

fiercely to protect the state's AAA bond rating, calming jittery New York bond houses during the state's various financial crises. And he earned the trust of a public that he never lost touch with, consistently winning high marks among Marylanders for a job well done.

"He truly represented the state of Maryland," said Robert A. Marano, a tractor dealer who was watching Towson's Fourth of July parade yesterday. "He loved what he was doing and it showed."

Said U.S. Sen. Barbara A. Mikulski: "There was and will be no one like him."

In a singular honor, Goldstein's body will lie in state for public viewing tomorrow in the Rotunda of the Maryland State House. A funeral service is scheduled for 11 a.m. Tuesday at Trinity United Methodist Church in Prince Frederick.

Gov. Parris N. Glendening, who ordered state flags to half staff to mark Goldstein's passing, said the comptroller's "personal touch would be missed very, very much."

Glendening, who was to appear with Goldstein in three parades yesterday, said he found it "really weird" not to see the comptroller in the car behind him.

Goldstein was one of three members—Glendening and Maryland Treasurer Richard N. Dixon being the other two—of the Board of Public Works, the powerful panel that oversees billions of dollars in expenditures each year.

FISCAL WATCHDOG

It was as a member of that board that he earned his reputation as the state's watchdog, a stickler for detail who often would grill bureaucrats—at times mercilessly—over even the smallest of contract awards. It was not unusual for him to impatiently scold them at the crowded meetings, as he looked up over half-lens glasses balanced on the end of his nose.

Of particular interest to him were school roofs—a subject on which he became an expert because the state replaced so many of them.

"Governors and treasurers have come and gone . . . but he's been the constant," said Dixon, who thought of Goldstein as the board's "General Overseer."

"He ran the show," Dixon said. "He read every page of those big agenda books before the meetings. He must have spent the weekend going through the items."

In fact, before his heart attack Friday evening, Goldstein spent a portion of the day reviewing the agenda for this week's board meeting.

State Sen. Robert R. Neall, an Anne Arundel Republican who as a county executive and legislator has put in time before the Board of Public Works, praised Goldstein for his work there.

"You had someone who was very competent at his job, someone who was very sharp fiscally," Neall said. "He would be cautioning a governor not to make a mistake that some governor, like Governor O'Connor, made 50 years ago," he said. "He just understood state government like no one else."

His knowledge of matters financial was such that six weeks prior to the stock market crash in October 1987, he advised the Maryland Retirement and Pension Board, which he chaired, to moved \$2 billion in investments out of stocks and into bonds. The board followed his advice, saving the pension system from huge losses and bolstering further his national reputation.

BORN IN 1913

Goldstein was born March 14, 1913, in Prince Frederick to immigrant merchant Goodman Goldstein and his wife, Belle.

He was first elected to public office in 1938, the year Herbert R. O'Connor became Mary-

land's governor and Franklin Delano Roosevelt was president.

He served one four-year term in the House of Delegates before entering the Marine Corps during World War II. In 1946, a month after returning stateside, he was elected to the Maryland Senate, where he spent 12 years, including four years as president.

In 1958, he ran for comptroller in what would be the first of 10 terms. Though his state service was uninterrupted, he did lose one election—to Joseph D. Tydings in the 1964 Democratic primary for U.S. Senate.

SUCCESSFUL IN BUSINESS

His distinctive Southern drawl and country-boy manner belied just how shrewd he was. He was a successful businessman as a real estate investor, tree farmer and former Calvert County newspaper publisher.

Over his career, primarily in the 1950s and early 1960s, Goldstein bought thousands of acres of land in Southern Maryland and on the Eastern Shore. He advised friends and acquaintances to do the same, "because the Good Lord isn't making any more of it."

Some of those deals were questioned, particularly when he sold some of the land at a high profit, but he protested that he had done nothing wrong.

Goldstein traded on his charm and affable ways, crisscrossing the state and seeming to turn up at every rally, fund-raiser or Rotary meeting to which he was invited.

He put as many as 100,000 miles a year on his state car, which was driven by Maryland State Police bodyguards.

