

JOHNSTON, Mr. PRYOR, Mr. BREAUX, Mr. EXON, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. ROBB, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. BYRD, Mr. GORTON, Mr. SPECTER, Mr. MCCONNELL, and Mr. BINGAMAN) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1026, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following:

**SEC. . LANDMINE USE MORATORIUM.**

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress makes the following findings:

(1) On September 26, 1994, the President declared that it is a goal of the United States to eventually eliminate antipersonnel landmines.

(2) On December 15, 1994, the United Nations General Assembly adopted a resolution sponsored by the United States which called for international efforts to eliminate antipersonnel landmines.

(3) According to the Department of State, there are an estimated 80,000,000 to 110,000,000 unexploded landmines in 62 countries.

(4) Antipersonnel landmines are routinely used against civilian populations and kill and maim an estimated 70 people each day, or 26,000 people each year.

(5) The Secretary of State has noted that landmines are "slow-motion weapons of mass destruction".

(6) There are hundreds of varieties of antipersonnel landmines, from a simple type available at a cost of only two dollars to the more complex self-destructing type, and all landmines of whatever variety kill and maim civilians, as well as combatants, indiscriminately.

(b) CONVENTIONAL WEAPONS CONVENTION REVIEW.—It is the sense of Congress that, at the United Nations conference to review the 1980 Conventional Weapons Convention, including Protocol II on landmines, that is to be held from September 25 to October 13, 1995, the President should actively support proposals to modify Protocol II that would implement as rapidly as possible the United States goal of eventually eliminating antipersonnel landmines.

**(c) MORATORIUM ON USE OF ANTIPERSONNEL LANDMINES.—**

(1) UNITED STATES MORATORIUM.—(A) For a period of one year beginning three years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the United States shall not use antipersonnel landmines except along internationally recognized national borders or in demilitarized zones within a perimeter marked area that is monitored by military personnel and protected by adequate means to ensure the exclusion of civilians.

(B) If the President determines, before the end of the period of the United States moratorium under subparagraph (A), that the governments of other nations are implementing moratoria on use of antipersonnel landmines similar to the United States moratorium, the President may extend the period of the United States moratorium for such additional period as the President considers appropriate.

(2) OTHER NATIONS.—It is the sense of Congress that the President should actively encourage the governments of other nations to join the United States in solving the global landmine crisis by implementing moratoria on use of antipersonnel landmines similar to the United States moratorium as a step toward the elimination of antipersonnel landmines.

(d) ANTIPERSONNEL LANDMINE EXPORTS.—It is the sense of Congress that, consistent with the United States moratorium on exports of antipersonnel landmines and in order to further discourage the global proliferations of antipersonnel landmines, the United States

Government should not sell, license for export, or otherwise transfer defense articles and services to any foreign government which, as determined by the President, sells, exports, or otherwise transfers antipersonnel landmines.

(e) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this Act:

(1) ANTIPERSONNEL LANDMINE.—The term "antipersonnel landmine" means any munition placed under, on, or near the ground or other surface area, delivered by artillery, rocket, mortar, or similar means, or dropped from an aircraft and which is designed, constructed, or adapted to be detonated or exploded by the presence, proximity, or contact of a person.

(2) 1980 CONVENTIONAL WEAPONS CONVENTION.—The term "1980 Conventional Weapons Convention" means the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed To Be Excessively Injurious or To Have Indiscriminate Effects, together with the protocols relating thereto, done at Geneva on October 10, 1980.

**BROWN AMENDMENT NO. 2125**

Mr. BROWN proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1026, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill add the following new section:

**SEC. . CLARIFICATION OF RESTRICTIONS.**

Subsection (e) of section 620E of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (P.L. 87-195) is amended:

(1) by striking the words "No assistance" and inserting the words "No military assistance";

(2) by striking the words "in which assistance is to be furnished or military equipment or technology" and inserting the words "in which military assistance is to be furnished or military equipment or technology"; and

(3) by striking the words "the proposed United States assistance" and inserting the words "the proposed United States military assistance".

(4) by adding the following new paragraph:

(2) The prohibitions in this section do not apply to any assistance or transfer provided for the purposes of:

(A) International narcotics control (including Chapter 8 of Part I of this Act) or any provision of law available for providing assistance for counternarcotics purposes;

(B) Facilitating military-to-military contact, training (including Chapter 5 of Part II of this Act) and humanitarian and civil assistance projects;

(C) Peacekeeping and other multilateral operations (including Chapter 6 of Part II of this Act relating to peacekeeping) or any provision of law available for providing assistance for peacekeeping purposes, except that lethal military equipment shall be provided on a lease or loan basis only and shall be returned upon completion of the operation for which it was provided;

(D) Antiterrorism assistance (including Chapter 8 of Part II of this Act relating to antiterrorism assistance) or any provision of law available for antiterrorism assistance purposes;

(5) by adding the following new subsections at the end—

(f) STORAGE COSTS.—The President may release the Government of Pakistan of its contractual obligation to pay the United States Government for the storage costs of items purchased prior to October 1, 1990, but not delivered by the United States Government pursuant to subsection (e) and may reimburse the Government of Pakistan for any such amounts paid, on such terms and conditions as the President may prescribe, provided that such payments have no budgetary impact.

