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 governments 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