

9:30 a.m., in room 428A of the Russell Senate Office Building.

For further information, please contact Louis Taylor at 224-5175.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PARKS, HISTORIC PRESERVATION, AND RECREATION

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the public that a hearing has been scheduled before the Subcommittee on Parks, Historic Preservation, and Recreation of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

The hearing will take place on Tuesday, December 12, 1995, at 9:30 a.m., in room SD-366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building in Washington, DC.

The purpose of this hearing is to review S. 873, a bill to establish the South Carolina National Heritage Corridor; S. 944, a bill to provide for the establishment of the Ohio River Corridor Study Commission; S. 945, a bill to amend the Illinois and Michigan Canal Heritage Corridor Act of 1984 to modify the boundaries of the corridor; S. 1020, a bill to establish the Augusta Canal National Heritage Area in the State of Georgia; S. 1110, a bill to establish guidelines for the designation of national heritage areas; S. 1127, a bill to establish the Vancouver National Historic Reserve; and S. 1190, a bill to establish the Ohio and Erie Canal National Heritage Corridor in the State of Ohio.

Because of the limited time available for the hearing, witnesses may testify by invitation only. However, those wishing to submit written testimony for the hearing record should send two copies of their testimony to the Subcommittee on Parks, Historic Preservation, and Recreation, Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, U.S. Senate, 364 Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, DC 20510-6150.

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON FORESTS AND PUBLIC LAND MANAGEMENT

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the benefit of Members and the public that the Subcommittee on Forests and Public Land Management of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources has scheduled a hearing on several measures relating to the Bureau of Reclamation.

The measures are:

S. 901.—To amend the Reclamation Projects Authorization and Adjustment Act of 1992 to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to participate in the design, planning, and construction of certain water reclamation and reuse projects and desalination research and development projects, and for other purposes;

S. 1013.—To amend the act of August 5, 1965, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire land for the purpose of exchange for privately held land for use as wildlife and wetland protection areas, in connection with the Garrison Diversion Unit Project, and for other purposes;

S. 1154.—To authorize the construction of the Fort Peck Rural Water Sup-

ply System, to authorize assistance to the Fort Peck Rural Water County Water District, Inc., a nonprofit corporation, for the planning, design, and construction of the water supply system, and for other purposes;

S. 1169.—To amend the Reclamation Wastewater and Groundwater Study and Facilities Act to authorize construction of facilities for the reclamation and reuse of wastewater at McCall, ID, and for other purposes; and

S. 1186.—To provide for the transfer of operation and maintenance of the Flathead irrigation and power project, and for other purposes.

The hearing will take place on Wednesday, December 13, 1995 at 2:30 p.m. in room SD-366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

Those wishing to testify or submit written statements for the record should contact James Beirne at (202) 224-2564 or Betty Nevitt at (202) 224-0765 of the subcommittee staff or write the Subcommittee on Forests and Public Land Management, Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC 20510.

NOTICE OF INTENTION TO AMEND THE STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, for the information of our colleagues, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCCAIN] and I ask unanimous consent that the text of a resolution which would make technical corrections to the Senate's gift rule.

There being no objection, the text was order to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. RES.—

Resolved, That (a) paragraph 1(c) of rule XXXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate (as added by section 1 of S. Res. 158, agreed to July 28, 1995) is amended—

(1) in clause (3) by striking “107(2)” and inserting “190(5)”; and

(2) in clause (4)(A) by inserting “, including personal hospitality,” after “Anything”.

(b) Paragraph 3 of rule XXXIV of the Standing Rules of the Senate (as added by section 2(a) of S. Res. 158, agreed to July 28, 1995) is amended—

(1) in the matter before clause (a) by striking “paragraph 2” and inserting “paragraph 1”; and

(2) in clause (b) by striking “income” and inserting “value”.

(c) Paragraph 4 of rule XXXIV of the Standing Rules of the Senate (as added by section 2(b)(1) of S. Res. 158, agreed to July 28, 1995) is amended by striking “paragraph 2” and inserting “paragraph 1”.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

NOTICE OF DETERMINATION BY THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON ETHICS UNDER RULE 35, PARAGRAPH 4, REGARDING EDUCATIONAL TRAVEL

• Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, it is required by paragraph 4 of rule 35 that I place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD notices of Senate employees who participate in programs, the principal objective of which is educational,

sponsored by a foreign government or a foreign educational or charitable organization involving travel to a foreign country paid for by that foreign government or organization.

The select committee received notification under rule 35 for William Triplett, a member of the staff of Senator BENNETT, to participate in a program in the Philippines sponsored by the Rotary Club of Makati-Legazpi from December 2-8, 1995.

