United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 104th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 142 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JANUARY 23, 1996 No. 8

House of Representatives

The House met at 12:30 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. GOODLING].

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
January 23, 1996.

I hereby designate the Honorable WILLIAM F. GOODLING to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 123. Concurrent resolution to provide for the provisional approval of regulations applicable to certain covered employing offices and covered employees and to be issued by the Office of Compliance before January 23, 1996.

MORNING BUSINESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of May 12, 1995, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debates. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to not to exceed 30 minutes, and each Member except the majority and minority leaders limited to not to exceed 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON] for 3 minutes.

KEEP THE CAPITAL IN BUSINESS

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor this morning to welcome my colleagues back from the short recess and to say they ought to be glad they were not here for the blizzard of 1996. We were snowed in, and I mean that quite literally.

For 4 days the Federal Government was shut down and this time this body had nothing to do with it, I am pleased to say. The District of Columbia was shut down as well. We do not mind if it is the snow. We do mind when the majority shuts us down.

I am pleased to believe, as I do, that there will not be another shutdown on Friday. I ask that the body recognize when a tool has run its course, and Federal workers I think would be grateful if we would move on with our business.

I do want to remind the body that the District budget is not yet passed, the appropriation is not yet out. Yet, we budgeted $2.1 million for snow and one blizzard has used it all up, and more. We spent $3.3 million.

I am grateful that the body approved a continuing resolution to last until September 30, but that allows the District only to spend its own money. We have only $327 million of the $712 million that we are due as payment in lieu of taxes. The absence of the cash money meant that the District could not plow the District of Columbia, and we had to call the Federal Government in because vendors would not contract with people who could not pay their bills.

I am pleased that the appropriations subcommittees in the Senate and the House have been working to solve their disagreement on vouchers. It is a disagreement among Republicans that is keeping our budget from coming through. That disagreement, I believe, could be solved and settled given the good faith, good work that has been ensuing during this recess.

I ask that the District get its full appropriation no later than Friday so that the District, 4 months late, can start its government up.

I also ask that the body be at pains not to allow this to happen again. As you know, the District is on its financial knees. Everything had happened to it, it seemed, but being put out of business, and it was put out of business for a week, when the Capital of the United States was shut down.

I ask this body, when the appropriation comes before it, to pass it speedily and to recognize that chief among your constitutional obligations is the obligation to let the Capital City of the United States engage in the business of running the Capital of the United States. Imagine how we look when the Congress looks as though it is not facilitating keeping the Capital of the United States in business. This would be the best way to start and end this week.

HOW BUDGET IS BALANCED A KEY QUESTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCCULLUM. Mr. Speaker, I come today to address the budget impasse issue that has been on the minds of us and many Americans for quite some time. We are all very concerned, I know, about why we have not gotten to a balanced budget and what the skinny is on what is going to happen with respect to it.

I think that this needs to be put in perspective. President Clinton took 11 months and four offers before he got a budget proposal to Congress that was balanced according to the Congressional Budget Office, the only objective arbiter of such matters around here. It took him 11 months to do that.

Printed on recycled paper containing 100% post consumer waste

I think it is also important to recognize that when he got there, that that budget was back-ended. What he sent to us has most of the savings that he has proposed to occur in the seventh year of this budget, after he has left office assuming that he would be reelected President again this fall.

It is a good start. It was important to get him to put it on the table. But it was never the objective of the new Republican majority in Congress simply to get a balanced budget. How we balance the budget is just as important as getting a balanced budget. The manner we go about it is just as important as achieving a balanced budget.

When the President put his budget that was in balance for the first time on the table in December, it should have been the starting point, not the end point, for negotiations to get us to a product that we can all agree to and accept. It is not a dollar question alone by any stretch of the imagination. To that extent the President is right. This is a debate much more fundamental than that. Republicans in this new majority believe in reducing the size and scope of the Federal Government. We believe in taking programs wherever we can and sending them back to the States and local governments for them to carry out their responsibilities, for them to make the decisions in welfare, in Medicaid, in crime fighting and many other areas. Big government in Washington and the way liberal Democrats that have run this place for 40 years before we came to be the new majority obviously did not believe that. President Clinton's rhetoric for quite some time in his first election campaign and through the past 3 years or so would have led one to believe that he somewhat sympathized with this. But I want to make it perfectly clear from my observations that that is not the way at all he is conducting himself now. He is kicking in with the big-government liberals that have run this place all these years. I think there is no better illustration of this anywhere than what has been put on the table in the negotiations here in January.

The Republicans in the congressional leadership put on the table a Medicaid proposal that was supported by 68 Democrats in this House, written by them basically, and the President said ''no'' to that. The Republican leadership put on the table a Medicare proposal that had the endorsement of 47 Democrats, and the President said ''no'' to that. And the Republicans put on the table a welfare reform proposal that had passed the other body that only had nine Democrats dissenting on it and the President said ''no'' to that. He does not want the changes that are proposed in that. He does not want to send the responsibilities largely back to the States to handle the programs that we have been unable to handle effectively and efficiently up here all the years we have been here.

We cannot have a credible balanced budget without doing that. We cannot have a credible balanced budget without addressing the two-thirds of Federal spending that are in entitlement programs. Yes, we proposed some substantive changes in Medicare. The President proposes to demagogue that issue instead of addressing those substantive issues. What we have proposed, as I said, have been endorsed by a lot of folks as positive common sense.

We would protect under Medicare all of those opportunities for anybody who is on Medicare now to stay in traditional Medicare. If one wanted to take choices and leave and go and do some other things that we might suggest, we propose that, but we would increase, not cut, Medicare spending. It would be increased by more than 50 percent over the 7 years in the proposal we have put on the table, and anybody who says otherwise to the contrary is telling something that is not true.

We would increase the spending on Medicaid by more than 50 percent as well. There is absolutely no truth to the argument that Republicans are out to gut or cut or do anything dastardly to Medicare or Medicaid or any of these other proposals. We simply want to allow the States the opportunity to make many of these decisions and we want to have fundamental reforms that give people choices about how they are going to handle and conduct their affairs with regard to their future years and retirement. But President Clinton and the liberal cronies that created big Federal Government spending do not want any part of that.

When the President is serious and ready to negotiate a true balanced budget deal over 7 years, not just the numbers within the CBO system, but that gets us and moves us in the direction of reducing the size and scope of the Federal Government, then I believe we will sit down and have some hope of getting to a balanced budget. Until and unless that occurs, it is apparent that he wants to please the big government interests in his party as he goes into the election this fall and he does not want to face the tough choices that are involved that would have to drive some wedges in that core base of his, and he wants to spend the time demagoguing the Medicare and Medicaid issues for his campaign purposes. He does not sound serious to me.

If he wants to get serious, it is time that he get serious over the substance of this matter instead of the way he has conducted it so far. Let us get a balanced budget, but how we do it is just as important as doing it.

DEMOCRATS SEEK FAIRNESS IN BUDGET DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. WYNN] is recognized during morning business for 3 minutes.

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Speaker, we do have a new majority. Let us see what they have brought us. Well, basically we have had a year of acrimonious and bitter debate. We have had a costly and wasteful government shutdown and we still have a budget stalemate. Why?

Well, the dust has settled and it is abundantly clear that the problem is the same problem it has always been. The Republicans want to give a big tax break to the wealthy. The Republicans want to give a big tax break to wealthy Americans.

We will recall first they said, give us a 7-year balanced budget, 7 is a magic number. The President has agreed to that. They then said no, we have to have CBO audited numbers, CBO real numbers. The President has given them that. They said they wanted to protect children and the future of our society, future generations.

But when the President of the United States presented a balanced budget, balanced in 7 years with CBO real numbers, what did they do? They walked away from the table. Why did they walk away from the table? The gentleman from Florida said it is how we balance the budget.

Well, they wanted to include a big tax break for the wealthy. The President has said he will not go along with that. The President and Democrats are for a balanced budget, but we believe it should not just be a balanced budget, it should also be a fair budget.

In truth, in point of fact, we should not have any tax breaks in this budget. If we are serious about balancing the budget and eliminating the deficit, we do not need to be taking money out of the Treasury in the form of a tax break. But again the President has been willing to compromise, and he has offered modest tax relief for education deductions and for people with children under the age of 14 for the true middle class.

But that is not good enough for the Republican new majority. They want to give tax breaks to people who make over $100,000 a year. Ladies and gentlemen, if their package goes through, half of the tax breaks, half of the $245 billion in tax breaks will go to the richest 2 percent of Americans. The richest 2 percent of Americans will get half of the tax breaks. That is not a fair balanced budget.

Let us move on and talk about Medicaid, because that specifically hurts our seniors and our disabled citizens. Item No. 1, there was not a single public hearing on specifically Medicaid cuts. Many people do not understand and say, well, this is another, quote, entitlement program.

In point of fact, nearly 60 percent of Medicaid funds pay for acute and long-term care and services for elderly and people with disabilities; 60 percent to the elderly and people with disabilities. Thirty-five percent pays for long-term care. That means when your mother or father or aunt or uncle or grandparents have to go into a nursing home, Medicaid is paying for that. Medicaid pays 52 percent of the Nation's nursing home bill. Why? Because nursing home care

is very expensive, and Medicaid also pays for home services for the frail and the disabled.

□ 1245

They want to cut Medicaid. They want to cut Medicaid and then send it to the State and say States can do it.

Well, I have been in the State government for 10 years as a State senator. They cannot do it if they do not have the money. So shaving this money and sending down the so-called block grant is no solution, because the States, in fact, under their new program, would be able to cut their funds.

This is not a balanced budget, not morally. It is an accounting device. But we want a balanced budget both from an accounting standpoint and a morally balanced budget that is fair to all Americans.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GOODLING). With respect to a prior speaker, the Chair would remind the Member to refrain from reference to demagoguery of the President or other Members.

CASTRO'S CRACKDOWN ON DISSIDENTS AND INDEPENDENT JOURNALISTS DURING JANUARY CONGRESSIONAL VISITS TO CUBA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DIAZ-BALART] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, last week two Members of this House, a gentleman from Massachusetts and a gentleman from New Mexico, went to Cuba to meet with Castro. One told the press he was looking for flexibility on Castro's part to help him oppose the sanctions bill that the Congress is currently pursuing against the Cuban dictatorship. The other said he was seeking the release of some fugitives from American justice now in Cuba. I will now briefly outline some of the ways in which Castro reacted to these congressional visits and treated dissidents and independent journalists in Cuba just during these last few days.

JANUARY 14

Raul Rivero, Cuban poet and president of the independent Cuba Press agency, was arrested.

Juan Antonio Sanchez Rodriguez, another independent reporter, arrested in Pinar del Rio.

Jorge Adrian Ayala Corzo, president of the Democratic Renovation Party, was arrested.

Rafael Solano and Julio Martinez of the independent Havana Press were arrested.

JANUARY 15

Gladys Linares, Miguel Andres Palenque, Orlando Morejon were arrested.

Bernardo Fuentes, an independent journalist in Camaguey Province, was arrested.

Abel de Jesus Acosta, member of the Pro-Human Rights Party in Villa Clara Province, was arrested by State Security Lt. Boris Ruiz, his home ransacked and his motorcycle confiscated.

Jesus Zuniga, of the National Conciliacion Movement, was arrested.

The parents of Yndamiro Restano, were detained and interrogated for over 14 hours. Their son Yndamiro Restano, is the president of the Bureau of Independent Cuban Journalists who is out of Cuba on a visitor's permit due to a petition made to Castro by Dannielle Mitterand. They were told that if the bureau does not cease its work, they, as parents of Restano, will be faced with long-term detention and their son will be banned from returning.

JANUARY 16

The gentleman from Massachusetts arrived in Cuba. That day a meeting by the opposition umbrella grouping Concilio Cubano was disrupted in Havana by state security agents. Participants including Elizardo Sanchez and Marta Beatriz Roque were threatened with arrest.

Alberto Perera Martinez, vice-president of the Bloque Democratico Jose Marti was arrested.

Lazaro Gonzalez, president of the Pro-Human Rights Party, was detained and threatened.

JANUARY 17

The gentleman from New Mexico arrived in Cuba.

Jose Miranda Acosta, a political prisoner in a dungeon known as Kilo 5½ in Pinar del Rio was tortured by having water drops fall throughout the day and night into his cell. He has been sentenced to 15 years of confinement, without family visits, due to enemy propaganda. As a result of his imprisonment, he is practically blind and suffering from extreme malnutrition. Miranda has had his food poisoned in the past as punishment for a 72-day hunger strike in 1994, which he carried out to try to draw attention to his case.

JANUARY 18

Olance Nogueras, vice-president of the Bureau of Independent Cuban Reporters, was detained after asking a question at a press conference held by the gentleman from Massachusetts in Havana.

Eugenio Rodriguez Chaple, president of the Democratic Bloc Jose Marti, was run off the road and injured by state security while on his way to meet with French Embassy officials.

Leonel Morejon Almagro, Concilio Cubano member, was detained and told that his family would suffer serious consequences if he continued to participate in Concilio and that the Interior Minister Colome Ibarra was giving him his last chance.

JANUARY 19

Both Congressmen returned from Cuba.

That day, Roxana Valdivia, an independent journalist was questioned at state security headquarters in Ciego de Avila and threatened with exile or prison for disseminating enemy propaganda.

During the days of the congressional visits, the thousands of Cuban prisoners of conscience continued suffering the same savage brutality that they continue to suffer to this very moment. Col. Enrique Labrada continues to receive electroshock torture at the Mazorra institution for the mentally ill. Labrada was sent there after staging a pro-democracy protest last year. The Reverend Orson Vila remains in prison for preaching the word of Christ. A 30-year-old writer, Carmen Arias, remains in a dungeon for sending a letter to Castro asking for free elections, as do Sergio Aguiar Cruz, Francisco Chaviano, Omar del Pozo, and thousands of others.

Upon his return one Congressman declared that Castro is very flexible.

The other Congressman said that he had gotten Castro to reduce the amount of dollars that Castro charges some Cubans who are leaving Cuba, and that that constitutes a humanitarian gesture.

Mr. Speaker, what will it take for the world to help Cuba free itself of its tyrant?

Imagine if this were happening in apartheid South Africa or Pinochet's Chile.

CONSIDER PRIORITIES DURING BUDGET CUTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] is recognized during morning business for 3 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I was very surprised and disappointed when I saw that the Republican leadership walked away from the budget negotiations with the President about a week ago.

Frankly, I thought that the President went very far, maybe even too far, just before we adjourned 2 weeks ago when he not only agreed to a balanced budget, which we all support, but agreed to a 7-year budget, put it on the table, agreed to put forward a budget that was based on CBO estimates. The President essentially did everything the Republicans asked for as part of the negotiation and, instead of reacting and saying, OK, now we have a 7-year budget and it is CBO and it uses our numbers, instead of sitting down and saying now we can work out the differences over our priorities and still protect Medicare and Medicaid and the environment and education, instead they said, ''No, that is not good enough. We are going to walk out. We don't want to have any negotiations.'' That is incredible.

We have gone on now for, I guess, about 6 months, and all during that time the Republican leadership has said that they supported the priorities of Medicare and Medicaid and also to

protect the environment and education, but now it is abundantly clear that is not really what they are all about. They are insisting on the level of tax cuts or tax breaks, mostly for wealthy individuals and for large corporations, that would make devastating cuts in Medicare and Medicaid. They are saying that, ''We want to use those cuts to pay for a tax cut or tax breaks primarily for the wealthy Americans.''

It really seems to me at that point there is not much more the President can do.

There was an article in the Star Ledger, which is the largest circulation daily in my home State of New Jersey that I just wanted to quote from briefly today in the time that I have left because I think it says it all.

It says that, ''We need an agreement on a balanced budget, but we don't want a budget agreement at all costs,'' which is essentially what the Republican leadership is asking for, and I quote from the Star Ledger. It says, ''The cost is too great if the budget agreement includes a tax cut benefiting mostly those in the upper income brackets, as this Republican one does. In fact, there is no reason for a tax cut at all. Balanced budgets and tax cuts are goals that work at cross purposes. The cost is too great if it means turning over Medicaid, medical care for the indigents, to the States. That would mean ending the right to medical care for those who can afford it least and are most vulnerable. It would be a great leap backward for this country. And the cost is too great if it means slashing Medicare to the point where the cost to the aged for their premiums becomes painful, which is what is proposed in this Republican budget. If there continues to be no national health care program, then some cost adjustments must be made in financing Medicare to prepare for the crush of retiring baby-boomers in the next century, but to include the overhaul in a political budget that is meant to work against aid for the indigent and the elderly is not the proper context. The cost is too great.''

And that is what I would say to my colleagues on the other side. We would like a balanced budget, but we cannot have it at this great cost to our priorities.

AMERICA'S MOST TRAGIC MORAL FAILING OF THE MODERN ERA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, 1 day after the 23d anniversary of Roe versus Wade, many people were up here to recognize this fact, to address one of the most important and divisive moral issues our Nation faces.

Abortion clearly stands as America's greatest and most tragic moral failing of the modern era. In the last century America was called upon to address the moral blight of slavery. And we did it. Though the struggle was great and tore the country in two, good ultimately triumphed over evil and the scourge of slavery was banished from the land. In this century we face a different fight—the fight against what anyone with a moral conscience can only consider the taking of a human life. Will America rise to this new challenge? Will we come to our moral senses? Only time will tell.

But we can say this: Whatever happens, those who believe abortion is simply wrong will continue to take their case to the American people. Although the courts still consider abortion a legal right, that doesn't make it a moral right. And although any change in the legal status of abortion may still be a long way off, there are still measures we can take not to combat this crime against humanity.

It is my belief that political change in America only happens as a result of cultural change. Until we change America's culture—until America regains a commitment to the sanctity of human life—all our efforts will produce little change. We need to argue our case forcefully. We need to convince America by the power of our ideas and by the depth of our passion that abortion deserves no place in any society that would call itself civilized. We condemn Hitler for the slaughter of 6 million Jews. We condemn Stalin for the murder of 20 million Russians. We condemn Pol Pot for the extermination of 1 million Cambodians. But we raise nary a peep about the 1.5 million innocent children who are killed on our own shores every year. My colleagues, I ask you: Where is our conscience? Where is our shame?

Now our foes on the other side of this debate refuse to admit that what is at stake in abortion is a human life. No; they insist that abortion is just a medical procedure intended to terminate a pregnancy. The fetus to them is not life. It is not even potential life. It is merely a blob of tissue, or worse, a parasite that needs to be excised from the victimized mother. Abortion is solely about the so-called rights of the mother. The rights of the unborn child are never part of the equation, because for them the fetus has no rights.

But I have a question for the pro-abortion forces in this country: How can you be so sure? How do you know the fetus is merely human tissue with no claim to personhood? How do you know abortion is not, in fact, the taking of a human life? Their answer, of course, is that they just know. Never do they produce any evidence that the fetus is not a human life. They simply assume that the fetus is not life. And after all, what other choice do they have? The only way they can feel comfortable morally is to pretend what they advocate is the surgical equivalent of having a tooth pulled.

In his book ''The Unaborted Socrates,'' the moral philosopher Peter Kreeft poses this analogy for abortion. Pretend you're a hunter going off into the woods with your friend, but you get separated. Now you're alone hunting for deer and you hear something rustle in the bushes in front of you. You can't see what it is, but you know something is there. What do you do? Do you shoot, hoping the noise is caused by a deer and not your friend? Or do you play it safe and hold your fire until you're sure that it's not your friend? My friends, the abortionist faces the same quandary every day of his life. He can't say for sure that the fetus is not human. But does he play it safe? No, he takes a chance that the fetus he is aborting is really a human being. He literally risks that he is a murderer.

We all know there are deep divisions within our society over abortion. But the one thing I hope we all can agree on is that it is morally risky at best to practice a procedure that even an abortionist must admit could be murder. But it is up to us, my colleagues, to make these arguments, to persuade the country that it is best to err on the side of caution when contemplating abortion. If we do not act, who will? If we do not speak up on behalf of the unborn, will they speak up for themselves?

But I have hope. I believe we are beginning to turn the corner. Congress, through the hard work of Representatives like CHRIS SMITH, BOB DORNAN, and HENRY HYDE, has finally succeeded in passing the first legislation ever that would prevent a particular abortion procedure from being used. I speak here of the so-called partial-birth abortion, a gruesome act whereby the fetus is delivered right to the base of the skull, at which point the abortionist plunges in a pair of surgical scissors to facilitate the evacuation of the brain. The baby, of course, is then fully delivered, but dead. In this act of barbarity, only 3 inches separates a legal abortion from murder. But of course, we all know it is murder anyway.

Unfortunately, the Clinton administration has promised to veto this bill, despite bipartisan support. This is interesting, because even the President has said his goal is to make abortion safe, legal, and rare. Well, here was a chance to make it a little rarer, and what did he do? He promised a veto.

But I wonder something? Why does the President want abortion to be rare? If it is just a harmless medical procedure that improves the lives of women—as the President believes—then why should it be rare? In his world abortion is a good thing and therefore it should be plentiful. But the reality is that even the President knows the American people are uncomfortable with abortion. He knows that even if he sees nothing wrong with 1.5 million abortions, the majority of the American people do.

Fortunately, America's moral climate is changing. Americans never thought legal abortion would be used for anything other than extreme cases.

But now they realize they were sold a false bill of goods. Now they realize that abortion, far from being used to save the life of the mother, is little more than a convenient form of birth control for countless women. It is my contention that had Americans known that, they never would have consented to legalizing abortion in the first place.

Simply put, abortion detracts from our national greatness. As Alexis de Toqueville said in his pioneering study of American democracy more than 100 years ago: ''America is great because America is good.'' If we lose our goodness, our greatness is sure to follow.

I think most Americans realize this, which is why abortion troubles them. But as with all great public debates, we must reinforce our truths again and again. Together, we can make a difference. So let's make a commitment, right here and right now, that we will labor to restore America to greatness by restoring it to goodness. And do we really have any other choice? Basic morality demands that we who possess the power to speak, stand up for the rights of those who lack the power to speak for themselves.

□ 1300

GOP MOVING THE GOAL POSTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GOODLING). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO] is recognized during morning business for 3 minutes.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, in November, House Budget Chairman JOHN KASICH said this about the budget negotiations: ''Frankly, we don't ask for a lot. We ask for nothing more than a commitment to do this in a 7-year period. The priorities within that 7-year plan are negotiable.''

The Republican leadership in both House and the Senate echoed Mr. KASICH's sentiments and asked President Clinton to produce a 7-year balanced budget using the economic assumptions of the Congressional Budget Office. That's all we want, they said, and then we can negotiate the details.

Well, the President has done his part. He has given Republicans a 7-year balanced budget using CBO numbers. But now, Republican leaders want to move the goal posts in the middle of the game. Now, Mr. KASICH and the Republican leadership in Congress say they will not negotiate on the budget priorities.

The budget negotiations do come down to a question of priorities. Democrats and the President want a balanced budget that protects Medicare, education and the environment, and includes a tax cut for middle-class families. The Republicans want deeper cuts in Medicare, education, and the environment to help pay for a larger tax break that goes primarily to upper-income families and large corporations. And they want a backroom deal on Medicare. That is wrong.

Yet, despite our differences, a balanced budget is in reach. Both sides of the aisle have produced plans that will get us there. We will never all agree on all the details. However, if we can produce a balanced budget that protects Medicare, Medicaid, education, and the environment, it will pass this House, it will pass the other body and it will be signed into law by the President.

My Republican colleagues said that if the President gave them a 7-year CBO budget, they would negotiate. The President has done that. It's time for Republicans to keep your word and get back to the negotiating table.

For 220 years, this democracy has worked. Let's make it work again. Government shutdowns and threatened defaults on our debt—these tactics are an affront to democracy. It's time to put away the blackmail schemes and put America on the track to a balanced budget that protects our priorities: Medicare, education, environmental protection, and a tax cut for working middle-class families.

Thus far, this Congress has been the least productive Congress since 1933. Will that be the legacy of the 104th Congress? Or, will we rise above partisan politics and do what's right for the country?

FARM LEGISLATION FOR 1996 NEEDS TO BEGIN NOW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. EWING] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. EWING. Mr. Speaker, I come here today to talk about something that is basic to America and basic to this country, and something that we need to take action on, and that deals with farm legislation for 1996.

We need to take action now, because even while you may have been snowed in here in the Nation's capital and winter holds its grip across this Nation, it is but a few weeks until we will be going to the fields in my district in Illinois, and, yes, across the whole Nation. It is time that we take action.

Unfortunately, the farm bill for 1996 and the next 7 years, which contributed $13 billion to deficit reduction, was vetoed by President Clinton when he vetoed the Balanced Budget Act. So since there has been no agreement with the President on a true balanced budget and it does not appear that one is going to happen, we have got to take care of agriculture policy, food policy for this Nation, just as we would our military policy if he had vetoed that bill also.

We need to do it in a bipartisan way. Agriculture and agricultural policy has, for the most part, always been a bipartisan effort. We need to do that, and I am sure that the gentleman from Kansas, Chairman ROBERTS, is working in that regard, and the gentleman from Texas, ranking member DE LA GARZA, is also very cooperative. But we are late, and now is the time to take action; we cannot wait any longer, and be doing what is good for the country.

What are the options? Well, of course, if the President would agree to a balanced budget that this Congress could approve, we could put it in that act. As I said, that is not probably going to happen.

We could do it as an independent bill, or we could attach it to the next CR, which I feel certain will be passed, and we could pass it on to the President, and hopefully he would sign it.

Now, another option is to extend the farm policy that has been in effect up until October 1 of last year. But, see, that policy does not contain the reforms, the market orientation, that we had in the new bill. It is counterproductive to go back and extend old policy, which really decreases the amount of investment we are going to put into our food policy and our food programs in this country. It is tired old policy. It is time to retire it. We need to move on.

The final option is we could go back to a 1949 act, and that is not practical at all. Certainly legislation in 1949 does not now cover the needs of agriculture today.

Finally, on this issue, let me say that the Secretary of Agriculture is considering retiring some of the CRP ground, the Crop Reserve Program. This program has been very beneficial to the environment, and I think that we should ask the Secretary to go very slowly in releasing millions of acres of ground, some of which should not be put back into cropland, to be put into crops. We should not overreact the first time in two decades that we have decent commodity prices and farmers across this country have a chance to be profitable. As we move with the new farm bill out of government-controlled agriculture, let us not kill the goose before it has a chance to lay a golden egg. I would ask that the Secretary of Agriculture take the very limited option in reducing CRP ground, and let us follow the pattern and see what happens before we get into it too deeply.

GIVE FULL ATTENTION TO STATE OF THE UNION MESSAGE TONIGHT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] is recognized during morning business for 3 minutes.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I am just here to hope that this body tonight can listen to what the President says and we can come together and not have another shutdown of the Government or not declare a default on the debt, which would be the first time in the history of this great Republic.

This House floor has all the ambience of downtown Sarajevo before the Dayton agreement. I do not know what we do, whether we load everybody off and send them to Dayton. Maybe there is something in the water that can get

them to come together. But if we could find the parties in the former Yugoslavia that could come together and put a peace together, why can we not get an agreement to get this body going?

Why are we talking about shutting down the Government because we cannot do the budget this year, and basically the reason is they say it is because they are arguing over numbers for 7 years from now, which in all honesty none of us can bind people to 7 years from now. We ought to be held accountable for this year. I think we will be held accountable for this year by the voters. I think they are getting very tired of this.

Every time the President looks up, they are shooting at his feet and asking him to tap dance a little more. You put out one thing, he meets it. You put out another thing, he meets it. You put out another thing, he meets it. Finally, you begin to say, This must not be for real. Fifty-plus hours? Criteria after criteria met? And every time you do it, someone says, Oh, well, one more thing before we think this is really real.

Now, I honestly think that if anyone thinks this is new, they are wrong. I have been here for 23 years, and we have had all sorts of disagreements between this body and between the person down at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue. We have had Republican presidents and Democratic Congresses and all sorts of different combinations in between and all sorts of polarizing incidents. But we have never let it get to this level, never.

This is one of the great things we pride ourselves in America on, is pragmatism. At the end of the day we can all say, OK, we didn't get 100 percent of what we wanted, but we moved the debate in a certain direction, and we will come back and fight again tomorrow. But we do not stop everything, and we do not default on the debt, and we do not throw ourselves on the floor and have tantrums.

So I really hope that all of us, on both sides of the aisle, give full attention tonight to this State of the Union, to this President, our only President of this great Nation, who is out here trying to chart a course to get us out of this century and into the next.

Mr. Speaker, I think the citizens deserve much better than what they got in the first half of this Congress. Let us clean up our act tonight and let us start tonight for this second Congress.

REMEMBERING PRIOR STATE OF THE UNION MESSAGE STATEMENTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Colorado for sharing her views here, and I think she does point up something upon which we can all agree, and that is that fundamental to debate in a free society is the notion of disagreement, and it is the mission of all of us to achieve consensus. But the question comes, at what price?

Mr. Speaker, I bring you greetings from Arizona, the Grand Canyon State. I am here, Mr. Speaker, to use this time to address what is not a credibility gap, but instead a credibility canyon. Indeed, all members of the new majority, as well as members of the minority, welcome the President of the United States to this Chamber tonight, where he will stand at this podium and deliver his State of the Union Message.

To quote one pundit in this town, he said, ''Heretofore most State of the Union Addresses by most chief executives have been forgivable.'' Well, at the danger of incurring the wrath of that pundit, Mr. Speaker, let us remember, let us remember the words of our President in his previous State of the Union Messages.

First dealing with the budget. Quoting now from his 1993 address:

> The plan substantially reduces the Federal deficit honestly and credibly by using in the beginning the most conservative estimates of Government revenues, not as the executive branch has done so often in the past using the most optimistic ones.

Again from 1993:

> This budget plan, by contrast, will by 1997 cut $140 billion in that year alone from the deficit, a real spending cut, a real revenue increase, a real deficit reduction, using the independent numbers of the Congressional Budget Office.

Yet throughout last year, throughout 1995, President Clinton submitted to this body budget after budget after budget, but refused to use those objective numbers of the Congressional Budget Office. It was not until this new majority ultimately persuaded him to submit a CBO-scored budget to end the recent shutdown that he lived up to the above statements.

Most astonishingly, Mr. Speaker, from last year, quoting now the President of the United States who stood at this podium. ''I certainly want to balance the budget.''

Yet the fact remains, Mr. Speaker, as reflected in the record of this institution and through reports of the news media, President Clinton vetoed the first balanced budget submitted by the Congress in a quarter of a century.

Then to the topic of welfare reform. Quoting again from 1993's address:

> Later this year, we will offer a plan to end welfare as we know it. I want to offer the people on welfare the education, the training, the child care, the healthcare they need to get back on their feet. But, say after 2 years, they must get back to work.

Then from 1994:

> So we must also revolutionize our welfare system. We will say to teenagers, if you have a child out of wedlock, we will no longer give you a check to set up a separate household. We want families to stay together. We will provide the support, the job training, the child care you need, for up to 2 years. But after that anyone who can work, must.

Then from last year:

> Nothing has done more to undermine our sense of common responsibility than our failed welfare system. Let this be the year to end welfare as we know it.

Mr. Speaker, despite the fact that the President year after year has come to this House and addressed from this podium his willingness to end welfare as we know it, he did not support the welfare reform bill that had broad bipartisan support. Instead, he vetoed the welfare bill that Congress sent him.

Again from 1993:

> This plan will give this country the toughest child support enforcement system it has ever had.

From 1994:

> If we value responsibility, we cannot ignore the $34 billion in child support absent parents ought to be paying to millions of parents who are taking care of their children.

Then from 1995:

> If the parent is not paying child support, they should be forced to pay. We should suspend drivers licenses, track them across State lines.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the welfare reform bill that President Clinton vetoed would have required States to create a central case registry to track the status of all child support orders. The bill also gave the States the authority to suspend drivers, professional, occupational and recreational licenses of anyone whose child support payments are in arrears, all the things the President said he wanted to do last year.

□ 1315

Mr. Speaker, I understand my time is short. The record is replete. Words mean something. Actions speak louder than words. Mr. President, keep your promises, join with the new majority, and let us help govern this Nation.

REPUBLICAN REVOLUTION IS PARALYZING THE NATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON] is recognized during morning business for 3 minutes.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, it is said one can tell one who wants to move on by those who argue last year's argument. My last colleague who spoke is regurgitating for us the arguments they will not let go.

Mr. Speaker, the Republicans demanded a 7-year budget. The President has given them a 7-year budget. The Republicans demanded that any budget plan that is adopted be approved by the Congressional Budget Office using their numbers. Again, the President has agreed to that. The Republicans further insisted that there be a large tax cut as a part of their budget plan. Again, the President has offered a smaller tax cut but for working families.

Mr. Speaker, the President has gone a considerable distance to meet the demands of the Republican Party, and

yet they continue those same arguments. We just heard the litany go on. What is their argument, then, if he has done those essential things that they say they wanted?

Why not move on, as one of my colleagues suggested, to the farm bill? I can tell my colleagues that farmers in my State are uncertain as to what their future will hold. Democrats are simply insisting that the budget we pass hold fast to the principle that made this Nation strong; principles that Republicans and Democrats should indeed support. Democrats want to safeguard health care for seniors, for children, for poor families; to promote education for our future and to protect our environment.

Here we are again almost facing yet a third shutdown and threatening to default on our Nation's liability and debt; that we will not honor our obligation. What kind of governance is that? Is that being responsible?

Yes, we have made progress in the last few years. Unemployment is down, interest is indeed low, and inflation is stabilized. That is progress we all, Republicans and Democrats, should want to protect. Progress like that, however, will stop and our economy will suffer if we do not work together. Both Democrats and Republicans must come and work together to prevent a national default on our obligations.

I can tell my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, this Republican revolution is paralyzing this Nation and it will do great damage to this economy. It is now time for cool heads and rational minds and thoughtful persons to come together, to join together and revive what is important to Americans in this Nation.

NAFTA AND SOUTHWEST FLORIDA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] is recognized during morning business for 3 minutes.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, January first marked the 2-year anniversary of NAFTA. As we begin the third year of tariff reductions and opening markets under this accord, it is appropriate to take a moment to assess our progress—so far reports show NAFTA has been a mixed bag: Mostly the news is positive; however, there are some serious problem areas that clearly need attention. In Florida, we are particularly concerned about the negative impact that import surges of tomatoes and other winter fruit and vegetables are having on southwest Florida's growers, the packing houses and the workers in these industries. This is a bi-partisan concern—and I am pleased that Senator BOB GRAHAM is working this issue in the Senate. On November 16, 1993, the President wrote a letter to the members of the Florida delegation, assuring us that he was committed to taking the necessary steps to ensure that the trade representative and the ITC would take prompt and effective action to protect the United States vegetable industry against price-based import surges from Mexico. Now is the time for him to take that action because, unfortunately, it seems that the safeguards in NAFTA and the implementing language—the volume-based snapback provision, the automatic price monitoring and the expedited import relief procedures—have not lived up to our hopes. They are not working properly. I am currently drafting legislation calling on the President to live up to the promise he made and to protect our growers from potentially unfair Mexican trading practices. In the meantime, my colleagues in the Florida delegation and I will continue to work in a bipartisan, bicameral fashion to address the urgent needs of the Florida fruit and vegetable industries. To their credit the Department of Agriculture has been very forthcoming and willing to work with the Florida delegation and our growers.

Unfortunately, I have to say that the USTR could be more helpful. Of course, the administration and its officers can't fix all of the problems, some of that is our responsibility in Congress. In response to the very real needs of the tomato and fruit and vegetable industries in Florida, a series of bills have been introduced to address definitional problems faced by our growers when they attempted to seek relief through the section 202 process, to address the differences in enforced packing requirements between Mexican and domestic growers, and to create national country of origin labeling to allow consumers to make more informed decisions when they make their individual purchasing choices at the market. An invitation has been issued for U.S. Trade Representative Ambassador Kantor and Secretary of Agriculture Dan Glickman to brief Florida delegation members on the tomato and winter fruit and vegetable situation. I understand this meeting will take place tomorrow and I hope it will bring progress we need and look for. This is a critical issue for Florida and an important one for the Nation.

I think it is also a very critical one in terms of living up to the promises that have been made.

