these occupied territories—the Croatian Government may not have taken the action it did on Monday. Let us not forget, the occupied areas are part of the territory of Croatia. So while the international community should urge the Croatian Government and its forces to fully respect the human and civil rights of the population in the areas they have retaken, it should not urge Croatia to give up control of reclaimed territory.

NATIONAL SMALL BUSINESS WEEK—1995

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize some very special businesses in my home State of South Dakota during National Small Business Week. Through work on the Senate Committee on Small Business for 17 of my 21 years in Congress, I know small businesses have not always enjoyed the recognition and attention they deserve. For too long, America's entrepreneurs have been taken for granted. These dynamic men and women play a critical role in this Nation's economy. During the last major recession, small businesses created 4.1 million jobs, while large firms reduced employment by 500,000 jobs. Without the spirit, drive, and determination of small businesses, our economy would not have been able to break out of the economic stagnancy of the early 1990's. Clearly, this sector of our economy is finally getting the respect it is due.

Wile credit availability has improved significantly and now appears stable, we must continue to monitor this situation. Without adequate financing, entrepreneurs will not be able to get out of the gate. Likewise, I am encouraged by recent efforts in Congress to decrease the burdens of Federal regulations and paperwork. And while the Senate still is deliberating S. 565, the Product Liability Fairness Act of 1995, I hope we will be able to protect small manufacturers from frivolous lawsuits by enacting sensible tort reforms.

Though we have worked to level the playing field for small businesses, small firms now face unique problems. America and the world are in the throws of an information technology revolution. The ability of an enterprise to use high-technology tools very well may dictate whether the business survives. We must ensure established and fledgling small businesses are able to be players in the technological arena. We must ensure small firms wishing to provide high-technology goods and services have access to credit and capital. Because the very nature of capital assets tends to be less tangible, small firms may have difficulty securing the traditional forms of collateral lenders often seek. Is it possible to put a value on the time, effort, and knowledge of a software developer? I do not know. However, from my position as chairman of the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, I hope to identify solutions to these potential roadblocks.

Mr. President, I would be remiss if I also did not raise some of the unique challenges rural small businesses face. South Dakota's 1995 Small Business Person of the Year has defied conventional wisdom that says a successful manufacturing business must be located in an urban area. In 1982, Randy Boyd returned to his native Geddes, SD, where he joined his father in a gunsmith and gun repair business. By 1986, their operation hired three employees to assist in the manufacturing of gunstocks for shotguns and big game rifles. Since then, their venture has expanded to 25 full time, 10 part-time, and 10 contract employees. Boyd's Gunstock Industries, Inc., currently is one of the country's leading gunstock manufacturers.

I commend Randy Boyd for the well deserved honor of being named South Dakota Small Business Person of the Year. He is an inspiration to other entrepreneurs with a dream and a willingness to work hard to see that dreams take shape.

During my visit with Randy this week, I learned he would like to expand Boyds' Gunstock even further. Unfortunately, he has encountered a limitation many burgeoning small businesses face in rural States like South Dakota. Randy wants very badly to keep his operation in the small city of Geddes. In order to overcome the community's limited work force, Randy has aggressively pursued workers from surrounding communities. Though such efforts have been successful for Randy in the past, he is discovering that the city of Geddes lacks affordable housing for these new employees. Indeed, it would be a tremendous loss for the community if this opportunity is lost.

I will be working with Randy and the community of Geddes to try to resolve a problem that has become all too common for communities across my State. Private investments in real estate must be both appealing and lucrative. As I said during my visit with Randy, I will promote tax incentives that, in turn, will promote economic growth. It is important that we continue to cultivate a climate that will stimulate small business growth. We must reward and encourage entrepreneurs such as Randy Boyd to continue their efforts.

I again congratulate Randy for his success and the success of Boyds' Gunstock. I also would like to recognize some of my State's other businesses leaders. I congratulate: Arlin W. Anderson of the South Dakota American Legion, Veteran Small Business Advocate of the Year; William F. Carlson of Tower Systems, Inc., Small Business Exporter; John E. Brewer of Rushmore State Bank, Financial Services Advocate; Eileen Lunderman of the Sincangu Enterprise Center, Minority Small Business Advocate; Brenda Wade Schmidt of the Sioux Falls Argus Leader, Media Advocate, and Jan Steensland of Eyes on You magazine, Women in Business Advocate.

Each of these individuals has played a very important role in making small businesses the driving force behind South Dakota's vibrant economy. I am proud of their generous efforts. They have contributed tremendously to their neighbors and friends. It is the duty of Congress and the Federal Government to allow them to continue making such important contributions. Often this can best be achieved staying out of their way.

