now it amounts to more than a 30-percent cut that we are cutting the Office of Technology Assessment.

When he talks of the number of employees, Mr. President, there are 4,707 employees over there at GAO. I think we perhaps ought to consolidate it a little bit more.

These arguments that we have heard out of the whole cloth, never have I heard that the Office of Technology Assessment never studied one of the greatest advancements in science and technology, the super collider. They certainly did not, because they have to be asked by these committees, and the committee chairmen were already in favor of it, and they did not want that study. Now, if we had that studied, and they asked, we would have had it, and we might have done away with the super collider a lot quicker, which perhaps the Senator from Florida and I and the Senator from Nevada and I agree on. It is \$36 billion in research and studies and development over in the Pentagon—billions. The distinguished Senator from Nevada says we have to economize. But then the Senator from Utah says, "Wait a minute. We have to look at the entire Government."

I do not know how to satisfy these arguments. We have worked to protect the Library of Congress in this amendment and hope that our colleagues will support us.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ABRAHAM). Under the previous order, the hour of 5:15 having arrived, it is time to recognize the majority leader.

Mr. MACK. Mr. President, I move to table the Hollings amendment.

Mr. DOLE. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second. The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. DOLE. Before we start the vote, I will enter a unanimous-consent request. I am waiting for Senator DASCHLE. In that request will be that, regardless of the outcome of the cloture vote, notwithstanding rule XXII, immediately following the cloture vote, Senator MACK be recognized to move to table the Hollings amendment. He has done that. So the vote will occur on the motion to table the amendment No. 1808.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, as I understand it, the unanimous-consent

agreement just propounded by the majority leader would then require two recorded votes beginning at 6:15.

Mr. DOLE. I did not propound it. I wanted to wait until the Senator was on the floor.

#### BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA SELF-DEFENSE ACT OF 1995

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I call for the regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 21) to terminate the United States arms embargo applicable to the Government of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill.

Pending:

Dole amendment No. 1801, in the nature of a substitute.

#### COMPREHENSIVE REGULATORY REFORM ACT

Mr. DOLE. I exercise my right to call for the regular order, thereby beginning 1 hour of debate prior to a cloture vote on the reg reform bill.

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

The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 343) to reform the regulatory process, and for other purposes.

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill.

Pending:

Dole amendment No. 1487, in the nature of a substitute.

Ashcroft amendment No. 1786 (to Amendment No. 1487), to provide for the designation of distressed areas within qualifying cities as regulatory relief zones and for the selective waiver of Federal regulations within such zones.

Hutchison/Ashcroft amendment No. 1789 (to Amendment No. 1786), in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. DOLE. I ask unanimous consent that all second-degree amendments under rule XXII must be filed by the time of the cloture vote.

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

Mr. DOLE. I further ask unanimous consent that regardless of the outcome of the cloture vote, and notwithstanding rule XXII, immediately following the cloture vote, the motion to table by Senator MACK be voted on, on amendment No. 1808, the legislative appropriations bill.

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

Mr. DOLE. I also ask unanimous consent that if cloture is not invoked, the Senate resume the legislative appropriations bill.

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

#### UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT—S. 21

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I think we have an agreement on Bosnia.