Those of us who felt NAFTA would be good for the United States of America want to be certain that we correct the sore spots that are there, if they are correctable. If not, we will have to excise those sore spots with legislation. In any event, once we see those sore spots, the time is now to move, and we have seen them and we must move.

WEST VIRGINIA DIGGING OUT FROM RECORD FLOOD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WISE] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, today West Virginia is digging out from a record flood, just like your State of Pennsylvania, and like other areas of the mid-Atlantic. I want to report to Congress today on our efforts and to ask for assistance.

Mr. Speaker, this was a true bicoastal flood for our State, going from the Ohio River all the way to the Potomac and Shenandoah Rivers, from border to border of our State. The Governor, during the weekend, declared 29 of our 55 counties in a state of emergency. Thousands have been driven from their homes or had their homes and jobs threatened. Water systems have been damaged, sewer systems have been compromised. Businesses in some cases have been wiped out, others will take a while to resume. Highways in some cases have been washed out.

From Friday night, beginning Friday night in the basement of the State capital and the State Office of Emergency Services office, I have tried to monitor and follow this flood as closely as possible. From Friday night, with the State OES personnel, to traveling with the Governor on Saturday to our hardest hit central West Virginia counties, to going Sunday night to Mason County to watch the Ohio River as it began its relentless rise, and then yesterday back across the State to Jefferson County where I watched the swollen Potomac and Shenandoah Rivers as they began to recede, I can testify about how awesome and how devastating this flood has been for many of our people.

Today and yesterday our staff has been fanning out across the hardest hit counties trying to bring immediate word about where people can get assistance and to assist in assessing the damage.

Mr. Speaker, in the face of this devastation, of course, we also see incredible acts of human spirit, and I just cannot speak highly enough or applaud loudly enough nor respect enough those thousands of volunteers across our State at every level: The hundreds of National Guard that were mobilized and responded. We do not know what it means, in a county that is still watching the flood waters recede, to see those National Guard uniforms come rolling in on those trucks bringing the promise of help.

The emergency service personnel at every level in the county and the State, the Red Cross, the sheriff and police departments, the highway department staffs, the Corps of Engineers, who control the many dams that prevented the damage from being far worse. All of them working long hours, Mr. Speaker. Long hours, of course, that did not start just with this flood, but started with the blizzard that began over 10 days before. Then the flood came and many of those volunteers and personnel are still working. Many individual acts of people rebuilding immediately their lives.

One question I have received, Mr. Speaker, time after time as I made my trip back across the flood-stricken

areas, ''BOB, will funding be cut off next week for any of the vital activities?'' I am confident that this Congress will not permit that to happen.

I am assured that the Federal Emergency Management Agency is taken care of financially, at least for the immediate future, but we must also remember the other flood recovery programs, the Small Business Administration's disaster recovery loans, the Economic Development Administration, which has been so active in economic recovery in the Midwest and many of our other devastated areas, the HUD, Housing and Urban Development programs, and so the many other programs, too. We must make sure and vow, Mr. Speaker, that no amount of partisan politics will stop these vital programs from going forward and that there will be no interruption in flood recovery.

Mr. Speaker, if I can report some positive things. Our death rate was nowhere near as high as 1985, even through the 1985 flood levels were reached in some communities. Some communities have been hit every bit as hard as 1985, but many, some in the Eastern Panhandle, saw far less damage. Sometimes the water did not crest at the predicted levels. In other cases flood prevention efforts such as dikes and levies have been installed. We are smarter in many of our areas now and we know to evacuate. We have a much more professional emergency services operation.

But there are also farther reaching flood implications. While many counties in the central part of our State did not see the 1985 flood levels, at the same time we had to deal with the Ohio River. Nine additional counties that were not affected, but did see record levels not seen since 1972 in Hurricane Agnes. So this time we are much more far-reaching in the flood devastation.

Mr. Speaker, one woman stood on her front porch pushing liquid mud down the steps with a broom. Behind her stood her sons and her neighbors helping her dig out. Tears ran down her face as she cried and quietly said, ''I have lost my home and my job.'' Her home had been devastated for the second time in 10 years. Her workplace has been wiped out and her employer said he was not returning.

Mr. Speaker, she knows what she has to do. She will do the work. She is going to rebuild. She just asks that wherever this Congress and this Federal Government, her Federal Government, can help, it do so and we owe her that.

HISTORIC SIGNIFICANCE OF THE 104TH CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, as a former teacher, I know that you are interested, like I am, in history and the historic significance of events as they occur. I know that the Speaker of the House, NEWT GINGRICH, being a former history professor, is also interested in historic significance.

I say that because we can look back on the first session, and let us take a look at some of the historic significance that has occurred in this Congress, in the first session.

Well, one of the biggest things that is going to go down in the history books is that it is the first and only Congress, the first and only Congress led by the Republican majority, that closed down the Federal Government for a 6-day period in November, and a 21-day period in December of 1995 and January of 1996. Total of 27 days. Never in the history of this country has that ever occurred. That will be in the history books.

□ 1330

What was the total cost of that to our taxpayers by the Republican majority that says they want to save money, they want to cut out waste in Government? A waste of over $1 billion. Not a million, folks. A billion. A waste of over $1 billion. That is the historic significance. That is to the taxpayers. Now, it is all orchestrated by the Speaker of the House, NEWT GINGRICH.

Another historic significance. It is only the third time in the history of this country, over 200 years, that this House has gone 365 days, we opened up in January 3 or 4, if I remember, of 1995, we ended up January 3 of this year. Five minutes later we opened the second session. That has only happened three times. So we worked 365 days. We worked long hours. We had more votes in this House than at any time in the near past, from the 93d to the 104th Congress. More votes. But another historic significance. We did less legislation enacted into law than any other Congress in the first session since 1933.

So we did a lot here yelling and hollering, a lot of passing bills and sending them to the Senate and the Republicans over in the Senate, led by the majority leader from Kansas say, ''No, we don't want that. That's too radical. We're not going to do that. That's too extreme.'' And as a result, we did almost nothing.

That leads me to right now. Let us look at today. There is nobody else here. There is not another Member on the floor. We are back after 2 weeks' vacation. Where is everybody? They are not here because they are not going to do anything today.

Members, what are we going to do today? Well, we are going to do a little Corrections Day bill. We are going to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act relating to standards for constructed water conveyances. That is really important to the country.

We are going to award a Congressional gold medal to Ruth and Billy Graham. We are going to do a bill on Saddleback Mountain-Arizona; and then we are going to make certain technical corrections in laws relating to Native Americans. That is what we are going to do today. That is really important.

We are not going to do welfare reform. We are not going to do line-time veto. We are not going to do any of those things. We probably will not do them the rest of this year.

What are we going to do tomorrow? Well, tomorrow we may do a continuing resolution, because the Republican majority under NEWT GINGRICH now tell us that they are not going to close down the Government anymore so we have to pass one because the Government will close down after January 26 if we do not. So we will do that. Everybody agrees on that. There will be no problem with that. It will take about a half an hour at the most. I do not know what the rest of the day we are going to do or what we are going to do Friday.

They tell me we may have a new conference report on the defense authorization bill and we may do that. Then they are telling me, and I hear through the grapevine, we may quit until sometime near the end of February.

Talk about a do-nothing Congress. I do not know, I think most of us should go ahead and send all of our pay back, because most of the Members have not done anything. I say to Speaker GINGRICH, that it is time to get things done. You want a balanced budget? You can have a balanced budget. You know you can have a balanced budget. Because the Democratic coalition budget is balanced in 7 years. By 2002 it is a balanced budget scored by CBO, the Congressional Budget Office. But it does not have your big tax cut in it, it does not have that $245 billion for the wealthy.

That is why you will not do it. You really want the tax cut for the wealthy. You really do not want a balanced budget.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. GOODLING]. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 33 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 2 p.m.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

The Reverend Harold Bradley, S.J., Georgetown University, Washington, DC, offered the following prayer:

With praise and adoration we offer this prayer, O God, in appreciation for all Your blessings to us and to all people. We are aware of our responsibilities to use Your blessings as good

stewards of Your divine purposes and to use Your gifts in ways that promote justice and equity to every person. May we work together as faithful custodians of the bounty of Your creation and reflect in our lives the beauty of all Your gifts. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARKEY] come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. MARKEY led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

> I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain fifteen 1-minutes on each side.

CONTINUE ON THE PATH TO A BALANCED BUDGET

(Mr. TIAHRT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, we are back and we have learned a lot. No. 1, you cannot negotiate with a ''say anything, do nothing'' President. It is clear that he is for big government, he is for higher taxes, and he is for more spending. The President condones wasteful spending in the Government.

We have ''out of town'' Brown, Secretary of Commerce, who has overextended his travel budget. We have Secretary O'Leary, who is a congenital flier. We cannot keep her in town. But this is just the tip of the iceberg. We have massive wastes of Federal spending in our bureaucracy and we must downsize it.

Mr. Speaker, we are back, we are for a balanced budget, we are on track to get there. We are going to continue to keep pressure on the administration. We are going to reform Medicaid through block grants, we are going to preserve and protect Medicare, and we are going to try to give back to American families some of what they lost in the 1990 tax increase and in the 1993 tax increase. So we are working that hard and we are going to continue on that path. I appreciate my fellow colleagues who are going to join in that effort.

THE 7-YEAR BALANCED BUDGET

(Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, welcome back. I am glad to welcome our folks back to the kinder and gentler Congress after that first 1-minute.

Mr. Speaker, if you think you remember hearing congressional Republicans saying all they wanted was a CBO-scored 7-year balanced budget, your memory is not failing you. Here is what they said:

Our House budget chairman. ''Frankly, we don't ask for a lot. We ask for nothing more than a commitment to do this in a 7-year period.''

Our colleague from Idaho. ''We have no hidden agenda. The only thing we are asking for is a 7-year balanced budget using CBO numbers.''

A colleague from New York. ''All we have asked the President of the United States with all his tremendous resources at his hands to do likewise, to come up with those numbers reflecting his own priorities to balance the budget in 7 years using real numbers. That is all we have asked for.''

Now they want more. They want their balanced budget bill. They want to include deep cuts in Medicare needs, education needs, and the environment in order to fund a massive tax break, or no bill at all.

The President sent a 7-year balanced budget 2 weeks ago with CBO numbers. But that is not good enough because that is not what their priorities are. They want to hurt seniors and hurt education funding.

HONEST NUMBERS TO BALANCE THE BUDGET IN 7 YEARS IS THE STARTING POINT

(Mr. HAYWORTH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, once again, I listened with interest to the remarks of my friend from Texas, and what a pity it is, ladies and gentlemen, that the minority is reduced to this, to chanting a seemingly mindless mantra, with no basis in fact, with selective use of quotation.

What this new majority always said is that the starting point was looking to find numbers, honest numbers, that begin to balance this budget in 7 years. That is the starting point. That is the parameters of the debate. But it is not a fait accompli. It is not sending us a budget that has all the savings in the last year and continues the culture of tax and spend and spend and tax some more.

What the American people want, Mr. Speaker, is this: A government that achieves an honest consensus, that saves not only the seniors of this generation, but generations yet unborn; a commonsense budget and set of priorities that preserves this great noble experiment in a constitutional republic and preserves this American dream. That is the task before all of us, conservative and liberal, Republican and Democrat.

COURT-MARTIAL OF MICHAEL NEW IS WRONG

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, Michael New is a decorated soldier, he loves his country. His bravery, patriotism, and devotion to duty have never been questioned. As we meet today, Michael New is being court-martialed, court-martialed for refusing to wear the blue beret and shoulder patch of the United Nations on a peacekeeping mission.

Michael New said, ''I will only wear the uniform of my country, the United States of America.'' Bravo, Michael New. Michael New took an oath to the Constitution of the United States, not to the charter of the United Nations, and I cannot speak for the Congress, ladies and gentlemen, but if I could, I would tell all these politically correct bureaucrats to take their one world order hands off Michael New and leave him alone.

Mr. Speaker, there is something drastically wrong when a military hero is being court-martialed because he refuses to wear a foreign uniform. Think about it and beam me up.

FROM THE WHITE HOUSE ON TAX RELIEF

(Mr. BALLENGER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, here is a quote from the White House yesterday. ''But he''—meaning President Clinton—''will certainly acknowledge that tax relief, as he has been fighting for as President, is something that remains very important.''

Mr. Speaker, let me point out that Clinton is now in the fourth year of his Presidency. If he has been fighting for tax relief, why don't the taxpayers have it?

Is it because in his first year as President, he pushed the largest tax increase in history on the backs of the American people?

Is it because when a middle-class, family tax relief bill was laid on his desk, he vetoed it?

Or is it because he didn't even start talking about tax cuts until Republicans became the majority in Congress?

Mr. Speaker, all the above help point out that Bill Clinton is a say-anything, do-nothing liberal President. He claims to be for the people, but his actions show that his policies are higher taxes, bigger government, and more spending.

THREE STRIKES AND YOU ARE OUT

(Mr. MARKEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, radical Republicans in Congress are preparing again to take political hostages in order to force President Clinton to accept their extreme agenda.

If insanity consists of doing the same thing over and over again and expecting a different result, legislative lunacy is shutting down the Federal Government for a third time and expecting public support. Having learned nothing from the two Government shutdowns they manufactured last year, key Republican leaders are threatening to force yet another fiscal crisis unless they get a substantial share of their agenda. They're threatening to load up funding bills with extremist riders and let the United States go into default unless the President agrees to give massive tax breaks for the rich paid for by deep cuts in Medicare, education, and the environment.

Last fall, the Republicans launched their first fiscal strike, shutting down the Government for 5 days. In December, the GOP launched their second strike, shutting down the Government for 3 weeks. If there is another Government shutdown or a default, the American people have every right to go to the polls in November and tell the GOP: ''Three Strikes and You're Out.''

WELFARE STATE ENCOURAGING FAMILY BREAKDOWN

(Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, as a candidate for President 4 years ago, Bill Clinton said that he would ''end welfare as we know it.''

Earlier this month, President Clinton vetoed a welfare bill that would have done exactly what candidate Clinton had promised.

Let us review some of the facts.

Almost $5 trillion has been spent on the welfare state since LBJ launched the war on poverty.

Over half of the individuals receiving AFDC remain dependent on welfare for 10 or more years.

In 1973, the illegitimacy rate for AFDC mothers was 32 percent. Today, it is over 50 percent.

Mr. Speaker, the welfare state has become a system that encourages family breakdown and government dependence. It fails to hold absentee fathers accountable and traps young people in poverty. When given a chance to change this destructive system, Bill Clinton again proved that he is a say anything, do nothing liberal President.

TAXPAYER MONEY BEING WASTED

(Mr. DOGGETT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, if word were out this afternoon that a governmental official had wasted $150,000 of taxpayer money to further a political agenda, someone would surely be here denouncing it, and if the figure were instead $1.5 million, I am sure the line of speakers would be rather long. Were it $150 million of wasted taxpayer money, there would be bills and resolutions filed and other extraordinary action.

But what we are dealing with this afternoon is not $150,000 or $150 million, but $1.5 billion of the greatest waste of taxpayer money in the history of these United States. That is the cost of the two Gingrich government shutdowns, $1.5 billion totally wasted, frivolously, to further a political agenda, and, in the word of the sponsor of this action, to pressure another political official into doing what they want; $1.5 billion.

In all these budget negotiations, I have never seen a line item that should be there; $1.5 billion Gingrich government wasteful spending for shutting down the Government. Are they going to take that out of Medicare or just add it to the Government deficit?

A LITTLE FRIENDLY ADVICE FOR PRESIDENT CLINTON

(Mr. CHABOT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, President Clinton has not asked me for any advice, but if he were to ask in the spirit of bipartisanship, I would be happy to oblige. I would say, ''Mr. President, you are about to give your State of the Union Address. You have got your hands full right now with a host of problems. You vetoed the Balanced Budget Act while keeping Hazel O'Leary, who uses taxpayer dollars to hire Madonna's plane, still on the job. You still have got people upset with you because you raised taxes, the biggest tax increase in American history. You have promised to end welfare as we know it, and then you vetoed welfare reform. And you have gone back on your word to cut taxes on the American people.''

I would say, ''Mr. President, you can still make things right with the American people. You can still keep those promises you have made and broken so many times. You can agree to balance the budget by restraining spending and cutting taxes on hard-working American families. If you do that, Mr. President, you would finally be keeping your word and you would make an awful lot of Americans happy.''

For what it is worth, that is the advice I would give President Clinton.

FUND NASA NOW

(Ms. HARMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, what a difference a day makes.

Yesterday, NASA's Galileo spacecraft beamed back incredible images of Jupiter, our solar system's most intriguing plant. Today, however, Members are ready to allow NASA to be caught in the crossfire of another Government shutdown.

When I met last week with NASA contractors in my district, they told me that the failure to enact NASA's appropriation would cause devastation and hardship to the region's aerospace industry. Small contractors, who don't have the financial flexibility of their large counterparts, would be particularly hard-hit.

Thermal Electronics, Luna Defense Systems, RGA Labs, and Phoenix Engineering will all be forced to lay off—not furlough, but lay off—a substantial percentage of their workers unless we act in a bipartisan manner to immediately enact a NASA appropriation which funds the space station and key science initiatives like the mission to plant Earth.

If one adds in Hughes, TRW, Allied Signal, and Cal Tech's Jet Propulsion Lab, we are talking about the possibility of over 10,000 layoffs.

Mr. Speaker, we must find common ground and fund NASA now. Our future depends on it.

SHAMEFUL DEMAGOGUERY

(Mr. HOKE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, I was on a plane last week and a fellow citizen of Lakewood turned to me and he said:

> You know, Martin, it seems to be the difference between the new Democrat and the old Democrat is that the new Democrats are talking a great game, a great wonderful conservative game, and then they turn around and do the same thing that all the old liberal Democrats did.

This was a fellow who grew up in Texas as a Democrat.

I think that is exactly right on the money, and exactly what we can expect tonight from the President's State of the Union Address. We are going to hear another fabulous address. But when it gets down to the nitty-gritty, when we actually present a balanced budget, when we can actually do the right thing, then we in fact get into the gutter and engage in the most mindless and really shameful demagoguery that we have heard around here in a long time.

Let me just give you one example, and that is the Medicare example. Our Medicare program would increase spending at 7.4 percent per pay for the next 7 years; the President's is around 7.6, 7.7 percent. Yet this is deep cuts in Medicare to pay for a tax cut for our rich friends? And with a straight face? It is just shameless.

□ 1415

TALK OF DEFAULT MORE RECKLESS THAN GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

(Ms. NORTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, the only thing more reckless than a Government shutdown is talk of default, and I mean talk. Talk alone on this subject is playing with fire. Secretary Rubin is accused of bluffing. The real question is are we bluffing?

The market opened today down 50 points. It is beginning to level off. But I do not like this game of chicken and I hope my colleagues do not. We have maligned the Secretary, but I think we should thank him for finding magic money. They language he is using this time is quite different and quite definitive and he concludes by saying I will not sell the Nation's gold, and I will not withhold taxpayers' refunds.

Now we are into whether we will have a clean or dirty debt limit bill. This gets us into the mode from which we have just ascended. Please, no more ''deja vu all over again,'' not with the Nation's full faith and credit.

PRESIDENT CLINTON LONG ON PROMISES, SHORT ON KEEPING THOSE PROMISES

(Mrs. SEASTRAND asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. SEASTRAND. Mr. Speaker, tonight the President will deliver the State of the Union Address, and I am sure we will all hear a great speech tonight, because he always does give a great speech. But the fact is that also, just as usual, he will be long on promises and short on keeping those promises.

For example, in last year's State of the Union, President Clinton said and I quote, ''We ought to help people raise their incomes immediately by lowering their taxes,'' end quote. But in reality he vetoed a middle-class family tax relief package.

Another example from last year's State of the Union. The President again, quote, ''Nothing is done more to undermine our sense of common responsibility than our failed welfare system. It rewards welfare over work; it undermines family values,'' end quote. But in reality he vetoed the welfare reform bill.

Mr. Speaker, once again, President Clinton will probably give us a speech long on promises but short on results, just reinforcing the fact that he is the say-anything and do-nothing liberal President.

PRESIDENT HAS AGREED TO A 7-YEAR BALANCED BUDGET

(Mr. PALLONE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, President Clinton has agreed to a 7-year balanced budget using CBO numbers. The problem is that the Republicans do not want to protect the priorities that the President thinks are important, such as the environment, Medicare, Medicaid, and also education. I would like to pay particular attention to the environment.

The Republicans are saying they want this huge tax cut or tax break, yet they want to cut back on environment enforcement. They do not want to properly fund the Superfund Program to clean up toxic waste sites. In my home State of New Jersey, we have 114 Superfund sites, and a lot of those sites are not being cleaned up now and will not be cleaned up if the Republicans do not agree to fully fund the Superfund Program, which they have not agreed to do so so far.

The President has stood strong. He agreed on a balanced budget and he agreed on the Republican terms, but he wants to protect the environment and he wants to make sure the Superfund Program moves forward so that in States like New Jersey those toxic waste sites that pose a direct threat to the health of many Americans who live nearby, he wants to make sure that those sites are cleaned up, and I commend him for it.

MEMBERS OF CONGRESS MUST REPRESENT THE CHILDREN

(Mr. SHAYS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, we have three primary objectives. One is to get our financial house in order and balance our Federal budget; the second is to save our trust funds from insolvency, and ultimate bankruptcy, particularly Medicare; and our third objective is to transform our caretaking social and corporate welfare state into what I would call a caring opportunity society.

Our country has grown into debt from $430 billion since the Vietnam War to $4,900 billion. That has got to end. Adults, Members of Congress, are elected by adults to represent the children, and that is what we are about to do.

PRESIDENT CHIRAC DISREGARDS HEALTH AND WELFARE OF SOUTH PACIFIC

(Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, sometime next week President Ghirac of France will be visiting Washington to meet with our President, and I understand there may even be a chance that he will address a joint session of the Congress. Mr. Speaker, give me a break. This is the man with tremendous arrogance and disregard for the concerns of some 170 nations.

He totally disregarded the concerns of the health and welfare of some 27 million men, women, and children who live in the nations of the Pacific. He disregarded and decided to break the moratorium and has already exploded five nuclear bombs in atolls in the South Pacific.

Mr. Speaker, by my last count, President Chirac and his predecessors have already exploded 182 nuclear bombs in the atmosphere and in 2 Pacific atolls. One of these atolls is a timed nuclear bomb, the equivalent of several Chernobyls that the French Government has forced upon the lives of the Pacific people. Is this fair, Mr. Speaker?

Shame on you, President Chirac of France. Shame on you for doing this to the Pacific people.

REPUBLICANS HAVE WALKED AWAY FROM THE BUDGET NEGOTIATIONS TABLE

(Ms. DELAURO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, House Budget Chairman JOHN KASICH said in November about the budget negotiations, and I quote, ''Frankly, we do not ask for a lot. We ask for nothing more than a commitment to do this in a 7-year period. The priorities within that 7-year plan are negotiable.''

Well, the President did exactly that, but now the Republicans want to move the goalpost in the middle of the game. Now the Republican leadership says that they will not negotiate on the budget priorities. What they want to do is to have a backroom deal on deep cuts in Medicare for a tax break for the wealthiest Americans.

Where I come from a person's word is his or her bond. Mr. KASICH and other Members of the Republican majority gave their word that they would sit down and negotiate the details of the budget once the President produced a 7-year balanced budget. The President met the Republicans more than halfway, but instead of responding in kind, Republicans have walked away from the negotiating table, walking away from their promise to the President, but more importantly than that, walking away from their duty to the American people.

MEMORIAL TO ED WHITE, FORMER CHIEF CLERK TO REPORTERS OF DEBATES

(Mr. FAZIO of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT] to memorialize one of our staff who has passed away.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California.

Congress is a busy place. Members interact with many workers. Sometimes we know them, but yet we do not know them. One of those individuals was a great worker here. Ed White. He was, in fact, the Chief Clerk to the reporters. He sat right at the first level of the dais there, right behind the Republican podium.

Ed has passed away. He served in Korea. He retired in 1993. He is from Boston, MA. While in the service they handed him a tank, but no one taught him how to operate it. He taught himself and operated that tank in defense of our great country.

Ed White leaves his beautiful wife, Patricia; two sons, Patrick and Teddy; and an awful lot of people who knew him here and cared deeply for him. There will be, in fact, a memorial mass, 2 p.m., Thursday, January 25, St. James Catholic Church, 103 North Spring St., Falls Church, VA, for all of us who remember Ed and want to give our best to the family, and God bless.

CORRECTIONS CALENDAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WHITE). This is the day for the call of the Corrections Calendar.

The Clerk will call the bill on the Corrections Calendar.

CONSTRUCTED WATER CONVEYANCES REFORM ACT OF 1995

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2567) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act relating to standards for constructed water conveyances.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 2567

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Constructed Water Conveyances Reform Act of 1995''.

SEC. 2. CONSTRUCTED WATER CONVEYANCES.

Section 303(c)(2) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1313(c)(2)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(C) STANDARDS FOR CONSTRUCTED WATER CONVEYANCES.—

''(i) RELEVANT FACTORS.—If a State exercised jurisdiction over constructed water conveyances in establishing standards under this section, the State shall consider any water quality impacts resulting from any return flow from a constructed water conveyance to navigable waters and the need to protect downstream uses and may consider the following:

''(I) The existing and planned uses of water transported in a conveyance system.

''(II) Management practices necessary to maintain the conveyance system.

''(III) Any State or regional water resources management and water conservation plans.

''(IV) The intended purposes for the constructed conveyance.

''(ii) RELEVANT USES.—If a State adopts or reviews water quality standards for constructed water conveyances, it shall not be required to establish recreational, aquatic life, or fish consumption uses for such systems if the uses are not existing or reasonably foreseeable or the uses interfere with the intended purposes of the conveyance system.

''(iii) STATUTORY CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subparagraph shall be construed to require a State to exercise jurisdiction over constructed water conveyances in establishing standards or to prohibit a State from considering any relevant factor in establishing standards or from establishing any relevant use.

''(iv) CONSTRUCTED WATER CONVEYANCES DEFINED.—In this subparagraph, the term 'constructed water conveyance' means a manmade water transport system constructed for the purpose of transporting water for agricultural purposes or municipal and industrial water supply purposes in a waterway that is not and never was a natural waterway.''.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment in the nature of a substitute:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Constructed Water Conveyances Reform Act of 1995''.

SEC. 2. CONSTRUCTED WATER CONVEYANCES.

Section 303(c)(2) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1313(c)(2)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(C) STANDARDS FOR CONSTRUCTED WATER CONVEYANCES.—

''(i) RELEVANT FACTORS.—If a State exercises jurisdiction over constructed water conveyances in establishing standards under this section, the State shall consider any water quality impacts resulting from any return flow from a constructed water conveyance to navigable waters and the need to protect downstream uses and may consider the following:

''(I) The existing and planned uses of water transported in a conveyance system.

''(II) Management practices necessary to maintain the conveyance system.

''(III) Any State or regional water resources management and water conservation plans.

''(IV) The intended purposes for the constructed conveyance.

''(ii) RELEVANT USES.—If a State adopts or reviews water quality standards for constructed water conveyances, it shall not be required to establish recreational, aquatic life, or fish consumption uses for such systems if the uses are not existing or reasonably foreseeable or the uses interfere with the intended purposes of the conveyance system.

''(iii) STATUTORY CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subparagraph shall be construed to require a State to exercise jurisdiction over constructed water conveyances in establishing standards or to prohibit a State from considering any relevant factor in establishing standards or from establishing any relevant use.

''(iv) CONSTRUCTED WATER CONVEYANCES DEFINED.—In this subparagraph, the term 'constructed water conveyance' means a manmade water transport system constructed for the purpose of transporting water for agricultural purposes or municipal and industrial water supply purposes in a waterway that is not and never was a natural waterway.''.

Mr. SHUSTER (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHUSTER] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BORSKI] will each be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHUSTER].

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2567, the Constructed Water Conveyances Reform Act. This correction day bill, which is the first of 1996, fixes a specific problem under the Clean Water Act that will benefit State and local officials and agricultural interests and continue, at the same time, to protect our Nation's waters.

It is also the first piece of legislation for the House to consider this year under the new constraints imposed by the Unfunded Mandate Reform Act of 1995. This bill not only passes the test of not imposing unfunded Federal mandates, it passes it with flying colors. In fact, the Congressional Budget Office finds that this bill is likely to reduce State and local costs by interjecting flexibility to avoid unnecessary water use designations.

This legislation amends the Clean Water Act to allow States greater flexibility in setting water quality standards for so-called constructed water conveyances; that is, manmade drains, canals, and other conduits to transport water for agricultural and water supply purposes.

The bill is essentially the same as provisions in the House-passed clean water bill, and is based on testimony gathered from several hearings.

It is before us today by a bipartisan coalition of Members; and, indeed, there are nine original cosponsors, five Republicans, four Democrats. So it is totally bipartisan.

Our Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure responded by reporting the bill on December 21, 1995. I particularly want to commend the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. OBERSTAR], the ranking Democrat of the Committee on Transportation and infrastructure, the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT], the chairman of the Water Resources and Environment Subcommittee, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BORSKI], the ranking Democrat on the Water Resources and Environment Subcommittee. They all cooperated in putting together a very reasonable package.

I also would be quite remiss if I did not commend and congratulate the primary sponsors of the bill, the gentleman from California [Mr. CONDIT] and the gentleman from California [Mr. MATSUI] along with others who have continued to press for this legislation.

The bill fixes a problem, and that is EPA's overly stringent interpretation and implementation of the Clean Water Act as it applies to these manmade water conveyances. It fixes the problem without weakening the act. Indeed, the bill helps make the Clean Water Act even more acceptable to the public by making it more flexible and more realistic.

Over the years certain manmade ditches and canals, particularly in the arid Western States, have been designated as navigable waters that must be regulated under the Clean Water Act. States, in turn, must then establish water quality standards for the manmade canals that in some cases presume that they will be used for fishing, swimming, or even drinking.

Now, it does not make any sense to regulate an agricultural drainage canal or a ditch the same way that you quite properly would regulate a pristine lake or a navigable river. It simply does not make sense to put farmers and municipal and State water officials in a regulatory straitjacket.

So this legislation fixes that problem, Mr. Speaker. For example, rice growers in California have manmade ditches and drains which help remove excess water from the fields. It does not make sense to treat the water before it enters the drains as if it were entering a swimming hole or a lake. Rice and cotton and other commodity growers in other States, such as Missouri, Louisiana, Texas, and Colorado have cited similar problems.

And what is the cost of this overregulation? An EPA mandated use attainability analysis alone, this is simply the analysis, could cost several hundred thousand dollars. For example, the municipal water officials in Arizona tell us that the canals transporting raw water to drinking water treatment plants should not be subject to water quality standards designed for water bodies that people swim in and fish in and drink from.

Fro Phoenix alone, one city, the cost of these added, unnecessary requirements would be $66 million. In addition, annual maintenance costs would be $12 million. That is over 25 times their current annual cost.

This needs to be fixed and that is only one city, so you can extrapolate it to see what the overall cost would be for the American people.

□ 1430

In an effort to accommodate the minority and to reflect comments from EPA, we have made several changes to the bill that was introduced, and those changes are described in detail in the committee report.

We have clarified that nothing in this bill prevents a State from considering any relevant factors or uses in setting standards. In other words, nothing, absolutely nothing, prevents States from doing what they need to do.

We have revised provisions so that the States are authorized, not mandated, to consider certain factors and uses.

Among the many supporters of this legislation are included the Western Governors Association, the Western States Water Council, the Western Coalition for Arid States, the National Water Resources Association, the Western Growers Association, the California rice industry, the USA Rice Federation and the city of Phoenix, AZ. This is a bipartisan bill, supported by Members across the country, and I urge its adoption.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. BORSKI asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support H.R. 2567, the Constructed Water Conveyances Reform Act. I particularly want to commend my California colleagues, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. MATSUI, and Mr. CONDIT, who have worked to get this bill onto the House floor today.

We have worked with them and with the majority to develop a bill that will meet the specific needs of the districts represented by my California colleagues while assuring protection of human health and the environment. It deserves the approval of the House.

When H.R. 2567 was introduced, I was concerned that it was too broad and that it lacked clear standards for States to use in setting designated uses for constructed water conveyances. However, the chairman was willing to work in a bipartisan manner to modify the bill, and to include explanatory language in the committee report which alleviated most of my concerns.

Mr. Speaker, the Constructed Water Conveyances Reform Act reflects the desire of owners of constructed water conveyance systems to have greater flexibility in how the standards of the Clean Water Act apply to those conveyances. It has been modified to assure that this flexibility is tempered with the responsibility to take reasonable, affordable measures to assure protection of water quality.

Obviously there may be situations where the fishable and swimmable standards applicable to natural waterways would not be appropriate for constructed waterways. However, we should not automatically assume that all constructed conveyance systems would be subject to lower standards under this bill. There must be some meaningful interference with the authorized purposes of the conveyance to justify any lesser level of protection.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that H.R. 2567 will allow States the flexibility which they seek while assuring protection of human health and the environment. I thank the chairman for his willingness to work in a bipartisan manner to address my concerns about the bill, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT], the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the chairman for the openness that has been evident all through the consideration of this bill. It is noncontroversial now. As a matter of fact, the provisions of this bill were included in the committee bill, H.R. 961, and the substitute that my colleague the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON] and I offered to that.

Frankly, I wish the bill was not necessary, but the truth is there are times when the Clean Water Act is interpreted and applied too narrowly and the views of State and local water officials are not adequately taken into account. This bill improves the Clean Water Act and the flexibility and responsiveness to site-specific circumstances, while keeping in place all the successes and important goals of the Act.

Because certain so-called constructed water conveyances are interpreted to be navigable waters under the Clean Water Act, States are required to set water quality standards for the conveyances. The problem is that in some situations the standards are set with the automatic assumption that the ditches or drains or canals will be used for swimming or fishing or drinking. This can lead to, as we understand it, very costly and unnecessary requirements.

In response, the bill makes clear that States do not automatically have to establish standards based on recreational, aquatic, or fish consumption uses for these constructed water conveyances. Nothing in the bill, however, prevents a State from doing so if it wants.

So we would say to the States, ''If you want to do it, you can do it. We're not going to prevent you from doing it.'' Also, nothing in the bill exempts constructed water conveyances from regulation under the act.

The committee added additional safeguards and clarifications to the introduced bill and worked with all interests to reach a reasonable compromise. I want to emphasize that: worked with all interests to reach a reasonable compromise.

No one can say this bill weakens the Clean Water Act. Boy, I would not be identified with anything that would weaken the Clean Water Act. It simply gives State officials more flexibility to take into account specific situations.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I want to thank the chairman for the leadership that he has provided and for the opportunity he has afforded me to work with him.

Mr. Speaker, I would invite those Members who have not done so, to visit the committee room and witness the new portrait of our chairman. It is a magnificent work of art.

Mr. BORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. CONDIT], the original sponsor of this bill.

Mr. CONDIT. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairman SHUSTER and Ranking Member OBERSTAR for helping move H.R. 2567, the Water Conveyance Reform Act of 1995, expeditiously through the committee and to the House floor today.

Without your leadership and bipartisan effort, none of this could be accomplished.

I also want to thank the corrections day advisory task force for their understanding of the need for this legislation and the support it deserves.

Basically, the problem exists with EPA's interpretation of the Clean Water Act.

The EPA has interpreted constructed water conveyance facilities to be waters of the United States and therefore subject to the same Clean Water Act standards as California's most pristine mountain streams.

In the case of California rice, many facilities proposed for regulations were specifically constructed as part of the tremendous and widely acclaimed successful effort to keep agricultural drain water out of the Sacramento River and the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta.

Basically my bill is designed to easily rectify this situation by amending the Clean Water Act to make it clear that no State need regulate water within a constructed conveyance facility except to ensure the facility's continued use for the purpose for which it was constructed; and to prevent water quality problems in downstream natural waterways.

I firmly believe this is a unique opportunity to address a problem that has confronted the rice industry for a couple of years and portends to turn into a significant economic and environmental hardship for the Central Valley if not repaired.