"He was very much a retail, press-the-flesh politician," said Marvin A. Bond, Goldstein's long-time assistant and friend. "He never had the benefit of a machine or vast organization, and he believed that Maryland was a small enough state that people still expected to see you."

Some of Goldstein's detractors complained privately that he was an unabashed publicity seeker with a penchant for taking the politically easy vote.

If true, voters across the state never seemed to notice; they returned him to office time and again by impressive margins. He consistently outscored other politicians in polls that measured name recognition and voter satisfaction—an unusual occurrence for a state's tax collector.

Goldstein had a remarkable memory, for figures as well as faces.

Glendening recalled the first time he met Goldstein—at a Prince George's County crab feast—just after coming to Maryland from Florida in 1967. There "must have been 600 or 700 people there," the governor said, and at the time, Glendening was a mere political science professor at the University of Maryland, College Park.

"I saw him about a year later, and he said to me, 'Hi professor, how are you?'"

Shocked, Glendening asked Goldstein if he remembered him, to which the comptroller responded, "Sure I do, Parris."

"THE STATE FOSSIL"

Goldstein had been around for so long that in introducing him, other politicians could not resist making some crack about his being in Maryland when the colony was founded. Recently, he was referred to affectionately in an introduction as "the state fossil."

"Louis had become an institution . . . a sort of goodwill ambassador," Neall said. "He had gone beyond the sort of typical pol looking to renew his lease."

At the Towson parade yesterday, J. Kevin Wight, 38, said he did not remember much about Goldstein's politics, but he did remember his personality.

"He was always going up to people, waving," Wight said. "He always had a smile on his face."

"GOD BLESS YOU ALL"

Goldstein's name became synonymous with his trademark phrase, "God bless you all real good." The expression was emblazoned on one side of gold-painted coins he handed out everywhere he went. The other side read simply "Louis L. Goldstein, State Comptroller, Maryland."

After an event, he followed up quickly with thank-you notes, often dictating them to his secretary over the car phone as he left.

Goldstein was so popular that Democratic candidates had all but stopped running against him, and state Republicans put up only token opposition.

The GOP future brightened for a short time after the 1994 election, when Goldstein announced that he would not seek an 11th term. But that changed after Goldstein's wife of 48 years, Hazel, died in April 1996. With only state business to turn to, he announced in June of that year that he would run again. His decision sent virtually everyone who had considered a bid out of the race.

On Tuesday, Goldstein will be buried next to his wife at the Trinity churchyard cemetery.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I yield the floor and note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

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

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1999

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report S. 2168.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2168) making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that full floor privileges be granted to Carrie Apostolou, a member of the subcommittee staff, during the consideration of S. 2168, the fiscal year 1999 VA-HUD appropriations bill.

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

Mr. BOND. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I am pleased to present to the Senate the fiscal year 1999 VA, HUD, and independent agencies appropriations bill, S. 2168. This legislation provides a total of \$69.986 billion in discretionary budget authority and \$80.78 billion in outlays, and an additional \$23 billion in mandatory spending for veterans programs.

The Subcommittee allocation was about \$750 million below the President's request in budget authority. In

addition, there were some significant shortfalls in the President's budget in such areas as veterans medical care and elderly housing. In attempting to balance all the competing demands, we were forced to make a number of tough decisions.

The committee did its best to provide the needed funding for the important priorities within the bill, with the highest priority given to veterans programs and elderly housing. Other priorities included maintaining environmental programs at or above current year levels, ensuring adequate funds for our nation's space and science programs, and providing adequate funding for disaster relief. The committee also met the commitment we made to provide the necessary funding to cover all expiring section 8 contracts.

On balance, I believe the recommendation is fair and balanced. Not everyone is happy, but I believe it is equitable. Clearly, we were not able to provide fully what each member requested—and I should note that we received about 1,000 requests from Members of this body for items in this bill—but we attempted to meet the priorities.

