

American Development Bank in the bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a table displaying the budget committee scoring of this bill be printed in the RECORD.

I urge the adoption of the bill.

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

FOREIGN OPERATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE SPENDING
TOTALS—SENATE-REPORTED BILL
[Fiscal year 1997, in millions of dollars]

	Budget authority	Outlays
Nondefense discretionary:		
Outlays from prior-year BA and other actions completed	72	8,253
H.R. 3540, as reported to the Senate	12,174	5,123
Scorekeeping adjustment		
Subtotal nondefense discretionary	12,246	13,376
Mandatory:		
Outlays from prior-year BA and other actions completed		
H.R. 3540, as reported to the Senate	44	44
Adjustment to conform mandatory programs with Budget Resolution assumptions		
Subtotal mandatory	44	44
Adjusted Bill Total	12,290	13,420
Senate Subcommittee 602(b) allocation:		
Defense discretionary		
Nondefense discretionary	12,250	13,311
Violent crime reduction trust fund		
Mandatory	44	44
Total allocation	12,294	13,355
Adjusted bill total compared to Senate Subcommittee 602(b) allocation:		
Defense discretionary		
Nondefense discretionary	-4	65
Violent crime reduction trust fund		
Mandatory		
Total allocation	-4	65

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

Mr. MCCAIN. The foreign operations appropriations bill is generally a bill that does not have a problem with earmarks designed to benefit the States of individual members. This is the case again this year. Having said this, I do have some concerns about the bill and report in this regard and would like to briefly outline them.

There is a specific appropriation for \$2.5 million in the bill for the American-Russian Center to provide business training and technical assistance to the Russian Far East. I have no reason to doubt the utility of this program. It may offer valuable assistance to the NIS, and I have long been a supporter of such assistance. However, if, as I am informed, AID would have spent roughly the same amount of funds on this program without the earmark, it is not clear to me why it required an earmark. Why cannot AID simply fund the program out of a larger account, as it apparently has in the past?

I accept AID's support of the program and I do not object to the provision. But as with any appropriations bill, a specific request for funding, which AID did not make in this case, is very helpful in evaluating the need for it when it appears in the bill as an earmark. The cause of a useful program is only helpful by AID listing such things as priorities.

There are assurances in the report that Russian industries and govern-

ments support 70 percent of the center's costs and that they have pledged 100 percent support by 1997. For purely budgetary reasons—\$2.5 million in any bill is not insignificant—I hope they will follow through on their pledges. I will be following the program carefully to see that this is the case.

Unlike the bill, the committee report contains several comments on the advisability of funding particular programs that cause me some concern and would appear to have specific members' interest at heart.

First, the report "directs" AID to make at least \$2 million available for the core grant of the International Fertilizer Development Center based in Alabama.

Second, it "strongly encourages" support for programs conducted by the University of Hawaii in Pacific regional development. It "strongly supports" the university's efforts to develop a United States-Russian partnership to educate young voters, and it "encourages" AID to collaborate with the university in health and human services training.

Third, it "supports" \$750,000 for Florida International University's Latin American Journalism Program.

Fourth, it "urges" AID to support the research activity on pests of Montana State University.

Fifth, it "encourages" AID to support the education program of the University of Northern Iowa in Slovakia.

Last, it "urges" the International Fund for Ireland to support the work of Montana State University, Virginia Commonwealth, and Portland State.

Again, all of these matters are listed in the report, not the bill, and I would remind the agencies concerned that they are under no legal obligation to spend the funds as directed.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, it is my understanding the rollcall vote will be tomorrow on the Lieberman amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's understanding is correct.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Outside of the windup, which I understand I have been entrusted with, I have no further comments.

Mr. LIEBERMAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, briefly, let me thank my friend and colleague from Alaska for his excellent statement and, of course, for the spirit of partnership with which we have gone forward on this.

If I read this right, the foreign operations bill that is before us would appropriate over \$12,217,000,000. This amendment concerns \$25 million of that—a speck. For anybody individually, \$25 million is a lot of money. As part of this bill, it is a very, very small percentage.

I can tell you personally, I don't believe that there is any part of this bill that is a better investment, in terms of

preserving international security, saving American soldiers from having to go into battle—which would truly cost us a lot of money—than this \$25 million. I know that the administration right up to the President feels that very, very strongly.