Lastly, I want to especially point out Congressman MATSUI and Congressman FAZIO for their efforts with this bill and also thank Members who cosponsored H.R. 2567.

In a time when there has been limited bipartisan effort on legislation, the Constructed Water Conveyance Reform Act of 1995 truly demonstrates we can work together to find solutions to real problems.

I would ask all my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I want to be certain that I also acknowledge the tremendous contribution to this effort of the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO]. We certainly very much appreciate it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. SEASTRAND], a member of the committee.

Mrs. SEASTRAND. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this legislation. This bill is a commonsense reform to the Clean Water Act, it has significant bipartisan support and it is a necessary amendment and I thank Mr. CONDIT and SHUSTER for their leadership in bringing it to the House floor.

It must be stressed that when the original Clean Water Act was constructed it was designed to require States to establish water quality standards for navigable waters used for fishing, swimming, or water supply purposes. This amendment to the act gives States the authority rather than the Federal Government to regulate facilities constructed to transport water for municipal, agricultural, or industrial purposes which were never meant to support recreation or aquatic life.

This legislation will realize savings for U.S. EPA. The agency will no longer have to review and approve State's plans for water conveyance systems. Savings will also be seen at the State level in that they will no longer be mandated to oversee the implementation of constructed conveyance facilities. These total more than 6,300 in central California that have a combined excess of 20,000 miles. Similarly, the correction will save State and local governments money so they will not be forced to develop control plans for constructed conveyances or develop implementation plans. Finally, private citizens will see a reduced cost for their water supply or at least a slowing in the rate of increase.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank Mr. CONDIT and Mr. SHUSTER for their hard work on this sound legislation which I wholeheartedly support.

Mr. BORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO], a prime sponsor of the legislation before us.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank both the gentlemen from Pennsylvania and the gentlemen from Minnesota and New York for helping those of us in the West solve a problem. This is something that means a lot to us in Nevada, Arizona, and California where we have many thousands of miles of canals, of water conveyances constructed largely on private property maintained by reclamation districts, irrigation districts that are basically made up of the property owners who pool their resources to make it possible for us to evacuate these conveyances into streams and rivers in a way that is most beneficial for clean water.

But we did not need the regulation of EPA and the Clean Water Act, and this bill makes clear we do not need it. The State of California, for example, and I believe the State of Arizona as well, maintained that they needed to follow a rigorous policy of enforcing the Clean Water Act in these private drainage canals because of the Federal requirements. We make it clear that if any further action is taken on this level, it will be at the requirement and the behest of the State and local government.

As has already been indicated, this is a great potential savings not only to EPA and to the State water quality agencies and entities, regional as well as statewide, but most of all to the local landowners who have been in most cases already in the lead in trying to handle the environmental problems that they encounter in their crop patterns, in their rice industry or in the cotton industry, as the case may be. They deserve the attention of the administration, they have gotten it from the President, and even though the administration indicates they have some work they want to see done on this bill in the Senate, I think they have indicated that they understand the problem needs to be addressed and they are willing to work with us to make sure that it will be before the end of this Congress.

Legislation very similar to this was included in the Clean Water Act that passed this House. This problem is of such a magnitude that the gentleman from California, Mr. CONDIT, along with Mr. MATSUI and myself, felt it needed to come up on the Corrections Day occasion. I appreciate the leadership he has provided. I appreciate the fact that we could bring it here and attempt to solve this problem, which stands out from others, in a way that will not require us to come to the conclusion of the Clean Water Act fix which remains controversial and may yet fail to get to the President.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank all of my colleagues for allowing this legislation to come to the floor. It means a great deal to agriculture in my district. They will be very gratified to see that reason has prevailed here in Washington on something that makes so much sense to them.

Mr. Speaker, I include my statement on this legislation for the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Speaker, I want to make my colleagues aware of a serious problem in my district in California. Currently, the Clean Water Act is being applied somewhat capriciously to agricultural drainage conveyances. One of the legitimate concerns in my community is that when we apply Federal regulations we do so with good intentions but sometime with a bad outcome. In this case, the Government—in its effort to protect the water quality of natural waterways—is extending its reach to man-made systems that are designed to protect against contamination in the natural waterways to which these facilities ultimately drain.

Several months ago President Clinton visited the State of California and met with growers including constituents from my area. They conveyed to the President how burdensome this expansion of the Clean Water Act was becoming to California agriculture. President Clinton agreed. It was clearly not the intent of the Clean Water Act to try and bring agriculture drainage systems up to the standards applied to pristine mountain streams.

I have a large majority of rice growers in my area and they are committed to making progress in protecting the environment. The difficulty they face is when they are forced to meet unreasonable measures that do nothing to meet that goal.

I appreciate President Clinton's support for this clarification. I understand that the Administration may have some concerns regarding the bill's expansion to include industrial and municipal conveyances. I will do everything I can to see that these concerns are addressed in the Senate. It is critical, however, that this measure move forward and that the agriculture industry in my State be reassured that Congress is willing and able to address this problem.

I strongly ask my colleagues' support.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH].

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to rise in support of H.R. 2567 our 12th corrections day bill and the first bill of the 2d session of the 104th Congress. I congratulate Chairman SHUSTER for moving this legislation so quickly to the floor. I also congratulate Mr. CONDIT for introducing this bill.

In only 5 months time the House has considered 11 bills under this calendar and passed all of them. The Senate has sent three of those bills to the President for signature. I believe we are compiling a record of success and that the corrections calendar will become heavily relied upon by the House as a way to fix past errors.

The American people are demanding a more responsive Government, and corrections day is a key part of delivering on their demands.

On the floor today, we again have a prime example of the need for the corrections day process. Here we have the EPA interpreting the Clean Water Act to require the State of California to consider irrigation ditches as waters of the United States, and, therefore, subject to the same Clean Water Act standards as the most pristine mountain streams. Everyone can recognize this as being ridiculous but a strict reading of the act results in this problem.

The only reasonable solution is for Congress to step in and make the much needed change. Mr. CONDIT's bill was introduced only a couple of months ago and already we have it here on the House floor. I want to recognize Chairman SHUSTER for his hard work in getting this bill to the floor in such short order. I am hopeful that the other body will recognize the need for quick action and send this bill to the President without delay.

□ 1445

Mr. BORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

(Mr. MILLER of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this legislation and when I say that, when I say in opposition, I say in opposition in its current form because I believe the bill, as it currently is written, is overly broad and allows an exemption far greater than that that is necessary.

I also want to recognize the work of my colleagues from California, the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO], the gentleman from California [Mr. CONDIT], and the gentleman from California [Mr. MATSUI], for the attention they have given this problem to address what has been considered a very legitimate problem in California with respect to the use of these facilities.

My concern with this legislation is that in fact what we now see is that this use of these facilities will override, should the State so decide, will override the public health and safety and environmental quality. These facilities, in many instances, are used to discharge agricultural water from the lands, as my colleagues have pointed out, but I would also suggest to you that these facilities are being used for a multiple of other purposes, including fish and wildlife and water-based recreation contact and noncontact use of these waters. Some of these facilities are rather large and, in fact, in the State of California now in the Delta-Mendota Canal and the California aqueduct dedicated under the Clean Water Act, including contact and noncontact recreation, warm-water fish and wildlife habitat and used by thousands of people over the year for sport fishing. In southern California, water from the Colorado River flows into many canals serving the Palo Verde irrigation district, Imperial irrigation district, and, again, fishing and contact use of the water is made by other than agricultural interests.

The Imperial irrigation district and in several locations in Texas near the border with Mexico, low-income people, unfortunately, in this country live alongside these irrigation canals and depend upon them for subsistence fishing, for bathing and even drinking supplies because of the of the tragic situations they find themselves in with respect to housing conditions in those areas.

In the Palo Verde Basin, a significant amount of sport fishing takes place in the Palo Verde Outfall Dam. Some swimming and boating also occurs here.

The point is this. Here, Mr. Speaker, I think this legislation, and I think the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] already mentioned it, the administration is continuing negotiations. I would hope this legislation could be more narrowly drawn to protect those public health and safety issues that can occur under the legislation as currently drafted.

The EPA memorandum follows:

U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY,

San Francisco, CA, January 18, 1996.

Subject: Status of Corrections Day Bill HR 2567 Constructed Water Conveyance Reform Act of 1995.

From: Catherine Roberts, Congressional Liaison Officer.

To: Felicia Marcus, Regional Administrator.

The Corrections Day bill HR 2567 introduced by Representative Gary Condit and co-sponsored by Representatives Robert Matsui and Vic Fazio was passed by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure by voice vote on December 14, 1995. Headquarters expects the bill to move to the House floor as soon as January 23, 1996 although it is possible that a delay will occur until the next Corrections Day.

The original purpose of the bill as described by Representative Condit's staff was to provide relief to the rice industry from the designation of uses for irrigation return flows. It was on this basis that Representatives Fazio and Matsui were persuaded to be co-sponsors although Mr. Fazio withheld support until a few days before Committee mark up of the bill. However, the Committee had entirely different intentions than the ones expressed by the California sponsors. Indeed, it became evident that the Committee, Chaired by Representative Bud Shuster (R–PA), wished to provide relief to any state nationwide with manmade/constructed water conveyances for agriculture, municipal and industrial purposes.

Historically, Region 9, at the request of Senator Harry Reid during the 103rd Congress, participated in a working group comprised of arid west states to develop amendments to provide flexibility in the Clean Water Act for states in the Arid West. The proposed amendments were originally designed for a more broad set of physical characteristics such as ephemeral streams in the arid west than just constructed water conveyances. Nevertheless these types of conveyances were recognized in a subsection of the amendments and were given relief under specific criteria. These amendments were included in the Clean Water Act reauthorization and passed by the Senate in the summer of 1994. In the House of Representatives, the reauthorization of the Clean Water Act failed to emerge from the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. Arid west amendments were subsequently included in HR961 passed by the House during the first session of the 104th Congress but the language and intent was changed significantly from the original Reid amendment.

The significance of the changes made to the original language on constructed water conveyances were associated with: (1) broadening applicability to the whole country instead of limiting it to the arid west; (2) broadening the definition of constructed conveyance and; (3) the addition of a clause describing relevant uses. These changes were made in HR961 and then extended further in HR2567. Representative Condit's office initially did not realize that HR2567 had been taken out of the arid west context and thus made relevant nationwide. This issue was immediately raised by Region 9 and was recognized by Mr. Condit's staff as needing further discussion. However, we were to discover that the majority staff on the Committee were not receptive to the limitation to arid west states. During our conference calls with Committee staff, it was expressed that it was their intention to retain the original language in HR961 since it had already passed the House however the Committee markup resulted in expanding the language further and well beyond the carefully phrased language in the original Reid Bill.

The passage of this bill is a high priority for Mr. Condit for several reasons not least of which is that a ''commitment'' was made to the rice industry President Clinton's Central Valley visit regarding constructed water conveyances. The substance of this discussion has been narrowly summarized as providing relief through a Correction's Day Bill. The efforts of the WMD and the State of California to work with the rice industry on their concerns has been seriously overlooked by the bill's co-sponsors. We believe that the

Clean Water Act already provides the flexibility to address their concerns and indeed exemptions have been made by the State.

The debate on this bill has been further complicated by the very different concerns raised by the state of Arizona. Arizona actively supports the bill and is in the process of trying to dedesignate uses for some of their constructed water conveyances. It appears that the preferred approach is to carve out permanent legislative relief rather that working within the parameters of the existing CWA. Furthermore, the efforts of EPA staff to work with the various stakeholders whether from Colorado or California through a consensus process is being forfeited to political expediency.

At this point HQ is recommending to OMB that the bill as written be vetoed by the President. The recommendation is based on a number of concerns that were presented to OMB as official Agency comments (attachment). In essence, HQ stated that HR2567 would exempt States from establishing standards for constructed water conveyances, specifically for the adoption of standards for recreation, aquatic life and fish consumption. HQ comments further state that the purpose of the water conveyance system is given a higher priority than the protection of human health and the environment. There are a significant number of water bodies defined as waters of United States that could be impacted by HR2567 and we have provided a preliminary list of these areas for HDQ and the House Minority staff (attachment). Unfortunately, HQ has very limited information on impacts to waters in Regions other than Region 9 and 6.

The House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee is chaired by Bill Shuster (R–PA) who will be taking the lead along with Sherwood Boehlert (R–NY) on the floor debate. It is expected that the argument for passage will be a simplistic reference to this bill as being part of the already passed HR961. The Region 9 Members on this Committee are as follows: Bill Baker (R), Jay Kim (R), Steve Horn (R), Andrea Seastrand (R) and Bob Filner (D). In addition, Representatives Condit, Fazio and Matsui will also be there to encourage their colleagues to vote for a bill that will give relief for the rice industry. I have included for your review a copy of HR2567, the original Reid amendments, Region 8 comments and a statement by Representative James Oberstar (D–MN) the ranking minority Member on the Committee (attachment).

If you have any questions or need further assistance please let me know at x1560.

Attachments.

EPA COMMENTS ON H.R. 2567

EPA believes that H.R. 2567, relating to standards for constructed water conveyances within the context of the Clean Water Act (CWA), is unnecessary. Current CWA authority already provides the necessary flexibility to address standards for constructed water conveyances.

H.R. 2567 would:

Exempt States from establishing standards of any kind for constructed water conveyances and

Exempt States (when they do develop standards for constructed water conveyances) from adopting recreation, aquatic life, fish consumption uses if these uses ''are not existing or reasonably foreseeable or such uses impede the authorized uses of the conveyance system.''

This language essentially sets the water conveyance use above the protection of human health and the environment and lacks a mechanism to ensure that the basic water quality protections of the CWA, even if existing, are maintained. Such categorical exclusions are inappropriate. Site-specific analyses and use attainability analyses under current authority and implementing regulations can and should be conducted to determine the appropriate requirements for water conveyance systems on a case-by-case basis.

Because of the blanket exclusion in H.R. 2567 for all water conveyances anywhere in the country, this bill could have resulting adverse impacts on water quality affecting not only water quality in arid/semi-arid areas, but a substantial number of water bodies nation-wide. In addition the H.R. 2567 does not anticipate any additional impacts due to new, non-agricultural development which could add stormwater discharge to the conveyance and result in increased flows during storm events (see suggested changes in (C)(i)(II) below).

Whether a use is existing or not does not mean that it is not attainable (see #2 above). Also, the meaning of ''reasonably foreseeable'' should be clearly defined.

The statutory construction provision in subsection (iii) would allow States to avoid exercising jurisdiction over constructed conveyances at all, although they may be supporting at least limited aquatic life, wildlife or irrigation uses, clearly avoiding the goals of the Act set out in Sections 101(a)(2) and 303(c). Since many of the conveyances are functionally perennial rivers, the definition of constructed water conveyance is similarly flawed.

If this bill were to go forward we offer the following suggested changes (If however, the intent of this bill expands to include municipal water conveyances, we would need to re-evaluate the specific language to be protective of human health and the environment.):

Suggested changes are in italics deleted matter in bold brackets:

Section 1. *Arid West* Constructed Water Conveyances

(C) Standards for *Arid West* constructed water conveyances.

(i) Relevant Factors.—

* * * * *

(II) Any water quality impacts resulting from any **[**return**]** flow from a constructed water conveyance to navigable waters and the need to protect *hydrologic integrity at the confluence with navigable waters, as well as* downstream **[**users**]** *uses.*

* * * * *

(ii) Relevant Uses.—If a State adopts or reviews water quality standards for constructed water conveyances, it shall not be required to establish recreation, aquatic life, or fish consumption uses for such systems it the uses are not existing or reasonably foreseeable **[**or**]** *and* such uses *unreasonably* impede the authorized **[**uses**]** *purposes* of the conveyance system.''

* * * * *

(iv) Constructed Water Conveyances Defined.—In this subparagraph, the term 'constructed water conveyance' means a manmade *agricultural drainage* water transport system....''

(v) Arid West defined.—In this subparagraph, the term ''Arid West'' means an area in the western portion of the United States that typically receives less than fifteen inches of rain on an annual basis.

or

(v) Arid West defined.—In this subparagraph, the term ''Arid West'' means an area in the western portion of the United States west of the 100th meridian.

In summary, EPA believes that the legislation is unnecessary, that the flexibility contained in the CWA currently gives States the functional equivalent of this bill; and that a case-by-case analysis is the way to determine which conveyances deserve the exclusions provided in H.R. 2567.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH].

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania and the distinguished chairman for yielding me the time, also for his hard work on this important issue.

I turn to this side of the aisle and see my very good friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. CONDIT], who has worked so hard on the same.

Mr. Speaker, one of many issues addressed here, and I have risen on many occasions to note that what this entire exercise should be all about, is what is reasonable, what makes sense, and I believe, as part of the Corrections Day, this piece of legislation is eminently reasonable because it resolves a problem that agricultural interests and endeavors have experienced with the Clean Water Act.

H.R. 2567 will modify the way the Clean Water Act applies to constructed agricultural drains, recognizing that this law was never intended to bring the quality of agricultural runoff to the level of a pristine stream.

I am pleased to be a cosponsor of H.R. 2567. I urge the adoption of this commonsense legislation, and, Mr. Speaker, I pause again and make note of the commonsense consensus in this Chamber on this act, on this corrections exercise.

Mr. BORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas, Mr. PETE GEREN, and, in fact, I welcome him back to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2567, the Constructed Water Conveyances Reform Act of 1995.

This legislation, introduced by my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. CONDIT], corrects the improper application of the Clean Water Act to constructed water systems. Constructed water systems are otherwise known as ditches and canals.

It clearly is the intent of Congress to cover a wide array of natural waters or water bodies in establishing water quality standards. However, it was not Congress' intent to subject constructed water systems to the act's very strict requirements.

Earlier this session, the body passed H.R. 961, the Clean Water Act Amendments of 1995, to provide greater flexibility to the States in setting water quality standards. This legislation contains similar provisions allowing the States to recognize the special features and purposes of agricultural water conveyances. Under this bill, the State will be allowed to make distinction between a manmade water transport system and a constructed water body used for recreation, aquatic life or fish consumption, and establish appropriate

standards. This legislation is critical for arid States such as California and Arizona, where farmers must construct manmade waterways and irrigation canals in order to support agricultural industry.

Mr. Speaker, lastly, I would like to note that this is the first piece of legislation that would fall into the new unfunded mandate law passed and signed into law last year, a bill also authored by the gentleman from California [Mr. CONDIT]. The supporters of this legislation are proud to point out CBO has certified H.R. 2567 would actually reduce costs to States because it would give States greater flexibility when establishing water quality standards for constructed water conveyances.

This is a win for the States. This is an effort to inject commonsense reform into the application of a very important act. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. BORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE].

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I am very concerned about continued efforts to use the Corrections Day Calendar for exceptions to the Clean Water Act, particularly with regard to the overall goal of the act of achieving fishable and swimmable waters.

As we know, water bodies are in no way isolated. They are all part of the cycle.

I am concerned, and I believe a lot of other people who swim, boat, and fish would be concerned, if water in water conveyances were being held up to a lesser standard than any river, lake, or stream, because one is not mutually exclusive of the other.

I share the concern of the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER], which I believe is also shared by the administration, that this bill will have a broader impact than is necessary and that, as a result, the negative impacts of the legislation will be greater than anticipated by its sponsors. No one can know the impact that relaxing standards on all conveyances will have on water quality overall, and substandard water that may flow from a conveyance into navigable waters will have a varying degree of impact over time.

However, this impact will be cumulative, and receiving water will in some ways degrade. The bottom line, in my opinion, is that maintaining certain water quality standards for conveyances will in no way interfere with the intended purposes of conveyance systems. It will, however, ensure the safety of those that fish and swim in our Nation's waters, as well as protect invaluable aquatic habitat.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I do urge opposition to the bill.

Mr. BORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. OBERSTAR], the distinguished ranking member who, in just a short few months, has done such an outstanding job on the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

(Mr. OBERSTAR asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I compliment our ranking member, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BORSKI], for the splendid job he continues to do as our voice on the Subcommittee on Water Resources. I want to express my appreciation to the chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHUSTER], and to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT], chairman of the Subcommittee on Water Resources, for their cooperative spirit as we worked our way through this legislation.

Initially, as introduced, I was opposed to H.R. 2567. However, due to the willingness of the chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHUSTER], the chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT], of the subcommittee, to work with us both in making substantive changes in the language of the bill and in committee report language to further clarify bill language, we have, I feel, addressed our concerns, certainly the concerns that we have had on this side of the aisle, and those that the administration had, and, as a result, I do not oppose its passage. I am not for it, but I do not oppose it.

What really troubles me about where we are today and what we are doing today, is that for the second time in this Congress, our Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure is on the floor with a bill considering an item under corrections day procedure on an issue where there is either nothing or relatively little to correct or something that is in the process of being corrected by the administration. We are here considering a bill which would more appropriately and more properly be considered under one of the other calendars of the House, either the Union Calendar, where there would be general debate and an open amendment process or on the Suspension Calendar, where an individual Member would have more leverage to express their concerns and have those concerns addressed because the bill has to pass by, we know, two-thirds on the Suspension Calendar.

I just viscerally oppose this corrections day process. In all of my 32-years' experience in the House, I think this is a very dangerous deviation from long-established process that protects interests that otherwise do not have an adequate voice.

Now, I know corrections day was intended to address inappropriate laws or laws that people called dumb or regulations that are inappropriate or where there is a consensus that they ought to be corrected. Bills under this calendar were supposed to be narrow in scope, to address an immediate need that could not await reauthorization legislation. Well, that is the framework within which this corrections day was spelled out in the advisory to House Members last year.

There is no reason this particular bill could not await the Clean Water Act reauthorization. In fact, a similar provision was included in H.R. 961. As we have already heard today, the bill is not noncontroversial.

My colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER], had very serious objections to it. The administration has expressed further reservations which they hope to have addressed when the bill reaches the Senate. If they are not addressed there, I suspect the administration would be opposed to the bill.

Rather than making a limited technical amendment, the bill has far-reaching policy implications.

Now, the worst of those, fortunately and wisely, and I think in a very timely fashion, was addressed by the majority in our process of negotiation, and, thank goodness, this bill came through this committee and not through some other committee where things are very contentious. We might have something very lopsided on the floor. I think we have a bill that has a reasoned approach to this problem.

But, again, my objection is on the basis of process. There is no opportunity for amendment to this bill. There is no opportunity for votes on such amendments, and I think that we ought to have an issue of this magnitude considered under a process where it could be open to amendment.

If there is going to be a continuation of this corrections day procedure, it ought to be limited much more narrowly than it has been in the two instances arising out of our committee and in the 10 other instances of other bills that have been considered so far in this Congress.

I expressed concerns during our committee markup that the bill would allow States to forgo protection of human health and the environment in order instead to accommodate industrial, agricultural, and municipal interests who want to save money.

□ 1500

Even in situations where it would be possible to strike a reasonable balance that would simultaneously accommodate multiple uses of a constructed water body and protect human health. I think we have to be sensitive, regardless of who owns this body of water, that all these waters eventually are in the public domain. There are many constructed water bodies that States have designated for uses both for irrigation, agriculture drainage, and for recreation, aquatic life, and for fisheries. Experience has shown us that we can use water bodies wisely, in a multiple-use way, for a wide range of purposes, for swimming, for example, and for irrigation, but also protect those individual multiple uses.

We should not obstruct our ability to work in the normal legislative process to address these issues in the normal legislative way, open to amendment, open to broad and extensive debate and

discussion, and to address, particularly in the environment, particularly in this area, of staying on course, to achieve the objective of the Clean Water Act of 1972 to make our waters fishable and swimmable.

Mr. Speaker, corrections day was to address inappropriate or dumb laws or regulations about which there would be little controversy. Corrections bills are supposed to be ''narrow in scope'' and to ''address an immediate need which cannot await reauthorization * * * legislation.'' These are requirements spelled out by the Corrections Day Advisory Group in its letter to House Members last summer.

There is no reason this bill could not await Clean Water Act reauthorization, especially in view of the fact that a similar provision was included in H.R. 961. Moreover, this bill is not noncontroversial, and is not limited to a specific problem. Rather than making a limited technical amendment, this bill has far-reaching policy implications. Prior to committee action I recommended amending H.R. 2567 to address only the particular irrigation issue which gave rise to the bill, but that suggestion was rejected by the majority. Instead, we have a bill of national application with no consideration of its national implications.

Most disturbingly, there is no opportunity for amendment on this floor. Had this been brought to the floor as a freestanding bill on the Union Calendar, it would have been open to amendment. If it were brought on the Suspension Calendar, it would have been subject to a higher level of consideration, where a Member with concern over this issue could have insisted that his or her concerns be reflected in the final version of the bill considered on the floor. This bill should be considered either on the Suspension Calendar or in regular order, not on the Corrections Calendar.

Mr. Speaker, if there is to be a corrections day, let us limit it to true corrections, and not subvert the regular legislative process.

This bill would allow States to not establish recreational, aquatic life, or fish consumption uses for certain constructed water conveyances in limited circumstances where these uses would give rise to an unreasonable burden.

During markup of H.R. 2567 I expressed concerns that the bill could allow States to forego protection of human health and the environment in order to accommodate industrial, agricultural, and municipal interests in saving money, even in situations where it would be possible to strike a reasonable balance that simultaneously accommodates multiple uses of a constructed waterbody and protects human health.

There are many constructed waterbodies that States have designated both for uses such as irrigation, agricultural drainage, and flood control and for recreation, aquatic life, and fish consumption. Experience has proven that we can use waterbodies for a range of purposes—for example swimming and irrigation—and simultaneously protect those multiple uses. This Congress must not obstruct our proven ability to strike a reasonable balance that both protects people who swim and fish in constructed waterbodies, and avoids unreasonable burdens on agricultural and municipal and industrial interests.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to mention two of the most important improvements made during committee consideration of H.R. 2567:

First, under the bill as introduced, States were not required to establish water quality standards for recreation, aquatic life, or fish consumption uses if those uses would impede other authorized uses of the waterbody. I was vigorously opposed to this provision because it set a very low threshold for excusing the protection of recreation and other uses and thereby endangering human health. Where multiple uses, such as swimming and fishing and agriculture, can reasonably be accommodated, it would be a terrible precedent to allow for standards that fail to protect people who swim and fish in canals.

The preferable approach would have been to modify the bill by eliminating the clause concerning interference with the intended purposes of the conveyance system. The committee amendment substituted the word ''interfere'' for the word ''impede.'' This change and the explanation in the legislative history indicate the committee's intent to establish a meaningful, substantive threshold.

The committee amendment reflects the intent that States will be required to establish water quality standards for recreation, aquatic life, and fish consumption uses, unless doing so would create an appreciable interference that diminishes the ability of the conveyance to accomplish its intended purpose. As the chairman noted in the committee report, ''[g]enerally speaking interference caused by reasonable, affordable measures to accommodate multiple uses would not be expected to exceed the threshold.''

For example, measures that would not be expected to meet the threshold for modifying the requirement to establish water quality standards for recreational, aquatic life, or fish consumption uses include rice growers in California who have changed irrigation practices in order to capture, hold, and reuse irrigation water contaminated with herbicides. The new practices significantly reduce the amount of chemicals discharged to the Sacramento River, while reducing the amount of water used and, therefore, the cost of the water. Measures such as these would not be expected to justify a State's decision to not establish water quality standards for recreational, aquatic life, or fish consumption uses.

The second amendment I would like to note narrows the breadth of the bill, by clarifying that it does not apply to conveyances constructed for navigational purposes. As introduced, H.R. 2567 applied to constructed conveyances regardless of their purpose. The bill reported by the Transportation Committee limits the application of the bill to those conveyances constructed for agricultural purposes or municipal and industrial water supply purposes. Although I believe that the bill should be narrower still, I believe that this modification is an important one.

Under H.R. 2567 as reported by the Transportation Committee, if a constructed water conveyance was constructed for or serves more than one purpose, and navigation is one of those purposes, then that conveyance is not covered by the bill.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out a few ways in which I believe H.R. 2567 does not alter current law under the Clean Water Act. The bill does not modify existing law relating to the authority of the Environmental Protection Agency to approve or disapprove water quality standards. Nor does the bill authorize the downgrading of existing uses. Finally, the factors for consideration under subparagraph (C)(i) of the bill are in addition to, not in lieu of, those under current law at section 303(c)(2) of the Clean Water Act.

Mr. Speaker, with the changes offered by the chairman and adopted by the committee, and with the explanation of the bill in the committee report and as outlined above, I do not oppose passage of this bill.

Mr. BORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, in closing, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to emphasize as strongly as I know how that this bill is on the floor today not because the Republican majority wants to stuff it down the minority's throats. Quite the contrary, this bill is on the floor today because our Democrat colleagues are the ones who have provided the leadership to get this moving.

Indeed, as we mentioned at the start of this debate, it has been the gentleman from California [Mr. CONDIT], the gentleman from California [Mr. MATSUI], and the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO], who have provided the leadership and the driving force behind this legislation. That is why this is here today, and the majority is happy to have been accommodating to our friends in the minority. That is why this legislation is here today. It is bipartisan in nature, with nine original cosponsors, five Republicans, four Democrats.

With regard to the substance of the legislation and some of the objections which have been expressed, first, to say that this should be limited to only a part of the West does not solve the real problem. Farmers in Arkansas, Florida, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, and Texas are all affected. So we need to address those regions of the country as well. This legislation does that.

Further, to say, as the President has indicated, that this should apply only to agricultural conveyances, does not solve the real problem. It only solves a part of the problem. What do we say to the city of Phoenix and other cities who have concrete-lined culverts? Do we tell them they have to treat that water like it was a pristine stream, even though it is going to cost, in the case of Phoenix, $66 million and provide absolutely no additional environmental benefit? No, I think that is not wise.

So this legislation does go beyond agricultural conveyances, and indeed does address the real problems that many of the cities, particularly in the West, face.

Finally, let me emphasize that in this legislation, it is very, very clear, States may use more stringent environmental requirements if they choose to. So once again, some of the objections we hear really stem from a ''Washington knows best'' attitude.

The States may impose much more stringent requirements. We trust the States. We have confidence in the States. So let us not fall back into the old trap of saying ''Washington knows best.'' Let us give flexibility to the States. Let us pass this bipartisan legislation overwhelmingly. I urge adoption of the bill before us.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in strong support of H.R. 2567, the Constructed Water Conveyances Reform Act of 1995. I want to thank Representative CONDIT for his efforts to address this important issue.

California farmers have been very active in developing innovative strategies for reducing the discharge of pollutants into our natural waterways. Producers in the Sacramento Valley have used closed drainage systems that hold water until its pesticides degrade, making it safe for release. Such efforts have yielded extremely impressive results. However, the possibility that these closed drainage systems could be required to meet water quality standards similar to those for natural waterways has created a great deal or uncertainty for users of these pollution control methods.

H.R. 2567 would provide the certainty needed to ensure that these innovative efforts to improve water quality can continue to go forward. At the same time, its provisions will ensure that there is no change in the regulation of the impact of constructed water conveyances on natural waterways. In the Sacramento area, we already face significant challenges in protecting and improving the quality of our waterways. We must not make this task more difficult.

I am aware that the administration has expressed concern about certain aspects of this legislation. I am pleased, however, that they are committed to addressing the concerns of California agriculture on this matter, and I am ready to work with them to achieve resolution.

I urge my colleagues support for this issue of great importance to California's agricultural economy.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WHITE). Pursuant to the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and (three-fifths having voted in favor thereof) the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5 of rule I, the Chair announces he will postpone further proceedings today on each motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered or on which the vote is objected to under clause 4 of rule XV. Such rollcall votes, if postponed, will be taken after debate has been concluded on all motions to suspend the rules.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE TO NOTIFY THE PRESIDENT

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, your committee on the part of the House to join a like committee on the part of the Senate to notify the President of the United States that a quorum of each House has been assembled and is ready to receive any communication that he may be pleased to make has performed that duty.

The President asked us to report that he will be pleased to deliver his message at 9 p.m. tonight to a joint session of the two Houses.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I concur in the report of the majority leader.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the majority leader and the minority leader.

AWARDING CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL TO RUTH AND BILL GRAHAM

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2657) to award a congressional gold medal to Ruth and Billy Graham.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2657

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. FINDINGS.

The Congress hereby finds the following:

(1) Ruth and Billy Graham have made outstanding and lasting contributions to morality, racial equality, family, philanthropy, and religion.

(2) America's most respected and admired evangelical leader for the past half century, Billy Graham's crusades have reached 100,000,000 people in person and reached over 2,000,000,000 people worldwide on television.

(3) Billy Graham, throughout his 76 years of life and his 52-year marriage to Ruth Graham, has exemplified the highest ideals of teaching, counseling, ethics, charity, faith, and family.

(4) Billy Graham's daily newspaper column and 14 books have provided spiritual counseling and personal enrichment to millions of people.

(5) Ruth and Billy Graham have been the driving force to create the Ruth and Billy Graham Children's Health Center at Memorial Mission Hospital in Asherville, North Carolina, whose vision it is to improve the health and well-being of children and to become a new resource for ending the pain and suffering of children.

SEC. 2. CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL.

(a) PRESENTATION AUTHORIZED.—The Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro tempore of the Senate are authorized to present, on behalf of the Congress, to Billy and Ruth Graham a gold medal of appropriate design, in recognition of their outstanding and enduring contributions toward faith, morality, and charity.

(b) DESIGN AND STRIKING.—For purposes of the presentation referred to in subsection (a), the Secretary of the Treasury shall strike a gold medal with suitable emblems, devices, and inscriptions to be determined by the Secretary.

(c) GIFTS AND DONATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Treasury may accept, use, and disburse gifts or donations of property or money to carry out this section.

(2) NO APPROPRIATION AUTHORIZED.—No amount is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section.

SEC. 3. DUPLICATE MEDALS.

The Secretary of the Treasury may strike and sell duplicates in bronze of the gold medal struck pursuant to section 2 under such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe, at a price sufficient to cover the cost thereof, including labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, and overhead expenses, and the cost of the gold medal.

SEC. 4. STATUS OF MEDALS.

(a) NATIONAL MEDALS.—The medals struck pursuant to this Act are national medals for purposes of chapter 51 of title 31, United States Code.

(b) NUMISMATIC ITEMS.—For purposes of section 5134 of title 31, United States Code, all medals struck under this Act shall be considered to be numismatic items.

SEC. 5. TRANSFER OF ANY PROFIT TO LIBRARY OF CONGRESS.

The Secretary of the Treasury shall transfer an amount equal to the amount by which—

(1) the sum of any gifts and donations received by the Secretary in accordance with section 2(c)(2) and any proceeds from the sale of duplicate medals under section 3, exceeds

(2) the total amount of the costs incurred by the Secretary in carrying out his Act,

from the Numismatic Public Enterprise Fund to the Library of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CASTLE] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. FLAKE] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CASTLE].

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of H.R. 2657, the bill to award a congressional gold medal to Ruth and Billy Graham. Members on both sides of the aisle support H.R. 2657. Included on the list of 296 cosponsors are Speaker GINGRICH, Majority Leader ARMEY, and Majority Whip DELAY. Chairman LEACH of the Banking Committee, Ranking Minority Member GONZALEZ, and Representative FLAKE, ranking minority member of the subcommittee are also cosponsors.

Throughout their lives Ruth and Billy Graham have made great contributions to American society. They are religious leaders and role models. Their commitment to each other and their marriage is something both rare and wonderful in today's society. Billy Graham's crusades, daily newspaper column, and books have helped millions of people in need. Ruth and Billy's support of the Children's Health Center in Asheville, NC is yet another example of their dedication to the health and well-being of our Nation's children.

H.R. 2657 complies with Banking Committee rules regarding the authorization of congressional gold medals. Although a committee markup was not held, a majority of both committee and subcommittee members are cosponsors. There is no opposition from Members of Congress or the U.S. Mint.