Before describing what is included in this legislation for each agency, I want to thank Chairman STEVENS for all his support, and I particularly thank my ranking member, Senator MIKULSKI, for all of her hard work and cooperation in putting this legislation together. This is always a difficult task, and it is made for easier and more efficient by the professional and wholehearted cooperation of Senator MIKULSKI and her staff—Andy Givens, David Bowers, and Bertha Lopez. I extend my thanks to them. Their contributions to this process have been invaluable.

Mr. President, for the Department of Veterans Affairs, the committee recommendation totals \$42.5 billion, including \$19.2 billion in discretionary spending. This is an increase of \$373 million above the President's request. The amount recommended includes \$222 million more for medical care, \$53 million more for the state home construction program to reduce the large backlog of priority projects, and \$79 million in additional funds for other construction programs.

The additional funds are intended to ensure VA medical care is the best possible quality, and that it is available to as many eligible veterans as possible. The funds are also intended to ensure VA facilities are adequately maintained, safe, and seismically secure, and that the final resting places for our fallen heroes are maintained in an appropriate and dignified manner.

The recommendation also includes an increase of \$10 million above the President's request for VA research, for a total of \$310 million.

This is a critical program, veterans research, in improving the quality of VA care, in furthering our understanding of such illnesses as gulf war syndrome, in developing prosthetic devices

and other items which will improve the quality of life to veterans and others, and in seeking cures to diseases which veterans and the Nation at large face. The program is also key in the recruitment and retention of top-notch medical staff at VA hospitals.

For the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the committee recommendation totals \$24.1 billion, an increase of \$2.66 billion over the fiscal year 1998 level.

This means we have been able to fund HUD programs fairly while meeting our commitment to provide the needed funding for all expiring section 8 contracts and by more than fully funding the section 202 elderly housing program at \$676 million, an increase of \$31 million over the fiscal year 1998 level and an increase of \$576 million over the President's request of \$109 million.

I emphasize that the section 202 Elderly Housing Program is the most important housing program for elderly, low-income Americans, providing both affordable, low-income housing and supportive services designed to meet the special needs of the elderly. This combination of supportive services and affordable housing is critical to promoting independent living, self-sufficiency, and dignity while delaying the more costly alternative of institutional care. Section 202 elderly housing is more than just housing—it is a safety net for the elderly, providing both emotional and physical security and a sense of community. I am very disappointed and puzzled by the administration's failure to propose the needed funding for the section 202 program.

Moreover, at the direction of the Senate and House VA/HUD Appropriations Subcommittees, GAO conducted a very thorough budget investigation of the HUD section 8 accounts. Based on the GAO budget scrub and after discussions with HUD, we discovered that the administration's request for \$1.3 billion in section 8 amendment funding is unnecessary for fiscal year 1999 and that a further \$1.4 billion in section 8 project-based recaptures may be considered excess funding, which means we are actually above the President's request for HUD.

These additional funds have provided us with needed flexibility to fund HUD programs as well as to fund other priorities throughout this bill. As a result, the committee has provided additional funding for HUD programs such as the HOME program, CDBG, Youthbuild, the HOPE VI program, and the Homeless Assistance Grants program. I think these all are needed additions that were made available as a result of this review by GAO and work with HUD.

Nevertheless, HUD continues to be a troubled agency with GAO designating the entire agency as "high-risk." In fact, HUD is the only agency ever to have received a "high-risk" designation agency-wide. Now, Secretary Cuomo has begun implementing the HUD 2020 management reform plan as

his first step to agency reform and downsizing. Many of our future funding recommendations will depend on the success of this plan and I want to state my support of the Secretary in his efforts to reform the Department. Nevertheless, we expect to see tangible and quantifiable results. We need to know that HUD programs work, that HUD staff are capable of effectively administering HUD programs, and that there is accountability within HUD programs.

Further, we also do not look to fund new HUD programs and initiatives until HUD can demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Congress its ability to administer effectively its primary programs. I want to make it very clear that self-serving press releases by HUD that announce success carry little weight. I am from Missouri and I want to be shown.