Again, Mr. President, I salute South Dakota's 1995 National Small Business Week Award winners and thank them for their efforts.

WAS CONGRESS IRRESPONSIBLE? THE VOTERS HAVE SAID YES

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, as of the close of business yesterday, Thursday, May 4, the Federal debt stood at $4,854,832,235,127.63. On a per capita basis, every man, woman, and child in America owes $18,429.03 as his or her share of that debt.

Mr. DORGAN. I make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I rise to speak for a short period of time about several key pieces of reform legislation. I ask unanimous consent I be allowed to speak as in morning business.

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

POLITICAL REFORM LEGISLATION LONG PAST DUE

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I rise to express my deep concern—and even some indignation—that several key pieces of reform legislation continue to be bottled up in the Congress, including the gift ban, the lobbying reform bill, and tough, sweeping campaign finance reforms. I am more convinced than ever that one of the key issues, maybe the root issue of American politics, is the way in which we now have to finance campaigns. And the sooner we move toward a system where we are able to get a lot of the bigger money out of politics and have a level playing field for incumbents and challengers and figure out how to do this in a sane way, the sooner we will have a much better political system.

The lobbying disclosure bill, a key piece of legislation that Senator LEVIN has taken important leadership on, is really simple and straightforward. But just to summarize, what this legislation says is that those who are actually

paid to lobby, hired to lobby, ought to be officially registered. This is in the spirit of accountability. Nobody is pointing the finger at those who lobby, or suggesting that somehow constitutional rights for citizens to petition our Government should be curtailed. We are simply saying that we ought to have openness and accountability in this political process by requiring all those who engage in lobbying activities to register.

But in addition to lobbying registration and campaign finance reform, what I want to focus on more specifically, at least for a short time, is the gift ban. It is very simple and very straightforward. Americans are watching closely to see if the new majority in the Congress delivers on its promise of reform. While some of the new Members ran for office on reform platforms, so far they have not produced much of anything. This should not come as a surprise, because many of those same people who talked about reform were the ones who blocked major reform last year in each of these areas. I think, toward the end of the last Congress—and I will just editorialize on this question—toward the end of the last Congress I think the effort to block the gift ban reform was more an effort to make sure that Democrats did not get any credit for it. It really had nothing to do with the high ground of good public policy. I believe the reform promises have rung hollow all along and they ring even more hollow today.

Mr. President, I have an editorial from the Washington Post, I believe it was yesterday. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington Post, May 5, 1995]

WOULD-BE REFORMERS

''Three times as many lobbyists are in the streets and corridors of Washington as were here 20 years ago,'' President Clinton declared in his State of the Union address last January. ''The American people look at their capital, and they see a city where the well-connected and the well-protected can work the system, but the interests of ordinary citizens are often left out.''

''The first duty of our generation is to re-establish integrity and a bond of honesty in the political process,'' said Newt Gingrich in 1990. ''We must punish wrongdoers in politics and government and pass reform laws to clean up the election and lobbying systems. We must ensure that citizen politics defeats money politics.''

Gosh—if they agree, why has so little happened in this Congress on behalf of political reform? In the grand days of January, Congress took a step forward with a bill requiring the House and Senate to live under many of the same labor and safety laws that are applied to the rest of the country. But the major items that might change the system, such as lobbying reform and new laws regulating campaign fund-raising and spending, have been, well, less than top priorities for either the new Congress or the president. Congress put on a big show over that crowd-pleasing issue, term limits. But a Congress intent on taking steps to restore public confidence does not have to resort to changing the Constitution. Simpler measures are available.

Simplest of all would be a ban on the various sorts of gifts lobbyists and others can now give, perfectly legally, to members of Congress. The rules covering members of Congress, who write the laws, are much looser than those in the executive branch, which enforces them. It would not take great legislative creativity to write a good bill. A fine proposal nearly passed Congress last year. It would ban all personal gifts from lobbyists and most gifts from non-lobbyists, including those famous ''charity'' golf and tennis tournaments through which interest groups can essentially give members of Congress and their families free vacations. A variant of the bill was introduced as an amendment in the Senate, but was voted down with the Republican leadership saying the timing was inopportune. Senate Majority Leader Robert Dole said he'd bring the issue back this month. We'll see.

A gift ban would not change everything in Washington. It's no substitute for reforming the campaign spending laws. But the ban is right on the merits and would be a potent way for members of Congress to back up their repeated professions that they want to get rid of business as usual in Washington, shake up the system etc. etc. etc.