The Memorial Mission Medical Center and its not-for-profit foundation have offered to cover the costs for designing and striking the medal, up to $25,000. The Congressional Budget Office reports a possible impact to the Federal budget of about $10,000, depending on sales of the duplicate medals. All donations and proceeds in excess of the cost of designing and striking the medal will be given to the Library of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, because the U.S. Mint normally needs about 6 months to produce a congressional gold medal, and we hope to present this medal to the Graham's in the late spring, we need to move quickly to pass this bill. I urge the immediate adoption of H.R. 2657.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in full support of H.R. 2657 and join with the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CASTLE] the chairman of the Subcommittee on Domestic and International Monetary Policy, because I believe that this represents for us an opportunity to say to the American people and to the world that it is important for persons to make commitments with their life that express the very best of what it means to be not only a citizen of this Nation, but a citizen of the world. No one has done that more effectively than Billy Graham, with Mrs. Ruth Graham, who stands beside him as the First Lady.

As they have moved throughout the world, persons have been moved to levels of commitment that perhaps would never have happened. We talk about salvation often, but many times it is nothing more than theoretical language. For the Grahams it is much more than that. It has been a reflection of not only their faith commitment; it has been a reflection of a faith commitment that is deep down within their hearts, given to them by virtue of their calling as religious leaders.

Truly in a world like the one in which we live, to find a person who has been available to every President, who has been available to even the lowest of persons, the many thousands who have gathered in auditoriums and in stadiums throughout this Nation, to the many who have come up from all around the world and found their hope in the message of this great and sainted leader, we take time out today to honor them through this gold medal.

It is more appropriate when you consider that one who follows the teachings of the Bible would readily associate Billy Graham with the Apostle Paul, for indeed the missions he has carried out throughout this world have been those that have been productive to so many people, have changed so many people's lives, have caused them to feel there is a reason for living, have given them hope that today is not their last day, but there is hope for their tomorrows.

Over and over again he has been able to come in moments when he did not feel physically able to give a message, and yet to give one. When there have been times when this Nation has been at its very worst, he has been able to raise us to levels of thinking about not only ourselves, but thinking about matters which are greater than us. He moved from one place to the other, one journey after another, proclaiming the gospel, proclaiming the good news, letting the world know that in the midst of all that is bad, there is yet much to live for, there is yet much to hope for.

I am pleased as the ranking member of this subcommittee to have this opportunity to honor another cleric. As one who has been in the ministry since the age of 15 myself, I know the arduous task and the responsibility that is placed on one who assumes this level of commitment that drives them to go well beyond what they could ordinarily do as human beings without their special touch of God.

For a man who is anointed, for a man who knows he has been called to do a special work, for a woman who knows that her calling beside him is one to lift the hopes and aspirations of people throughout this world, regardless of race, regardless of color or gender, we are pleased this day to join with the committee in supporting H.R. 2657, asking all of our Members of this House to join with us in a resounding support for this particular piece of legislation, because it gives us an opportunity to look beyond whatever it is that separates us, whatever it is that causes us to participate in most instances in partisan fashion, to respond in a way that says this is a man and a woman that deserve the best of us for they have given their best to all of us.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time in the hopes that all of our colleagues will join with us in support of this legislation.

□ 1515

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. TAYLOR], the primary sponsor of this legislation.

(Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the chairman for giving me this time, and I also want to thank the ranking minority Member for the eloquent remarks he made about Reverend and Mrs. Graham.

Mr. Speaker, in sponsoring this legislation and talking to various Members to cosponsor, there was no problem in getting hundreds of Members of this House, all of whom had separate and individual reasons for endorsing this legislation.

As one of the most revered evangelical leaders in modern history, Billy Graham has helped the less fortunate and prescribed the need for a moral society. He has been spiritual adviser and confidant to 10 Presidents. Over 100 million people have come to see Billy Graham at crusades, and another 2 billion people have watched him on television. His character and strength have made him America's most admired man. He has used his immense popularity to confront major social problems, such as racism, the homeless, and hunger. He continues trying to reverse the decline in our society's morals by emphasizing ethical and spiritual values.

Billy Graham was reared in Charlotte, NC, and upon finishing seminary began preaching his message in Tampa, FL. He now has preached to more people than anyone else in history. To extend the reach of his message, he used television, magazines, and a weekly radio broadcast for which he was given a gold star on the Hollywood Walk of Fame. He has also spread his message through his daily newspaper column and 14 books.

The Billy Graham Training Center in Black Mountain and the Billy Graham Evangelical Association, headquartered in Minneapolis, MN, have become beacons of spirituality for people around the world.

Billy Graham adheres to the principles of which he preached. He and his wife of 52 years, Ruth, live their lives with the commitment to their family, each other, and God.

The other side of Billy Graham is the humanitarian and champion of the disadvantaged. He helped the flood victims of India rebuild their villages. He arranged for food and supplies to be flown to the earthquake victims of Guatemala and aided refugees fleeing political oppression.

Reverend Graham was also deeply involved in the fight for racial equality in the South. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., declared, and I quote, ''that had it not been for the ministry of Billy Graham, he could not have done the work that he did.''

People with Billy Graham's strength and devotion are very rare. His duty to God has led him to be the great man that he has become today. It is fitting for this Congress to honor both Reverend Graham and his wife, who has been by his side. His son, Franklin Graham, who heads the Samaritan Purse, and is now moving into his father's ministry, has carried on works for many years helping the poor, helping disadvantaged around the world.

Most recently, the Grahams have devoted themselves to the establishment of the Ruth and Billy Graham Children's Health Center at Memorial Mission in Asheville, NC. They share the vision of this new center in its efforts to improve the health and well-being of

the children of the southern Appalachia and the world. Their goal is for the Ruth and Billy Graham Children's Center to become a new resource for ending the pain and suffering of children.

We hope that once this legislation is passed by the Congress, the Congressional Gold Medal will be presented to the Grahams at a joint session of this Congress, and I take pride in being one of the many cosponsors of this legislation.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from American Samoa [Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA].

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman and my colleague from New York for this time; and also the chief sponsor of the legislation, the gentleman from Delaware.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation to give special recognition by the Congress to the Reverend and Mrs. Billy Graham, who over the course of some 60 years, have provided comfort and support for the spiritual needs of millions of men, women, and children throughout the world.

Mr. Speaker, the Reverend Billy Graham, in my humble opinion, is perhaps the greatest Christian evangelist of this century. His spiritual messages were universal, in that they touched the hearts and minds of every human being who has been influenced by his demeanor, his example, and, most important of all by the giving of his life to serve the needs of others. That is pure Christianity in every way.

Again, I commend my good friend from New York and the gentleman from Delaware for sponsoring this legislation.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEINEMAN], another distinguished Member of the House.

(Mr. HEINEMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HEINEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 2657, legislation which commissions a Congressional Gold Medal to be awarded to Billy Graham and his wife Ruth. I am proud to be an original co-sponsor of this legislation. H.R. 2657 honors Billy and Ruth Graham's years of service towards morality, racial equality, family, charity and religion.

The Reverend Billy Graham was raised in North Carolina and has been a great spiritual leader, not only for the United States, but for the rest of the world. He has dedicated his life crusading against homelessness, racism, and hunger while helping spread spiritual and moral values to those willing to listen. Billy and Ruth Graham have positively affected the lives of millions throughout the world. In today's society, it is rare to find such undying dedication and devotion to one's beliefs.

Rev. Graham has used the media to help spread his message of hope to billions of people. Billy and Ruth Graham's faith in God has helped them in their fight to aid the disadvantaged and less fortunate. It is only right that this Congress honor the Reverend Billy Graham and his wife Ruth with the Congressional Gold Medal.

I'd like the RECORD to indicate that this Member of Congress attended the Billy Graham Crusade in 1957 at the Polo Grounds in the Bronx, NY. Although the site no longer exists, the vestiges of that experience still live within me.

I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan legislation and vote for the legislation, and I also compliment the gentleman from North Carolina, Congressman CHARLES TAYLOR, for his initiative; and the gentleman from Delaware, Congressman MIKE CASTLE, for sponsoring this bill.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BURR], yet another distinguished Member.

Mr. BURR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues in honoring two outstanding Americans and fellow North Carolinians. Throughout their lives, Ruth and Billy Graham have exemplified the highest goals our country holds dear, and as a result, they have left a lasting impression not only on the people they touch individually, but on our Nation as a whole.

Most people first encountered Rev. Graham through his many crusades. Through this vehicle, he has reached over 100 million people in person and over 2 billion people throughout the world in his television audiences spreading his message of hope. Rev. Graham's achievements, however, go much deeper than his accomplishments as a religious leader. He and his wife are also leaders in promoting education, charity, and the importance of family. They were the driving force in creating the Ruth and Billy Graham Children's Health Center at Memorial Mission Hospital in Asheville, NC. This facility provides comfort and care to the most helpless members of society—our children. And, finally, Rev. and Mrs. Graham have served us as leaders—leaders by example. If we would all dedicate ourselves to just a fraction of the unselfish endeavors of these two people, the world would be a much better place.

Mr. Speaker, in this Olympic year, when we honor our best athletes with gold medals for achievements on the field, it is fitting that we honor these two outstanding individuals with a gold medal for their outstanding achievements in a much more difficult arena—life. So, for myself, my colleagues in this House, and for our Nation, I say thank you, Ruth and Billy Graham.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to say that there was one other person who clearly wanted to speak, and there are two others who have contacted us that they are trying to get here, but they are not presently with us.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STOCKMAN].

Mr. STOCKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for allowing me this opportunity to speak on behalf of what, in my personal life, has meant more to me than anything else, and that is my faith.

As I was growing up and watching throughout my history, I watched Rev. Billy Graham as he portrayed what I think was good in everything in life. And now as we get older and we look and reflect upon our lives, today I have to tell you I still reflect upon Billy Graham.

Billy Graham has meant a lot to me personally in influencing my life and my goals, and I cannot think of anybody better that we dedicate this medal to than to Dr. Graham and his wife Ruth.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that I think this one man has meant more to more people than anyone else in the world. As he goes and travels, he is respected by leaders and government officials and that without Mr. Graham, we would not have, I think, some of the moral principles that we have in this Nation today.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

As one who has traveled to various seminaries throughout this land, periodically speaking to those young ministers who are in training, I want to take this opportunity to just say a word, and that is a word to encourage them to look at the ministry of Billy Graham as a model by which they might be able to emulate and replicate, because I think it indicates the kind of commitment that is necessary when one feels the authority of God that has called and anointed them to do the special work.

And it is special work that can only be done by a calling. The Bible tells us that many are called, but few are chosen. Truly, Billy Graham and Ruth Graham represent they who have been chosen of the Lord and who understand what it means to make the fullest of commitments, understand what it means when the Bible talks about bearing our crosses daily and denying one's self. For truly his ministry indicates that regardless of one's training, one has to have a real sense about what it is the Lord wants him to do and where the Lord wants it done.

The commission of the Lord commands that we go into all nations and baptize and teach and reach all of those who have not been reached and bring them into the family of the faithful. I tend to believe that this Nation will be a better place because of Billy Graham and Ruth Graham, but more importantly those young men and women who are in training in seminaries, as they look at this model, as they make the same kind of commitment, as they

understand that their faith commitment should drive them to never having to feel that they have to be of the world, but rather that they can be in it, but live beyond it as it relates to how they maintain themselves morally and spiritually. Billy Graham has shown us all of that.

I would hope that his model is one, as he nears the sunset of his life, that there will be someone who will pick up that mantel and will go forth into the world making the same kind of proclamations without fear of trembling, but understand, as we say in that song, to be on the battlefield for the Lord, and to do so with the kind of courageousness that will not allow them to be able to turn around.

We can change families, we can change the quality of life for people in this Nation, we can change the quality of life for people in the world. More of us have to be on the battlefield and believe this is a battle that we cannot afford to lose.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1530

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I will be very brief and then yield back the balance of the time.

Mr. Speaker, as a layperson and one who is not involved in the clergy as the distinguished ranking member is, and without being as eloquent as he is on the subject, it is wonderful to admire from afar and from television, an individual and a couple who have lived the way we would like the heroes of America to live.

Mr. Speaker, so often we see people, individuals who are flawed in all walks of life and we make them our role models and somehow they fall. This is a couple that not only is not going to fall, but has risen from pedestal to pedestal and we admire them greatly. This coin that we are dedicating today is well earned.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank all of those who were able to come to the floor and speak. I would remind those who were not able to, that they could submit statements at the end.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, to the gentleman from Delaware, chairman of the subcommittee, I say thank you. This is a glorious day for both of us. I think the way we work together in our committee represents the essence of the kind of spirit that Billy Graham would hope all American citizens would be able to work together.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to work with the gentleman from Delaware and proud to have shared with him in the sponsorship of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and hope that our Members will join with us, not only in trying to work together the way we do, but also in supporting this legislation.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. FLAKE], our ranking member. I must say I do not think we have ever had a cross word in the over a year that we have worked together. Our legislation, as is most true in this particular bill today, is generally positively received. We are blessed in that way. Working with the gentleman from New York and his staff has been an extraordinary pleasure, and I look forward to the balance of our time together.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the people of the Ninth Congressional District I want to take this opportunity to pay tribute to our hometown hero, Dr. Billy Graham. I have been friends with Dr. and Mrs. Graham for many years, and it is a privilege to know people of such high moral fortitude and devotion to principle.

Dr. and Mrs. Graham have traveled the world in the advancement of a message of hope, a message that has reached the ears and hearts of millions of people. Those who have known the Graham family have been enriched not only by their words, but by the living example their daily walk in life has set for us. Their endless devotion to the advancement of a simple, yet profound message has truly changed the lives of millions of people around the globe.

I can think of no better recipients of this award than the Reverend and Mrs. Billy Graham. May this award serve as a small token of appreciation for their lifetime of service.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WHITE). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CASTLE] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2657.

The question was taken.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5, rule I, and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE—PROTECTING CREDITWORTHINESS OF UNITED STATES, AVOIDING DEFAULT, AND AVERTING ANOTHER GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause (2)(a)(1) of rule XI, I give notice of my intention to offer a resolution on behalf of myself and the gentleman from Houston, TX [Mr. BENTSEN], who is at the mike and who joins me today.

Mr. Speaker, this would be a resolution that raises a question of the privileges of the House and the form of the resolution is as follows:

Whereas, the inability of the House to pass an adjustment in the public debt limit unburdened by the unrelated political agenda of either party, an adjustment to maintain the creditworthiness of the United States and to avoid disruption of interest rates and the financial markets, brings dsicredit upon the House;

Whereas, the inability of the House to pass a clean resolution to continue normal governmental operations so as to end the abuse of American citizens and their hard-earned dollars, Federal employees, private businesses who perform work for the Federal government, and those who rely upon Federal services as a bargaining tactic to gain political advantage in the budget negotiations, brings discredit upon the House;

Whereas, previous inaction of the House has already cost the American taxpayer about $1.5 billion in wasteful governmental shutdown costs, reduced the productivity and responsiveness of federal agencies and caused untold human suffering;

Whereas, the failure of the House of Representatives to adjust the federal debt limit and keep the nation from default or to act on legislation to avert another government shutdown impairs the dignity of the House, the integrity of its proceedings and the esteem the public holds for the House;

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution the enrolling clerk of the House of Representatives shall prepare an engrossment of the bill, H.R. 2862, and the joint resolution, H.J. Res. 157. The vote by which this resolution is adopted by the House shall be deemed to have been a vote in favor of such bill and a vote in favor of such joint resolution upon final passage in the House of Representatives. Upon engrossment of the bill and the joint resolution, each shall be deemed to have passed the House of Representatives and been duly certified and examined; the engrossed copies shall be signed by the Clerk and transmitted to the Senate for further legislative action; and (upon final passage by both Houses) the bill and the joint resolution shall be signed by the presiding officers of both Houses and presented to the President for his signature (and otherwise treated for all purposes) in the manner provided for bills and joint resolution generally.

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, in respect to the resolution offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT], my colleague, as it related——

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would inform the gentleman that the resolution is not debatable at this time.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, is it in order at this time to determine whether or not this rule IX applies to this resolution and is it also in order at this time for the House to debate whether rule IX would apply with respect to this resolution?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would inform the gentleman that under rule IX, a resolution offered from the floor by a Member other than the majority leader or the minority leader as a question of the privileges of the House has immediate precedence only at a time or place designated by the Speaker in the legislative schedule within 2 legislative days its being properly noticed. The Chair will announce the Speaker's designation at a later time. In the meantime, the form of the resolution proffered by the gentleman from Texas will appear in the RECORD at this point.

The Chair is not at this point making a determination as to whether the resolution constitutes a question of privilege. That determination will be made at the time designated by the Speaker for consideration of the resolution.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, we thank you and we stand ready to proceed upon proper notice.

SADDLEBACK MOUNTAIN-ARIZONA SETTLEMENT ACT OF 1995

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 1341) to provide for the transfer of certain lands to the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community and the city of Scottsdale, Arizona, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 1341

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Saddleback Mountain-Arizona Settlement Act of 1995''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND PURPOSES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community and the city of Scottsdale, Arizona, have a longstanding interest in a 701-acre tract of land known as the ''Saddleback Property'', that lies within the boundaries of the City and abuts the north boundary of the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Reservation;

(2) the Saddleback Property includes Saddleback Mountain and scenic hilly terrain along the Shea Boulevard corridor in Scottsdale, Arizona, that—

(A) has significant conservation value; and

(B) is of historic and cultural significance to the community;

(3) in 1989, the Resolution Trust Corporation acquired the Saddleback Property as a receiver for the Sun City Savings and Loan Association;

(4) after the Saddleback Property was noticed for sale by the Resolution Trust Corporation, a dispute between the Community and the City arose concerning the future ownership, use, and development of the Saddleback Property;

(5) the Community and the City each filed litigation with respect to that dispute, but in lieu of pursuing that litigation, the Community and the City negotiated a Settlement Agreement that—

(A) addresses the concerns of each of those parties with respect to the future use and development of the Saddleback Property; and

(B) provides for the dismissal of the litigation;

(6) under the Settlement Agreement, subject to detailed use and development agreements—

(A) the Community will purchase a portion of the Saddleback Property; and

(B) the City will purchase the remaining portion of that property; and

(7) the Community and the City agree that the enactment of legislation by Congress to ratify the Settlement Agreement is necessary in order for—

(A) the Settlement Agreement to become effective; and

(B) the United States to take into trust the property referred to in paragraph (6)(A) and make that property a part of the Reservation.

(b) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this Act are—

(1) to approve and confirm the Settlement, Release, and Property Conveyance Agreement executed by the Community, the City, and the Resolution Trust Corporation;

(2) to ensure that the Settlement Agreement (including the Development Agreement, the Use Agreement, and all other associated ancillary agreements and exhibits)—

(A) is carried out; and

(B) is fully enforceable in accordance with its terms, including judicial remedies and binding arbitration provisions; and

(3) to provide for the taking into trust by the United States of the portion of the Saddleback Property purchased by the Community in order to make that portion a part of the Reservation.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

For the purposes of this Act, the following definitions shall apply:

(1) CITY.—The term ''City'' means the city of Scottsdale, Arizona, which is a municipal corporation in the State of Arizona.

(2) COMMUNITY.—The term ''Community'' means the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, which is a federally recognized Indian tribe.

(3) DEDICATION PROPERTY.—The term ''Dedication Property'' means a portion of the Saddleback Property, consisting of approximately 27 acres of such property, that the City will acquire in accordance with the Settlement Agreement.

(4) DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT.—The term ''Development Agreement'' means the agreement between the City and the Community, executed on September 11, 1995, that sets forth conditions and restrictions that—

(A) are supplemental to the Settlement, Release and Property Conveyance Agreement referred to in paragraph (11)(A); and

(B) apply to the future use and development of the Development Property.

(5) DEVELOPMENT PROPERTY.—The term ''Development Property'' means a portion of the Saddleback Property, consisting of approximately 211 acres, that the Community will acquire in accordance with the Settlement Agreement.

(6) MOUNTAIN PROPERTY.—The term ''Mountain Property'' means a portion of the Saddleback Property, consisting of approximately 365 acres, that the Community will acquire in accordance with the Settlement Agreement.

(7) PRESERVATION PROPERTY.—The term ''Preservation Property'' means a portion of the Saddleback Property, consisting of approximately 98 acres, that the City will acquire in accordance with the Settlement Agreement.

(8) RESERVATION.—The term ''Reservation'' means the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Reservation.

(9) SADDLEBACK PROPERTY.—The term ''Saddleback Property'' means a tract of land that—

(A) consists of approximately 701 acres within the city of Scottsdale, Arizona; and

(B) includes the Dedication Property, the Development Property, the Mountain Property, and the Preservation Property.

(10) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Interior.

(11) SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT.—The term ''Settlement Agreement''—

(A) means the Settlement, Release and Property Conveyance Agreement executed on September 11, 1995, by the Community, the City, and the Resolution Trust Corporation (in its capacity as the Receiver for the Sun State Savings and Loan Association, F.S.A.); and

(B) includes the Development Agreement, the Use Agreement, and all other associated ancillary agreements and exhibits.

(12) USE AGREEMENT.—The term ''Use Agreement'' means the agreement between the City and the Community, executed on September 11, 1995, that sets forth conditions and restrictions that—

(A) are supplemental to the Settlement, Release and Property Conveyance Agreement referred to in paragraph (11)(A); and

(B) apply to the future use and development of the Mountain Property.

SEC. 4. APPROVAL OF AGREEMENT.

The Settlement Agreement is hereby approved and ratified and shall be fully enforceable in accordance with its terms and the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 5. TRANSFER OF PROPERTIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Upon satisfaction of all conditions to closing set forth in the Settlement Agreement, the Resolution Trust Corporation shall transfer, pursuant to the terms of the Settlement Agreement—

(1) to the Secretary, the Mountain Property and the Development Property purchased by the Community from the Resolution Trust Corporation; and

(2) to the City, the Preservation Property and the Dedication Property purchased by the City from the Resolution Trust Corporation.

(b) TRUST STATUS.—The Mountain Property and the Development Property transferred pursuant to subsection (a)(1) shall, subject to sections 6 and 7—

(1) be held in trust by the United States for the Community; and

(2) become part of the Reservation.

(c) LIMITATION ON LIABILITY.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the United States shall not incur any liability for conditions, existing prior to the transfer, on the parcels of land referred to in subsection (b) to be transferred to the United States in trust for the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community.

(d) RECORDS.—Upon the satisfaction of all of the conditions of closing set forth in the Settlement Agreement, the Secretary shall file a plat of survey depicting the Saddleback Property (that includes a depiction of the Dedication Property, the Development Property, the Mountain Property, and the Preservation Property) with—

(1) the office of the Recorder of Maricopa County, Arizona; and

(2) the Titles and Records Center of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, located in Albuquerque, New Mexico.

SEC. 6. LIMITATIONS ON USE AND DEVELOPMENT.

Upon the satisfaction of all of the conditions of closing set forth in the Settlement Agreement, the properties transferred pursuant to paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 5(a) shall be subject to the following limitations and conditions on use and development:

(1) PRESERVATION PROPERTY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the Preservation Property shall be forever preserved in its natural state for use only as a public park or recreation area that shall—

(i) be utilized and maintained for the purposes set forth in section 4(C) of the Settlement Agreement; and

(ii) be subject to the restrictions set forth in section 4(C) of the Settlement Agreement.

(B) SHEA BOULEVARD.—At the sole discretion of the City, a portion of the Preservation Property may be used to widen, reconfigure, repair, or reengineer Shea Boulevard in accordance with section 4(D) of the Settlement Agreement.

(2) DEDICATION PROPERTY.—The Dedication Property shall be used to widen, reconfigure, repair, or reengineer Shea Boulevard and 136th Street, in accordance with sections 4(D) and 7 of the Settlement Agreement.

(3) MOUNTAIN PROPERTY.—Except for the areas in the Mountain Property referred to

as Special Cultural Land in section 5(C) of the Settlement Agreement, the Mountain Property shall be forever preserved in its natural state for use only as a public park or recreation area that shall—

(A) be utilized and maintained for the purposes set forth in section 5(C) of the Settlement Agreement; and

(B) be subject to the restrictions set forth in section 5(C) of the Settlement Agreement.

(4) DEVELOPMENT PROPERTY.—The Development Property shall be used and developed for the economic benefit of the Community in accordance with the provisions of the Settlement Agreement and the Development Agreement.

SEC. 7. AMENDMENTS TO THE SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT.

No amendment made to the Settlement Agreement (including any deviation from an approved plan described in section 9(B) of the Settlement Agreement) shall become effective, unless the amendment—

(1) is made in accordance with the applicable requirements relating to the form and approval of the amendment under sections 9(B) and 34 of the Settlement Agreement; and

(2) is consistent with the provisions of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California [Mr. GALLEGLY] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from American Samoa [Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. GALLEGLY].

(Mr. GALLEGLY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, S. 1341, the proposed Saddleback Mountain-Arizona Settlement Act of 1995, ratifies a land settlement agreement between the Resolution Trust Corporation, the city of Scottsdale, and the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian community.

Seven hundred and one acres of land, currently held by the Resolution Trust Corporation, would be disposed of, pursuant to S. 1341, as follows: one 27-acre tract and one 98-acre tract would be purchased by the city of Scottsdale; and one 211-acre tract and one 365-acre tract would be purchased by the Salt River Tribe.

Pending litigation between the parties would be dismissed.

Each of the four tracts would be administered according to a detailed ownership, development, and use agreement.

Finally, S. 1341 provides that the land purchased by the tribe will be taken into trust and become part of the Salt River Reservation.

The Congressional Budget Office estimates that, over time, ''there would be no significant net budgetary impact'' if S. 1341 is enacted into law.

The administration has testified that it ''strongly support[s] the enactment of S. 1341''.

I would also like to commend Congressman J.D. HAYWORTH for his leadership and tenacity in moving this ahead in an expeditious manner.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I recommend a favorable vote on S. 1341.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, this bill would approve an agreement among the Resolution Trust Corporation, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community of Arizona, and the city of Scottsdale to divide 701 acres of land known as the Saddleback Mountain property. In 1989, the RTC, in its capacity as receiver for the Sun State Savings and Loan Association, acquired the Saddleback Mountain property and noticed the land for sale. The Pima Tribe submitted the highest cash bid for the property offering $6.5 million. In response to this bid, the city of Scottsdale filed suit against the RTC to acquire the property through eminent domain. Reacting to the suit, the RTC rejected all bids on the land and prepared to transfer the land to the city of Scottsdale at which point the tribe sued the city and the RTC for damages.

Finally, all sides agreed to negotiate a settlement. The agreement will allow the tribe to receive the bulk of the land, the city of Scottsdale to obtain land for preservation purposes and to address traffic flow problems, and the RTC will receive the full amount originally bid. All parties support this agreement and both lawsuits will be dismissed upon its enactment.

I support enactment of this bill and ask my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH].

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, at this juncture, I would also like to publicly thank the gentleman from California, chairman of the Subcommittee on Native American and Insular Affairs, along with the ranking member. It is great to have a chairman like the gentleman from California [Mr. GALLEGLY] and a ranking member like the gentleman from American Samoa [Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA], my dear friend, who have worked so hard to try and address and redress some areas that are in need of common sense and a consensus. So, Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from American Samoa very much for all of his efforts as well.

Mr. Speaker, as has been mentioned by my colleague, this legislation is to approve an agreement for the settlement of litigation over the Saddleback Mountain property in Arizona. The agreement provides for the sale by the RTC of part of the Saddleback Mountain property to the Salt River Pima Indian community, to be held in trust by the United States as part of the property to the city of Scottsdale.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is the result of months of negotiation between the city of Scottsdale and the Salt River Pima Tribe, and lacks solely to authorize and confirm the agreement and to provide that the property purchased by the tribe will be taken into trust reservation status.

Mr. Speaker, again, as we take a look across our country, and as we take a look here in the Nation's Capital, so many contentious issues where at times we agree to disagree, I think it is especially noteworthy that here we have an example for, indeed, not only this august Chamber, but for the rest of the country, of local empowerment; of officials from the city of Scottsdale working with officials from the Salt River Pima Indian community to work out the problems to their mutual satisfaction, and then inviting the Federal Government to work to approve this. I think it typifies the notion of a new partnership and local empowerment.

Again, I think it is important, as both the chairman of the subcommittee and the ranking member pointed out, S. 1341 does not authorize any expenditure of funds by the United States. So, this is a cost-free, or relatively cost-free item that again empowers local communities given the special trust relationship with the United States Government and the special things we needed to work out in this place of legislation.

Undoubtedly, I would urge this august body to joint with our friends in the other body to adopt this and move forward. Once again, in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I pause and thank my good friends, the chairman of the subcommittee and the distinguished ranking member, for all their efforts and call on my colleagues to overwhelmingly pass this common sense, practical approach to local empowerment and good government.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as has been stated earlier by my good friend, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH], I want to again express the true spirit of bipartisanship as we work towards agreement on some of the areas that were brought to the attention of both sides of the aisle. I commend my good friend from California, the chairman of the subcommittee, for his tremendous work in bringing this legislation to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, just in conclusion, I would like to reiterate my appreciation for the help of the gentleman from American Samoa, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, the ranking member of the committee, and for the leadership that we had from our good friend from Arizona, Mr. HAYWORTH.

Mr. Speaker, having no further requests for time, I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1545

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WHITE). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. GALLEGLY] that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 1341.

The question was taken.

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5, rule I, and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS IN LAWS RELATING TO NATIVE AMERICANS

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2726) to make certain technical corrections in laws relating to Native Americans, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2726

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. CORRECTION TO POKAGON RESTORATION ACT.

Section 9 of the Act entitled ''An Act to restore Federal services to the Pokagon Band of Potawatomi Indians'' (25 U.S.C. 1300j–7a) is amended—

(1) by striking ''Bands'' each place it appears and inserting ''Band'';

(2) in subsection (a), by striking ''respective''; and

(3) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in the first sentence—

(I) by striking ''membership rolls that contain'' and inserting ''a membership roll that contains''; and

(II) by striking ''in such'' and inserting ''in the''; and

(ii) in the second sentence, by striking ''Each such'' and inserting ''The'';

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by striking ''rolls have'' and inserting ''roll has''; and

(ii) by striking ''such rolls'' and inserting ''such roll'';

(C) in the heading for paragraph (3), by striking ''ROLLS'' and inserting ''ROLL''; and

(D) in paragraph (3), by striking ''rolls are maintained'' and inserting ''roll is maintained''.

SEC. 2. CORRECTION TO ODAWA AND OTTAWA RESTORATION ACT.

(a) REAFFIRMATION OF RIGHTS.—The heading of section 5(b) of the Little Traverse Bay Bands of Odawa Indians and the Little River Band of Ottawa Indians Act (25 U.S.C. 1300k–3) is amended by striking ''TRIBE'' and inserting ''BANDS''.

(b) MEMBERSHIP LIST.—Section 9 of the Little Traverse Bay Bands of Odawa and the Little River Band of Ottawa Indians Act (25 U.S.C. 1300k–7) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking ''Band'' the first place it appears and inserting ''Bands''; and

(B) by striking ''the Band.'' and inserting ''the respective Bands.''; and

(2) in subsection (b)(1)—

(A) in the first sentence, by striking ''the Band shall submit to the Secretary membership rolls that contain the names of all individuals eligible for membership in such Band'' and inserting ''each of the Bands shall submit to the Secretary a membership roll that contains the names of all individuals that are eligible for membership in such Band''; and

(B) in the second sentence, by striking ''The Band, in consultation'' and inserting ''Each such Band, in consultation''.

SEC. 3. INDIAN DAMS SAFETY ACT OF 1994.

Section 4(h) of the Indian Dams Safety Act of 1994 (25 U.S.C. 3803(h); 108 Stat. 1562) is amended by striking ''(under the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450b(e))), as amended,'' and inserting ''under the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450 et seq.)''.

SEC. 4. PASCUA YAQUI INDIANS OF ARIZONA.

Section 4(b) of the Act entitled ''An Act to provide for the extension of certain Federal benefits, services, and assistance to the Pascua Yaqui Indians of Arizona, and for other purposes'' (25 U.S.C. 1300f–3(b)) is amended by striking ''Pascua Yaqui tribe'' and inserting ''Pascua Yaqui Tribe''.

SEC. 5. INDIAN LANDS OPEN DUMP CLEANUP ACT OF 1994.

Section 3(7) of the Indian Lands Open Dump Cleanup Act of 1994 (25 U.S.C. 3902(7); 108 Stat. 4165) is amended by striking ''under section 6944 of the Solid Waste Disposal Act (42 U.S.C. 6941 et seq.)'' and inserting ''under section 4004 of the Solid Waste Disposal Act (42 U.S.C. 6944)''.

SEC. 6. AMERICAN INDIAN TRUST FUND MANAGEMENT REFORM ACT OF 1994.

(a) MAINTENANCE OF RECORDS.—Section 303(c)(5)(D) of the American Indian Trust Fund Management Reform Act of 1994 (25 U.S.C. 4043(c)(5)(D); 108 Stat. 4247) is amended by striking ''made under paragraph (3)(B)'' and inserting ''made under subparagraph (C)''.

(b) ADVISORY BOARD.—Section 306(d) of the Indian Trust Fund Management Reform Act of 1994 (25 U.S.C. 4046(d); 108 Stat. 4249) is amended by striking ''Advisory Board'' and inserting ''advisory board''.

SEC. 7. INDIAN SELF-DETERMINATION CONTRACT REFORM ACT OF 1994.

Section 102(11) of the Indian Self-Determination Contract Reform Act of 1994 (108 Stat. 4254) is amended by striking ''subsection (e)'' and inserting ''subsection (e) of section 105''.

SEC. 8. AUBURN INDIAN RESTORATION.

(a) ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT.—Section 203 of the Auburn Indian Restoration Act (25 U.S.C. 1300l–1) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(2), by striking ''as provided in section 107'' and inserting ''as provided in section 207''; and

(2) in subsection (b), by striking ''section 104'' and inserting ''section 204''.

(b) INTERIM GOVERNMENT.—The last sentence of section 206 of the Auburn Indian Restoration Act (25 U.S.C. 1300l–4) is amended by striking ''Interim council'' and inserting ''Interim Council''.

SEC. 9. CROW BOUNDARY SETTLEMENT ACT OF 1994.

(a) ENFORCEMENT.—Section 5(b)(3) of the Crow Boundary Settlement Act of 1994 (25 U.S.C. 1776c(b)(3); 108 Stat. 4636) is amended by striking ''provisions of subsection (b)'' and inserting ''provisions of this subsection''.

(b) APPLICABILITY.—Section 9(a) of the Crow Boundary Settlement Act of 1994 (25 U.S.C. 1776g(a); 108 Stat. 4640) is amended by striking ''The Act'' and inserting ''This Act''.

(c) ESCROW FUNDS.—Section 10(b) of the Crow Boundary Settlement Act of 1994 (25 U.S.C. 1776h(b); 108 Stat. 4641) is amended by striking ''(collectively referred to in this subsection as the 'Suspension Accounts')'' and inserting ''(collectively referred to in this section as the 'Suspension Accounts')''.

SEC. 10. TLINGIT AND HAIDA STATUS CLARIFICATION ACT.

The first sentence of section 205 of the Tlingit and Haida Status Clarification Act (25 U.S.C. 1215) is amended by striking ''Indian tribes'' and inserting ''Indian Tribes''.

SEC. 11. NATIVE AMERICAN LANGUAGES ACT.

Section 103 of the Native American Languages Act (25 U.S.C. 2902) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by striking ''under section 5351(4) of the Indian Education Act of 1988 (25 U.S.C. 2651(4))'' and inserting ''under section 9161(4) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7881(4))''; and

(2) in paragraph (3), by striking ''section 4009 of Public Law 100–297 (20 U.S.C. 4909)'' and inserting ''section 9212(1) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7912(1))''.

SEC. 12. PONCA RESTORATION ACT.

Section 5 of the Ponca Restoration Act (25 U.S.C. 983c) is amended—

(1) by inserting ''Sarpy, Burt, Platte, Stanton, Holt, Hall, Wayne,'' before ''Knox''; and

(2) by striking ''or Charles Mix County'' and inserting '', Woodbury or Pottawattomie Counties of Iowa, or Charles Mix County''.

SEC. 13. REVOCATION OF CHARTER OF INCORPORATION OF THE MINNESOTA CHIPPEWA TRIBE UNDER THE INDIAN REORGANIZATION ACT.