Finally, for the first time in a number of years, this bill would provide modest increases in the FHA mortgage insurance limits, raising the floor from 38 percent of the Freddie Mac conforming loan limit, or some \$86,000, to 48 percent of the conforming loan limit, or some \$109,000, and establishing a new ceiling for high-cost areas from the existing 75 percent of the conforming loan limit, or some \$170,000, to 87 percent of the conforming loan limit, or some \$197,000.

I know for some that this is considered controversial, but we have tried to strike a reasonable balance and I believe that the new limit is needed especially in non-urban areas where the price of new housing has escalated beyond the capacity of first-time homebuyers to use FHA mortgage insurance to buy a house. In my own state I have seen many areas where, because of the FHA lower limits, financing is not available for construction of first homes for families of workers with lower wages.

Nevertheless, I remain concerned about HUD's capacity to manage the FHA mortgage insurance programs and will be looking for additional ways to ensure the solvency of the mutual mortgage insurance fund.

For EPA, the bill includes \$7.4 billion. This is about \$50 million more than the fiscal year 1998 level. The bill maintains level funding or provides some increases to all EPA programs, reflecting the priority we have placed on environmental protection activities. Included in the recommendation is \$350 million more than the President requested for state revolving funds, which he had proposed to cut by \$275 million. The SRFs help to meet a need in excess of \$200 billion nationally for water infrastructure financing. Cleaning up waste water and assuring safe drinking water should be at the top of our environmental priority list.

The committee has provided 80 percent of the administration's request for the clean water action plan, including \$180 million for nonpoint source grants

and \$106 million for water quality grants. The committee's action recognizes the importance of addressing polluted runoff and seeks to ensure that our Nation's rivers, lakes, and streams are protected from polluted runoff, and are clean for recreation and for wildlife. These funds give the states the tools they need to improve the quality of our Nation's water. I promised Administrator Browner I would try to find more funds for this critical program, and I have.

The bill includes level funding for Superfund. Given the myriad problems with this program, coupled with the lack of a reauthorization bill, an increase simply was not warranted. I remind my colleagues, with respect to the fiscal year 1999 advance that was provided in last year's bill for Superfund, those funds were to be made available only if the program was reauthorized. We had a deal with the administration on this, and unfortunately the administration conveniently seems to have forgotten this deal.

Further, the program continues to be listed by GAO as high risk, subject to fraud, waste and abuse. Such abuse recently was demonstrated in an IG report which found that Superfund was being used to rebuild homes at several times their market value. Finally, experts agree that funds invested in Superfund yield less reduction in risk to human health and the environment compared to other EPA programs.

Our recommendation totals \$13.6 billion for NASA, an increase of \$150 million above the request to ensure adequate funds for space station and other critical NASA programs. It also includes a restructuring of the NASA appropriation accounts to improve fiscal accountability.

In particular, we have included a new account for the International Space Station to ensure that Congress and this subcommittee gets honest figures for the ISS from the administration.

While I strongly support the ISS and the many important programs administered by NASA, the long history of space station overruns reached a new and unprecedented level with the recent release of the report by the independent cost assessment and validation team headed by Jay Chabrow. The Chabrow report estimates that the ISS will cost some \$24.7 billion instead of \$17.4 billion and will take up to 38 months longer to build than NASA's current estimates.

For NSF, the recommendation includes \$3.6 billion, an increase of about \$220 million above the 1998 level. NSF is an investment in the future and this additional funding is intended to reaffirm the strong and longstanding support of this subcommittee to scientific research and education.

Finally, for FEMA, there is a total of \$1.3 billion, including \$846 million in disaster relief and about \$500 million in nondisaster relief programs. The amount recommended for disaster relief, coupled with the \$1.6 billion pro-

vided in the fiscal year 1998 supplemental, approximates the 5-year historical average cost of disaster relief in 1999 dollars.

The recommendation includes the restoration of \$11 million in state and local assistance grants to state emergency management agencies. It also includes \$25 million in the new pre-disaster mitigation program.

Mr. President, as you know, the administration last month submitted a budget amendment to increase funds for FEMA counterterrorism preparedness activities.