I believe that we have achieved two very significant accomplishments with the addition of the Murkowski-McCain second-degree amendment. This is all about keeping promises. The Agreed Framework of October 1994 was a very significant agreement between the United States, South Korea, Japan, and North Korea, the Democratic Peoples' Republic of Korea.

We are saying, by overriding the committee's recommendation to cut the funding down to \$13 million, that we promise \$25 million a year to fund this agreement. The Congress says we are going to keep that agreement. We are going to fund up to the \$25 million. But we expect the North Koreans to keep their end of the bargain as well. We are counting on the administration to effectively monitor the agreement and report to Congress if there is any indication that the North Koreans are not keeping their end of the bargain.

So far, I say, so good. I think the second-degree amendment greatly improves my underlying amendment. I am grateful, again, to my two colleagues, Senators MURKOWSKI and MCCAIN, for the way in which we have gone at this.

I thank the Chair, and I yield the floor.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there now be a period for morning business.

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

GAO REPORT ON MOTOR FUELS: ISSUES RELATED TO REFORMULATED GASOLINE, OXYGENATED FUELS, AND BIOFUELS

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, a report released last week by the General Accounting Office [GAO] concludes that the reformulated gasoline [RFG] program is a cost-effective means of reducing ozone pollution and easing our Nation's vulnerability to oil supply disruptions and related price shocks. Congress ought to pay close attention to the conclusions of this study as it seeks to wean the nation off imported petroleum and further improve air quality throughout the Nation.

This independent analysis confirms that the reformulated gasoline program is good for the economy and good for the environment. RFG, which reduces emissions of volatile organic compounds and toxic air pollutants by 15 percent, displaces significant amounts of petroleum, much of which is imported. Given the gasoline price shocks that this country recently experienced and the petroleum displacement goals established by Congress in

the 1992 Energy Policy Act, it is time to consider nationwide use of RFG.

According to the GAO report, the potential for RFG with oxygenates to displace petroleum consumption is significant. GAO expects that by the year 2000 about 305,000 barrels per day of petroleum will be displaced by oxygenates. This amounts to about 37 percent of the 10 percent petroleum displacement goal established by Congress in the 1992 Energy Policy Act.

GAO noted in its report that if all gasoline in the country were reformulated, the Nation could displace 762,000 barrels of petroleum per day by 2000, and thus meet nearly all of the 10 percent petroleum displacement goal. Moreover, despite predictions by the oil industry that RFG would cost consumers over 13 cents per gallon more than conventional gasoline, GAO found that the actual cost to consumers has been negligible.

The environmental potential of an expanded RFG program is extraordinary. In the future, RFG will be even cleaner. In the year 2000, the Environmental Protection Agency will implement RFG Phase II, which will require further reductions in emissions of volatile organic compounds and toxic pollutants, as well as reductions of nitrous oxides.

Expanding RFG nationwide will bring these clean air benefits to new areas of the country. Moreover, since air pollution is transported over vast distances, adopting a nationwide RFG program will help further reduce pollution in areas already using RFG to lower ozone levels.

A nationwide program would achieve these air quality benefits at low cost. GAO concluded that Phase II RFG will be one of the most cost-effective measures available to control low-level ozone pollution. With the additional petroleum displacement benefits associated with nationwide use of RFG, there seems to be no reason why we should not move in that direction.

Finally, the GAO report demonstrates that continuing research into ethanol, an oxygenate used in RFG, is critical. GAO confirmed that substantial progress has been made in reducing the cost to produce ethanol. Since 1980, the cost to produce corn-based ethanol has dropped from \$2.50 per gallon to about \$1.34 per gallon. I hope that my colleagues in Congress will review the findings of the General Accounting Office and continue to support the research and incentives that have proven so successful in lowering the cost of ethanol production and encouraging the development of a strong domestic industry. As GAO has shown, these investments provide important dividends in terms of cleaner air and greater energy independence for the United States.

THE VERY BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I think so often of that November evening long

ago, in 1972, when the television networks reported that I had been elected as a U.S. Senator from North Carolina. I remember well the exact time that the announcement was made and how stunned I was.