The request of the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe to surrender the charter of incorporation issued to that tribe on September 17, 1937, pursuant to section 17 of the Act of June 18, 1934, commonly known as the ''Indian Reorganization Act'' (48 Stat. 988, chapter 576; 25 U.S.C. 477) is hereby accepted and that charter of incorporation is hereby revoked.

SEC. 14. ADVISORY COUNCIL ON CALIFORNIA INDIAN POLICY ACT OF 1992.

Section 5(6) of the Advisory Council on California Indian Policy Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 2133; 25 U.S.C. 651 note) is amended by striking ''18 months'' and inserting ''36 months''.

SEC. 15. IN-LIEU FISHING SITE TRANSFER AUTHORITY.

Section 401 of Public Law 100–581 (102 Stat. 2944–2945) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(g) The Secretary of the Army is authorized to transfer funds to the Department of the Interior to be used for purposes of the continued operation and maintenance of sites improved or developed under this section.''.

SEC. 16. ADOLESCENT TRANSITIONAL LIVING FACILITY.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any funds that were provided to the Ponca Indian Tribe of Nebraska for any of the fiscal years 1992 through 1995, and that were retained by that Indian tribe, pursuant to a self-determination contract with the Secretary of Health and Human Services that the Indian tribe entered into under section 102 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450f) to carry out programs and functions of the Indian Health Service may be used by that Indian tribe to acquire, develop, and maintain a transitional living facility for adolescents, including land for that facility.

SEC. 17. EXPENDITURE OF MESCALERO APACHE TRIBE JUDGMENT FUNDS.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, or any distribution plan approved pursuant to the Indian Tribal Judgment Funds Use or Distribution Act (25 U.S.C. 1401 et seq.), the Secretary of the Interior may reprogram, in accordance with the Resolutions, approved by the Mescalero Apache Tribal Council on January 24, 1995, any and all remaining funds (principal and interest accounts) regarding specific changes in the Secretarial Plans for the use of the funds in Docket Nos. 22–G, 30, 48, 30–A, and 48–A, awarded in satisfaction of the judgments by the Indian Claims Commission.

SEC. 18. ESTABLISHMENT OF A BAND ROLL.

Section 5(d)(2) of the Lac Vieux Desert Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians Act (25 U.S.C. 1300h–3(d)(2); 102 Stat. 1578) is amended—

(1) by inserting ''and base roll'' after ''requirement''; and

(2) by striking ''modification is'' and inserting ''modifications are''.

SEC. 19. OPTION TO INCORPORATE SELF-DETERMINATION PROVISIONS INTO SELF-GOVERNANCE.

Section 403 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 458cc) is amended by adding the following new subsection:

''(l) INCORPORATE SELF-DETERMINATION PROVISIONS.—At the option of a participating tribe or tribes, any or all provisions of title I of this Act shall be made part of an agreement entered into under title III of this Act or this title. The Secretary is obligated to include such provisions at the option of the participating tribe or tribes. If such provision is incorporated it shall have the same force and effect as if set out in full in title III or this title.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California [Mr. GALLEGLY] and the gentleman from American Samoa [Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA] will each be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. GALLEGLY].

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. GALLEGLY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2726 contains 19 sections which I will try to summarize briefly.

The first 11 sections make various technical corrections to existing Indian-related statutes. Typographical errors are corrected, words are capitalized, and so forth.

Section 12 modifies the service area of the Ponca Indian Tribe to include Indians living in certain counties near its reservation;

Section 13 accepts the surrender of an unused tribal charter of incorporation;

Section 14 extends the term of the Advisory Council on California Indian Policy;

Section 15 grants authority to the Army Corps of Engineers to provide funding to the Department of the Interior for the operation and maintenance of certain in lieu fishing access sites which have been constructed;

Section 16 provides authority to the Ponca Indian Tribe to utilize funds to acquire, develop, and maintain a transitional living facility for Indian adolescents;

Section 17 provides authority to the Secretary of the Interior to reprogram certain funds, awarded to the Mescalero Apache Tribe, as requested by the Tribe;

Section 18 provides to the Lac Vieux Desert Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians authority to amend its base membership roll; and

Section 19 amends the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act to provide that participating tribes may elect to include, in Title III and Title IV Self-Governance compacts, any or all provisions of Title I, which deals with Public Law 93–638 contracts.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, let me point out that the other body has passed and sent to us legislation quite similar to H.R. 2726. The Committee on Resources marked up and reported H.R. 2726 to the floor by unanimous vote.

I recommend a favorable vote on H.R. 2726.

Mr. Speaker. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FALEMOVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. FALEMOVAEGA asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, again in the spirit of bipartisanship, I commend my good friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. GALLEGLY], chairman of the subcommittee, for bringing this bill to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, the bill before us today, H.R. 2726, contains 19 technical amendments that, for the most part, correct grammatical oversights or incorrect statutory references in Indian-related laws.

I would like to note two of the changes made by this bill. The first, contained in section 19, will make it easier for Indian tribes to carry out Self-Goverance compacts under the Indian Self-Determination Act. Mr. Speaker, the Indian Self-Determination Act is one of the most important acts passed by Congress for Indians and has enabled tribes to carry out governmental activities and become more self-sufficient. The second change is contained in section 14, which extends by 18 months the life of the Advisory Council of California Indian Policy, a body created through legislation sponsored by the ranking member of the Committee on Resources, the gentleman from California, GEORGE MILLER.

I would like to commend my colleague, Chairman GALLEGLY and his staff for their work on this bill. I have always been proud of the fact that both sides of our committee have always worked together on Indian issues. I am sure that we will continue to do so in the future.

The Self-Governance amendment, which has been requested and is supported by the Indian tribes, would correct an oversight in last year's amendments to the Self-Governance program.

Last year, Congress chose to respond to the six-year resistance of the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Indian Health Service to streamlining the ''638'' contracting process by amending the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act. The 1994 amendments further streamlining the ''638'' contracting and made permanent the Self-Governance program. The 1994 amendments also required the agencies to negotiate new regulations by mid 1996 with the Indian tribes to carry out the amendments.

Since the passage of the 1994 Amendments, however, the Departments of the Interior and Health and Human Services have not interpreted and implemented all portions of the Act in accordance with Congressional intent.

Specifically, the two departments have taken the position that certain beneficial provisions of Title I, governing Self-Determination or ''638'' contracts, may not be included in Title III or IV Self-Governance compacts and annual funding agreements. In addition, the position of the two departments has not always been consistent, so that in certain instances, one department has permitted inclusion of a Self-Governance clause reflective of a Title I provision while the other has not.

Mr. Speaker, the result has been an inconsistent treatment of Self-Governance issues by the two Departments, and the denial to Self-Governance tribes of the substantial advantages afforded to the tribes under Title I of the Indian Self-Determination Act. This is troubling, since it has always been the intent of Congress that the Self-Governance initiative should be at least as broad and favorable to the tribes as the original Title I contracting mechanism.

The amendment, which has been requested by the tribes and is supported by them, would allow tribes to incorporate the beneficial provisions of Title I of the Indian Self-Determination Act into Self-Governance compacts.

Mr. Speaker, the amendment allows Self-Governance tribes to take advantage of the benefits extended to 638 contracting tribes. These advantages include—the ability to prepare annual audits pursuant to the Single Audit Act, using Indian preference in hiring, carryover prior year funding, coverage under the Federal Tort Claims Act, access to technical assistance grants, access to federal sources of supply, affords comparable rental rates for housing in Alaska, incorporation of 638 contract support cost provisions, protections against agency funding reductions, use of more flexible cost accounting procedures, incorporation of title I contract disputes procedures, limitation of costs provisions, applicability of Prompt Payment Act, authority to acquire excess Federal property, access to GSA screener IDs, use of interagency motor pool vehicles, and the Federal Tort Claims Act.

The Government (basically IHS counsel) has taken the position that Congress did not apply these provisions in title I explicitly enough to titles III and IV. The Congress and the tribes disagree, but since the IHS has no real objection to them actually applying a technical amendment seemed like the proper thing to do.

I want to commend the committee staff members on both sides of the aisle for this hard work.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

In conclusion, I would just like to again thank my good friend, the gentleman from American Samoa [Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA]. I think today is a real testimony on both of the bills we have brought to the floor as to how well we have worked together in a bipartisan way. In fact it appears that about the most controversial problems we have had is the way we pronounce each other's last name.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GALLEGLY. I yield to the gentleman from American Samoa.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to note the gentleman's remarks. It is true that it seems as if some of our colleagues have always had a very difficult time in pronouncing our names, but in spite of all of that, I think more importantly to commend the gentleman again in bringing this kind of legislation in a spirit of bipartisanship that I sure hope that in the coming weeks and months perhaps our other colleagues could better exemplify the true spirit of how legislation could be passed, in the spirit of cooperation, and the spirit of resolving the problems and not be part of the problem.

Again I commend my good friend from California for bringing this bill. I hope we will continue to pass more legislation in the same spirit as we have done in these two pieces of legislation. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. GALLEGLY. I thank the gentleman for his kind comments. Perhaps the gentleman from American Samoa [Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA] and I should hold some seminars. Maybe this body would work a lot better.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. GALLEGLY] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2726, as amended.

The question was taken.

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5, rule I, and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I, the Chair will now put the question on each motion to suspend the rules on which further proceedings were postponed earlier today in the order in which that motion was entertained.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 2657, de novo; S. 1341, de novo; and H.R. 2726, de novo.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first such vote in this series.

AWARDING CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL TO RUTH AND BILLY GRAHAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 2657.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CASTLE] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2657.

The question was taken.

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 403, nays 2, not voting 28, as follows:

[Roll No. 13]

YEAS—403

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allard
Andrews
Archer
Bachus
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Bereuter
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Coleman
Collins (GA)
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cooley
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Danner
Davis
de la Garza
Deal
DeLauro
DeLay
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Dornan
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Ensign
Eshoo
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fawell
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Fields (TX)
Filner
Flake
Flanagan
Foglietta
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Frost
Funderburk
Furse
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Geren
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Green
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hefner
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Johnston
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaFalce
LaHood
Lantos
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lincoln
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Longley
Lowey
Lucas
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Martini
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum
McDade
McDermott
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Metcalf
Meyers
Mfume
Mica
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Molinari
Montgomery
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Murtha
Myers
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Paxon
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Reed
Regula
Richardson
Riggs
Rivers
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Roth
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Sabo
Salmon
Sanders
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schiff
Schumer
Scott
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Stockman
Stokes
Studds
Stump
Stupak
Talent
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas
Thompson
Thornberry
Thornton
Thurman
Tiahrt
Torres
Towns
Traficant
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NAYS—2

Schroeder
Slaughter

NOT VOTING—28

Armey
Berman
Bryant (TX)
Chapman
DeFazio
Dellums
Durbin
Fattah
Ford
Gibbons
Hunter
Lightfoot
Livingston
McCrery
Mollohan
Olver
Payne (NJ)
Schaefer
Tate
Torkildsen
Torricelli
Waldholtz
Ward
Waters
Waxman
Williams
Wyden
Young (AK)

□ 1616

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof), the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The results of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall vote No. 13 on the bill just passed, I mistakenly voted ''nay''. I had intended to vote ''yea''.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. WARD. Mr. Speaker; during rollcall vote No. 13 on H.R. 2657 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present I would have voted "yea".

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WHITE). Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5 of rule I, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device may be taken on each additional motion to suspend the rules on which the Chair has postponed further proceedings.

SADDLEBACK MOUNTAIN-ARIZONA SETTLEMENT ACT OF 1995

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the Senate bill, S. 1341.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. GALLEGLY], that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 1341.

The question was taken.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a five-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 403, noes 1, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 14]

AYES—403

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allard
Andrews
Archer
Bachus
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Bereuter
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Coleman
Collins (GA)
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cooley
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Danner
Davis
de la Garza
Deal
DeLauro
DeLay
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Dornan
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Ensign
Eshoo
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fawell
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Fields (TX)
Filner
Flake
Flanagan
Foglietta
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Frost
Funderburk
Furse
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Geren
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Green
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hefner
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Johnston
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaFalce
LaHood
Lantos
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lincoln
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Longley
Lowey
Lucas
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Martini
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum
McDade
McDermott
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Metcalf
Meyers
Mfume
Mica
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Molinari
Montgomery
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Murtha
Myers
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Paxon
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Reed
Regula
Richardson
Riggs
Rivers
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Roth
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Sabo
Salmon
Sanders
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schiff
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Stockman
Stokes
Studds
Stump
Stupak
Talent
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas
Thompson
Thornberry
Thornton
Thurman
Tiahrt
Torres
Towns
Traficant
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOES—1

Wilson

NOT VOTING—29

Armey
Berman
Bryant (TX)
Chapman
DeFazio
Dellums
Doolittle
Durbin
Fattah
Ford
Gibbons
Hunter
Lightfoot
Livingston
McCrery
Mollohan
Olver
Payne (NJ)
Schaefer
Tate
Torkildsen
Torricelli
Waldholtz
Ward
Waters
Waxman
Williams
Wyden
Young (AK)

□ 1627

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof), the rules were suspended and the Senate bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. WARD. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 14 on S. 1341, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present I would have voted "aye."

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on S. 1341.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS IN LAWS RELATING TO NATIVE AMERICANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 2726, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. GALLEGLY], that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2726, as amended.

The question was taken.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 407, noes 0, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 15]

AYES—407

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allard
Andrews
Archer
Bachus
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Bereuter
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Coleman
Collins (GA)
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cooley
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Danner
Davis
de la Garza
Deal
DeLauro
DeLay
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Dornan
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Ensign
Eshoo
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fawell
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Fields (TX)
Filner
Flake
Flanagan
Foglietta
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Frost
Funderburk
Furse
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Geren
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Green
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hefner
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Johnston
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaFalce
LaHood
Lantos
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lincoln
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Longley
Lowey
Lucas
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Martini
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum
McDade
McDermott
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Metcalf
Meyers
Mfume
Mica
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Molinari
Montgomery
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Murtha
Myers
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Paxon
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Reed
Regula
Richardson
Riggs
Rivers
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Roth
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Sabo
Salmon
Sanders
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schiff
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Stockman
Stokes
Studds
Stump
Stupak
Talent
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas
Thompson
Thornberry
Thornton
Thurman
Tiahrt
Torres
Towns
Traficant
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—26

Armey
Berman
Bryant (TX)
Chapman
DeFazio
Dellums
Durbin
Fattah
Ford
Gibbons
Hunter
Lightfoot
Livingston
McCrery
Mollohan
Olver
Schaefer
Tate
Torkildsen
Torricelli
Waldholtz
Ward
Waxman
Williams
Wyden
Young (AK)

□ 1638

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. WARD. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 15 on H.R. 2726 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present I would have voted "aye".

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 2657 and H.R. 2726.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WHITE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair desires to make an announcement.

After consultation with the majority and minority leaders, and with their consent and approval, the Chair announces that tonight when the two Houses meet in joint session to hear an address by the President of the United States, only the doors immediately opposite the Speaker and those on his left and right will be open.

No one will be allowed on the floor of the House who does not have the privilege of the floor of the House.

Due to the large attendance which is anticipated, the Chair feels that the rule regarding the privilege of the floor must be strictly adhered to.

Children of Members will not be permitted on the floor, and the cooperation of all Members is requested.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 8:40 p.m. for the purpose of receiving in joint session the President of the United States.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 43 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 8:40 p.m.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 8 o'clock and 48 minutes p.m.

JOINT SESSION OF THE HOUSE AND SENATE HELD PURSUANT TO THE PROVISIONS OF SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 39 TO HEAR AN ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER of the House presided.

The Assistant to the Sergeant at Arms, Mr. Kevin Brennan, announced the Vice President and Members of the U.S. Senate, who entered the Hall of the House of Representatives, the Vice President taking the chair at the right of the Speaker, and the Members of the Senate the seats reserved for them.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as members of the committee on the part of the House to escort the President of the United States into the Chamber:

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY];

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY];

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOEHNER];

The gentleman from California [Mr. COX];

The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. DICKEY];

The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HUTCHINSON];

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT];

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR];

The gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO];

The gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. KENNELLY];

The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. THORNTON]; and

The gentlewoman from Arkansas [Mrs. LINCOLN].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The President of the Senate, at the direction of that body, appoints the following Senators as members of the committee on the part of the Senate to escort the President of the United States into the Chamber:

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. DOLE];

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. LOTT];

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. COCHRAN];

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. NICKLES];

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND];

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. DASCHLE];

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. FORD];

The Senator from Maryland [Ms. MIKULSKI];

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KERRY];

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. KERREY];

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID];

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ROCKEFELLER];

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN];

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BREAUX];

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD]; and

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. EXON].

The Assistant to the Sergeant at Arms announced the Dean of the Diplomatic Corps, His Royal Highness, Prince Bandar bin Sultan, Ambassador of Saudi Arabia.

The Dean of the Diplomatic Corps entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seat reserved for him.

The Assistant to the Sergeant at Arms announced the Chief Justice and Associate Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States.

The Chief Justice and the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

The Assistant to the Sergeant at Arms announced the Cabinet of the President of the United States.

The members of the Cabinet of the President of the United States entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

At 9 o'clock and 8 minutes p.m., the Sergeant at Arms, Mr. Wilson Livingood, announced the President of the United States.

The President of the United States, escorted by the committee of Senators and Representatives, entered the Hall of the House of Representatives, and stood at the Clerk's desk.

[Applause, the Members rising.]

The SPEAKER. Members of the Congress, I have the high privilege and distinct honor of presenting to you the President of the United States.

[Applause, the Members rising.]

THE STATE OF THE UNION ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The PRESIDENT. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Vice President, Members of the 104th Congress, distinguished guests, my fellow Americans all across our land: Let me begin tonight by saying to our men and women in uniform around the world and especially those helping peace take root in Bosnia and to their families, I thank you. America is very, very proud of you.

My duty tonight is to report on the State of the Union, not the state of our government but of our American community, and to set forth our responsibilities, in the words of our Founders, to ''form a more perfect union.''

The State of the Union is strong. Our economy is the healthiest it has been in three decades. We have the lowest combined rates of unemployment and inflation in 27 years. We have created nearly 8 million new jobs, over a million of them in basic industries like construction and automobiles. American is selling more cars than Japan for the first time since the 1970s, and for three years in a row we have had a record number of new businesses started in our country.

Our leadership in the world is also strong, bringing hope for new peace. And perhaps most important, we are gaining ground and restoring our fundamental values. The crime rate, the welfare and food stamp rolls, the poverty rate and the teen pregnancy rate are all down. And as they go down, prospects for America's future go up.

We live in an Age of Possibility. A hundred years ago we moved from farm to factory. Now we move to an age of technology, information and global competition. These changes have opened vast new opportunities for our people, but they have also presented them with stiff challenges.

While more Americans are living better, too many of our fellow citizens are working harder just to keep up, and they are rightly concerned about the security of their families.

We must answer here three fundamental questions: First, how do we make the American dream of opportunity for all a reality for all Americans who are willing to work for it? Second, how do we preserve our old and enduring values as we move into the future? And third, how do we meet these challenges together as one America?

We know big government does not have all the answers. We know there's not a program for every problem. We know and we have worked to give the American people a smaller, less bureaucratic government in Washington. And we have to give the American people one that lives within its means. The era of big government is over. But we cannot go back to the time when our citizens were left to fend for themselves. Instead, we must go forward as one America, one nation, working together to meet the challenges we face together. Self-reliance and teamwork are not opposing virtues. We must have both.

I believe our new, smaller government must work in an old-fashioned American way, together with all of our citizens through State and local governments, in the workplace, in religious, charitable and civic associations. Our goal must be to enable all our people to make the most of their own lives, with stronger families, more educational opportunities, economic security, safer streets, a cleaner environment and a safer world.

To improve the state of our union, we must ask more of ourselves. We must expect more of each other and we must face our challenges together.

Here in this place our responsibility begins with balancing the budget in a way that is fair to all Americans. There is now broad bipartisan agreement that permanent deficit spending must come to an end.

I compliment the Republican leadership and their membership for the energy and determination you have brought to this task of balancing the budget. And I thank the Democrats for passing the largest deficit reduction plan in history in 1993, which has already cut the deficit nearly in half in three years.

Since 1993, we have all begun to see the benefits of deficit reduction. Lower interest rates have made it easier for businesses to borrow and to invest and to create new jobs. Lower interest rates have brought down the cost of home mortgages, car payments and credit card rates to ordinary citizens. Now it is time to finish the job and balance the budget.

Though differences remain among us which are significant, the combined total of the proposed savings that are common to both plans is more than enough, using the numbers from your Congressional Budget Office, to balance the budget in 7 years and to provide a modest tax cut. These cuts are real. They will require sacrifice from everyone. But these cuts do not undermine our fundamental obligations to our parents, our children and our future by endangering Medicare or Medicaid or education or the environment or by raising taxes on working families.

I have said before, and let me say again, many good ideas have come out of our negotiations. I have learned a lot about the way both Republicans and Democrats view the debate before us. I have learned a lot about the good ideas that each side has that we could all embrace. We ought to resolve our remaining differences.

I am willing to work to resolve them. I am ready to meet tomorrow. But I

ask you to consider that we should at least enact the savings that both plans have in common and give the American people their balanced budget, a tax cut, lower interest rates, and a brighter future. We should do that now and make permanent deficits yesterday's legacy.

Now it is time for us to look also to the challenges of today and tomorrow, beyond the burdens of yesterday. The challenges are significant. But our Nation was built on challenges. America was built on challenges, not promises. And when we work together to meet them we never fail. That is the key to a more perfect union. Our individual dreams must be realized by our common efforts.

Tonight I want to speak to you about the challenges we all face as a people. Our first challenge is to cherish our children and strengthen America's families. Families are the foundation of American life. If we have stronger families, we will have a stronger America.

Before I go on, I would like to take just a moment to thank my own family and to thank the person who has taught me more than anyone else, over 25 years, about the importance of families and children, a wonderful wife, a magnificent mother, and a great First Lady. Thank you, Hillary.

All strong families begin with taking more responsibility for our children. I have heard Mrs. Gore say that it is hard to be a parent today, but it is even harder to be a child. So all of us, not just as parents, but all of us in our other roles, our media, our schools, our teachers, our communities, our churches and synagogues, our businesses, our governments, all of us have a responsibility to help our children to make it and to make the most of their lives and their God-given capacities.

To the media, I say you should create movies and CD's and television shows you'd want your own children and grandchildren to enjoy.

I call on Congress to pass the requirement for a ''V chip'' in TV sets so that parents can screen out programs they believe are inappropriate for their children.

When parents control what their young children see, that is not censorship; that is enabling parents to assume more personal responsibility for their children's upbringing, and I urge them to do it. The ''V chip'' requirement is part of the important telecommunications bill now pending in this Congress. It has bipartisan support, and I urge you to pass it now.

To make the ''V chip'' work, I challenge the broadcast industry to do what movies have done: to identify your program in ways that help parents to protect their children. And I invite the leaders of major media corporations in the entertainment industry to come to the White House next month to work with us in a positive way on concrete ways to improve what our children see on television. I am ready to work with you.

I say to those who make and market cigarettes, every year a million children take up smoking, even though it's against the law. Three hundred thousand of them will have their lives shortened as a result. Our administration has taken steps to stop the massive marketing campaigns that appeal to our children. We are simply saying, ''Market your products to adults if you wish, but draw the line on children.''

I say to those who are on welfare and especially to those who have been trapped on welfare for a long time, for too long our welfare system has undermined the values of family and work instead of supporting them. The Congress and I are near agreement on sweeping welfare reform. We agree on time limits, tough work requirements, and the toughest possible child support enforcement. But I believe we must also provide child care so that mothers who are required to go to work can do so without worrying about what is happening to their children.

I challenge this Congress to send me a bipartisan welfare reform bill that will really move people from welfare to work and do the right thing by our children. I will sign it immediately.

Let us be candid about this difficult problem. Passing a law, even the best possible law, is only a first step. The next stop is to make it work. I challenge people on welfare to make the most of this opportunity for independence. I challenge American businesses to give people on welfare the chance to move into the work force. I applaud the work of religious groups and others who care for the poor. More than anyone else in our society, they know the true difficulty of the task before us, and they are in a position to help. Every one of us should join them. That is the only way we can make real welfare reform a reality in the lives of the American people.

To strengthen the family, we must do everything we can to keep the teen pregnancy rate going down. I am gratified, as I am sure all Americans are, that it has dropped for 2 years in a row, but we all know it is still far too high.

Tonight I am pleased to announce that a group of prominent Americans is responding to that challenge by forming an organization that will support grassroots community efforts all across our country in a national campaign against teen pregnancy. And I challenge all of us and every American to join their efforts.

I call on American men and women in families to give greater respect to one another. We must end the deadly scourge of domestic violence in our country.

And I challenge America's families to work harder to stay together, for families that stay together not only do better economically, their children do better as well. In particular, I challenge the fathers of this country to love and care for their children. If your family has separated, you must pay your child support. We are doing more than ever to make sure you do, and we are going to do more, but let's all admit something about that, too. A check will never substitute for a parent's love and guidance, and only you, only you, can make the decision to help raise your children. No matter who you are, how low or high your station in life, it is the most basic human duty of every American to do that job to the best of his or her ability.

Our second challenge is to provide Americans with the educational opportunities we'll all need for this new century. In our schools every classroom in America must be connected to the information superhighway with computers, and good software, and well-trained teachers. We are working with the telecommunications industry, educators and parents, to connect 20 percent of California's classrooms by this spring, and every classroom and every library in the entire United States by the year 2000.

I ask Congress to support this education technology initiative so that we can make sure this national partnership succeeds.

Every diploma ought to mean something. I challenge every community, every school, and every State to adopt national standards of excellence, to measure whether schools are meeting those standards, to cut bureaucratic red tape so that schools and teachers have more flexibility for grassroots reform, and to hold them accountable for results. That's what our Goals 2000 initiative is all about.

I challenge every State to give all parents the right to choose which public school their children will attend and to let teachers form new schools with a charter they can keep only if they do a good job.

I challenge all our schools to teach character education, to teach good values and good citizenship, and if it means that teenagers will stop killing each other over designers jackets, then our public schools should be able to require their students to wear school uniforms.

I challenge our parents to become their children's first teachers, turn off the TV, see that the homework is done, and visit your children's classroom. No program, no teacher, no one else can do that for you.

My fellow Americans, higher education is more important today than ever before. We've created a new student loan program that has made it easier to borrow and repay those loans, and we have dramatically cut the student loan default rate. That is something we should all be proud of because it was unconscionably high just a few years ago. Through AmeriCorps, our national service program, this year 25,000 young people will earn college money by serving their local communities to improve the lives of their friends and neighbors.

These initiatives are right for America, and we should keep them going, and we should also work hard to open the doors of college even wider.

I challenge Congress to expand work study and help 1 million young Americans work their way through college by the year 2000, to provide a $1,000 merit scholarship for the top 5 percent of graduates in every high school in the United States, to expand Pell grant scholarships for deserving and needy students, and to make up to $10,000 a year of college tuition tax deductible. It is a good idea for America.

Our third challenge is to help every American who is willing to work for it achieve economic security in this new age. People who work hard still need support to get ahead in the new economy, they need education and training for a lifetime, they need more support for families raising children, they need retirement security, they need access to health care. More and more Americans are finding that the education of their childhood simply doesn't last a lifetime. So I challenge Congress to consolidate 70 overlapping, antiquated job training programs into a simple voucher worth $2,600 for unemployed or underemployed workers to use as they please for community college tuition or other training. This is a GI bill for America's workers we should all be able to agree on.

More and more Americans are working hard without a raise. Congress sets the minimum wage. Within a year the minimum wage will fall to a 40-year low in purchasing power. Four dollars and twenty-five cents an hour is no longer a minimum wage, but millions of Americans and their children are trying to live on it. I challenge you to raise their minimum wage.

In 1993 Congress cut the taxes of 15 million hard-pressed working families to make sure that no parents who work full time would have to raise their children in poverty and to encourage people to move from welfare to work. This expanded Earned Income Tax Credit is now worth about $1,800 a year to a family of four living on $20,000. The budget bill I vetoed would have reversed this achievement and raised taxes on nearly 8 million of these people. We should not do that. We should not do that.

But I also agree that the people who are helped under this initiative are not all those in our country who are working hard to do a good job raising their children and that work. I agree that we need a tax credit for working families with children. That's one of the things most of us in this Chamber, I hope, can agree on. I know it is strongly supported by the Republican majority, and it should be part of any final budget agreement.

I want to challenge every business that can possibly afford it to provide pensions for your employees, and I challenge Congress to pass a proposal recommended by the White House Conference on Small Business that would make it easier for small businesses and farmers to establish their own pension plans. That is something we should all agree on.

□ 2140

We should also protect existing pension plans. Two years ago, with bipartisan support, it was almost unanimous on both sides of the aisle, we moved to protect the pensions of 8 million working people and to stabilize the pension of 32 million more. Congress should not now let companies endanger those workers' pension funds.

I know the proposal to liberalize the ability of employers to take money out of the pension funds for other purposes would raise money for the Treasury, but I believe it is false economy. I vetoed that proposal last year, and I would have to do so again.

Finally, if our working families are going to succeed in the new economy, they must be able to buy health insurance policies that they do not lose when they change jobs or when someone in their family gets sick. Over the past two years, over 1 million Americans in working families have lost their health insurance. We have to do more to make health care available to every American, and Congress should start by passing the bipartisan bill sponsored by Senator KENNEDY and Senator KASSEBAUM that would require insurance companies to stop dropping people when they switch jobs and stop denying coverage for preexisting conditions. Let's all do that.

And even as we enact savings in these programs, we must have a common commitment to preserve the basic protections of Medicare and Medicaid, not just to the poor, but to people in working families, including children, people with disabilities, people with AIDS, senior citizens in nursing homes. In the past three years, we have saved $15 billion just by fighting health care fraud and abuse.

We have all agreed to save much more. We have all agreed to stabilize the Medicare Trust Fund, but we must not abandon our fundamental obligations to the people who need Medicare and Medicaid. America cannot become stronger if they become weaker.

The GI Bill for Workers, tax relief for education and child-rearing, pension availability and protection, access to health care, preservation of Medicare and Medicaid, these things, along with the Family and Medical Leave Act passed in 1993, these things will help responsible, hard-working American families to make the most of their own lives.

But employers and employees must do their part as well, as they are doing in so many of our finest companies: working together, putting the long-term prosperity ahead of the short-term gain. As workers increase their hours and their productivity, employers should make sure they get the skills they need and share the benefits of the good years as well as the burdens of the bad ones. When companies and workers work as a team, they do better, and so does America.

Our fourth great challenge is to take our streets back from crime and gangs and drugs. At last we have begun to find a way to reduce crime, forming community partnerships with local police forces to catch criminals and prevent crime.

This strategy, called community policing, is clearly working. Violent crime is coming down all across America. In New York City, murders are down 25 percent; in St. Louis, 18 percent; and in Seattle, 32 percent. But we still have a long way to go before our streets are safe and our people are free from fear.

The Crime Bill of 1994 is critical to the success of community policing. It provides funds for 100,000 new police in communities of all sizes. We are already a third of the way there, and I challenge the Congress to finish the job. Let us stick with a strategy that is working and keep the crime rate coming down.

Community policing also requires bonds of trust between citizens and police. I ask all Americans to respect and support our law enforcement officers, and to our police I say, our children need you as role models and heroes. Don't let them down.

The Brady Bill has already stopped 44,000 people with criminal records from buying guns. The assault weapons ban is keeping 19 kinds of assault weapons out of the hands of violent gangs. I challenge the Congress to keep those laws on the books.

Our next step in the fight against crime is to take on gangs the way we once took on the mob. I am directing the FBI and other investigative agencies to target gangs that involve juveniles and violent crime, and to seek authority to prosecute as adults teenagers who maim and kill like adults. And I challenge local housing authorities and tenant associations: Criminal gang members and drug dealers are destroying the lives of decent tenants. From now on, the rule for residents who commit crime and peddle drugs should be, one strike and you're out.

I challenge every State to match Federal policy to assure that serious violent criminals serve at least 85 percent of their sentence. More police and punishment are important, but they are not enough. We have got to keep more of our young people out of trouble with prevention strategies not dictated by Washington, but developed in communities. I challenge all of our communities, all of our adults, to give our children futures to say yes to, and I challenge Congress not to abandon the Crime Bill's support of these grassroots prevention efforts.

Finally, to reduce crime and violence, we have to reduce the drug problem. The challenge begins in our homes with parents talking to their children openly and firmly, and embraces our churches and synagogues, our youth groups and our schools. I challenge Congress not to cut our support for drug-free schools. People like these DARE officers are making a real impression on grade school children that

will give them the strength to say no when the time comes.

Meanwhile, we continue our efforts to cut the flow of drugs into America. For the last two years, one man in particular has been on the front lines of that effort. Tonight I am nominating him, a hero of the Persian Gulf War and the Commander in Chief of the United States military's Southern Command, General Barry McCaffrey as America's new drug czar.

General McCaffrey has earned three Purple Hearts and two Silver Stars fighting for this country. Tonight I ask that he lead our Nation's battle against drugs at home and abroad. To succeed, he needs a force far larger than he has ever commanded before. He needs all of us, every one of us has a role to play on this team. Thank you, General McCaffrey, for agreeing to serve your country one more time.

Our fifth challenge, to leave our environment safe and clean for the next generation. Because of a generation of bipartisan effort, we do have cleaner water and air; lead levels in children's blood has been cut by 70 percent; toxic emissions from factories, cut in half. Lake Erie was dead and now it is a thriving resource. But 10 million children under 12 still live within fur miles of a toxic waste dump. A third of us breathe air that endangers our health, and in too many communities, the water is not safe to drink.

We still have much to do. Yet Congress has voted to cut environmental enforcement by 25 percent. That means more toxic chemicals in our water, more smog in our air, more pesticides in our food. Lobbyists for our polluters have been allowed to write their own loopholes into bills to weaken laws that protect the health and safety of our children.

Some say that the taxpayers should pick up the tab for toxic waste and let polluters who can afford to fix it off the hook. I challenge Congress to reexamine those policies and to reverse them. This issue has not been a partisan issue. The most significant environmental gains in the last 30 years were made under a Democratic Congress and President Richard Nixon. We can work together.

We have to believe some basic things. Do you believe we can expand the economy without hurting the environment? I do. Do you believe we can create more jobs over the long run by cleaning the environment up? I know we can. That should be our commitment.

We must challenge businesses and communities to take more initiative in protecting the environment, and we have to make it easier for them to do it. To businesses, this administration is saying, if you can find a cheaper, more efficient way than government regulations require to meet tough pollution standards, do it, as long as you do it right. To communities we say, we must strengthen community right-to-know laws requiring polluters to disclose their emissions, but you have to use the information to work with business to cut pollution. People do have a right to know that their air and their water are safe.

Our sixth challenge is to maintain America's leadership in the fight for freedom and peace throughout the world. Because of American leadership, more people than ever before live free and at peace, and Americans have known 50 years of prosperity and security.

We owe thanks especially to our veterans of World War II. I would like to say to Senator BOB DOLE and to all others in this Chamber who fought in World War II; and to all others on both sides of the aisle who have fought bravely in all of our conflicts since, I salute your service and so do the American people.

All over the world, even after the Cold War, people still look to us and trust us to help them seek the blessings of peace and freedom. But as the Cold War fades in the memory, voices of isolation say, America should retreat from its responsibilities. I say they are wrong.

The threats we face today as Americans respect no Nation's borders. Think of them: terrorism, the spread of weapons of mass destruction, organized crime, drug trafficking, ethnic and religious hatred, aggression by rogue states, environmental degradation. If we fail to address these threats today, we will suffer the consequences in all our tomorrows.

Of course we can't be everywhere; of course we can't do everything. But where our interests and our values are at stake and where we can make a difference, America must lead. We must not be isolationists, we must not be the world's policeman, but we can and should be the world's very best peacemaker.

By keeping our military strong, by using diplomacy where we can and force where we must, by working with others to share the risk and the cost of our efforts, America is making a difference for people here and around the world. For the first time since the dawn of the nuclear age, for the first time since the dawn of the nuclear age, there is not a single Russian missile pointed at America's children.