I intend to work with my ranking member, Senator MIKULSKI, to offer an amendment to increase funds for such activities in FEMA by \$8 million, in addition to the \$9 million currently included in the committee mark. These are critical activities. I think it is important we accommodate the administration's request, and I ask for my colleagues' attention to this very important measure. We think not only the work that goes on in FEMA, but the work that goes on elsewhere in the Federal Government, needs to take account of the risks that we face in these areas.

Mr. President, that concludes my statement. It is a pleasure to turn to my ranking member, Senator MIKULSKI. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I thank the chairman.

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

I ask unanimous consent that during consideration of S. 2168, the fiscal year 1999 VA-HUD appropriations bill, Ms. Bertha Lopez, a detailee from HUD serving with the committee, be provided the privilege of the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. COLLINS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Madam President, once again, we are on the floor to bring to the U.S. Senate for its consideration the appropriations on VA, HUD, and independent agencies. I thank Senator BOND for his very hard work and the bipartisan approach to producing this bill.

I also acknowledge his professional staff and the collegial and cooperative way in which they have worked with my staff to bring this bill to the floor. It is this type of bipartisan effort that I think focuses on results, not rhetoric, meeting our obligations to important constituencies, like veterans and the elderly, and yet creating opportunities for people, like we are in FHA and VA mortgages, national service, and various other empowerment things we do. No one Member or party will get everything they want in this bill, but we do believe that this really does meet compelling human needs. Given the spartan allocation for the subcommittee and the need to make up cuts in programs, like housing for the elderly, I believe that this legislation is very solid. I strongly support it and encourage those on my side of the aisle to do so.

This bill shows our commitment to both high touch and high tech. We have kept our high-touch commitment to our veterans and the elderly and the high-tech commitment to science in agencies like National Science Foundation, the space agency, and EPA.

Let me talk a minute, though, just after the Fourth of July, about a constituency that truly does rely on the U.S. Senate for promises made, promises kept, and that is the veterans. The veterans of America rely on us, and I believe that Senator BOND and I have worked to scour every line item to be sure that the promises made to the veterans of the United States of America for their health care have been promised.

This year, we will be funding veterans health care at the amount of \$17.2 billion. That is "b" like in Barbara, not million, like "m" in Mikulski—\$17.2 billion, and with the way we have been able to view the bill, this is a \$200 million increase.

Also, we want to improve VA medical research. The Veterans' Administration, through their excellent medical services, does an astounding amount of medical research, particularly the applied research that goes to hands-on clinical practice. In this budget, we have increased VA medical research by \$38 million, to the tune of \$310 million, and this will go to focus on research affecting aging populations, like Alzheimer's and Parkinson's, special needs of veterans, particularly those related to orthopaedic injury, surgical practice, and other improvements in clinical practice, to improve health care and shorten stays and not skimp.

Also, as everyone here knows, as a champion of the women's health agenda, I wanted to be sure, working with Senator BOND, that we did not forget the men of this country. There is a special set-aside in here for research on prostate cancer, so that we can find a cure and we can find better early detection methods. We, the women of the Senate, as I know the Presiding Officer feels, want to show the men of America we are squarely on their side.

I thank Senator BOND for going over this budget so that we could work to establish VA medical care, VA medical research, and also, at the same time, increase funding for something called veterans State homes. "State home" is an old-fashioned word. It comes out, really, of the Spanish-American War and out of World War I, where we had "old-age homes" for veterans. We are now at the end of the old century and moving to a new one, and State homes really now are long-term care and rehabilitation facilities for our veterans, but they are unique partnerships between the Federal Government and the State government, forming Federal-State partnerships to establish long-term care facilities, maximizing our dollars to operate it and even help build it, but State resources in purchases of land. This way, we stretch out the Federal dollar and the State

becomes a stakeholder. I think this is a unique way of meeting the long-term care needs of our veterans population.

While we were working to make sure promises made to the veterans were kept, we also, I think, had an excellent approach to the Housing and Urban Development Department. Particularly, I am impressed with the fact that we worked very hard, again, on a bipartisan basis in restoring the \$489 million cut to elderly housing. HUD's elderly housing program is one of the more successful housing programs at the agency. It works with nonprofit organizations and faith-based organizations. The HUD 202 Program leverages those community resources that help provide safe and decent housing for the elderly and a sense of community in many communities around the country.