(g) RETURN OF MILITARY EQUIPMENT.—The President may return to the Government of Pakistan military equipment paid for and delivered to Pakistan and subsequently transferred for repair or upgrade to the United States but not returned to Pakistan pursuant to subsection (e). Such equipment or its equivalent may be returned to the Government of Pakistan provided that the President determines and so certifies to the appropriate congressional committees that such equipment or equivalent neither constitutes nor has received any significant qualitative upgrade since being transferred to the United States.

**NOTICE OF HEARING**

**COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES**

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the public that a field hearing has been scheduled before the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

The hearing will take place Monday, August 28, 1995, at 1 p.m. in the Shrine of the Ages Auditorium at Grand Canyon National Park, AZ.

The purpose of this hearing is to review the priority needs of the park and identify ways to address these needs in the context of the Grand Canyon general management plan as well as alternative plans or solutions.

The committee will invite witnesses representing a cross-section of views and organizations to testify at the hearing. Others wishing to testify may, as time permits, make a brief statement of no more than 2 minutes. Those wishing to testify should contact Senator KYL's office in Phoenix at (602) 840-1891. The deadline for signing up to testify is Tuesday, August 22, 1995. Every attempt will be made to accommodate as many witnesses as possible, while ensuring that all views are represented.

Witnesses invited to testify are requested to bring 10 copies of their testimony with them to the hearing; it is not necessary to submit any testimony in advance. Statements may also be submitted for inclusion in the hearing record. Those wishing to submit written testimony should send two copies of their testimony to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, United States Senate, 364 Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, DC 20510.

For further information, please contact Jim O'Toole of the committee staff at (202) 224-5161.

**COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES**

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate and the public that a field hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, August 29, 1995, at 9 a.m. and will conclude at 1 p.m. in Flagstaff, AZ, before the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

The purpose of the hearing is to receive testimony on forest ecosystem

health and to understand the science of forest health and discuss the changes necessary to manage for long-term forest health. The hearing will be held at the Northern Arizona University at Flagstaff in Ashurst Hall.

The hearing is by invitation only. Witnesses testifying at the hearing are requested to bring 10 copies of their written statement with them on the day of the hearing. Please submit one copy in advance to the attention of Mark Rey, Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC 20510. Time permitting, an open mike session will be held. If interested in giving a 2-minute statement, please contact Senator KYL's office in Phoenix, AZ, at (602) 840-1891.

For further information, please contact Mark Rey, at (202) 224-6170.

#### AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

##### COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to hold a business meeting during the session of the Senate on Friday, August 4, 1995.

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

#### ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

##### OPPORTUNITY AND CHALLENGE

• Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I wanted to share with my colleagues a fine book authored by Dr. Fredrick Chien, Foreign Minister of the Republic of China.

"Opportunity and Challenge," published by the Arizona Historical Foundation, is a collection of Minister Fredrick Chien's speeches and writings, given between 1990 and 1994. These writings fully explain Taiwan's foreign policy; students of politics or anyone interested in the study of Taiwan will find them extremely helpful.

Of particular note is Taiwan's advocacy of "pragmatic diplomacy." Even though the Republic of China does not have formal relations with many countries, its "pragmatic diplomacy" has enabled Taiwan to have substantive relations with nearly all the countries in the world. Taiwan's relationship with the United States is a classic example of "pragmatic diplomacy" at work. Despite the lack of formal ties, Taiwan and the United States enjoy an informal working relationship which continually grows stronger. After a careful study of Chien's writings, I conclude that the Republic of China is on the right track in terms of expanding its international presence.

One of the challenges facing Minister Fredrick Chien and his government is Taiwan's bid to rejoin the United Nations. Clearly, Taiwan is qualified to be a member of the U.N. It is to be hoped that the world will soon see the injustice of keeping Taiwan out of the U.N. and will invite Taiwan to rejoin the world body.

The U.N. issue has been mentioned prominently in "Opportunity and Challenge," and so have a number of other interesting issues such as Taiwan's relationship with the Chinese Communists, the independence movement in Taiwan and the role of Taiwan in the 21st century.

"Opportunity and Challenge" is a collection of well thought-out statements on Taiwan's foreign relations by one of Taiwan's most eminent leaders: Fredrick Chien. I highly recommend this book.●

#### MISLEADING LOTTERY ADS

• Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, many States have been directly involved in the explosive growth of gambling across the Nation in the last two decades.