North Korea has now frozen its dangerous nuclear weapons program. In Haiti, the dictators are gone, democracy has a new day, the flow of desperate refugees to our shores has subsided. Through tougher trade deals for America, over 80 of them, we have opened markets abroad, and now exports are at an all-time high, growing faster than imports and creating good American jobs.

We stood with those taking risks for peace, in Northern Ireland where Catholic and Protestant children now tell their parents, violence must never return; in the Middle East where Arabs and Jews who once seemed destined to fight forever now share knowledge and resources and even dreams.

And we stood up for peace in Bosnia. Remember the skeletal prisoners, the mass graves, the campaigns of rape and torture, the endless lines of refugees, the threat of a spreading war. All of these threats, all these horrors, have now begun to give way to the promise of peace. Now our troops and a strong NATO, together with our new partners from Central Europe and elsewhere, are helping that peace to take hold. As all of you know, I was just there with a bipartisan congressional group, and I was so proud not only of what our troops were doing, but of the pride they evidenced in what they were doing. They knew what America's mission in this world is, and they were proud to be carrying it out.

Through these efforts, we have enhanced the security of the American people. But make no mistake about it, important challenges remain. The START II treaty with Russia will cut our nuclear stockpiles by another 25 percent. I urge the Senate to ratify it now. We must end the race to create new nuclear weapons by signing a truly comprehensive nuclear test ban treaty this year.

As we remember what happened in the Japanese subway, we can outlaw poison gas forever if the Senate ratifies the Chemical Weapons Convention this year.

We can intensify the fight against terrorists and organized criminals at home and abroad, if Congress passes the anti-terrorism legislation I proposed after the Oklahoma City bombing now. We can help more people move from hatred to hope all across the world in our own interest if Congress gives us the means to remain the world's leader for peace.

My fellow Americans, the six challenges I have just discussed are for all of us. Our seventh challenge is really America's challenge to those of us in this hallowed hall tonight, to reinvent our government and make our democracy work for them.

Last year this Congress applied to itself the laws it applies to everyone else. This Congress banned gifts and meals from lobbyists. This Congress forced lobbyists to disclose who pays them and what legislation they are trying to pass or kill. This Congress did that and I applaud you for it.

Now I challenge Congress to go further, to curb special interest influence in politics by passing the first truly bipartisan campaign finance reform bill in a generation. You, Republicans and Democrats alike, can show the American people that we can limit spending and we can open the airwaves to all candidates.

I also appeal to Congress to pass the line item veto you promised the American people.

Our administration is working hard to give the American people a government that works better and costs less. Thanks to the work of Vice President GORE we are eliminating 16,000 pages of unnecessary rules and regulations,

shifting more decisionmaking out of Washington back to States and local communities. As we move into the era of balanced budgets and smaller government, we must work in new ways to enable people to make the most of their own lives. We are helping America's communities not with more bureaucracy but with more opportunities.

Through our successful empowerment zones and community development banks, we are helping people to find jobs, to start businesses. And with tax incentives for companies that clean up abandoned industrial properties, we can bring jobs back to places that desperately, desperately need them. But there are some areas that the Federal Government should not leave and should address and address strongly.

One of these areas is the problem of illegal immigration. After years of neglect, this administration has taken a strong stand to stiffen the protection of our borders. We are increasing border controls by 50 percent. We are increasing inspections to prevent the hiring of illegal immigrants. And tonight I announce I will sign an executive order to deny Federal contracts to businesses that hire illegal immigrants.

Let me be very clear about this. We are still a nation of immigrants. We should be proud of it. We should honor every legal immigrant here working hard to be a good citizen, working hard to become a new citizen. But we are also a nation of laws.

I want to say a special word now to those who work for our Federal Government. Today the Federal work force is 200,000 employees smaller than it was the day I took office as President. Our Federal Government today is the smallest it has been in 30 years, and it is getting smaller every day. Most of our fellow Americans probably don't know that. There's a good reason, a good reason. The remaining Federal work force is composed of hard-working Americans who are now working harder and working smarter than ever before to make sure the quality of our services does not decline.

I would like to give you one example. His name is Richard Dean. He is a 49-year-old Vietnam veteran who has worked for the Social Security Administration for 22 years now. Last year he was hard at work in the Federal building in Oklahoma City, when the blast killed 169 people and brought the rubble down all around him. He reentered that building four times. He saved the lives of three women. He is here with us this evening and I want to recognize Richard and applaud both his public service and his extraordinary personal heroism.

But Richard Dean's story doesn't end there. This last November, he was forced out of his office when the government shut down. And the second time the government shut down, he continued helping Social Security recipients, but he was working without pay.

On behalf of Richard Dean and his family and all the other people who are out there working every day doing a good job for the American people, I challenge all of you in this Chamber, never, ever shut the Federal Government down again.

On behalf of all Americans, especially those who need their Social Security payments at the beginning of March, I also challenge the Congress to preserve the full faith and credit of the United States, to honor the obligations of this great nation as we have for 220 years, to rise above partisanship and pass a straightforward extension of the debt limit and show the people America keeps its word.

I know that this evening I have asked a lot of Congress and even more from America, but I am confident. When Americans work together in their homes, their schools, their churches and synagogues, their civic groups, their workplace, they can meet any challenge.

I say again, the era of big government is over, but we can't go back to the era of fending for yourself. We have to go forward to the era of working together as a community, as a team, as one America, with all of us reaching across these lines that divide us, the division, the discrimination, the rancor, we have to reach across it to find common ground. We have got to work together, if we want America to work.

I want you to meet two more people tonight who do just that. Lucius Wright is a teacher in the Jackson, Mississippi public school system. A Vietnam veteran, he has created groups to help inner city children turn away from gangs and build futures they can believe in.

Sergeant Jennifer Rogers is a police officer in Oklahoma City. Like Richard Dean she helped to pull her fellow citizens out of the rubble and deal with that awful tragedy. She reminds us that in their response to that atrocity, the people of Oklahoma City lifted all of us with their basic sense of decency and community.

Lucius Wright and Jennifer Rogers are special Americans, and I have the honor to announce tonight that they are the very first of several thousand Americans who will be chosen to carry the Olympic torch on its long journey from Los Angeles to the centennial of the modern Olympics in Atlanta this summer, not because they are star athletes but because they are star citizens, community heroes meeting America's challenges. They are our real champions. Please stand up.

Now each of us must hold high the torch of citizenship in our own lives. None of us can finish the race alone. We can only achieve our destiny together, one hand, one generation, one American connecting to another.

There have always been things we could do together, dreams we could make real which we could never have done on our own. We Americans have forged our identity, our very union, from the very point of view that we can accommodate every point on the planet, every different opinion. But we must be bound together by a faith more powerful than any doctrine that divides us, by our belief in progress, our love of liberty and our relentless search for common ground. America has always sought and always risen to every challenge.

Who would say that having come so far together we will not go forward from here? Who would say that this Age of Possibility is not for all Americans?

Our country is and always has been a great and good nation, but the best is yet to come, if we all do our part.

Thank you, God bless you, and God bless the United States of America.

[Applause, the Members rising.]

At 10 o'clock and 13 minutes p.m. the President of the United States accompanied by the committee of escort retired from the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The Assistant to the Sergeant at Arms escorted the invited guests from the Chamber in the following order:

The members of the President's Cabinet.

The Chief Justice and Associate Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States.

The Dean of the Diplomatic Corps.

JOINT SESSION DISSOLVED

The SPEAKER. The Chair declares the joint meeting of the two Houses dissolved.

Accordingly, at 10 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m., the joint session of the two Houses was dissolved.

The Members of the Senate retired to their Chamber.

MESSAGE OF THE PRESIDENT REFERRED TO THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE ON THE STATE OF THE UNION

Mr. DIAZ–BALART. Mr. Speaker, I move that the message of the President be referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered printed.

The motion was agreed to.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST THE CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 1124, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1996

Mr. DIAZ–BALART, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104–451) on the resolution (H. Res. 340) waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany the bill (S. 1124) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1996 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes, which was referred to the

House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. TORKILDSEN (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today and the balance of the week, on account of personal reasons.

Mr. TATE (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today, on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. COOLEY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, for 5 minutes, on January 24.

Mr. FOLEY, for 5 minutes, on January 24.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART, for 5 minutes, on January 24.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan, for 5 minutes, on January 24.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. SCHUMER in two instances.

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland.

Mr. BONIOR.

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.

Mr. PALLONE.

Mr. FOGLIETTA in two instances.

Mr. HAMILTON.

Mr. TORRICELLI.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida.

Ms. DELAURO in two instances.

Mr. BEILENSON.

Mr. STOKES.

Mr. MATSUI.

Mr. RAHALL.

Mrs. SCHROEDER.

Mr. ACKERMAN.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. COOLEY) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. OXLEY.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM.

Mr. DORNAN in two instances.

Mr. HOUGHTON.

Mr. GEKAS.

Mr. EMERSON.

Mr. QUINN.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Oversight, reported that the committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1606. An act to designate the United States Post Office building located at 24 Corliss Street, Providence, Rhode Island, as the ''Henry Kizirian Post Office Building.''

H.R. 2061. An act to designate the Federal building located at 1550 Dewey Avenue, Baker City, Oregon, as the ''David J. Wheeler Federal Building.''

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, January 24, 1996, at 12 noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1942. A letter from the Director, Congressional Budget Office, transmitting CBO's final sequestration report for fiscal year 1996, pursuant to Public Law 101–508, section 13101(a) (104 Stat. 1388–587); to the Committee on Appropriations.

1943. A letter from the Chief of Legislative Affairs, Department of the Navy, transmitting notification that the Department of the Navy intends to transfer by sale the ship U.S.S. *Edenton* to the Government of Spain, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 7307(b)(2); to the Committee on National Security.

1944. A letter from the Chief of Legislative Affairs, Department of the Navy, transmitting notification that the Department of the Navy intends to transfer by sale the following ships, the U.S.S. *Affray*, the U.S.S. *Fortify*, and the U.S.S. *Exultant* to the Taiwanese Navy, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 7307(b)(2); to the Committee on National Security.

1945. A letter from the Chief of Legislative Affairs, Department of the Navy, transmitting notification that the Department of the Navy intends to transfer by sale the ship U.S.S. *James M. Gillis* to the Government of Mexico, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 7307(b)(2); to the Committee on National Security.

1946. A letter from the Chief of Legislative Affairs, Department of the Navy, transmitting notification that the Department of the Navy intends to transfer by sale the following ships, the U.S.S. *Beaufort*, and the U.S.S. *Brunswick* to the Government of Korea, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 7307(b)(2); to the Committee on National Security.

1947. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary (Industrial Affairs), Department of Defense, transmitting the strategic and critical materials report during the period October 1994 through September 1995, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 98h–2(b); to the Committee on National Security.

1948. A letter from the Chairman, Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System, transmitting a report on credit for small businesses and small farms in 1995, pursuant to section 477 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Improvement Act of 1991 [FDICIA]; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

1949. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notification concerning a cooperative project with Israel on the Arrow Deployability Program [ADP] (Transmittal No. 02–96), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2767(f); to the Committee on International Relations.

1950. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a copy of Presidential Determination No. 96–8: Suspending Restrictions on U.S. Relations with the Palestine Liberation Organization, pursuant to Public Law 103–236, section 583(b)(2) (108 Stat. 489); to the Committee on International Relations.

1951. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 11–180, ''Community Development Corporations Money Lender Licensing Fee and Bonding Exemption Temporary Amendment Act of 1995,'' pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1–233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

1952. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 11–181, ''Budget Support Act of 1995,'' pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1–233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

1953. A letter from the Manager, Benefits Communications, Ninth Farm Credit District, transmitting the annual report for the plan year ended December 31, 1994, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9503(a)(1)(B); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

1954. A letter from the Administrator, Panama Canal Commission, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1995, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

1955. A letter from the Administrator, Small Business Administration, transmitting the semiannual report of the inspector general for the period April 1, 1995, through September 30, 1995, and the semiannual report of management on final actions, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

1956. A letter from the Deputy Associate Director for Compliance, Department of the Interior, transmitting notification of proposed refunds of excess royalty payments in OCS areas, pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 1339(b); to the Committee on Resources.

1957. A letter from the executive director, American Chemical Society, transmitting the society's annual report for the calendar year 1994 and the comprehensive report to the board of directors of the American Chemical Society on the examination of their books and records for the year ending December 31, 1994, pursuant to 36 U.S.C. 1101(2) and 1103; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1958. A letter from the Under Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report for fiscal year 1995 to identify the contracts that were awarded in excess of the dollar threshold in section 4(11) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 403(11)) pursuant to a waiver of the prohibition on contracting with a foreign entity unless that entity certifies that it does not comply with the secondary Arab boycott of Israel, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2401i; jointly, to the Committees on National Security and Appropriations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DIAZ-BALART: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 340. Resolution waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany the bill (S. 1124) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1996 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other

purposes (Rept. 104–451). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HOUGHTON (for himself, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. CRANE, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SHAW, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, and Mrs. KENNELLY):

H.R. 2864. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for 501(c)(3) bonds a tax treatment similar to governmental bonds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MEEK of Florida:

H.R. 2865. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the tax on handguns and assault weapons, to increase the license application fee for gun dealers, and to use the proceeds from those increases to pay for medical care for gunshot victims; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SCHUMER:

H.R. 2866. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, with respect to health care fraud, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SOLOMON (for himself, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. SAM JOHNSON, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. EWING, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, and Mr. HILLEARY):

H.R. 2867. A bill to prohibit U.S. voluntary and assessed contributions to the United Nations if the United Nations imposes any tax or fee on U.S. persons or continues to develop or promote proposals for such taxes or fees; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. TEJEDA (for himself, Mr. BUYER, Ms. WATERS, and Mr. MONTGOMERY):

H.R. 2868. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to make permanent alternative teacher certification programs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WHITFIELD:

H.R. 2869. A bill to extend the deadline for commencement of construction of a hydroelectric project in the State of Kentucky; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. ZIMMER (for himself and Mr. SPRATT):

H.R. 2870. A bill to eliminate the duties on Tetraamino Biphenyl; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OBEY:

H.J. Res. 157. Joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1996, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. YOUNG of Florida introduced a bill (H.R. 2871) to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to issue a certificate of documentation with appropriate endorsement for employment in the coastwise trade and on the Great Lakes and their tributary and connecting waters in trade with Canada for vessel *Ark;* which was referred to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 65: Mr. CHAMBLISS.

H.R. 103: Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

H.R. 109: Mr. HAYWORTH.

H.R. 163: Mr. GEJDENSON.

H.R. 218: Mr. SALMON, Mr. FRAZER, Mr. CRAPO, and Mr. KING.

H.R. 359: Mr. CLEMENT.

H.R. 497: Mr. HANSEN.

H.R. 784: Mr. POMBO and Mr. SMITH of Texas.

H.R. 852: Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey.

H.R. 911: Mr. DORNAN.

H.R. 940: Mr. ABERCROMBIE.

H.R. 1363: Mr. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 1386: Mr. GUNDERSON.

H.R. 1454: Mr. COX.

H.R. 1560: Mr. GEJDENSON and Mr. TORRES.

H.R. 1591: Mr. STARK.

H.R. 1619: Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. BURR, and Mr. FORBES.

H.R. 1625: Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. HANCOCK, and Mr. STOCKMAN.

H.R. 1684: Mr. PETERSON of Florida, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. WARD, and Mr. WILSON.

H.R. 1707: Ms. JACKSON-LEE.

H.R. 1733: Mr. STARK.

H.R. 1791: Mr. WELDON of Florida.

H.R. 1818: Mr. BEREUTER.

H.R. 1893: Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 1968: Mr. TORKILDSEN, Ms. JACKSON-LEE, and Mr. LATOURETTE.

H.R. 2009: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 2128: Mr. CALVERT, Mr. LINDER, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, and Mr. BACHUS.

H.R. 2192: Mr. LANTOS.

H.R. 2276: Mr. LATOURETTE.

H.R. 2350: Mr. EHLERS and Mr. STOCKMAN.

H.R. 2445: Mr. ISTOOK.

H.R. 2458: Mr. LATOURETTE and Mr. CARDIN.

H.R. 2477: Mr. ENSIGN.

H.R. 2548: Mrs. SMITH of Washington, Mr. CALVERT, and Mr. HAYWORTH.

H.R. 2566: Mr. BLUTE, Mr. SCHUMER, and Mr. UNDERWOOD.

H.R. 2568: Mr. CRAPO.

H.R. 2579: Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. EVANS, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. WOLF, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. CRANE, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. FOGLIETTA, and Mr. ORTON.

H.R. 2585: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 2634: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska and Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky.

H.R. 2655: Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. TANNER, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mr. LONGLEY, and Mr. MENENDEZ.

H.R. 2657: Mr. WARD.

H.R. 2664: Mr. COBLE, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. BASS, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky, and Mrs. WALDHOLTZ.

H.R. 2683: Mr. LANTOS.

H.R. 2690: Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. CALVERT, and Ms. JACKSON-LEE.

H.R. 2707: Mr. WICKER.

H.R. 2723: Mr. NETHERCUTT and Mr. HAYWORTH.

H.R. 2724: Mr. BERMAN, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. VENTO, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. DELLUMS.

H.R. 2725: Mr. BERMAN, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. VENTO, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. DELLUMS.

H.R. 2751: Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 2757: Mr. EHLERS, Mr. MORAN, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. QUILLEN, and Mr. HASTINGS of Washington.

H.R. 2769: Mr. WELDON of Florida and Mr. OXLEY.

H.R. 2779: Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. DREIER, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. STUMP, and Mr. TRAFICANT.

H.R. 2796: Ms. RIVERS, Ms. JACKSON-LEE, and Mr. HYDE.

H.R. 2837: Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. FILNER, Mr. MOAKLEY, and Mr. FROST.

H.R. 2839: Mrs. MINK of Hawaii and Mr. FROST.

H.R. 2841: Mr. BROWDER, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. FROST, and Mr. BONIOR.

H.J. Res. 93: Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. SCARBOROUGH, and Mr. MCCOLLUM.

H.J. Res. 106: Mr. GREENWOOD.

H. Con. Res. 50: Mr. CHRISTENSEN.

H. Res. 59: Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.

H. Res. 333: Mr. RICHARDSON.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 104th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 142 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JANUARY 23, 1996 No. 8

Senate

(Legislative day of Monday, January 22, 1996)

The Senate met at 2:30 p.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the President pro tempore [Mr. THURMOND].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Today's prayer will be offered by a guest Chaplain, Rev. Johnny Sloan, Hamilton Christian Center, Hamilton, OH. He is a guest of Senator DEWINE.

PRAYER

The guest Chaplain, the Reverend Dr. Johnny W. Sloan, offered the following prayer:

Let us bow our heads for prayer.

Lord God Almighty, Creator of life, giver of liberty, we exalt Your holy name. This day we come before You with hearts grateful for Your grace upon our lives. You have faithfully protected and provided for our Nation. From generation to generation, You have been our guide, giving light where there was darkness and strength when there was weakness. Lord, we ask for Your will in the affairs of this land. Help us to speak less and listen more. Help us to take less and give more. Help us to fear less and trust more. Let us walk in unity without requiring individual conformity. Let our song be in harmony, sung by a people of diversity. We want to love, as You have loved us. We want to forgive, as You have forgiven us. Lift our eyes from the human mud stains of yesterday's journey to the rising sun of divine destiny and hope for tomorrow. Give us wisdom, as we set our hands to the task before us, that working together we may accomplish Your will and purpose. Lord, to You be all glory, honor, and praise, now and forever. Amen.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The able majority leader, Senator DOLE, is now recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, there will be a period for the transaction of morning business until the hour of 3:30 this afternoon. Then, following morning business—it could be extended, of course—we will recess until 8:35 this evening, at which time the Members will gather in the Senate Chamber so the Senate may proceed as a body to the Hall of the House of Representatives for the State of the Union Address.

It is hoped that we can reach an agreement regarding the consideration of the continuing resolution and the DOD authorization conference report for either Thursday or Friday. I am not certain when the House is going to take up the CR, and if it requires a rollcall vote, we have sort of indicated we would give Members some notice to get back here. So we would at least give them the opportunity to come back if there is going to be debate, amendments, and votes on the continuing resolution.

If an agreement is reached on these two items today, the Senate will adjourn until this Friday, January 26, to complete action on those matters.

Also, to inform all Members, if both of these items are completed on Friday as well as the D.C. appropriations or Interior appropriations conference reports, if available, then it may be that the Senate would not be in session until February 26. But, again, that depends on what may develop tonight in the President's State of the Union Message and what may develop during the day in our discussions with the Republican leadership on when we may want to proceed to another budget resolution to send the President another balanced budget. But we do hope to complete action on all the previously mentioned items by unanimous consent.

I might say, on the other side of the aisle, if someone indicates now that they will not give us consent, then I think we could give notice as quickly as we can that Members would have to be back here on Friday.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DEWINE). Under the previous order, there will now be a period for the transaction of morning business not to extend beyond the hour of 3:30 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for not to exceed 10 minutes each.

The Senator from Massachusetts.

PASSAGE OF ANOTHER CONTINUING RESOLUTION

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I intend to use my time to address where we are as a nation in terms of the impact of the continuing resolution at 75 percent, but I see the majority leader still here. It is a little difficult to state at this time whether there would be objection to a continuing resolution since we are not informed at this time as to what would be in the continuing resolution. And I know that there is a desire among some of our colleagues to be able to introduce clean budget ceiling legislation to move toward addressing one of the critical issues before the Nation.

So I, just for one, want to work in cooperation with the leadership, the majority leader and the minority leader, but I do think it is probably premature to try to make a judgment of whether we are going to be able to get agreements on no votes at all, because we at this time do not have a continuing resolution. We saw the changes that were made in the continuing resolution at the final hours the last time. We do not know where we are going to be on the debt ceiling issue. And I, for one, feel that we ought to be around here doing

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper containing 100% post consumer waste

the Nation's business between now and the end of February.

With all respect to those who have different schedules, I find it somewhat difficult to understand why we are not here dealing with the Nation's business on the range of different issues that have not been addressed in the Senate. We have a number of those. One of the most important is the whole issue of what is going to be the future for the young people in this country with a continuing resolution that just funds education at some 75 percent of what it was a year ago, with all of the implications that that has in higher education and also K through 12.

EDUCATIONAL IMPACT OF SHORT-TERM FUNDING MEASURES

Mr. KENNEDY. On Friday, January 26, the continuing resolution that has kept the Government operating for the last 3 weeks will expire. Once again, it will be necessary to enact a temporary funding measure to avoid shutting down the Government.

Although I understand the need to make certain accommodations while we attempt to negotiate an acceptable budget agreement, many of the areas we are fighting to protect, especially education, are facing increasing risk from this series of short-term measures.

A new continuing resolution, even for a few weeks, will take us past critical budget, planning, and teacher contract dates in school districts and will wreak havoc on the college admissions and financial aid process for high school students making critical college decisions. Furthermore, it will take us through half this fiscal year at funding levels that cut education by 13 percent overall and many programs by much more. This is no way to run a Government or to indicate the support for education from kindergarten through high school and to the colleges.

Mr. President, in the case of colleges, they cannot complete financial aid packages for the spring admissions cycle. By February 1, the Federal Government is required by statute to supply colleges with the numbers showing their Pell grant allocations and tables showing how much students of different need levels will receive in Pell grants. As of now, there are four different Pell grant appropriations numbers—the House, the Senate, the President's, and the continuing resolution—and there are different minimum and maximum award levels.

Likewise, by February 1, the Government is required to supply colleges with their allocation of campus-based aid—college work study, supplemental education opportunity grants, and Perkins loans.

In February, March, and April, when high school students are admitted to college for next fall, they receive a detailed financial aid offer showing how much each college will cost and how much aid they will get from each source—Federal, State, or college. Colleges cannot do this packaging for individual students without 1996 numbers for each type of financial aid.

Today I received a letter from the American Council on Education urging Congress to approve a full-year budget for education. Otherwise, they say, ''The confusion that all students will face as a result of this uncertainty will have its most profound impact on high school seniors.'' This is what they say, ''* * * profound impact on high school seniors. As these students sit down with their parents to negotiate the process of selecting a college to attend next fall, or determining whether they will even be able to enroll, their decisions will be influenced heavily by the level and types of aid for which they may be eligible in a particular school.''

Mr. President, just as it affects higher education, let me just mention what happens in many of the K–12 programs.

School districts across the country face needless uncertainty as they struggle to prepare budgets for next year and enter into teacher contracts. The Committee for Education Funding, a coalition of 90 education groups representing education at all levels, calls the funding levels in the continuing resolution ''a setback for education unprecedented in our nation's history,'' that will force ''layoffs of thousands of school employees and cutbacks in services to millions of children.''

Boston, for example, is required by State law to submit its school budget for the next year to its school committee by the first Wednesday in February. The school committee must submit its budget to the mayor by the last Wednesday in March.

Teacher union contracts require teachers to be notified of any layoffs for the next school year by May 15, or else teachers must be paid for the next year regardless.

Because there are no 1996 figures for key Federal education programs, Boston feels that it must adopt a budget based on the worst-case—House—level of funding for the title I Program, there would be a 15-percent cut for Boston schools. The city will have to eliminate title I services at 14 of their 79 title I schools, and they will also have to lay off teachers.

In Framingham, MA, Superintendent Eugene Thayer tells me that they will have to eliminate all title I reading programs in all middle schools, and severely cut back the support in elementary schools.

The Philadelphia public schools estimate that they will lose $13.5 million in title I funds under the current continuing resolution. At these levels, they will be forced to eliminate services in 62 schools serving 48,000 children. They will also have to lay off 100 teachers and 200 aides.

In New York, even if a final budget is passed by March 15, school districts may not be able to learn their allocations before the beginning of May—far beyond the April 1 deadline for teacher contract negotiations.

Based on past experience, New York educators say that it will take the Federal Government a few weeks, once a budget is passed, to determine State allocations for title I. These allocations are based on counties, and it takes New York 2 to 3 weeks to determine sub-allocations to its 700 school districts. This timetable would put school districts far behind their required budget schedules to comply with teacher contracts.

Mr. President, if you look at what we are doing, it is that effectively we will be cutting $3.1 billion, the largest cut in the Nation's history, in education. Last year, with the rescissions program, it was more than $600 million, and we are adding to that $3.1 billion in cuts. Those education programs would be cut basically by some 13 percent overall; the title I by 17 percent, and the list goes on.

We should oppose education cuts whenever and wherever they occur. President Clinton has demonstrated we can balance the budget in 7 years and protect education. We should not allow education to be slashed through the back door when those cuts would not be accepted through the front door.

That is the problem. We are going to be asked, on a continuing resolution, to fund it at 75 percent on this, with all of the disruption that it is going to be having for hundreds of thousands of young people who have graduated from high school and who want to go to colleges, with all the disruption it will have for the parents and those young people, with all the disruption it will have for hundreds of thousands of young people who will be going, either from Head Start through kindergarten and all the way up through high school, with all the disruption it will have in the classrooms for the teachers, the parents and the students.

Effectively, now, we have gone from holding hostage the Federal employees to holding hostage the schoolchildren in this country. That will be the effect and the impact of the continuing resolution, even at the 75 percent.

So, Mr. President, when we hear the majority leader talk about whether we can get an agreement, we know what they are saying: You better take the 75 percent or take responsibility for closing down the Government. That is the policy which is being announced here on the floor of the Senate this afternoon. That is an intolerable policy. It is, in terms of the young people of this country. Why should they, effectively, be held hostage? The education policy in this country will be held hostage because of the small minority of Members in this body or in the other body who refuse to permit an orderly processing of the education programs.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent letters from the American Council on Education and the Committee for Education Funding be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION,
OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
Washington, DC, January 23, 1996.

Hon. MARK HATFIELD,
Chairman, Senate Appropriations, U.S. Senate, S–128 The Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: We write on behalf of the nation's colleges and universities to express our hope that Congress will approve a full-year budget that provides adequate appropriations for education programs, especially the student financial assistance programs administered by the Department of Education.

As you are aware, federal student assistance is the primary means by which students and their families receive help financing a college education. Nearly eight million students rely on some form of federal student aid. This year, however, the highly effective system to deliver federal aid that was constructed with bipartisan support is threatened with chaos and uncertainty. Deadlines that will set the parameters for the amount of aid our campuses may distribute to needy students are approaching rapidly. Without knowing the Pell Grant maximum award level, or the amount of Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grant (SEOG) or College Work-Study (CWS) money available, or whether any funding will exist for State Student Incentive Grants (SSIG), Perkins Loans, Javits or Harris Fellowships, college aid officers and admissions counselors will be unable to develop aid packages for the coming academic year or provide accurate and appropriate advice to students.

The confusion that all students will face as a result of this uncertainly will have its most profound impact on high school seniors. As these students sit down with their parents to negotiate the process of selecting a college to attend next fall, or determining whether they even will be able to enroll, their decisions will be influenced heavily by the level and types of aid for which they may be eligible at a particular school.

As you prepare a Continuing Resolution to keep federal programs operating past January 26th, we urge you to provide secure funding for the federal student assistance programs through the end of the fiscal year. The House and Senate bills provide identical appropriations for SEOG, CWS, and TRIO, and contain similar language regarding the Pell Grant maximum award. We urge the deletion of a Senate restriction limiting Pell Grants to not more than 3,768,000 students. However, we urge you to adopt the Senate provisions continuing the current Pell Grant minimum award level and assuring that funding is provided for the SSIG program, the Perkins Loan program, the Javits Fellowship program, and the Harris Fellowship program.

We appreciate your consideration of these views.

Sincerely,

ROBERT H. ATWELL,
President.

On behalf of the following postsecondary education associations: American Association of Community Colleges, American Association of State Colleges and Universities, American Council on Education, Association of American Universities, Association of Catholic Colleges and Universities, Association of Community College Trustees, Association of Governing Boards of Colleges and Universities, Association of Jesuit Colleges and Universities, Council of Graduate Schools, Council of Independent Colleges, Hispanic Association of Colleges and Universities, National Association for Equal Opportunity in Higher Education, National Association of College and University Business Officers, National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities, National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, United Negro College Fund.

COMMITTEE FOR EDUCATION FUNDING,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR/REPRESENTATIVE: The Committee for Education Funding (CEF), a coalition of ninety major education organizations representing a broad spectrum of the education community, strongly urges you to seek a bipartisan budget agreement that makes education investment a priority and also to approve a continuing resolution that maintains the vital educational opportunities of America's children, youth, and adults while negotiations proceed. We also urge you to oppose a year long extension of the current continuing resolution, which cuts education by $3.1 billion, or targeted appropriations that fund some programs while eliminating or cutting others.

Recent polls show that the American public believes strongly that improving education should be a top priority for Congress. The polls also demonstrate overwhelming—92%—support for the same or increased federal funding for education. Yet Congress is about to approve another continuing resolution for FY96 that would cut education by $3.1 billion if extended for the remainder of this fiscal year—a setback for education unprecedented in our nation's history. This is in addition to $600 million in rescissions from education already enacted for FY95.

A full year extension of the current continuing resolution would mean severe cuts in basic skills instruction; college grants, scholarships, and loans for needy students; school reform and educational standards; teacher education; vocational and career preparation; educational technology; learning English; school safety and drug abuse prevention; educational research and innovation; impact aid; libraries; Head Start; and other vital education programs. See the attached sheets for details of the impact of these cuts.

Almost a third of this fiscal year is over without providing 1996 funding levels for education. Postsecondary institutions across the country are unable to approve financial aid packages for millions of students. States and local school districts are making budget decisions now that will force layoffs of thousands of school employees and cutbacks of services to millions of children.

We urge you to oppose these cuts and insist that Congressional leaders make investment in education a top priority in the budget for FY96 and beyond. Americans want greater educational opportunities for themselves and their families to meet the challenges of a changing world economy. Stop the education cuts and secure America's economic future.

Sincerely,

VIOLET BOYER,
President.

1996 COMMITTEE FOR EDUCATION FUNDING MEMBERS

American Association of Classified School Employees, American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, American Association of Community Colleges, American Association of School Administrators, American Association of State Colleges and Universities, American Association of University Professors, American Counseling Association, American Council on Education, American Educational Research Association, American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations.

American Federation of School Administrators, American Federation of State, County, & Municipal Employees, American Federation of Teachers, American Library Association, American Psychological Association, American School Food Service Association, American Student Association of Community Colleges, American Vocational Association, America's Public Television Stations, Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, Association of American Publishers.

Association of American Universities, Association of Community College Trustees, Association of Proprietary Colleges, California Department of Education, California State University, Career College Association, City University of New York, Coalition of Higher Education Assistance Organizations, The College Board, Colorado Department of Education.

Cooperative Education Association, Incorporated, Council for American Private Education, Council for Educational Development and Research, The Council for Exceptional Children, Council of Chief State School Officers, Council of Graduate Schools, Council of the Great City Schools, Educational Testing Service, Georgetown University.

International Reading Association, John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, The McGraw-Hill Companies, Michigan Department of Education, Military Impacted Schools Association, National Association for Bilingual Education, National Association for Equal Opportunity in Higher Education, National Association of College Admission Counselors.

National Association of College and University Business Officers, National Association of Elementary School Principals, National Association of Federal Education Program Administrators, National Association of Federally Impacted Schools, National Association of Graduate Professional Students, Inc., National Association of Health Career Schools, National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities, National Association of Private Schools for Exceptional Children, National Association of School Psychologists, National Association of Secondary School Principals.

National Association of State Boards of Education, National Association of State Directors of Special Education, National Association of State Directors of Vocational & Technical Education Consortium, National Association of State Scholarship and Grant Programs, National Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators, National Board of Professional Teaching Standards, National Committee for School Desegregation, National Community Education Association, National Coalition of Title I Chapter I Parents, National Council for the Social Studies.

National Council of Educational Opportunity Associations, National Council of Higher Education Loan Programs, Incorporated, National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, National Dissemination Association, National Education Association, National Middle School Association, National School Boards Association, National School Development Council, The National Title VI Steering Committee, National Writing Project.

New York State Education Department, Princeton University, Public Education Fund Network, San Diego City Schools, Seattle Public Schools, Software Publishers Association, Texas Education Agency, United States Coalition of Education for All, United States Student Association, University of Michigan, Washington State Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction.

Mr. FEINGOLD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

THE POLITICAL REFORM AGENDA

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I think we are all very much looking forward to hearing the President's State of the Union Address tonight. It is a great honor to be a Member of this body and a great honor to be able to sit in the room with our national leader and hear his thoughts about the future for this country.

I recall just a year ago, when the President gave his first State of the Union Address, under the rule of a different political party in the Congress, that some of the pundits said one of the questions was whether President Clinton would be irrelevant to the process; he had to establish his relevance. That was an absurd proposition. Of course we found, during the past year, it is pretty tough to make any President irrelevant, given his powers and given the willingness of this President to use those powers this year to try to represent the reality of our Government. The reality of our Government in 1995, and now in 1996, is we have a split Government. One party is in the majority in the Congress and one party controls the Presidency.

What I appreciated at the time, though, despite some of those press comments about the President's possible irrelevance, is that he came right out there and talked about many issues, and, in the midst of all this alleged irrelevance, he was willing to put on the table something that had been overlooked, perhaps forgotten, in the language of the Contract With America. That is, he brought us back to what I like to call—what many people in both parties like to call—the reform agenda, the political reform agenda.

Those were issues across party lines that respond to the national feeling that maybe there is a little bit too much money in Washington that is expressed in too many ways and takes the elected representatives away from focusing on their constituents. So it was very helpful last year when the President in his State of the Union Address referred to the need for Members of Congress to give up the gifts, to have a gift ban. In fact, the President said something like, ''Why don't you just say no.'' Those words were helpful. And it came to pass, in part because of his leadership, in part because of the public's interest. The media helped by exposing the reality of the gift-giving practice.

But what helped most of all, along with the President's words, was the fact that there was a bipartisan effort, a true bipartisan effort, first in the Senate and then in the House, to try to stop this ridiculous practice of allowing gifts to be given to Members of Congress. It went into effect on January 1. I do not think it got enough attention in the year-end analysis of what happened in the 104th Congress. There were a lot of bad things to talk about, a lot of failure to resolve, a lot of failure to cooperate between the parties. But on that issue, both Houses in the end responded overwhelmingly and very positively.