The committee determined that no Federal statute or Senate rule would prohibit participation by Mr. Triplett in this program.●

TRIBUTE TO MAURICE ROSENBERG

• Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, Maurice Rosenberg, who passed away late last summer, was a well-known advocate for judicial reform on the State and Federal levels of government. He was a professor at Columbia University's School of Law. I had the great pleasure of working with him extensively over the years on the issues of court reform and judicial administration. He had a keen legal mind that led him to contribute enormously to our system of jurisprudence.

During his 39-year tenure as a professor at Columbia, Dr. Rosenberg wrote and lectured extensively on the legal system, particularly on issues of procedure and access to the courts. He had an intense dislike for the staggering increase in cases which clog the courts and proposed measures to help ease the burden. One of his recommendations was to replace juries in small-claims cases with arbitrators. During a 1977 interview, he questioned the effect on society as a whole of people being so quick to sue each other in court.

Between 1971 and 1975, Dr. Rosenberg headed the Advisory Council on Appellate Justice and was later on the Council on the Role of the Courts. In 1979, President Carter appointed him Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Office for Improvements in the Administration of Justice. Previously, he had served on the mayor's committee on the judiciary in New York City. In 1980, he was appointed by Chief Justice Warren Burger to the Federal Advisory Committee on Rules of Civil Procedure, on which he served until 1987. A graduate of Syracuse University, he received his law degree from Columbia.

Dr. Rosenberg was an outstanding court scholar, professor, and lawyer who early on foresaw what is now called the litigation explosion. He acknowledged that part of the increase in litigation and in the law's complexity was due to greater public awareness of rights and a willingness to try them out in court. He once said, “That is certainly preferable to having them tested in the streets.” But he also felt that law schools should do more to sensitize students to possibilities other

than simply adopting an adversarial frame of mind.

Maurice Rosenberg will long be remembered as one of this century's legal giants. His contributions to the field of jurisprudence will be lasting and will guide scholarly thought for decades to come. I extend my sincerest condolences to his family in the wake of their tremendous loss.●

(At the request of Mr. DASCHLE, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.)

CANADIAN FOOTBALL LEAGUE CHAMPION BALTIMORE STALLIONS

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, my hometown of Baltimore has always been a great sports city. We have a tradition of excellence in baseball with the Orioles, and last summer we celebrated the magical endurance streak of Cal Ripken, Jr.

I am proud to say that a new chapter in our tradition of sports excellence was written on November 19, 1995. The Baltimore Stallions defeated the Calgary Stampeders for the Canadian Football League's championship, the Grey Cup. The Grey Cup is the ultimate achievement in the CFL, and it will now reside in the United States for the first time in the 106-year history of the league.

To win the Grey Cup, a team must combine tremendous athletic ability with leadership, and come together as a team. Last year the Stallions gave the fans their best effort, but came up short for the CFL championship. This year was going to be different. The Stallions came back with renewed intensity and desire. Their goal was to bring the Grey Cup to Baltimore, and they worked until their dream became a reality.

The Stallions' victory gives Baltimore three championships in three professional football leagues. The Stallions join the National Football League's Colts and the U.S. Football League's Stars as Baltimore champions.

I want to extend my congratulations to the owner of the Stallions, Jim Speros, and his dedicated players and coaches. They truly deserve this championship, and they have made Baltimore proud.●

IRONY ABOUND AS RETIRED OHIO SENATOR BEMOANS BROWNS' FATE

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, there is no one with whom I have served in my years in Congress for whom I have greater respect than Senator Howard Metzenbaum, our former colleague from Ohio.

One of the few issues where we differed was on the antitrust exemption for professional baseball.

The recent moves of professional football teams, particularly the movement of the Cleveland Browns to Baltimore, suggests that the antitrust ex-

emption for baseball may be a very good thing for professional sports, as well as the communities involved.

Recently, a veteran sports writer for the Chicago Tribune, Jerome Holtzman, had a column about movement of the Browns and its relationship to antitrust baseball. I ask that this be printed in the RECORD. In fairness, I should add that the Chicago Tribune owns the Chicago Cubs, but I have no reason to believe that Jerome Holtzman is not writing from conviction.

The column follows:

[From the Chicago Tribune, Nov. 21, 1995]

IRONY ABOUND AS RETIRED OHIO SENATOR
BEMOANS BROWNS' FATE
(By Jerome Holtzman)

Put in a call Howard Metzenbaum, the recently retired Democratic senator from Ohio, and had only one simple question.

After years of attempting to rid baseball of its antitrust exemption, what were his thoughts about his beloved Cleveland Browns moving to Baltimore?

