

make good use of better relations with the Vietnamese to help advance in that country a decent respect for the rights of man.

Finally, the people of Arizona expect me to act in the best interests of the Nation. We have looked back in anger at Vietnam for too long. I cannot allow whatever resentments I incurred during my time in Vietnam to hold me from doing what is so clearly my duty. I believe it is my duty to encourage this country to build from the losses and the hopes of our tragic war in Vietnam a better peace for both the American and the Vietnamese people. By his action today, the President has helped bring us closer to that worthy goal. I strongly commend him for having done so.●

THE HIGHWAY BILL

● Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, I want to take a few months to explain several of my votes concerning S. 440, the highway bill. I voted in favor of final passage of the bill because it would meet Federal transportation responsibilities while returning to the States much of their rightful authority to manage their own roadways.

Many of the amendments offered to the bill concerned the question of whether the States should be required to enact various highway safety laws. Although the debate on these amendments focused to a large extent on the wisdom of the safety laws at issue, my votes on the amendments turned more on the threshold question of whether the States should retain the power to decide for themselves whether to enact those laws. As a general matter, I think the Federal Government should decide only those issues that, by their very nature, demand a uniform resolution throughout the Nation. On issues like these, a resolution of the issue at the State level would itself be harmful, no matter how wisely the State legislatures exercise their power. National defense is one such example; the need for central direction and economies of scale preclude a satisfactory resolution of the issue at the State level. But our laws in other areas should in the main be left to the discretion of the States, so that they can be tailored to the respective circumstances and values prevalent in each State.

These principles led me to oppose the Reid amendment to set a national speed limit for trucks, the Lautenberg amendment to set a national speed limit for all motor vehicles, and the Dorgan amendment to prohibit open containers of alcohol in motor vehicles. They likewise explain my support for the Smith amendment to repeal Federal seatbelt and motorcycle helmet law mandates, and the Snowe amendment to repeal the Federal motorcycle-helmet law mandate. None of these issues demands a single resolution across the Nation. I further note that my home State of Michigan already has a seatbelt law, which only

underscores the fact that my votes on these amendments turned not on my views as to whether States should have seatbelt and helmet laws, but rather on my belief that States ought to be able to decide these issues for themselves.

Similarly, I opposed the Hutchinson amendment to retain the Federal motorcycle-helmet law mandate with respect to States that do not assume the cost of treating injuries attributable to a person's failure to wear a helmet while riding a motorcycle. This amendment was presented as an attempt to marry States' responsibility with States' rights. And it is true that the Federal Government assumes certain medical costs through its Medicaid and Medicare programs. But that does not mean the Federal Government should be able to mandate motorcycle-helmet laws. For if it did, the Federal Government could likewise mandate laws prohibiting other activities—say, smoking or mountain climbing—that involve an appreciable risk of physical harm. The Hutchinson amendment in fact would have been a Trojan Horse for increasing the power of the Federal Government at the expense of not only the prerogatives of the States, but also of the liberties of the people.

My support of the Byrd amendment to encourage a national blood-alcohol standard for minor drivers was botched on these same principles. No one argues that kids should be able to drink and drive. To the contrary, everyone agrees that teenage drinking and driving is a danger that must be addressed. When there is this kind of overwhelming national consensus with respect to an issue, the question of whether the issue should be decided at the State level in fact becomes merely theoretical. Under these circumstances, the existence of a Federal rule is not likely to frustrate the desire of a State to enact a contrary rule. Such is the case with teenage drinking and driving. In cases like these, the practical, administrative benefits of a uniform Federal rule outweigh theoretical concerns related to federalism.●

THE 125th ANNIVERSARY OF LIBRARY OF CONGRESS COPYRIGHT SERVICE

● Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, as Chairman of the Joint Committee on the Library of Congress, it is my pleasure to acknowledge the 125th anniversary of the statute which centralized our Nation's copyright registration and deposit system in the Library. This law, signed by President Ulysses S. Grant on July 8, 1870, was the single most important factor in ensuring that Congress' library would eventually become the Nation's library and, in fact, the greatest repository of knowledge in the world.

Today, Dr. James Billington, our Librarian of Congress, will recognize the role of the copyright in building the Library's unsurpassed collection over the past 125 years in a program being held

in the Jefferson Building's Great Hall. I join with Dr. Billington in celebrating the anniversary of this important statute.

The act required both that all works be registered in the Library and that the Library be the repository of these copies. The Library could hold the copy of the work as a record of the copyright registration, but it also had the opportunity to make the work available as a resource for others. The joining of copyright and the Library was, and continues to be, a mutually beneficial arrangement. Then-Librarian of Congress Ainsworth Spofford believed that bringing copyright to the Library could help it become a great library, and he strongly urged passage of the 1870 legislation. However, I think even he could not have foreseen that the Library of Congress would become the great institution it is today.

It is hard to overemphasize the importance of copyright deposits to the collections of the Library and the resulting growth of the institution. Within a decade after the 1870 statute, the Library's collections tripled. When foreign works were granted U.S. copyright protection in 1891, many works from other countries were brought into the Library through copyright deposit.

Among the works the Library has received through copyright deposit are: the first edition of a Dvorak opera; an unpublished composition by the 14 year-old Aaron Copland; all the network news programs since the 1960's; rare performances by artists such as Martha Graham captured on videotape; and important Civil War and Spanish-American War photographs.

The importance of the copyright deposits to the Library continues today. Some of the Library's most heavily used collections, such as the local history and genealogy collection, would hardly exist were it not for copyright deposit. In fiscal year 1994, the value of works received through copyright deposit was estimated at more than \$15 million. The acquisition of these works could not have been accomplished through purchasing and gifts.