Tonight is an opportunity for the President, President Clinton, to take us to round 2 of the political reform agenda. I refer to it as sort of the big daddy of political reform compared to the gift ban. That is the issue of real campaign finance reform.

President Clinton is no newcomer to campaign finance reform. I remember, as a brandnew U.S. Senator, in January 1993, the President came to our Democratic conference in the Senate. He said he had three top priorities for his term. The first had to do with the deficit and the economy. Of course there has been progress. We are still struggling mightily to try to move forward even more in that area. Second, he talked about his desire to reform our health care system. We have not achieved our goals in that area. That has been an area of disappointment to which we must return. But the third item he mentioned and that not many people are aware that he stressed right from the beginning was his belief that we had to have campaign finance reform for congressional elections, to truly change the tenor of the debate and the policy outcomes in this country.

So he did not miss any time. He referred to the unnecessary and extreme hold that powerful moneyed interests have in this town of Washington and he did so in his Inaugural Address. Last summer, when he had the chance to appear jointly with the Speaker of the other body, he was quick to emphasize the issue of campaign finance reform, and did the famous handshake where he indicated his willingness to work together with both parties to solve the problem. So President Clinton has been there whenever the call for political reform has gone out. He has always been supportive, as we try to solve these problems. So he has been a big help.

But tonight we need more help. Tonight we need the President of the United States to specifically put his strength, and the strength of his office, and the strength of his resolve, behind a national effort to change our campaign laws so that the people of our country can feel for the first time in a long time that those elections belong to them, that their votes count, and that it is not just the power of big money and influences that they cannot see or hear that control those elections.

Mr. President, let us build on the success this year when some Members of this body tried to change the system we have for financing our Presidential election. Let us build on that. We were able to defeat that.

The Presidential election in 1992 actually involved less expenditures than the Presidential election in 1988. That is because of the national laws we have had in this area. That is lacking in the congressional area. We have a complete OK Corral situation where any amount of money can be spent, and there are no rules to speak of about how much is spent in these elections. So nothing would be more helpful than to have the President tonight mention the fact that he has been and continues to be very supportive of campaign finance reform.

I think he knows there is a unique opportunity in the Congress this year. Working with Senator MCCAIN of Arizona and others we have introduced the first bipartisan campaign finance reform bill in 10 years. It is a voluntary bill, as it must be under the Supreme Court rule in Buckley versus Valeo, but it addresses several of the major areas of concern. It addresses that there is too much money spent in individual elections. It addresses the fact that we would like to encourage candidates to get a majority of their campaign contributions from their own home States. It for the first time addresses the problem that too many people are spending their own personal fortunes to be elected.

All of these things are addressed in the bill. I am hoping the President has been made aware of that and is supportive.

What is even more exciting is, it is not only bipartisan but it is bicameral. In the House there was another bill being promoted that several of the House Members said, why do we not look at the Senate bill? They made their own version of the McCain-Feingold bill, and they have many supporters of both parties involved. People in the country have noticed.

A bipartisan, bicameral bill endorsed by over 25 major newspapers in this country—Common Cause, Public Citizen, and many other groups.

Mr. President, I think one of the reasons why it has received such reception from the public is that people know that it is not just a question of too much money being spent in elections. They know there is a connection between what is spent in Washington on campaigns, what is connected to things like why we cannot solve our budget problem, why there is too much money spent in Washington, even though the public is begging us to get our finances under control.

In fact, I think there is a direct connection between campaign financing, overspending in campaigns, the drive to raise all the money you can, and the fact that we still have not resolved the deficit problem. The ability of many special interests to secure millions, and sometimes billions, of taxpayers' dollars in Federal contracts and subsidies and other spending programs relates directly to our current campaign finance system where candidates for public office must raise millions of dollars for their campaigns.

A report was just issued by the Center for Responsive Politics entitled ''Cashing in From A to Z.'' It is a long report, but they list a few recent examples that I think the public can respond to. Cattle and sheep ranch interests contributed over $600,000 during the

last election cycle while fighting to protect Federal grazing fee policies that give ranchers access to Federal lands at below-market prices.

The mining industry spent over $1 million in 1993–94 on campaign contributions to Members of Congress so that they could try to prevent the reform of the 1872 mining law which allows people to pay a few thousand dollars for land that contains billions of dollars worth of gold and silver and other minerals.

The oil and gas interests contributed over $6.1 million during the last election cycle to help back their hefty 1995 agenda, which included repeal of the alternative minimum tax. They do not even want to pay a minimum tax for all the profits they are making.

Mr. President, in the 6 weeks following a close House vote on funding the B–2 bomber, opposed by even the Defense Department, contributions from defense contractor Northrop Grumman's PAC's to House Members who voted for the program totaled over $50,000, just from that one company for that one program that the Defense Department did not even want.

Mr. President, obviously I could go on with these examples, but they show the fact it is not just a question of there being too much money in campaigns, but the connection between campaigns and the fact that we still have a terrible budget and deficit problem in this country.

So, Mr. President, it has become clear to many of us, Democrats and Republicans alike, that their failed campaign finance system contributes to keeping many unnecessary Government subsidies flowing, and it helps explain why well-financed special interests were able to grab the legislative process by the scruff of the neck in the first place.

Mr. President, it is my fond hope the President of the United States will use his bully pulpit and excellent intentions on this issue to give a strong push behind the bicameral, bipartisan effort to reform our campaign finance laws.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

Mr. HEFLIN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

BUDGET NEGOTIATIONS

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I believe we are closer to a balanced budget than we have been in many years. I think the public overwhelmingly wants a balanced budget. I think we are moving in that direction. But there are little problems here and there that seem to prevent us from getting together in being able to shake hands on a balanced budget.

The President and the Republican leadership I think all realize that we need a balanced budget for it will certainly directly affect virtually every segment of the Government and every citizen of the country. I feel that lost in the political rhetoric over the budget is the fact that we have reached substantial agreements at this stage.

We have agreed that the budget ought to be balanced in 7 years. We have agreed that CBO figures ought be controlling. We have agreed that there ought to be less Government. We have agreed that there ought to be a tax cut. And while both sides still have some major differences to work out, I feel that good-faith negotiations on these issues can yield a budget that is fair and equitable to all segments of society, and each party can claim victory.

When the recess occurred, there was a statement to the effect that we were going to stop the negotiations and then come back again.

There have been three or four efforts that have been made recently to try to get the parties together to start negotiating again. But for some reason or other they have been called off. Now that the recess is over, and the recess from the negotiations is over, it is time to begin again and for each side to meet and come to an agreement. The longer the negotiators avoid constructive negotiations the greater the chances for each side to become reentrenched in their policy positions.

Compromise is an art that appears to have somehow been forgotten. It is apparent that in order for an agreement to be reached, both Democrats and Republicans are going to have to give and take. Each side is going to have to have some wins and each side is going to have to have some losses. If the Israelis and the Palestinians can get together and negotiate in good faith, there is no reason why the Democrats and the Republicans cannot do likewise. If the Croats, Moslems, and Serbs can agree on a cease-fire, why cannot both parties put their verbal pistols back in their holsters?

I do not know exactly what the solution is. But it may well be that we may have to go to Camp David and tell them to stay there until they reach an agreement. Maybe Dayton is the place. Maybe Norway. But whatever it takes in regards to getting together and finding a location and staying with it until we reach an agreement, it seems to me to be the proper course to follow. When you add it up, the current Democratic proposals and the Republican proposals are less than $100 billion apart. Taking into account $12 trillion over a 7-year period, this figure amounts to less than .8 of 1 percent. With this in mind, it seems to me that the negotiations should proceed with an emphasis on what each side is willing to give and take in order to reach a long overdue budget agreement.

The State of the Union Address will have a significant impact on the negotiations. It is a good opportunity for the President to demonstrate his willingness to reach an accord. However, if his speech is overly partisan, it can harm the negotiating atmosphere by having a hardening effect on the Republican negotiators. Likewise, the Republican response can also either help or hurt the negotiating process.

Hopefully, the President will extend a hand of conciliation, and if he does, I hope the Republicans will not slap it, but instead shake it. I hope that each Senator will keep this in mind when determining exactly what he or she wants to convey, when commenting on the content of the President's speech. Each Senator must be aware that their responses may affect the overall negotiations pertaining to the budget.

We need to adopt a continuing resolution—hopefully a clean one—by January 26. The expiration of the current continuing resolution, of course, runs out on that date. Despite all the heated rhetoric, I do not believe it is in the best interest of our citizens to have the remaining portion of Government closed down. A great number of the various Agencies and Departments will stay open under the legislation that has already been adopted.

Taxpayers and Federal employees should not be punished, because Congress and the administration have not fulfilled their obligation to reach a budget.

Mr. President, as I have stated before, I think it is imperative that we reach an agreement on the budget, and I am optimistic that when reasonable people sit down together an agreement can be worked out.

It seems to me we have made a great deal of progress. We have agreed on some fundamentals: A 7-year period for a balanced budget; CBO figures; a tax cut; and a cut in Government. We just need to get together. Perhaps we need a mediator. But I hope that we will let reason prevail, and we will not let this opportunity pass to achieve a balanced budget.

Mr. GRAMS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KYL). The Senator from Minnesota.

FRESHMAN TOUR: PROMISES MADE, PROMISES KEPT

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, too often here in Washington, politicians come to town with a mission but end up coming down with a severe case of Beltway fever.

They get caught up in the unreal atmosphere of this place and eventually forget what it was that first propelled them into public service.

They shut themselves away in their Senate or House offices or even in the Oval Office.

They spend their time hobnobbing with their new-found Washington friends. And after awhile, they just lose touch with the folks who sent them here. They think they are doing ''the people's business,'' but in truth, they are no longer speaking for the people at all.

The 11 Members of the Senate freshman class came to town with a mission, too, a mandate given to us by the voters.

We met often as a group last year to track our progress. And as 1995 came to

a close, we took a step back and began asking ourselves some pretty tough questions, such as:

What is the mood of the country?

What are people saying about Congress and the decisions we freshmen faced in our first year in the Senate?

Did we really hear the message we thought we heard in November 1994, when the voters sent us here to balance the budget to get Government spending under control, to deliver middle-class tax relief, and protect and strengthen Medicare and Medicaid?

Most importantly, is the message that brought this freshman class to the Senate in 1994 still alive and well in 1996?

We thought we knew the answers, and we knew we had delivered on each one of our promises, but after being in Washington and of course, debating those very important questions over the past year, we thought it was time for a reality check.

So last week, at the urging of my good friend, Senator Abraham from Michigan, nine Members of the freshman class took to the road to take our message directly to the people and bring the people's message back with us to Washington.

We visited eight cities over 4 days. What we saw and heard truly opened our eyes and, I believe, reaffirmed our mission.

In Philadelphia, we toured an empowerment zone and shared ideas on how to rebuild our troubled inner cities. The section of north Philadelphia we visited is a model for the concept that restoring neighborhoods means creating incentives for businesses to locate in urban areas. The Federal Government has made a difference, local officials told us, but the incentive is tax relief for these areas to attract businesses and jobs.

In Knoxville, 300 concerned citizens packed the auditorium at West High School for a town meeting. They cheered our progress on a balanced budget and called on us—and forcefully I might add—not to give up.

In Columbus, at a crime forum, we met with police, other law-enforcement officials, and victims of crime who shared how Washington can play an important role in making local neighborhoods safer.

Rain, sleet, snow, and even a blizzard warning could not stop a crowd from attending my town meeting in Minneapolis. We had a frank and, I believe, lively discussion covering a tremendous range of issues and the audience enthusiastically applauded our efforts to shrink the size and scope of government and return power to the States.

Employees at the Emerson Electric Co. in St. Louis sat down with us to talk about a balanced budget and just what it would mean for themselves and their families. It was heartening to hear their words of support, especially since our budget is specifically targeted at improving their lives, and the lives of every hard-working, taxpaying, middle-class American family.

In Tulsa, we met with small business owners—the men and women who create the jobs on Main Street—for a roundtable discussion organized by the Metropolitan Tulsa Chamber of Commerce.

Again, they thanked the Members of the 104th Congress for taking such a strong lead in bringing job providers relief from the stranglehold of Federal regulations and mandates.

Our whirlwind tour ended in Cheyenne, with a final opportunity to hear from the voters at a town hall meeting at the Cheyenne Civic Center.

At each stop, the people thanked us for taking our message directly to them and bypassing the curtain of misinformation draped over the issues by the congressional Democratic leadership, the White House, and too often, the media. They repeatedly shared their frustrations at hearing only one side of the budget debate.

And at each stop, they asked ''why can't you reach a compromise with the President on a balanced budget?''

The President's latest budget plan—the first plan of his that actually balances in 7 years—is similar to the four other budget plans he sent to Capitol Hill in the last year which, by the way, got no votes in the House and Senate. Throughout these weeks and weeks of budget negotiations, he has given up very little while Republicans have moved dramatically to help spur an agreement.

The President's budget cuts around the edges, but does not reform a thing. And I think we can say in one word the President's budget is a sham.

It does not reverse the kind of wild overspending that will continue to drag this Nation deeper into debt.

Spending remains unchecked under his latest plan, and $1 out of every $6 the President claims in deficit reduction comes not from cuts in spending, but from raising new revenue, new taxes.

It does not save Medicare and provide the choices for seniors our plan offers. Under the Clinton plan, Medicare remains a relic from 1960's that no longer works in the 1990's.

His budget does not reform Medicaid, either. We say let the States run Medicaid, and they will do a better job. The President's plan says, again, Washington has all the answers.

He does not offer meaningful tax relief. His tax cuts amount to only token tax relief, and with $66 billion in new taxes, the President's budget does nothing to reduce the tax liability of the country. His version of the $500-per-child tax credit is slowly phased in and then eliminated in 2002, and applies only to children 12 years old and younger.

He does not make fundamental changes in welfare to control spending.

In fact, his welfare proposals spend $20 billion more than the bipartisan welfare bill passed by Congress. The President does not ''end welfare as we know it,'' he extends welfare as we know it.

In reality, the President's budget plan is just a Band-Aid on a wound that is demanding emergency surgery. Yank off the Band-Aid after 7 years and the wound will not be healed, it will have festered and grown.

Mr. President, it will do no good to balance the budget in 2002 if it all unravels in 2003. And without a solid framework to work from, that is precisely where we would be heading under the President's version of a balanced budget.

That is how the freshman class answered the question each time we were asked why we have not been able to reach a budget compromise. We will not compromise our principles. No budget is better than a bad budget.

The President is right when he says the debate over the Federal budget is no longer just about dollars. It is about dollars and about something far more important: the future direction of this Nation, and which governing philosophy ought to lead us there.

The President says maybe we should wait until the next election and let the people decide what direction they want their Government to take. But the taxpayers we met with in Knoxville, and Philadelphia, and Minneapolis, and Tulsa last week told us that is the change they thought they voted for in November 1994, when they turned this Government around by electing a new majority in Congress.

You know, President Clinton is going to come here to the Capitol tonight to deliver what will undoubtedly be a passionate speech on the State of the Union.

As we all know, he can be an impressive speaker. He will speak fervently and forcefully and, with any luck, he will wrap up in time for Sunday's Super Bowl kickoff.

I hope that what we hear tonight is a message of leadership, an acknowledgement of the awesome responsibility with which a President is entrusted, and a willingness to put aside a narrow political agenda in order to do what is best for the American people.

Only great leadership will lead this Nation toward the great days that await us.

What I am afraid we will get instead is a campaign event—the great kick-off to Bill Clinton's 1996 re-election campaign.

Judging by the folks we met around the country last week, he may have a tougher go of it than he thinks in the weeks and months ahead because at every stop on our freshman tour, Americans offered us their full support.

''Do not back down,'' ''Hold the line,'' they said. ''Get the budget balanced, but do it right.'' A lot of people told us they would be willing to wait a year for a responsible budget agreement, if that is what it takes.

Maybe then, they said, somebody a little more serious about balancing the budget will be occupying the Oval Office.

And so the revolution of 1994 continues, Mr. President.

That is the strong message my freshman colleagues and I bring with us back to Washington. And for our colleagues who may not have ventured beyond the confines of the Beltway recently, that is the message the American people are demanding we do not forget.

Mr. HELMS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina is recognized.

Mr. HELMS. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. HELMS and Mr. FAIRCLOTH pertaining to the introduction of S. 1520 are located in today's RECORD under ''Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.'')

FRESHMAN TOUR

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I rise to follow my friend, the Senator from Minnesota, in noting what I thought was useful, and that was the tour of freshman Senators throughout the country, actually, starting here in Washington, on through the Midwest, and ending up in Cheyenne, WY.

It seemed to me to be a very useful kind of an activity. Our theme was ''Promises Made, Promises Kept.'' I think it was appropriate that 9 of the 11 new freshmen in this body participated. We made 10 stops in 9 States to talk about this kind of commitment to the things that had brought us to the Senate in 1994. I think we all agreed in general that there was a message in 1994, and that message basically was the Federal Government is too big and costs too much and we need to change the regulatory restrictions on the opportunities in this country.

That has been the effort of this freshman class, and to a large extent this body during that year. We have felt some kinship in that we have come here together, we did share this commitment, and we were committed to change. We had just come from an election where, I think, that message perhaps permeates a bit more than those who have been here before, perhaps.

There has been a great deal of success, I think, in that message. We have not accomplished specifically all the things that we would like to but the major change has been the turn of the debate. I think most anyone who has watched the Congress over the last 25 years would have to say that the conversation has basically been centered around those programs that have been in place for 25 years. They largely came in the Lyndon Johnson Great Society time, and each year most of the time has been spent saying, ''How much more money do we put into the program? If it has not worked as well as it should, we will put more money in.''

Now that debate has changed somewhat. The debate has change markedly. We are talking for the first time in 25 years about a balanced budget. We are talking for the first time in 25 years about how you spend less rather than more. That is a significant change in the framing of the debate in this country, a significant change in the direction that this Congress would take, and hopefully that this country would take.

We have talked about things like reducing spending as opposed to continuing to add more to the deficit, to add more to a $5 trillion debt. We talked about a balanced budget. We have not had a balanced budget in almost 30 years. This is the first time that a balanced budget has been presented to the President of the United States. Unfortunately, he saw fit to veto it.

We have talked about entitlement changes. Most anybody who looks at our financial situation fairly has to see that we have to do something about entitlements. You cannot change the direction of spending by simply talking about those things that are discretionary. Two-thirds of the spending is in entitlements. You have to change that. Of course it is difficult. But we have set about to do that. We have talked about welfare reform, to make welfare the kind of program that most everyone believes it ought to be, where you help people who need help, but help them get back into the system, back into the workplace.

Middle-income tax reform—instead of the largest tax increase in the history, which is what we had 2 years ago, we are talking about middle-income tax relief. Also line-item veto, term limits, regulatory reform.

That is what has happened. We are very pleased about that and we took that message to the country. In addition to that message, I think we took some facts. We sort of evolved into politics by posturing and to a situation of policy by perception rather than facts. It is ironic. We have the ability to present facts to the whole world in a second. Fifty years ago it was months after something was done here before people even knew about it. Now we have this great opportunity, but unfortunately we are doing governing by advertising, doing governing by spinning.

We talk about gutting Medicare. Nobody in this place is interested in gutting Medicare. In fact, when you look of course at the numbers, why, obviously, it is not. That is what we talked about.

We talked about fundamental change. We heard a great deal of positive response to that. People who are aware of the benefits that come from balancing the budget, the fact that we can lower interest rates, reduce the cost of mortgages, and reduce the cost of loans to send your kids to school, and we can talk about being responsible for going into a new century without continuing to add costs to the debt for our kids to pay.

I want to say that I think this trip was very useful and I am pleased that my colleagues were willing to take their time to go. I am particularly pleased they went to Cheyenne, WY. We had the largest town meeting we have ever had there. Not everyone is in agreement how to do it, but the preponderance of people say we need to be responsible. We need to look to the future. One little guy in the audience had a computer. We talked about $5 trillion debt, he divided it by the number of people and announced we each owe $17,000, and we were dazzled a little by the technology, but the answer is right, we do.

Mr. President, what we need here is leadership. We need to provide for the direction of this country. We do not need obstructionism. We do not need insistence on the status quo. This is a great country with a great future. We have the best opportunity that we have ever had to strengthen that future and make it a land of responsibility and the land of opportunity.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time for morning business be extended until 3:40.

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

CONCERN OVER CONGRESSIONAL RECESS

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I have sought recognition to express my concern about our being out of session for the next considerable period of time in the context of the gridlock and breakdown over the negotiations of the budget. It is my hope that the negotiators will continue the budget negotiations because of the importance of reaching a resolution on those subjects, and that we will not have a recurrence of the shutdown of Government, as we have had twice in the course of the past several weeks, or that there will not be a resort to the debt ceiling issue as an instrument of, candidly speaking, political blackmail—which I think will be unsuccessful. If we are not able to resolve the budget disagreements, that we will at least crystallize the issue and make that the election issue in 1996.

I made this point back on November 14, on the second day of the first governmental shutdown. It seemed to me from the start that this was bad policy. From the reaction of the American people, that view was confirmed. That is simply not the way to run the Government of the United States.

I think the budget negotiators, however, have worked hard and there has been considerable progress made. I have taken a look, in reviewing the issues, and believe that the negotiators with more work can come to a conclusion. The central point is to have a balanced budget—a matter of enormous importance.

There has been an agreement in principle by the Republican-controlled Congress and Republican-controlled White—almost a Freudian slip, to make the Republicans control the White House as well. We have a divided

Government, but at least there has been agreement on that principle. There is a substantial question as to whether the balanced budget proposal offered by the administration meets the ''fair'' criterion, since so much of it is deferred until the years 2001 and 2002. But I think there is ample room for negotiation, in order to have a realistic agreement made in those terms.

I spoke on this matter to some extent yesterday and wish to amplify it today. One set of figures which bear repeating are the statistics on the narrowing of the gap between the parties on major issues such as Medicare, where the rate of increase is reduced in the conference report passed by the Republican-controlled Congress. Note it is not a cut but rather a reduction of the rate of increase by $270 billion, which has since been reduced to $168 billion. The administration first agreed to $102 billion and now recommends reducing the rate of increase by $124 billion. So there is a gap now remaining of $44 billion, considerably closer than what had been initially in the range of $168 billion.

Similarly, on Medicare, the original position of the Republican-controlled Congress was $133 billion, since reduced to $85 billion with the administration at $59 billion on a reduction on the rate of increase. So that gap is narrowing.

Similarly, on the tax cut, the House figures are in the range of $350 billion and were reduced to $245 billion in the conference report. That has since been reduced further to $203 billion, while the administration proposes $130 billion.

I have taken a close look at a number of the structural points in disagreement, while working with others in the House and Senate, to try to report out a bill on the Appropriations Subcommittee for Labor, Health, Human Services and Education, a subcommittee which I chair. I have had extensive negotiations with Donna Shalala, Secretary of Health and Human Services, Richard Riley, Secretary of Education, and Robert Reich, Secretary of Labor and find that the principal issues arise in the Departments of Education and Health and Human Services.

As I have taken a look at the various issues, it seems to me that middle ground can be reached. If you take a look at the medical savings account, which is a controversial item, or the Medicare opt-out position as to HMO's back and forth, or the Medicare beneficiary part B payments, or the issue of balance billing by doctors, or the concern which has been expressed over the regulation of doctors' fees—all of those matters—if you take the congressional position as opposed to the administration position, you find there is middle ground available.

If you look at the Medicaid issue, in addition to the figures narrowing, the structural matters also are subject to compromise.

If you take a look at welfare, there again, compromise is possible. Where the welfare reform bill passed by the Senate with overwhelming numbers, some 87 Senators voting in favor of the measure, there was a great deal of reliance on the block grants. There is an area for compromise on providing the bulk of welfare related programs through block grants but certain specific programs should remain with standards established by the Federal Government. I think the statement made by the very distinguished Senator from Maine, Margaret Chase Smith, is worth repeating, when she distinguished between the issues of the principle of compromise as opposed to the compromise of principle. We are not talking about freedom of speech or freedom of religion or first amendment issues. We are talking about dollars and cents. And we are, really, very, very close together.

So it is my hope that the negotiators will continue, because I think agreement is within reach, and when we are talking about the central principle of a balanced budget, that is something that we ought not give up on. We ought to continue to work to try to narrow the gap, and I hope that we will continue to do that.

CAMPAIGN SPENDING LIMITS

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, January 29, which is next Monday, will be the 20th anniversary of the decision of Buckley v. Valeo. I had intended to comment on January 29, the anniversary date of that decision which established as a principle of constitutional law that any individual could spend as much of his or her money in a campaign as he or she chose. That issue was a matter of substantial consternation to me when the decision was handed down and, I think, remains a major impediment on public policy in the United States on the way we run our election campaigns, where, realistically viewed, any seat is up for sale.

There have been many, many examples of multimillion-dollar expenditures in this body, the U.S. Senate, the U.S. House of Representatives, and in State Government, and now we are witnessing one for the Presidency of the United States.

The fact of life is, if you advertise enough on television, if you sell candidacies like you sell soap, the sky is the limit. Even the White House of the United States of America, the Office of the President, may be, in fact, up for sale if someone is willing to start off by announcing a willingness to spend $25 million. If you have $400 million, that is not an enormous sum; you have $375 million left. Somebody might be able to get along on that. You might spend $50 million or even $75 million to promote a candidacy, both to articulate a positive view and then, perhaps even more effectively, to articulate a negative view.

This is a subject I have been concerned about for a long time because I filed for the U.S. Senate back in 1975 announcing my candidacy for the U.S. Senate on November 17, 1975, in the first election cycle where the 1974 election law was in effect. At that time the spending limitation applied to what an individual could spend, and, for a State the size of Pennsylvania, it was $35,000. I decided to run for the office of U.S. Senate against a very distinguished American who later became a U.S. Senator, John Heinz. After my election in 1980, he and I formed a very close working partnership and very close friendship. I have only the best things to say about Senator Heinz.

But, in the middle of that campaign, on January 29, 1976, the Supreme Court of the United States decided Buckley v. Valeo and said a candidate can spend any amount of money. My later colleague was in a position to do so and did just that. That made an indelible impression upon me, so much so that when the decision came down on January 29, I petitioned for leave to intervene as amicus and filed a set of legal appeals, all of which were denied.

But it seemed to me since that time, as I have watched enormous expenditures in campaign financing by individuals, that simply was unsound constitutional law and certainly unsound public policy. There is nothing in the Constitution, in my legal judgement, which guarantees freedom of speech on any reasonable, realistic, logical constitutional interpretation which says you ought to be able to spend as much money that you have to win an elective office. I think it is high time for the Congress of the United States and the 50 States to reexamine that in a constitutional amendment, which is currently pending.

Senator HOLLINGS has proposed the amendment for many Congresses, and I have joined with him and sometimes I have proposed individual constitutional amendments. But as we approach the 20th anniversary of Buckley v. Valeo, we ought to take a very serious look at it. And we may have a striking impetus for change in that law by the Presidential campaign which is currently underway. So, in advance of the 29th, I urge my colleagues to take a very close look at this issue which I think has very serious implications for the electoral process in America.

I thank the Chair. It is now 3:40. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. SPECTER. And I do suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

STATUTORY DEBT CEILING

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, it would be just 16 years since I came to the Senate floor to speak to a large new idea in our politics which seemed to me was then taking shape and which, as I do believe, has since become a central fact of American government. This was the idea on the part of those who legitimately, from their perspective, felt that the U.S. Government had become too large, too interfering, too dominant in the affairs of the State and local governments, and in general moving in a direction that this group did not desire.

They spoke to the futility of seeking to dismantle the great edifice of Government that had been growing, not truly since the New Deal, but since the beginning of the century with the administrations of Theodore Roosevelt, Woodrow Wilson, and thereafter, of course, President Franklin Roosevelt, President Johnson, President Nixon —a growth in Government that had never been fully accepted by all parts of the electorate, nor need it have been, and now was attaining very considerable opposition.

The effort to reverse this direction by repealing this statute and amending that and reducing this program and such was not so much countervailing as beyond the capacities of the legislature. Indeed, the Government had attained to a size and complexity that dismantling even a small part of it was a huge enterprise. So the reasoning of this new school was that this would never succeed.

What would indeed succeed, it was argued, was to deprive the National Government of revenue. By systematically reducing revenues through tax cuts, there would come a time when there was simply not the available resources to maintain the level of outlay that was then taking place.

This had many informed and sophisticated iterations, if you like, but the whole idea was put in one compact phrase that appeared in the first year of the administration of President Reagan. And it was in usage in the White House, as we understood. It was ''starve the beast.''

At that time, 1980, the debt of the Federal Government was about $900 billion, a sizable enough sum but in no way an unmanageable one. Debt had risen during the two world wars and had been brought back down. Some debt occurred in the 1930's, nothing spectacular; revenues were well within the range of obligations, and the Government was moving forward.

Two things then happened. Government outlays began to grow very rapidly as several entitlement programs took hold. Medicare is but the most important example. A good indicator, also, however, is Medicaid. Medicaid, which is a Federal entitlement to persons with very limited resources. Those Medicaid costs doubled in the 8 years of the administration of President Reagan, doubled again in the 4 years of the administration of President Bush. If you project this trend, as we have done, and put them in the form of a geometric progression, you find that the costs of Medicaid would double on the 29th of December of this year. So those outlays began to go up rapidly.

Then in 1981, there was a large tax reduction, and revenues ceased to grow. The income tax brackets were indexed so that there was not an inflationary increase in revenues that had previously been the case during the 1970's.

Mr. President, we passed five tax cuts, and indeed the level of inflation in 1980 was such that the Office of Management and Budget anticipated a surplus even with the tax reductions.

The 1982 recession brought that inflation down. The tax cut took hold. And so we were on a path simultaneously of increased outlays and reduced revenues, very much that which those who advocated this particular approach had anticipated.

What they had not anticipated was that President Reagan, who very much wanted a tax reduction, did not want programs reduced in any large amount and certainly in no very few particulars. Mr. David Stockman, President Reagan's Director of the Office of Management and Budget, in his memoirs, ''The Triumph of Politics,'' records the options he would present the President. There was a program, it costs this much, it should be abolished, it should be left alone, it should be reduced a little, and the President, in the kind of generous nature we know he has—happily—cut it a little, perhaps, but nothing large was done. Instead, debt in enormous amount was incurred.

We went from a debt of about $900 billion to a debt of almost $5 trillion in a very short time, and debt service began to crowd out other activities of the Federal Government. While there had been very little articulation of this theory—''starve the beast''—the practice has gone forward with extraordinary, almost inexorable, relentless thoroughness. We are now in this 16th or 17th year since I first spoke on the matter, and the situation approaches crisis.

The crisis that we come to is the working out of the theory, if you might, the debt having attained to its present level, the decision is being talked about of not extending the debt any further, with the consequence not that we would reduce the size of the American Government—a legitimate strategic objective I did not necessarily share; I do not disavow it in every respect nor does anybody in this Chamber. The idea today would be not to extend the debt ceiling and let the U.S. Government default on its obligations for the first time in our history.

I was remarking, Mr. President, to the Democratic caucus at noon today that in 1814, the British invaded Washington, burnt the White House, burnt this Capitol Building, the part just the other side of the door here, the original building. They did not burn the Marine Commandant's house, because they were staying there, but they overtook the Capitol completely. The President fled, the Congress fled, and the Nation seemed in the most dire possible circumstances: Our Capitol had been seized. Yet the service on the national debt continued to be paid. I think it probably was the case it was most paid overseas and in specie out of various subtreasuries.

In that degree of crisis in a newly formed nation, not fully even formed perhaps, we never defaulted. We never defaulted during the Civil War. The question did not arise in the great wars in the 20th century. But here, in a moment of peace, we may be about to do this. The consequences would be immeasurable. From the very height of its position in the world and in the history of the world, the United States would become a nation in default, a nation whose currency is in question, whose debt has, in effect, been repudiated.

We may not think of it this way. We may not imagine others thinking of it this way. It could happen, Mr. President, and if we do not do something in the next days, it very possibly will happen. The unimaginable, the unthinkable will happen.

We have reached the debt ceiling of $4.9 trillion. Either we raise the debt ceiling or we undermine the foundations of American democracy and the American economy and who knows what in the world at large.

I might recede and say, Mr. President, during the last Congress, I then had the honor to be chairman of the Committee on Finance. We raised the debt ceiling twice, not out of any unconcern for the deficit, but out of the realistic appreciation of what we could do.

In August 1993, we passed in this body a deficit reduction package of $500 billion. It was signed. It brought about the largest reduction in the deficit in history. Interest rates declined—a fiscal dividend—or as described by Secretary Rubin described, a reduction in the deficit premium on interest rates.

We did that, and we reduced the deficit. At the same time, we had to increase the debt ceiling. Twice we did that, leaving it at $4.9 trillion. This last November 9, I came to the floor and offered an amendment to increase the debt ceiling just a very small amount to $4,967,000,000,000, enough to get us through, as I hoped, until there was a Budget Reconciliation Act agreed to. And knowing what we would have to have in the way of additional debt expenditure in the course of the next 2 years, we could then pass a proper 2-year debt ceiling increased to perhaps $5,500,000,000,000.

That measure—offered, as I say, on November 9—failed by a vote of 47 to 49, a very close margin. Two votes would have put us over into the present moment, but not to a true resolution of a 2-year prospect.

Mr. President, in the absence of that, the debt ceiling was soon reached, and

the Secretary of the Treasury was reduced to borrowing moneys in ways that were entirely lawful but not really anticipated as a more than temporary steps to avoid a debt crisis. He had to deal with the fact that the Federal Government was without a budget. I say, it is no accident that this was the 11th time since 1981 that the Federal Government has been without a budget and without resources.

Within 1 year of my having observed this strategy here on the Senate floor, it was in effect. They were short-term events. They were referred to as monument closings: The Government would close down for a day and some national facilities would not be available but with no real interruption of the Government itself.

This time, we have had the longest shut down ever. It is not perhaps noticed, but we almost shut down the Federal courts, the third branch of Government, indispensable to governing but of itself the least dangerous branch, as one of the ''Federalist Papers'' referred to it.

It depends entirely on the Congress and the Executive to provide these choices. It had none. It was at the point where it would not have had money to pay criminal and civil jurors or security guards. The prospect of the Federal courts closing was upon us, and we did finally act, but only almost reluctantly, not as if performing a duty, but dealing with an irritating necessity.

Now, here we are again. Yesterday, the Secretary of the Treasury told us in the most explicit terms that he has reached the end of measures that he can legally take, that he is willing to take, or legally can take, the two being coterminous. He has said that he has three final measures. He will suspend the reinvestment of approximately $3.9 billion in Treasury securities held by the Exchange Stabilization Fund. That is the total amount of dollars in that fund. If we were to use the German mark and Japanese yen also, the dollar would be subject to the most extraordinary turbulence in world markets. The Secretary also said that the Federal Financing Bank will exchange $9 billion in assets in its portfolio, primarily, I believe, from the Tennessee Valley Authority, with which the distinguished Presiding Officer is very familiar, and several other Government activities, which he can do. The exchange of assets will permit the Treasury to obtain $9 billion in cash.

Finally, he has the ability to extend the 12-month debt issuance suspension period. That, I have to say, is what we are in, a debt issuance suspension period, from 12 months to 14 months. This will permit the Treasury to obtain an additional $6.4 billion in cash by temporarily using interest-bearing assets of the civil service retirement fund. And that is it. Nothing more.

These actions would raise $19.3 billion. They will take the U.S. Government through until February 29 or March 1. At that point, sir, the U.S. Government will default on its obligations—something that could not have been imagined in the world 20 years ago. We are facing it, but we are not facing up to it. I had hoped that I might offer a measure to increase the debt ceiling, a clean simple increase, on tomorrow, or on Thursday, but I understand we may not be in session. On Friday, I will try to do this, but it is not clear whether it will be possible with the continuing resolution that keeps the Government open for certain purposes and the rest of the fiscal year. Then I am told we will not be back until February 26. That is 3 days before default.