"It's horrible," Metzenbaum said from his office in Pompano Beach, Fla. "It's a travesty. No community was more supportive of its team than the fans in Cleveland. I was back in Cleveland for one day and the feeling of outrage is unbelievable. And I've lived in Cleveland all my life—78 years."

Certainly, he understood the Browns are able to pick up and hotfoot it to Baltimore because the National Football League does not have an antitrust exemption.

"That argument can be made," he conceded.

Yet, as the chairman of the Antitrust Committee of the Senate Judiciary Committee, he helped introduce legislation that sought to repeal baseball's exemption.

Doesn't he see the irony?

He is losing his hometown football team and if baseball didn't have antitrust protection, Cleveland also would have lost its baseball team. The Indians would have flown the coop years ago.

"I can't argue that," he replied. "They could have been moved."

He launched into a meaningless panegyric about the difference in ownership today compared with years ago:

"There are not the same kind of owners that were in the field yesteryear. Now, you're talking about multimillionaires who have a plaything. Before, it wasn't a question of making money. It was the pride of having a team in your community. Much of that doesn't exist anymore."

It certainly seems that way. But the senator is naive. If he had read up on baseball history he would discover most owners have been motivated by money, beginning with the 1869 Cincinnati Red Stockings, baseball's first professional team. To increase attendance, the owner encouraged the players to open with a song:

"We are a band of baseball players
From Cincinnati City;
We come to toss the ball around
And sing to you our ditty;
And if you listen to the song
We are about to sing,
We'll tell you all about baseball
And make the welkin ring.
The ladies want to know
Who are those gallant men in
Stocking red, they'd like to know."

The only owner in my time who appeared mostly to be a gentleman sportsman was the late Philip K. Wrigley, the longtime caretaker of the Cubs. He didn't need the money

because the gum business kept him and his family in viddles.

Metzenbaum was asked if, in his opinion, anything could be done to prevent the Browns from moving to Baltimore?

"The league won't do much," he acknowledged. "If push comes to shove they'll probably be able to move the team."

But if professional football had the exemption, the carpetbaggers couldn't move their franchises at will. They couldn't transplant without the approval of a majority of their fellow owners. And so the owners jump around like flies, forever devouring the sweetest fruit, a movable feast.

In the last 13 years, the Oakland Raiders have navigated a round trip—to Los Angeles and back to Oakland. The Los Angeles Rams are now in St. Louis. The Baltimore Colts are in Indianapolis. The Phoenix Cardinals were previously based in St. Louis. The Houston Oilers are enroute to Nashville. And the shameless Mike McCaskey, president of our Bears, is threatening to relocate to Gary.

I can't resist mentioning all the baseball bashing since the players' 1994 strike that forced cancellation of the World Series. But which is preferable? A temporary baseball shutdown, with replacements on the field, or no team at all?

Because of its exemption, the baseball map is unchanged since 1972 when the Washington Senators were allowed to move to Texas. In the 23 years since, the San Francisco Giants were denied a ticket to St. Petersburg, Fla. Minnesota's jump to Tampa was aborted, as was the White Sox to Denver, Oakland to Denver and Seattle to St. Petersburg.

The Pittsburgh Pirates and Cleveland Indians, when both were in poverty—the Pirates have yet to escape from the poor-house—repeatedly have sought greener fields. But they were ordered to stay put and could be sold only to local ownership groups. The Houston Astros now are threatening to move to somewhere in Virginia. Will they get permission? I doubt it.

"Fortunately, because of the events of the last four months everyone seems to better appreciate our position," said acting commissioner Bud Selig. "In all the times I have testified in Washington, and especially before Sen. Metzenbaum, I emphasized the exemption has been good for our fans. It has enabled us to stabilize our franchises."

I mentioned that I was planning to speak to Metzenbaum, formerly baseball's No. 1 congressional nemesis.

"Oh," said Selig, "send him my best regards. And be sure to tell him that in the 26 years I've been in baseball the Indians tried to move out of Cleveland at least four times."●

TRIBUTE TO CHARLES GOMILLION

● Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, Charles Goode Gomillion, who passed away on October 4 at the age of 95, will go down in history as the leader of the struggle to bring political power to the black majority of citizens in Tuskegee, AL. The case Gomillion versus Lightfoot ultimately yielded a landmark U.S. Supreme Court decision on the issue of re-districting. The decision in the case is also recognized by legal scholars as a major step forward in the dual causes of civil and voting rights.

Charles Gomillion will long be remembered as a pioneer who took a firm stand on principle and by so doing paved the way for major advances in the cause of equality. His legacy is