Mr. President, the Library of Congress provides valuable and unique services to the Congress and the Nation. Copyright continues to play an important role in the Library's work and I once again join in commemorating the 125th anniversary of the act which brought our national copyright system to the Library of Congress.●

RESTORING DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS WITH VIETNAM

● Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I feel that it is important that the Members of this Chamber move history forward and support the President's decision to normalize diplomatic relations with Vietnam.

Over the last 17 months, the Vietnamese Government has helped to resolve many cases of Americans who

were missing in action or held as prisoners of war. I strongly feel that our responsibility to the families of courageous, patriotic Americans who fought in the Vietnam conflict, and who are still missing, will never end until the status of their fate is resolved.

But important progress is being made. As President Clinton stated this afternoon, 29 families have received the remains of their loved ones with the assistance of the Vietnamese Government. Important documents have been passed on to our Government to help shed light on the fate of other missing Americans. And the number of discrepancy cases of Americans thought to be alive after they were lost has been reduced to 55.

Mr. President, we must continue serious efforts to secure information about our lost soldiers, and this effort can be greatly enhanced by coordinating and working with the Vietnamese Government and its people. Normalizing relations will help our cause and further our national interest.

Mr. President, those who have argued against normalization seem more comfortable with the past and have little vision of the future. We were engaged in serious conflict in Vietnam, and much of our military presence in Asia derived from the needs and requirements of that conflict. But who has benefited from American sacrifice? Not many in this country.

Japan has just emerged as the largest foreign investor in Vietnam. During the first half of this year, Japan won 30 major infrastructure projects worth \$755 million. Of Vietnam's intake of \$3.58 billion for these first 6 months, Taiwan, South Korea, and Singapore followed behind Japan in investment. The United States ranked sixth in this major new growth market in the Asia Pacific region.

Although the United States dropped its trade embargo with Vietnam last year, America's failure to restore diplomatic relations has meant that the Ex-Im Bank could not finance trade, that the Overseas Private Investment Corporation could not insure American firms' commerce with Vietnam, and that our Nation could not develop trade treaties with what many consider to be the most important, new, big-emerging market. Without the ability to establish a treaty and grant MFN status with Vietnam, it is unlikely that the Vietnamese will earn money to purchase American products.

Mr. President, last year in the Washington Post, Alan Tonelson of the Economic Strategy Institute wrote about a 104-page Mitsubishi Corp. report entitled: "Master Plan for the Automobile Industry in Vietnam." He noted that this Japanese trading firm had already organized its efforts and meticulously established a framework to build a Vietnamese automotive industry, dependent on Japanese support. For once, America needs to get ahead of the curve, to support U.S. firms entering

new markets, instead of having to elbow in after others have wrapped up the market.

Mr. President, America—more than any other nation in the Asian region—should be the beneficiary of Vietnam's economic development. We have an important duty to determine the fate of our lost and missing. But this effort will best be served by restoring diplomatic relations and recognizing Vietnam's Government. We must understand that our national economic interests are eroding each day that we allow other countries to push forward into this emerging economy and leave U.S. firms and American workers behind.

The time has come, Mr. President, for us to engage Vietnam and to build a future with this Government and its people that helps us deal with our wounds and helps our citizens into a new era.●

REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY—TREATY DOCUMENT NO. 104-14

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the Injunction of Secrecy be removed from the Investment Treaty with Trinidad and Tobago (Treaty Document No. 104-14), transmitted to the Senate by the President on July 11, 1995; that the treaty be considered as having been read for the first time, referred with accompanying papers to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed; and that the President's message be printed in the RECORD.

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

The President's message is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith the Treaty Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago Concerning the Encouragement and Reciprocal Protection of Investment, with Annex and Protocol, signed at Washington on September 26, 1994. I transmit also for the information of the Senate, the report of the Department of State with respect to this Treaty.

The bilateral investment Treaty (BIT) with Trinidad and Tobago is the third such treaty between the United States and a member of the Caribbean Community (CARICOM). The Treaty will protect U.S. investment and assist the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago in its efforts to develop its economy by creating conditions more favorable for U.S. private investment and thus strengthen the development of its private sector.

The Treaty is fully consistent with U.S. policy toward international and

domestic investment. A specific tenet of U.S. policy, reflected in this Treaty, is that U.S. investment abroad and foreign investment in the United States should receive national treatment. Under this Treaty, the Parties also agree to international law standards for expropriation and compensation for expropriation; free transfer of funds related to investments; freedom of investments from performance requirements; fair, equitable, and most-favored-nation treatment; and the investor or investment's freedom to choose to resolve disputes with the host government through international arbitration.

I recommend that the Senate consider this Treaty as soon as possible, and give its advice and consent to ratification of the Treaty, with Annex and Protocol, at an early date.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, July 11, 1995.

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, JULY 12, 1995

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in recess until the hour of 9 a.m. on Wednesday, July 12, 1995; that following the prayer, the Journal of proceedings be deemed approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and there be a period for the transaction of morning business until the hour of 9:45 a.m., with Senators permitted to speak for up to 5 minutes each, with the following exceptions: Senator SANTORUM, 10 minutes; Senator MURKOWSKI, 10 minutes; Senator SIMPSON, 15 minutes; Senator DORGAN, 10 minutes. Further, that at the hour of 9:45 a.m., the Senate resume consideration of S. 343, the regulatory reform bill.

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

PROGRAM

Mrs. HUTCHISON. For the information of all Senators, the Senate will resume consideration of the regulatory reform bill tomorrow at 9:45 a.m. Further amendments are expected to the bill. Therefore, Senators should expect rollcall votes throughout the day tomorrow and into the evening in order to make progress on the bill.

RECESS UNTIL 9 A.M. TOMORROW

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 8:46 p.m., recessed until Wednesday, July 12, 1995, at 9 a.m.