The staggering surge in State-sponsored and State-licensed gaming has largely been the result of impulsive decisions by cash-strapped State and local governments whose leaders are looking for painless new sources of revenue.

There has been scant attention, at any level of government, to the larger and often troubling public policy implications that accompany the gambling boom. I have introduced S. 704, a bill that would charter a Gambling Impact Study Commission which, after an 18-month inquiry, would release its findings in a report that would provide some guidance to the President, to the Congress, to State and local governments and to the American people as these decisions are made in the future. Senator LUGAR has joined in this effort as the chief Republican cosponsor of this legislation.

In the current issue of the Washington Monthly, Joshua Wolf Shenk offers an illuminating analysis of the ways that State lotteries often entice individuals into gambling with sales pitches that, he notes, are "the only form of advertising unburdened by State and federal truth-in-advertising standards." I call his article, "Everyone's A Loser," to the attention of my colleagues, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD. The article follows:

[From the Washington Monthly, July/Aug. 1995]

##### EVERYONE'S A LOSER: HOW LOTTERY ADS ENTICE THE WRONG PEOPLE TO GAMBLE (By Joshua Wolf Shenk)

Tom had been playing the lottery for two years when God started whispering in his ear. At first, Tom (who asked that his last name be withheld) would spend just a few dollars a week. He had his regular numbers, and he'd play them when he thought of it.

But then, he says, on the days that he hadn't planned on playing, the word would come from Heaven: Your number is coming tonight. Fear would strike him like ice water on the neck: "I'd think, 'I'm not going to win it. I don't have the [money] on that number.'" So he'd rush out to play his regular number, and many more. Before long, he was spending \$300 a week on tickets.

"It was 'A Dollar and a Dream'; 'Hey, You Never Know,'" he says, repeating the adver-

tising slogans of the New York lottery. Tom pauses. "Those were good come-ons."

It's no accident that the voices inside Tom's head echoed lottery ads. They're extremely effective. And they're everywhere: on the radio and TV, in bus shelters and on billboards, even in mailings sent straight to homes. The message is simple: Play the lottery and get rich. Get rich, and all your problems will be solved. The New York lottery takes in more than \$2 billion in sales each year, and it spends \$30 million each year on advertising to keep the cash rolling in.

State lotteries target anyone who might cough up a dollar (or \$10 or \$20) for the chance to strike it rich. Conveniently silent on the odds, these ads send the message that hard work and patience is for suckers. In the process, the ads help wring billions of dollars from the most vulnerable "customers" possible—the poor and the addicted.

Criticism of state lotteries runs a wide gamut. Some say the state shouldn't even allow gambling, much less conduct it. Others argue that gambling should be left in private hands. Still others believe that the state should run lotteries for roughly the same reason many states run liquor stores: to keep the business controlled and clean, and to make money for the state.

Regardless of where you stand on these important questions, though, one thing should be clear: The advertising that entices Americans to spend tens of billions of dollars on lottery tickets each year is deceitful and corrosive. It is the only form of advertising unburdened by state and federal truth-in-advertising standards. The fact that it comes from the state—which ought to encourage people's strengths, not prey on their weaknesses—makes it all the more foul.

Today, 37 states and the District of Columbia have instituted lotteries, and that number is likely to grow. "Quite simply, states need the revenue," explains David Gale, executive director of the North American Association of State and Provincial Lotteries. "Every dollar raised by the lottery is a dollar you don't need to get from taxes." Across the country, \$34 billion in lottery tickets were sold in 1994. In Texas, the lottery contributed \$935 million to the state's budget. In New York, the figure was \$1.01 billion. As states have become dependent on lottery revenue, the pressure to keep people playing has become relentless. "Marketing is absolutely essential," Gale says. "Lottery tickets are no different than any other product. Your market will lose interest after a while. You have to keep after them."

Like any sophisticated business, lotteries target the specific groups of people most susceptible to suggestion. The Iowa lottery's media plan, for example, contains the following statement of objective: "To target our message demographically against those that we know to be heavy users."

One such target is the poor. The charge that lotteries are regressive—that is, hitting lower-income residents the hardest—makes intuitive sense, since the pitch of wealthy fantasies clearly resonates most strongly among those who are least affluent. "There's absolutely no question about it," says Charles Clotfelter, a Duke University economist and a leading authority on lotteries. According to a study by the Heartland Institute, a conservative think tank, the poor spend more money than the non-poor on lotteries—not only as a percentage of their income, but also in absolute terms. Blacks and Hispanics also tend to play more often than whites.

I worked two summers at an Ohio convenience store that sold lottery tickets, and my experience there confirms these findings. The store drew customers from all socioeconomic backgrounds, but lottery players