In the last Congress, controlled by Democrats, Mr. Clinton failed to speak out forcefully for political reform until it was too late. He had pledged—beginning with that State of the Union speech—to fight hard for reform this time around. We're waiting. With the administration making such an issue of how lobbyists are involved in writing legislation in the new Congress, you'd think the reform issue would be a natural for the president. As for Mr. Gingrich, Mr. Dole and all those Republican freshmen who say they want to change things, they have the majority. Will they make good on their words?

Mr. WELLSTONE. This editorial in the Washington Post yesterday challenged the new congressional majority to enact a number of tough, sweeping political reform measures that have been proposed by a number of us in Congress but that have been bogged down for a number of years.

The Post observed in this editorial that the simplest and most straightforward of these reforms is legislation to impose a tough, sweeping ban on gifts, meals, vacation travel, and other perks—the same provisions that were killed at the end of the last Congress.

This is legislation that I have worked on with Senators LEVIN, FEINGOLD, LAUTENBERG, and others. Again, the simplest and most straightforward of the major items on the real reform agenda, if we are serious about not separating the lives we live from the words we speak, is legislation that would impose a tough sweeping ban on gifts, meals, vacation, travel, and other perks—the same provisions that were killed by a Republican-led filibuster in the waning days of the last Congress.

Mr. President, the President called for lobbying reform and a gift ban in his State of the Union Message. But nothing has been put forward by my colleagues in the majority. Frozen like deer in the headlights, with the exception of the Chair, they refused to move forward on the gift ban. Enthusiastic about slashing free or reduced-price school lunches, and the Chair is an exception, and I know there are some other colleagues that are an exception, but I will hold true that statement I am about to make—enthusiastic about slashing free or reduced-price lunches for children, reform opponents wither when it comes to eliminating free lunches for Members of the Congress. I mean some of the same colleagues who do not hesitate to vote to scale back school lunch programs are also the ones who voted to continue to allow free lunches for themselves.

I do not think this bitter irony will be lost on the American people. I intend to make sure, along with other colleagues, that in a very short period of time, as soon as appropriate, we will have this amendment out on the floor and we will have full-scale debate and every Senator will again be asked to vote on the simple proposition that there should be a ban on gifts, meals, vacation travel, and other perks from special interests to Members of Congress.

Mr. President, it is long past time for enactment of the gift ban. This bill would significantly change the Washington culture. It is larger than just the piece of legislation. People want to believe in this political process, and when people read about or find out that Senators or Representatives have this interest or that interest pay for vacations trips to resorts for a weekend to play golf or tennis or do whatever, people find that to be inappropriate. And they are right.

Mr. President, there is not a one of us that likes across-the-board indiscriminate bashing of public service. We would not be here if we did not believe in public service. But if you want people to have more confidence in the Congress, if you want people to have more confidence in this institution, and you want people to have more confidence in each individual Member, as a Senator representing our constituents back home, then we need to enact this tough gift ban legislation. We have delayed for far too long.

Mr. President, let me go back to this Congress. This legislation was killed at the end of the last Congress in the very last days. We then brought back the same provisions at the beginning of this session in January when we had the Congressional Accountability Act before us and we had a vote on the gift ban legislation. At that time, the majority leader essentially said that he intended to take up a gift ban bill in the next few months, and to have it on the Senate floor in May.

Mr. President, I remember this because, first of all, Senator LEVIN, myself, Senator FEINGOLD, Senator LAUTENBERG, all came out to the floor and we argued that the congressional accountability bill provided a great opportunity for us to impose a comprehensive ban on these special interest gifts. That was, we believed, in keeping with the general theme of accountability to the citizenry, and not

to special interests. That was voted down, on a virtually party-line vote.

At that time, the majority leader indicated that he intended to take up this legislation by the end of May, or sometime in May.

Then I came back with a sense-of-the-Senate resolution which would have simply put the Senate on record saying that we will take this up by the end of May. That too was voted down. I said, wait a minute. The majority leader just said that he intended to do this, so let's put the whole Senate on record that by May we will have this legislation back on the floor for full consideration. Let us have a vote to affirm what the majority leader had just said was his intention, because I just had this sort of feeling that people were going to continue to delay and delay, as had been done in the past.

Mr. President, let me just be clear. Now it is May and nothing has happened; zero, zippo, nada, nothing has happened. No hearings have been held. No bills have been introduced. Nothing to my knowledge on the gift ban legislation is scheduled for floor consideration any time soon.