It had never really occurred to me that I would be the first Republican in history to be elected by the people of North Carolina to the U.S. Senate. When I got over my astonishment, I thought about a lot of things. And I made some commitments to myself one of which was that I would never fail to see a young person, or a group of young people, who wanted to see me.

I have kept that commitment and it has proved enormously meaningful to me because I have been inspired by the estimated 66,000 young people with whom I have visited during the 23 years I have been in the Senate.

A large percentage of them are greatly concerned about the total Federal debt which back in February exceeded \$5 trillion for the first time in history. Congress created this monstrous debt which coming generations will have to pay.

Mr. President, the young people who visit with me almost always like to discuss the fact that under the U.S. Constitution, no President can spend a dime of Federal money that has not first been authorized and appropriated by both the House and Senate of the United States.

That is why I began making these daily reports to the Senate on February 25, 1992. I decided that it was important that a daily record be made of the precise size of the Federal debt which, at the close of business yesterday, Wednesday, July 24, stood at \$5,173,226,283,802.71. On a per capita basis, the existing Federal debt amounts to \$19,494.49 for every man, woman, and child in America on a per capita basis.

The increase in the national debt in the 24 hours since my report yesterday shows an increase of more than one billion dollars (\$1,562,134,965.80, to be exact). That one-day Federal debt increase involves enough money to pay the college tuitions for 231,633 students for 4 years.

CHIAPAS—A TEST FOR MEXICO'S FUTURE

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, 3 weeks ago, a group of armed rebels in the state of Guerrero, Mexico marched down from the mountains and into the city of Coyuca de Benitez, not far from the resort town of Acapulco. Then, last week, several armed men attacked a Mexican army vehicle, killing one civilian in the crossfire. They were arrested, and the Mexican army is scouring Guerrero's countryside looking for other members of the insurgent group, known as the "Popular Revolutionary Army," in an attempt to prevent future outbreaks of violence in the region.

These are just the most recent of several demonstrations of civil unrest in

Mexico since the 1994 uprising of the "Zapatista National Liberation Army" in Chiapas. In states like Tabasco, Puebla, and San Luis Potosi, indigenous people are increasingly staging protests, and resorting to violence, to expose the inequity and racism of which they have been victims for generations.

Unfortunately, while the Mexican Government has reportedly tripled its assistance to Chiapas in the 2 years since the Zapatista uprising, those efforts have produced little in the way of real economic and social change. The disparities that exist between Chiapas and the rest of Mexico are still as appalling as they were 2 years ago. While President Zedillo has recognized that poverty and the lack of access to justice among indigenous populations are matters which must be addressed, his administration has taken few effective steps to do so.

Chiapas is one of Mexico's richest states, contributing oil, electric energy, cattle, coffee, cocoa, sugar, and various fruits and vegetables to domestic and international markets. Yet the majority of the people there lack adequate food and shelter, or access to education and basic medical care.

Where the government built roads in Chiapas, the roads were often of poor quality. Health clinics lack beds and experienced doctors. Schools lack materials and trained teachers. The uneven distribution of wealth and the unjust distribution of land are at the root of the civil unrest that has captured the world's attention.

Over 50 percent of Mexico's hydroelectric power is generated in Chiapas, yet less than one-third of all houses there have electricity.

Coffee producers, with the help of over 80,000 Chiapanecos, almost all of whom are Mayan Indians, produce 35 percent of Mexico's coffee each year. While over 50 percent of the coffee is exported to markets in the United States and Europe for over three times its value in Chiapas, indigenous laborers, paid as little as \$2 per day, rarely see any of that profit.

Cattle has become an increasingly profitable industry, but while nearly 3 million head are exported each year, few of the people in indigenous communities can afford to buy meat. There are reports that half of Chiapanecos are malnourished, and in the highlands and jungle areas the percentage is even higher.

Half of the homes in Chiapas do not have potable water and two-thirds lack sewage systems. There is one doctor for every 2,000 people. Chiapas has the highest number of deaths per 100,000 people than any other state in Mexico. Infant mortality, is close to double the national average.

The illiteracy rate is five times the national average, and the percentage of students not attending school is more than three times the national average.

The situation in Chiapas stems in part from a government that has deliberately excluded the indigenous people