The agency proposed close to a half-billion-dollar cut, and I am pleased that in the budget deliberation and now in our own appropriations, Senator BOND and I joined hands, joined forces, to make sure that we restored that cut so that the elderly of this country can have the 202 Program building housing for them and operating those programs.

We also rejected with vigor the desire to take a substantial part of the housing for the elderly and convert that into vouchers.

The Presiding Officer, I know, is on the Select Committee on Aging, and I know both in her home State of Maine and in her role in the Senate, she has been devoted to the cause of the elderly. She knows, as Senator BOND and I, that you cannot take an 80-year-old lady with a walker who is frail elderly and give her a voucher to go out in a community to find her own housing.

Can you see her going up three flights of stairs with her voucher and her walker to see if the bathroom is fit for duty? We are not going to have the elderly of America going door-to-door with vouchers trying to find housing to meet their needs. That should be done through housing for the elderly, the 202 funding, housing for the elderly that is run primarily by nonprofit and faith-based organizations—Jewish charities and Catholic Charities in my own community. That is what the elderly want.

Guess what? In this bill, we restored the \$489 million, and I am really proud of the way we did that.

In addition to looking out for the elderly, we wanted to look out for the young people of our community.

We wanted to promote first-time home ownership. That is why we also looked at the FHA loan limit, recognizing that some parts of our country are very high cost. And we raised the FHA loan limit to \$197,000 in high-cost areas and \$108,000 in more modest areas. The administration proposed raising the limit to \$227,000 for all communities. We believe that that is too high.

We were deeply concerned about FHA foreclosures, that people would get into too much debt too early in their lives and end up not with an opportunity but

with a heartbreak, and leaving the taxpayer with the liability. So we did not want heartbreak for the family and we did not want heartburn for the taxpayer. So we believe that this is a reasonable compromise, to raise it at this rate. It is critical that we ensure that FHA is able to meet the new market realities without setting ourselves up for this big buck unfunded liability in the event of FHA foreclosures.

We also included language directing HUD to consult with Congress further before beginning its bulk sale of foreclosed properties. We do not want these houses to go at fire-sale prices or to end up adding blight to a community. We want to make sure that FHA is a tool for first-time home buyers, not a tool for neighborhood deterioration.

We are also pleased that in this bill we really tackle the issue of brownfields. Brownfields funding is both in the HUD part of the bill as well as in the environmental protection part. The President requested \$90 million for EPA's brownfields program. And \$25 million of the request is provided for HUD's brownfields program.

I happen to be a strong supporter of brownfields programs, and I think they are important tools to communities. They enable us to take care of areas that have a level of contamination and move them to clean up and redevelop them. My concern is that we will not get a Superfund authorization. And while we are waiting for Superfund funding—a great opportunity in our communities—brownfields that are not nearly as contaminated, with good gall and good appropriations, we can move brownfields to green fields, opening up opportunities for economic development.

This then takes me to talking about EPA. Our bill provides critical resources for the Environmental Protection Agency at \$7.4 billion. This is an increase of \$51 million over last year. This is primarily in the areas of improving water quality, which are very important to a State like my own. It also includes last year's level of \$1.5 billion for Superfund.

This bill also contains money for State and tribal assistance grants, providing critical resources for States' efforts to maintain clean and healthy water.

Madam President, water quality is absolutely crucial, and part of the funding is \$20 million for the Chesapeake Bay program to continue our commitment to protect this natural resource. This Chesapeake Bay program was started by my predecessor, Senator Charles McC. Mathias, a distinguished Republican from the State of Maryland. Senator SARBANES and I have kept that commitment. And we thank Presidents Ronald Reagan, George Bush, and Bill Clinton, and now the Republican leadership of this committee, for working to keep that commitment going.