So the question is: Where is the majority party on this issue, where are the Republicans with their version of gift reform? Since 37 Republicans, including the majority leader, already cosponsored at the end of last year the same provisions that we offered in January and will offer again, as I said, as soon as we have an appropriate vehicle on the floor, what changes do they intend to make in this bill? Do they intend again, as some did last year—to try to gut the provisions of the charitable vacation travel to golf and tennis hot spots like Vail, Aspen, Florida, or the Bahamas where Members are wined and dined as guests of lobbyists and other special interests? Because, if they intend to try to gut those provisions, we intend for there to be a major debate. We cannot pass something saying we are not going to take gifts with these huge gaping holes and loopholes.

Do they intend again to try to hollow out gift ban reforms by just slightly lowering the thresholds for expensive meals, sports tickets, and other gifts paid for by special interests here in Washington so that they can say they are for reform? That would be symbolic politics at its worst.

Let me just simply say to you, Mr. President, this is an idea whose time has come, and come, and come again. I have been working on this for just over 2 years now, and the real standard for gift ban reform is a tightened-up bill that Senator LEVIN and I, Senator FEINGOLD and Senator LAUTENBERG, put forth in January. We will come to the floor and we will offer tough gift ban legislation. I believe the overwhelming majority of Senators, Democrats and Republicans alike, should support it. We really have had extensive bipartisan support in some overwhelming votes for this legislation. But each time along the way somebody or some group of Senators figures out a way of sidetracking it.

The time is long past due for this reform. I think people in this country really are in a reform mood. And any Senator or Representative who believes that campaign finance reform or lobby disclosure or gift ban is just something that so-called good government groups are interested in, they are wrong. People want us to represent them well. They want this political process to be open and accountable. And many people, too many people, believe, and unfortunately I think they are right, that too few people have too much access to Senators and Representatives, and too many people, the vast majority of people, are left out of the decisionmaking loop, left out of the equation.

It is really time to get back to this reform agenda and finish up our work in this area. There are three critical parts, all of which I intend to one way or another help bring to the floor of the Senate for debate. One is campaign finance reform. That is fundamental. Another is the lobby disclosure, on which Senator LEVIN has taken a key leadership role. The other is the gift ban, where I will continue to work with Senators LEVIN, LAUTENBERG, FEINGOLD, and others.

I look forward to that debate. We will have that amendment out here on the floor soon and I think people in the country, whether they are Democrats, Republicans, or Independents, will hold us accountable.

I look forward to this debate. I look forward to this vote. I urge my colleagues to support our tough, sweeping gift ban legislation. I yield the floor.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, in his capacity as a Senator from the State of Vermont, asks unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded. And without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS UNTIL 12:30 P.M.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, in his capacity as a Senator from the State of Vermont, asks unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess until the hour of 12:30 p.m. today.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 11:36 p.m., recessed until 12:30 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. GRAMS).

COMMONSENSE PRODUCT LIABILITY AND LEGAL REFORM ACT

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill.

Pending:

Gorton Amendment No. 596, in the nature of a substitute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending question is the Gorton amendment numbered 596 to the bill H.R. 956.

In my capacity as a Senator from Minnesota, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I might proceed for 15 minutes as if in morning business.

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

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I thank the Chair.

TWO U.S. SENATORS

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I just want to say a few words about two U.S. Senators, one recently deceased and one recently embarked on a spirited new part of life, both of them dear friends of mine—Senator John Stennis of Mississippi and Senator DAVID PRYOR of Arkansas.

SENATOR JOHN C. STENNIS

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, Senator Stennis served with my father in the U.S. Senate. My father, Milward L. Simpson of Wyoming, served here from 1962 until 1966. He was a former Governor of Wyoming from 1954 until 1958, then came to the U.S. Senate, elected to fulfill a 4-year term, or remaining 4-year term, of a young man who had been elected to the Senate and died before he was sworn in. John Stennis and Mrs. Stennis immediately greeted my father when he came here in the most cordial way. They were very dear friends of my parents.

I must say that the philosophy of the western Senator, my father, and the southern gentleman, the Senator from Mississippi, were much the same with regard to national defense, fiscal matters, issues of substance in the social area, of the fabric of the country, and they became fast friends. I recall very distinctly my father called John Stennis ''Mr. Integrity.''

My father invited John Stennis, Senator Willis Robertson, and two other persons to Wyoming. I recall very distinctly. I was a young man practicing law in Cody, WY, and they asked me to join them. Dad took his two Senate friends fishing. You might imagine that John had not ever seen too much of Rocky Mountain trout fishing nor the attire that accompanies such activities. I will never forget him coming from his cabin, very nattily dressed, and he said, ''Milward, is this what we