We were also hit by something called an algae bloom. Now an algae bloom in

my State is called pfiesteria. I understand that the Senator from Maine, the Presiding Officer, has also been hit by algae bloom in her own State. We know Senator FAIRCLOTH and Senator HELMS have had it in North Carolina. We have had pfiesteria in Maryland; you have had problems in Maine; the Louisiana Senators have had it.

This algae bloom is now a national problem, and we have put over \$37 million in the EPA budget to begin to do the water quality monitoring and the research so that we can solve not only our problem in Maryland, but we also look forward to working with our colleagues, like yourself, in really dealing with this, because this could destroy our waters and it could destroy our mutual economies. Again, we look forward to working with you. This \$37 million we think is a very important step in research and monitoring and trying to get good science and the best practices from EPA and environmental agencies in this.

I regret that this year we do not have the authorization for the Superfund. Year after year, people want to reauthorize the Superfund site on appropriations and leave it to us to solve a problem that the authorizing cannot. I join in agreement with Senator BOND that we need the reauthorization of the Superfund site before we can move ahead on this bill.

I know the administration is looking at additional sites for us to be able to clean up while we are waiting for authorization. I talked to Administrator Browner, and I said, if you have the sites, show us the money and get us also the authorization so that we can see how we could move forward.

In the area of science and technology, I thank the chairman for working to increase both the funding of the national space agency as well as the National Science Foundation. In addition to increasing funding for the National Science Foundation, I am particularly pleased with the increases in informal education programs that will be important and also those in K through 12.

Now, why is this important? Because so much of getting our young people excited about science goes on through informal education programs. These are not spontaneous playground programs; these are structured afterschool activities.

In my own State, they are going on in the Maryland Science Center, the aquarium. I wish you had been with me during the break. I was at something called the Christopher Columbus Center, a marine biotech center. We have second graders there every day from 9 until 2. They do science in the morning; they do reading in the afternoon; and they are so excited. And when they go back then to the classroom, they are going to be much more reading ready and they are going to be excited about science. And, by the way, I got to do a few experiments myself.

In terms of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, FEMA has been

doing an outstanding job. I think FEMA has been doing an outstanding job, and we provided \$1.3 billion to the agency, \$500 million over the request. We also have provided a modest amount for predisaster mitigation, which I hope, as the bill moves forward through conference, we can actually increase because of the approach to preventing disasters.

In my own State, Allegheny County has gotten a \$700,000 grant, and we have worked with the Corps of Engineers and the Governor. We are well on our way to protecting communities that normally are hit.

Now, in this legislation also there is \$9 million for FEMA to have resources to do the training necessary to prevent us from terrorist attacks due to weapons of mass destruction. Senator BOND and I are working to increase that funding. I know it started out even more spartan than this. But, Madam President, we really have to worry that the predators in the world—be they nations or terrorists—are really going to once again try to spread weapons of mass destruction on the United States of America. I know that the military is standing sentry, our intelligence agencies will give us the warning, but we need to look out for our civilian population. I think we need to have the type of training at the local level that we can be able to move in this bill.

Let me also thank the chairman for including money for national service, which does provide the opportunity for so many people to volunteer in our own communities, at the rate of \$425 million, last year's request.

And let me close by saying there are two independent agencies—the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation, which we funded at \$60 million, that I think specific amounts of money are absolutely out there in poor communities and near-poor communities doing a good job. Also, our Consumer Product Safety Commission has gotten out of the rhetoric business under its able administrator Ms. Brown and really is giving much needed advice on consumer product safety. Most recently, she has been helping with the whole issue of a particular type of blanket which could cause the death of preschoolers.

This is our bill. It goes from funding Arlington Cemetery and the Consumer Product Safety Agency, to protecting us against national disasters, to honoring our commitment to veterans, to protecting the environment, and promoting science. This is one of the most interesting and exciting bills and subcommittees in the U.S. Senate. I believe the chairman and I have done an outstanding job in trying to get real value for the taxpayer and for the Nation in this bill. I hope that this bill moves forward and that our arguments have been so compelling that there won't be any amendments and we can pass this bill by tomorrow afternoon.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

Mr. BOND addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri is recognized.

Mr. BOND. Madam President, I thank my distinguished ranking member for her very cogent and persuasive arguments. She makes an excellent case for the bill.

I note when she says this is an interesting bill that there is an old curse that one should live in interesting times. But we are very fortunate to be able to work on a bill that has so many important programs and is of such great interest among our colleagues.

I want to begin the debate. Before I turn the floor over to our colleague from Ohio, who I understand has other business, I urge all of our colleagues to please come forward if they have amendments, if they have colloquies. It would really help us if we could get as many of those in today as possible in order for us to complete work on this measure by tomorrow afternoon, which would be my hope.

I know we have two amendments that are going to be argued with some enthusiasm and with great feeling on both sides. I hope we can complete those. In order for us to do that, I ask that all Senators who have amendments that might be cleared or colloquies which they wish to enter with us, they provide them by no later than the Tuesday lunches tomorrow so we may have an opportunity to look at them. If we get near the end it would be my desire to finish up, once we have dealt with the controversial amendments, and I would hate to have to turn down an amendment that might otherwise be agreed to because it is not presented in a timely fashion. In order for us to move forward with this bill so we can expedite the work of the Senate, I ask colleagues bring to us this afternoon, if possible, and tomorrow morning in any event, any amendments or colloquies or other matters it wishes to consider so we can complete work on them in as quick a fashion as possible.

I yield the floor.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Madam President, I wish to echo the request of Senator BOND. I say to all my Democratic colleagues, if you have an amendment, please let us know by noon tomorrow, preferably even by 10 o'clock tomorrow morning so we could have discussions with you and perhaps find other ways to resolve their, I am sure, very legitimate concerns.

Also, we ask our colleagues to cooperate with us in a time agreement. There are many bills waiting to come to the floor. We have very few days left in July. We are ready to move our bill.

I yield the floor.

Mr. GLENN. Madam President, I want to compliment Senator BOND and Senator MIKULSKI for the hard work they have done on this bill. I know personally of their efforts in this regard. I certainly support the tack they have taken and look forward to taking part in the debate as it continues over the next couple of days with regard to this matter.

I wish to speak today on a different matter. I ask unanimous consent we proceed as in morning business for the duration of my speech, which will not be beyond about 15 minutes, and then revert back to VA and HUD.

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

Mr. GLENN. I thank the Chair.

NUCLEAR WEAPONS AND SANCTIONS

Mr. GLENN. Madam President, if we go back in history, we see that the development of weapons of war have become more and more hideous as time goes on.

One of the biggest steps forward in that direction—or steps downward, depending on how you look at it—was the development of nuclear weaponry near the end of World War II. I was involved in World War II and in the Korean war. I have been through combat. I know what it is like. When I came to the Senate, I could not imagine anything more horrible than the use of nuclear weaponry in future wars, if they ever came up. The horrors of conventional war are bad enough without imposing nuclear weaponry into that scenario.

My desire to do something in this area motivated much of my work here in the Senate, and I have taken a leading position on this issue through the years. Some of it has been very controversial. There have been various approaches to this issue. I want to discuss just a few of those today.

We have been hearing much talk in this body lately about the use and the value of sanctions, which is one of the tools we have applied to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons to more and more countries around the world. This tool has been applied in many other foreign policy contexts as well, and I am the first to agree with those who say that we may have gone too far in the application of some of these instruments of foreign policy—some of them. There have been successes and there have been failures. It has been a rather spotty record all the way through.

When you consider this whole issue, it seems to revolve mainly around two questions: First, in our international relationships, where do we use carrots and where do we use sticks, to put it in those terms. Where do we use enticements to people, to try and entice them into a certain behavior we would like to see, and where do we use sticks? Where do we threaten the punishments that they may consider ahead of time that might cause them not to go into certain areas of behavior we would like to see them avoid?

Second, what role should sanctions play as an expression of disapproval or punishment in cases where it is manifest that behavior will not be significantly altered as a result of the imposition of sanctions?

Now, the debate in Congress and in most of the think tanks around town and across the country has been most