I would hope something would concentrate our minds. This measure would simply allow the Federal Government to meet its obligations while the negotiations about the budget continue between the Congress and the administration. There is room for agreement in those negotiations. The distinguished senior Senator from Pennsylvania was on the floor just now talking about the areas where no principle is involved. It is just a question of at what rate Medicare outlays grow. They are growing at say 9 percent, and another party says 8 percent, and another party says 7 percent. They are only discussions of increments where if there is a will, there is surely a way to agreement.

Maybe there is no will to reach final agreement on some issues that are thought to be of principle. Very well, let us have a national election. We are going to do that. The Republican Party caucuses begin—I guess, caucuses for both parties will begin in Iowa and then primaries in New Hampshire, and off we go. It is an extended period. There are days when you can wish this were Canada and if we had to have a national election we could do it in 2 weeks' time, and people would know what the issues are and vote and settle them for the parties involved, and the Parliament would resume.

We have a Constitution and we will abide by it. It provides for quadrennial elections and we will have them. It is all very well if we do not create a catastrophic crisis or undergo a catastrophic failure in the interval. We have to increase the debt ceiling. Secretary Rubin, an honorable man, the able Secretary of the Treasury, has done what he can do under law. He is acting as his predecessors did in the Reagan administration and in the Bush administration. But he can do no more than the law allows. He will do no more than the law allows. And the world watches.

I would say, if I could direct my views principally to the Congress, reach some agreement with the President and agree on what you can agree to, let the rest be decided in the Presidential election, and let the Government go forward.

I would also speak to the President in this matter. The President has a responsibility that goes far beyond electoral politics. He is required under the Constitution—and I sometimes think this is the only thing in article II that he is required to do. It says, ''He shall take care that the laws be faithfully executed.''

Certainly, those laws extend to preserving the full faith and credit of the United States. If, in some measure, agreement with the Congress would permit the debt ceiling to be extended and the solvency of the U.S. Government, the value of U.S. currency, the worth of the American credit and faith in our word, if in some measure this requires giving more in the way of negotiations than otherwise might be the case, I would say, sir, he has that responsibility, just as the Congress has an equivalent responsibility. This is something that transcends the issue of which party will have a majority in the next Congress or what kind of majority, which party will have the White House and under what circumstances.

These are temporary measures. They come and they go. This comes with regularity. What happens in November—2 years from that there will be another set of congressional elections, and 4 years another Presidential election.

There will never be a moment after a default on the debt like the two centuries preceding. This will scar our national existence. We will be remembered in history for this—not for what we did to the Medicare trust funds, not for what we did to the Tax Code or this entitlement or that discretionary program. This is what will mark our time—mark our time in history.

We will not be forgiven nor would we deserve to be if, in a feckless, short-sighted, irritated, calculating, what-do-the-overnight-polls-say mode, we bring about an irreversible disaster to the American Nation.

That is the option before us. We do not need to. We clearly are of the view that we should not. On November 9, a mere two votes separated the decision to extend the debt ceiling. We know that. We know we have to do it. To fail to do it, we fail in our first obligations as Members of the Congress. The President, too, must understand he has an obligation to help see that this does not come about.

We can do it, Mr. President. It will require 20 minutes in either body. If it takes all day, we take all day. There is no argument against this measure. If there is one Member of the Senate who wishes to stand up and say I think it would be a good thing if the U.S. Government defaulted on its debt, such that every Treasury bond in every investment portfolio, every retirement trust becomes, suddenly, a piece of paper not backed by the full faith and credit of the United States, if we want that, if we want the yen to become the world reserve currency, if we want our inflation to double, if we want our unemployment to suddenly soar, or see our national growth collapse, it is all within our power, and it will not simply be a negative act, it will have been

an affirmative choice because we know what the consequences will be.

I cannot think we will do this. If there is any Member of the Senate who thinks we ought, he or she is welcome to come to the floor. There will be none. We know what to do, I hope in a bipartisan spirit as we have done in the past. This is something that the Nation needs, and no party would wish to deny. I hope we do this, Mr. President. I dare not think of the consequences if we do not.

I see my friend, the distinguished member of the Finance Committee on the floor. I yield the floor.

AGRICULTURE

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I want to speak for a few minutes as a member of the Senate Agriculture Committee, not as a colleague of my colleague from New York as a member of the Finance Committee, and I want to discuss the 1995 farm bill, which obviously is not going to be a 1995 bill. It will be a 1996 farm bill if and when we ever get one passed.

It is January 23, 1996, but the farm bill that should have been in place by early fall, 1995, is still unresolved. So all across the country farmers are buying their seed, meeting with their bankers, making plans to cultivate and grow crop, all without knowing what the next farm program will be.

When I say it should have been done by early fall, I want to make clear to my colleagues that the reason for this is that when you do fall tillage, preparing the fields for the seed of the next spring, you need to make those decisions at harvest time of the crop that grew in 1995.

In a very real sense of the word for people who are planting crops in the Southern States of our great country, those are important agriculture regions, as well, they are only 2 or 3 weeks away from planting. In my State, it is going to be 2 months until we reach that point.

Everybody ought to understand that it is not the day you go to the field that you decide on certain things related to the 1996 crop. You need to know that months ahead of time. One of those factors—maybe farmers would rather not have this be a factor—but one of those factors is, what is the Government program toward agriculture? Probably in each of the last, except for 1 or 2 years out of the last 20 years, there has not been any slowness on the part of the Congress in this regard. Farmers have known well in advance what the Government's position was on agriculture and their decisions could wisely and timely be made in preparation for the next year's crop.

Now here we are, January 23, 1996, and we still do not let the farmers of America know what the Government's program is toward agriculture.

In the last few weeks, Mr. President, there has been a lot of finger pointing as to who was responsible for this situation. Some Members of the other side of the aisle would have you believe that Congress failed in its responsibilities to act on the farm bill last year. They would have you believe that Congress held no hearings, had no floor debate, and passed no farm bill.

Mr. President, not only do I come to the floor to urge quick resolution of the lack of a farm bill, but I think that we should also set the record straight. Basically it means taking the politics out of this debate. It is time to leave the ideology to the side. It is time to get down to the very important practical aspect that in the upper Midwest where my State of Iowa is, within 2 months of farmers going to the field, and right now in the Southern States of the United States they are probably 2 weeks from that point. It is time to put our constituents and our farmers above political posturing in Washington and enact a farm bill into law.

Contrary to the rhetoric coming from our Democratic colleagues in this body, in this Chamber, and also through the media, particularly my colleagues from the other side of the aisle, this Congress did act on the commodity provisions of the farm bill. Last year the Senate Agriculture Committee held at least 15 hearings, heard testimony from over 150 witnesses. Then in October the Senate debated and passed the commodity provisions of the farm bill as part of the Balanced Budget Act.

While I am talking about the Balanced Budget Act, and farmers are asking about the farm provisions that were in it, I also take advantage of the opportunity to say to the farmers of the United States, there are probably more important provisions in the Balanced Budget Act of 1995 than the commodity provisions that they ought to be aware of that are going to benefit agriculture to a greater extent than even the commodity provisions.

That would be, first of all, balancing the budget, reducing interest rates 1.5 to 2 percentage points a year. Multiply that times a $160 billion debt in agriculture and that adds up to real money in the pockets of farmers of America, just from balancing the budget.

Two other provisions very helpful to getting young people into agriculture, passing land and operations on from one generation to another generation of farmers, are the capital gains tax reduction and increasing the exemption, the estate tax exemption, and also having a special exemption, which was in this bill, when small businesses and farms are passed on to people within the family, an exemption of $1 million. This is what it is going to take, in rural America, to get young people into agriculture.

But I want to repeat that even though there were all these other good things for agriculture in the Balanced Budget Act, we did have the commodity provisions of the 1995 farm bill in that act. The Senate did debate and did pass a farm bill in 1995. Not only was there debate on the floor of the Senate at that time, but there were at least five amendments relating to the farm bill that were offered, debated, and voted on by the Senate.

These amendments included a very comprehensive farm bill alternative, a proposal put forward by our colleagues on the other side of the aisle. That specific alternative was rejected by the Senate by a bipartisan vote of 68 to 31.

So, what happened to the farm bill that we passed last year? As you know, it passed both Houses of Congress and was sent to the President for his signature. Unfortunately, the farm bill, as well as all these other good provisions of the Balanced Budget Act of 1995, was vetoed by the President. That is the reason why, on January 24, 1996, we are still discussing a 1995 farm bill.

Let us start this year with a clean slate by setting the record straight. The Republican Congress debated, voted on and passed a farm bill in 1995. Now maybe we can get beyond the politics of this issue and do what is best for our farmers. The farmers of this country deserve to know what the farm program will be this year and they need to know as soon as possible. The time for delay is over. The farmers also need to know what both sides want in a new farm bill.

The farm bill passed by the Republican majority in 1995 represents the most significant reform in farm legislation in the last 60 years. Under this provision, farmers will no longer have their planting decisions dictated by the politicians and the bureaucrats in Washington, DC. The reality of the budget crisis in Washington dictates that farmers must—and it is what farmers want to do—earn more of their income from the marketplace as opposed to the Federal Treasury.

If that is the case—and that is the environment we are in, the budget realities as well as the realities of the foreign trade environment, the freeing up of foreign trade—if this is the case, then, the farmers are going to get less support from the Federal Treasury. The shackles of Government regulation and the red tape that is inherent therein must be removed so that U.S. farmers have a fair chance to compete with our foreign competitors.

The farm provisions contained in the Balanced Budget Act do this. They remove the planting restrictions imposed on the farmers. They remove the Federal Government's authority to require that productive farmland be removed from production. In short, they send a very clear signal to the rest of the world that the U.S. farmer will compete for every sale in every marketplace.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I was not aware of a time restriction. Could I ask for 5 additional minutes?

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

Mr. GRASSLEY. Now, what has the other side had to offer as an alternative to the Republican plan? Most often, although not totally, we hear about a 1-year extension of the current program. To me, this idea has several problems. An extension of the current program ignores the reforms that have been made and that farmers have now come to expect. The farmers in my State want, they expect, and they deserve the regulatory relief provided by the Republican farm bill provisions. Furthermore, an extension would literally deprive rural America of billions of dollars. First, a 1-year extension would require farmers to pay back money they have already received as advance deficiency payments. Many of the farmers in Iowa had very poor crops this year due to heavy rain during the planting season. Particularly that is true of southern Iowa, northern Missouri, and western central Illinois. Yet by a 1-year extension, people are suggesting that they would force these farmers to write checks to the Treasury to pay back their advance deficiency payment. It is estimated that these provisions would cost farmers more than $2.1 billion nationwide and, in my State of Iowa, $217 million.

Second, any delay in passing a new farm bill could have a devastating effect on future farm programs. This is due to the Congressional Budget Office's baseline revision that continually shows that Congress will have less money to spend on farm programs in the future. When CBO revised its baseline in November, agriculture lost $7.8 billion from that baseline. This is $7.8 billion that we could have spent under the baseline if the President would have signed the farm bill enacted in October but now is lost, due to delay.

If we pass a 1-year extension, the House Agriculture Committee estimates that agriculture could lose an additional $6 billion—an additional $6 billion. So, it is time to be very candid with our constituents. An extension will take billions of dollars out of that baseline, or, another way of saying it, out of the pockets of the family farmers, and, at the same time, out of rural America. To this Senator, these numbers make a mere extension of the current program an unacceptable alternative. And, when the truth is known to the farmers and to our constituents, I think they will find it equally unacceptable.

I think it is interesting that the same Senators who have accused the Republican Congress of gutting rural America are willing to deprive these areas of billions of dollars by putting off the passing of a farm bill for another year, through a 1-year extension.

Mr. President, the conclusion is very clear to this Senator. The Senate should pass the farm bill provisions contained in the Balanced Budget Act once again. We should do this as soon as possible, preferably this week on the continuing resolution. The farmers, the bankers, and the rest of rural America need the certainty as to what the next farm program will be.

It is high time that we put ideology aside and enact a new farm bill.

I yield the floor.

Mr. DORGAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

(The remarks of Mr. DORGAN, Mr. CONRAD, Mr. GRASSLEY, and Mr. EXON pertaining to the introduction of S. 1523 are located in today's RECORD under ''Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.'')

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I came down for another matter that will take about 2 minutes, to clear some resolutions saluting the Nebraska Cornhuskers football team and the volleyball team which have been cleared on both sides.

I ask unanimous consent at this time I be allowed to proceed for a few more minutes for that purpose.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I will not object. The measures the Senator from Nebraska is presenting have been cleared by this side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska is recognized.

COMMENDING THE CORNHUSKERS FOR WINNING THE 1994 AND 1995 NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION FOOTBALL CHAMPIONSHIPS

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I send a resolution to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 210) to commend the Cornhuskers of the University of Nebraska at Lincoln for winning both the 1994 and 1995 National Collegiate Athletic Association Football championships back-to-back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I rise today to congratulate one of the top college football programs in history—the Nebraska Cornhuskers. The Huskers have once again clinched a national championship earning back-to-back titles in 1994 and 1995. Nebraska won two consecutive championships also in 1970 and 1971. This year's repeat was made special by the fact that this is only the second time ever in college football history that a team was a consensus, undisputed champ in the major polls 2 years in a row. The last time this occurred was in the 1950's.

The Huskers decisively defeated the Florida Gators 62–24 in the Fiesta Bowl on January 2. This victory not only brought with it the national championship, but a perfect 25–0 record for the past two seasons, a 36th victory for the Huskers in the last three seasons and the worst defeat of a number 1 versus number 2 in a championship game. As for the 36 victories, the Huskers are the only team to win that many games in 3 years time. Nebraska was 36–1 overall and the 1 loss came down to a last-second field goal attempt. That field goal was the difference between a repeat and a threepeat of the national title. The Huskers defeated the Miami Hurricanes in Miami 24–17 last year for the championship.

The Huskers this year managed to play nearly everyone on the roster in many of the games and crush opponents by averaging 52.4 offensive points per game. Also when matched against Top 10 opponents this season—Florida, Colorado, Kansas, Kansas State—the Huskers smacked each by an average of 49–18.

The Nebraska program has risen above all others on the field. The Huskers have the record for the most straight bowl game appearances at 27. Between 1970 and now, they have finished 19 times in the Top 10 and 4 of those were at number 1. Additionally, in this the final year of the Big Eight, the Huskers have dominated with the most Big Eight conference championships at 20. The Huskers were victorious in the Big Eight consecutively for the last 5 years. The Huskers likewise hold the record for overall conference championships—Big Six, Big Seven, Big Eight—at 41.

As it is clear that the Huskers have been winners on the field, they have been winners off the field as well. Coach Osborne, the coach with the highest winning percentage in college football, wrote ''More Than Winning,'' a book which describes his philosophy. There is certainly more than winning and Coach Osborne, who holds a doctorate in educational psychology, tries to teach each of his players how to be winners in the bigger game of life. For example, the University of Nebraska has had the most Academic-All-Americans on its teams at 132 players. The next closest college has 82. The football program itself is number 1 with a total of first team Academic-All-Americans at 49. The next closest college has 35.

I am very pleased with the Huskers for the success that they have had over the years and another repeat of the national championship. While the 1971 match-up between Nebraska and Oklahoma has often been called the game of the century, the run the Huskers have made in the last three seasons, 1993, 1994, and 1995, deserves the caption—''the Team of the Century.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 210) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 210

Whereas Dr. Tom Osborne, the winningest coach in college football, has led the Nebraska Cornhuskers to the last five Big Eight titles, a second perfect season, and repeat of the National Championship;

Whereas the Huskers have gone undefeated at 25–0 in the last two seasons and 36–1 in the last three seasons, the most victories ever in that time span for any collegiate team;

Whereas Tommie Frazier, the great Husker quarterback, continued the unmatched Nebraska tradition by being named Most Valuable Player in the last three Championship games and finished his brilliant career with a rushing high 199 yards in the 1996 Fiesta Bowl;

Whereas the Huskers decisively won the Fiesta Bowl becoming the second football team ever in collegiate history to earn a consensus #1 rank in the major polls for two consecutive years.

Resolved, That the Senate commends the Cornhuskers of the University of Nebraska at Lincoln for having won the 1995 National Collegiate Athletic Association Football Championship.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote and I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

COMMENDING THE CORNHUSKERS FOR WINNING THE 1995 NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION WOMEN'S VOLLEYBALL CHAMPIONSHIPS

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I send a resolution to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 211) to commend the Cornhuskers of the University of Nebraska at Lincoln for winning the 1995 National Collegiate Athletic Association Women's Volleyball Championship.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I rise today to congratulate a great women's volleyball team, as a matter of fact, the best in the Nation—the Nebraska Cornhuskers. This is only the second time in the history of the volleyball championship tournament that a team east of California has won the title.

The Huskers had a spectacular season led by their great coach Terry Pettit. Coach Pettit has been with the Huskers for 18 years and has become a key part of their success. The season was also boosted by the help of Allison Weston who was named cowinner of the national Player of the Year Award. And finally, the team was raised to a level above all others on the court by a team of national championship-winning players.

The Huskers have played for the title previously in the 1980's, so being in the limelight of college volleyball is nothing new for them. What it is, however, is a feat only few have attained outside of the Pacific rim. The only other team was the Texas Longhorns.

The Huskers were incredible in a 3–1 title match versus the Texas Longhorns.

The volleyball program should be acclaimed for another great record as well and that is the success in the classroom. The University of Nebraska has 132 Academic-All-Americans, the most of any college sports, and 16 of them are on the volleyball team. Playing like champions and being champions in the classroom are two incredible accomplishments.

I am quite pleased and very impressed by the success of the Nebraska Huskers and look forward to continued excellence by our great volleyball program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 211) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 211

Whereas the Cornhusker Volleyball team under the leadership and experience of Coach Terry Pettit has risen above all others in the volleyball arena;

Whereas Nebraska player Allison Weston was named co-winner of the national Player of the Year Award assisting her National Championship winning teammates in a spectacular season;

Whereas this year's Nebraska team was only the second east of California ever to win the Volleyball Championship Tournament by winning the title match;

Resolved, That the Senate commends the Cornhuskers of the University of Nebraska at Lincoln for having won 1995 National Collegiate Athletic Association Women's Volleyball Championship.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote and I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

THE AGRICULTURAL RECONCILIATION ACT OF 1995

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, in a few moments I will propound a unanimous consent request that I know the minority will want to be on the floor to respond to.

While they are coming, let me speak for a few moments to the dilemma we find ourselves in here in the Congress, having passed a Budget Reconciliation Act, and in that budget reconciliation having a substantial portion of new farm policy that is known as the Agricultural Reconciliation Act of 1995. Of course that went to the President and, as we know, was vetoed.

The problem has been spoken to by the Senator from Nebraska, the Senator from North Dakota, the Senator from Iowa already this afternoon, with clearly differing points of view as to how that was handled. But what is clear, in my State of Idaho, is that farmers and their bankers are now sitting down to determine which acres will go into potatoes or sugar beets or barley or wheat or alfalfa crops this coming season. That means that Idaho farmers are putting together their farm plans and determining their financial structure for the coming year. They prefer to do that in the presence of U.S. farm policy.

Of course, we know that on September 30 of this past year, the farm bill has expired. As a result of that, the Secretary of Agriculture is now at least looking at the possibility of our farm policy reverting to the Agriculture Act of 1949. All of us know that simply cannot be allowed to happen. The stalemate that has resulted from the budget considerations that we are now in simply has not produced farm policy as should be expected by American agriculture.

I serve on the Senate Agricultural Committee. Chairman Dick LUGAR and I and all Members of that committee now for over 10 months have been engaged in looking at and crafting farm policy on a title-by-title basis. But because of the necessary savings that we needed to acquire in fiscal 1996 as a result of the balanced budget process that this Congress is now in, the Budget Reconciliation Act handled a substantial portion of new farm policy. Whether you call it ''Freedom to Farm'' or whether you call it the Agricultural Reconciliation Act of 1995, all of us know that there were clear and substantial changes made. We had held extensive hearings with American agriculture and all segments of the commodity interest of agriculture to craft that farm policy. We had gone to conference with the House, the Senate and the House differing substantially on approaches toward this, but all of us coming together to agree on a policy, finally, that made its way into the Balanced Budget Act of 1995. Since that time, American agriculture has had an opportunity to review it, and I must say that the reviews have been favorable.

Early on, farmers scratched their heads and said, ''How will this work,'' only to recognize the kind of new flexibility that we offer in farm policy which says to American agriculture, no longer will you have to farm to the program. You can now start farming to the marketplace, and you can begin to adjust your cropping patterns to move toward the market.

Farmers cannot wait now for this President. Farmers need to know what we are going to do. It is clearly time that we speak to that issue.

This past summer and fall, as I have mentioned, the Congress, the Senate and the House alike, have attempted to craft new farm policy resulting in an approach that brings us to a balanced budget. Somehow there appears to be a message on this floor this afternoon that American agriculture is not interested in a balanced budget.

Mr. President, that is not what we heard this year. We heard from every commodity group that they were willing to do their fair share in moving us toward that balanced budget, and in so recognizing, they would get greater flexibility in the marketplace to move their cropping programs toward the market with the kind of flexibility and planning, instead of being stuck, if you will, or found in lockstep to farm policy, afraid to lose and therefore afraid of stepping outside that.

We have provided a safety net, and that marketing loan will provide that. The loan will allow farmers a reasonable time period to market their crops. These loans will be stabilized in the market cycle and continue to protect consumers as well as the producer. It will avoid the kind of unnecessary market gyrations.

In crafting these sound programs, the Senate and the House committees worked hard and worked long, together, to solve this issue and to bring us to balance in a very diverse segment of America's economy. And that is American agriculture.

In my State of Idaho, in Florida, in Louisiana, in Colorado, in Montana, and in the Dakotas, sugar, sugar beet and cane raising remains a very important commodity crop. Inside the legislation that was vetoed by the President was, again, a new compromise, a new program, a reduction in the program. Listening to the consumer's side, we made the kind of changes that bring us to the marketplace in a variety of these areas, that allow the producer to say, ''I am farming now to the market and not to the farm.''

Planning flexibility, as I have already mentioned, could clearly be jeopardized. Traditional nonprogram crops like fruits and vegetables, in my State of Idaho, potatoes, could be thrown in jeopardy if we do not deal with this program and deal with it now.

When we saw in the Freedom to Farm Act limited flexibility, it was the Senate that spoke up and said we want flexibility so farmers can move to the marketplace in lieu of what we want to solve with a balanced budget. At the same time, we want to make sure that we protect a variety of these program crops.

Here we are, not at the 11th hour, not at the 12th hour, but well beyond that, into 1996, with a farm bill that expired on September 30, 1995, with a policy that was cautiously and carefully crafted between both the House and the Senate, put in the Budget Reconciliation Act, sent to the President, and the President vetoed it. Now, the Secretary of Agriculture—and I appreciate the Secretary's problem—is terribly frustrated by a need to conduct farm policy at the same time no law is in place as a result of that Presidential veto.

So I come to the floor tonight in behalf of our Speaker, Leader DOLE, myself, Chairman LUGAR, Chairman COCHRAN, Senator GRASSLEY, and others.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.R. 2491

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that Title I, the Agricultural Reconciliation Act of 1995, of H.R. 2491, the 7-year Balanced Budget Reconciliation Act of 1995, as vetoed by the President, be introduced as a freestanding bill; that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; that the bill be advanced to the third reading and passed, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, all without any intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DORGAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I reserve the right to object, and I will object.

I would like to comment on the offering by the Senator from Idaho under the reservation, which, as I indicated, will result in an objection to this request.

The Senator from Idaho proposes that we strip from the budget reconciliation bill the cobbled version of the Freedom to Farm Act and bring it to the floor as a separate bill and deem it passed with this action. That is, in my judgment, not a good way to legislate farm policy. It follows last year's circumstances, rather than doing what has traditionally been done with 5-year farm bills. Instead of the development of a bipartisan approach in the Agriculture Committees of the House and Senate, and a markup in which there was bipartisan participation, there was a partisan writing of a farm proposal. It was brought to the committee with this statement, ''Here is the proposal. We can have a few votes if you want, but we are all going to vote the same way. This is what we are reporting out.'' That is what was done last year. This tends, in my judgment, to follow in the same steps.

I am not ascribing any improper motives. The Senator has every right to do this, and I understand the purpose of it. But I am constrained to object, and I intend to offer a unanimous consent request on my time.

Mr. President, at this point I object to the unanimous consent request.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, before the Chair puts the consideration, I would like to explain to the Senate that this would allow the Senate to once again pass the Agricultural Reconciliation Act of 1995, thereby giving the House their opportunity to once again enact the farm bill. Farmers of this country, as I have already explained, need this legislation now. The President has vetoed it. It is very clear he has vetoed this policy.

I certainly do not agree with my colleague that this has been cobbled up. We have been 5 months in the making of this legislation, in creating these difference. I think we are moving toward planting in the Southern parts of our country. As I mentioned in my earlier comments, farmers are now sitting down with their bankers to put the farm policy together, or their farming programs together, for the year. And we certainly need legislation at this time.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 1523

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I rise to propound a unanimous consent request, and I shall explain the request.

I introduced earlier today a bill that is now deemed S. 1523 which provides for a 1-year extension of the current farm program. The bill provides for enormous planting flexibility for farmers who operate under this program to allow them to plant what they want on base acres and not having the Government tell them what to plant, when to plant it or where to plant it. So there is substantial flexibility. And third, it would provide for the forgiveness of the advanced deficiency payment for those farmers that suffered crop losses last year.

I will ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of this because I agree with the Senator from Idaho that farmers deserve an answer. They deserve certainty. They deserve to know under what farm program will they be planting in just a matter of weeks in some parts of the country as they begin their spring's work.

I do not believe this is necessarily the first choice. It is not necessarily the best choice. But the piece of legislation that the President vetoed was a budget reconciliation bill which included a farm bill that I described as a cobbled product. The President vetoed a reconciliation bill which took with it a bad farm bill.

Now, why did that occur? Because this is the first time in history that rather than debate a 5-year farm bill on its own merits in this Chamber and the House, the majority party decided to stick the farm bill in the reconciliation bill which by last July people knew was going to be vetoed.

Now, that does not talk about the merits of the farm bill itself. The merits of this farm bill would be to say, ''Disconnect the price support programs from need. If market prices are high, ignore that. Still give the farmers the payment. And if after 7 years market prices are low, ignore that. There will be no farm program.''

I do not think and did not think this was a good approach. I believe the President thinks it is not a good approach for those who care about having a network of family farms in our country in the long term. That is why we did not support this approach.

It should never have been put in the reconciliation bill in the first place. It was never done previously. Doing so produced the jeopardy that now exists for farmers in January of 1996 in not knowing what the farm program will be for spring planting.

Mr. President, for purposes of trying to provide some certainty, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. 1523, a bill I introduced earlier today providing for a 1-year extension of the current farm programs for increased planting flexibility and providing for the forgiveness of the advanced deficiency payment for those who suffered crop loss; that the bill be read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I will object. I do object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I think the Senator and I speak to the same concern, but there is one thing that has gone on this year that it is important the record reflect—the very extensive hearings, well over 6 months of hearings now on every title of the farm bill. But because we were in a uniquely different situation, and that is we had to deal with the cost and the cost impacts of farm policy, we brought those provisions of what would be a new farm bill to the floor in the budget reconciliation to gain those kinds of savings, to gain the $15 billion in savings that was necessary.

What the Senator proposes in this extension under the current law would also wreak some peril. There is no question about it. Farmers are being required to repay nearly $2 billion in 1995 advanced deficiency payments, and I think only in the freedom to farm package do we resolve that issue.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield——

Mr. CRAIG. I would be happy to yield.

Mr. DORGAN. My unanimous consent request specifically includes, as my bill does, the forgiveness of the advanced deficiency payment.

Yes, it does. On page 3.

Mr. CRAIG. Obviously, the Senator does not have page 3 for me. He has a message that is less than legible, and I would like to see the full impact of this.

I must advise the Senator and my friend here that this is not a way to pass substantive legislation. We are dealing with an entire farm package here and it is critically necessary.

I do object. And I do object by the nature of the way this has been presented.

What I am offering and what has been objected to, Mr. President, is a full and complete package that has already been debated on the floor, well disseminated and understood by American agriculture, and I think largely accepted in their recognition of needing to participate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT REQUEST

Mr. CRAIG. In light of the objections, and that which has just transpired, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of a bill I now send to the desk which would suspend further implementation of the Permanent Agricultural Law of 1949, that the bill be read for a third time, passed, and the motion to reconsider be laid on the table, without any intervening action or debate.

I now send that legislation to the desk on behalf of myself, Senator DOLE, Senator LUGAR, and Senator COCHRAN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DORGAN. Reserving the right to object. The procedure the Senator from Idaho has just used was one he described about 2 minutes ago as a procedure that is unworthy on the floor of the Senate. That is bringing a bill that has had no hearings and which I have not received. So I do not quite understand the consistency here. But, nonetheless, repealing the underlying farm legislation, the Permanent Farm Act of 1949 makes no sense under any conditions given the circumstance we are in now.

We find ourselves in late January with no farm policy except an underlying permanent law. The reason I assume that some want to get rid of the permanent law—and they would get rid of the permanent law in the Freedom to Farm Act—is because they believe in the long term there ought not be a farm program, there ought not be a safety net for family farmers.

That is the reason this provision existed in the Freedom to Farm Act. It is one of the reasons I opposed the Freedom to Farm Act. I think there ought to be a farm program to provide some basic safety net for a family out there that is struggling with a few acres. Farm families are trying to make a living with twin risks: one, planting a seed that you do not know whether it will grow, and, second, if it grows you do not know whether you will get a price. Those risks are impossible for family farmers to overcome in circumstances where international grain prices dip and stay down.

The proposal being offered is a recipe for deciding we do not need family farms, what we need are agrifactories. So I cannot support that. I am here because I care about family farms, care about their future, and want them to have a decent opportunity to succeed.

I do not impugn the motives of anyone, and especially the Senator from Idaho. I am sure he wants the same thing for family farmers but probably finds a different way to achieve that. But I cannot support anyone who believes we ought not be left with some basic safety net for farm families out there who are struggling against those twin risks. So I am constrained to object to the unanimous-consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, before the Chair rules, let me explain why I presented this legislation. It is detailed in the sense of the titles of the law of 1949 that it would repeal. Obviously, in hearing from the Secretary of Agriculture, he, by the action of his own President in vetoing the Budget Reconciliation Act that laid farm policy out in it, is in a tremendous quandary at this moment. He has to implement a very cumbersome and costly law, the provisions of the 1949 Agricultural Adjustment Act. It does not fit modern-day agriculture.

I am sure the Senator from North Dakota and I are extremely concerned about family farms. We have worked together on that issue on the Agriculture Committee of the Senate in an effort to resolve those problems. I do not impugn his intention nor do I believe he impugns mine. But clearly we need policy. Policy has been created. Policy has been passed by this Congress. And policy has been vetoed by this President, the very kind of policy that would have created the certainty, that would have avoided the kind of frustrations that the Senator and I are involved in right now.

So by action here tonight I have attempted to say that which has been worked on should be freestanding legislation, that we ought to have a right to vote up or down on it, and that I hope then that the President would sign it. It certainly offers the kind of budgetary savings that he has offered in the cuts in discretionary spending and at the same time it allows the flexibility to avoid the downsizing of purely a budget-driven farm policy.

It allows the flexibility of a market-driven farm policy that protects American agriculture, that certainly protects the family farm, but also recognizes that they too are businesses that have to compete like everybody else in the small business sector of our society. It does provide a safety net, but it does set together a plan, a 7-year plan that allows them to create and move into the market away from simply farming to the program.

If there is one thing I heard from Idaho agriculture and that I heard from Midwestern agriculture, it is ''Give us the flexibility so we don't find ourselves totally constrained to a farm program that may not be all that profitable.''

I laughed a bit this afternoon when there were my colleagues coming to the floor talking about the freedom to farm as a welfare program. When we talk about welfare, one of the phrases that has always gotten used is that we provide a safety net to the recipient. Yet the record shows that the words ''safety net'' were oftentimes used by my colleagues as they decried the idea of a welfare program.

Offering stability, offering baseline, and at the same time offering movement into the market is not welfare. And nobody that is a producer and a hard worker out there that I know in my State that is a farmer or rancher is going to argue they are a recipient of a

welfare program, whether it be the Freedom to Farm Act or whether it be current policy.

Mr. President, we need action. This President needs to act. He needs to come to the table to work with us on a balanced budget and in so doing to be able to craft and move or resolve the issue that we are currently involved in that has brought real stalemate to the agricultural communities of our country.

That is why I propounded these two very important unanimous consent requests this afternoon, to see if it would not move our President off center and allow flexibility, both for the Senate and for our Secretary, to get on with the business of telling American agriculture what they can expect in the coming crop year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President. Actually the words ''safety net'' came from President Ronald Reagan who described a series of programs that represented the safety net, an important one of which is Social Security. I do not expect anyone here would make the case that Social Security is welfare or that Ronald Reagan meant that Social Security was welfare. That is a program workers pay into and at some point get some returns when they reach retirement.

So to use the words ''safety net,'' using the term of President Reagan, was to refer to the opportunity to try to provide some help for people who need some help through a series of programs, some of which might be welfare but many of which were not, including Social Security which is not a welfare program and the farm program which was never a welfare program.

EXTENDING THE CONTINUING RESOLUTION

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I would propose one additional unanimous-consent request and am constrained, I guess, not to offer the third. I felt that as long as we were offering unanimous consent requests, the most logical-unanimous consent request is to come here and say, well, let us at least now understand that Friday we have a CR that needs extension or we will have a shutdown.

The shutdown, it seems to me, is an example of what we have been through a couple of times, of poking taxpayers in the eye by saying, ''You pay for a couple hundred thousand people that will be prevented from coming to work, and we insist you pay for them,'' and then dangle Federal workers in front of this debate and say, ''By the way, you're the pawns we're going to use.''

If we have not been cured of Government shutdowns and the chaos that comes by using CR's as some kind of a line in the sand here where everybody else pays but nobody else suffers, if we have not cured ourselves of that apparently there is no cure for what ails us.

My urge is to offer a CR that says, let us extend the CR that expires on Friday at a minimum of 2 weeks, but I shall not do that. I will not do that in deference to the leadership. I think if one were to do this sort of thing, one would want to notify the leadership.

So my urge is to want to do this, and maybe sometime I will, as long as someone else comes out wanting to offer unanimous-consent requests. But I will not do that in deference to the leadership today.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT REQUEST

Mr. DORGAN. I will offer one additional unanimous-consent request. It does deal specifically with something that I know the Senator from Idaho cares about because he raised it a few minutes ago. He was concerned I did not include it in my legislation. That is some forgiveness of the advanced crops deficiency payments for 1995.

My legislation on page 3, which I introduced earlier today, and is at the desk, provides for the forgiveness of certain advanced deficiency payments for those crop producers who suffered a loss.

The Senator from Idaho raised that. I know he cares about it and I care about it. If we cannot pass the entire bill, let us at least pass that entire provision that both of us care about and both of us think should be passed. The forgiveness of the advanced deficiency payments is critically important to a lot of family farm producers out there. We do not need a large debate about that. Let us go ahead and do this.

So I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of a bill to provide for forgiveness of 1995 advance crop deficiency payments, as I described, and that the bill be read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRAMS). Is there objection?

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I have to object this evening. Maybe this is the kind of legislation that we could include in the CR this coming Friday. I think the Senator from North Dakota and I both know well that we are going to have to deal with a continuing resolution come Friday; that we are not going to shut the Government down anymore; that the President does not want to shut the Government down anymore.

At least out of all of this budget discussion that has gone on for the last good number of weeks, both the executive branch and the legislative branch have come to that conclusion, and I agree that that is the proper conclusion.

The Senator brings up an important point, that is why I brought it up, because it was not in his original unanimous consent, and I had hoped that we be thorough in dealing with this issue. I am glad the Senator has brought it up. It is a question of great concern. It is a repayment of nearly $2 billion of advance deficiency payments.

I hope that we can resolve this issue, but it is not a separate issue to be resolved tonight. I think the Senator has brought it to the floor with just intention, and because he has raised the issue to the level of visibility that he does tonight, I hope that maybe that is something we will consider as we deal with final resolution toward the end of the week of a continuing resolution, but I do object at this time.

Mr. DORGAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I know it is technical, but I did include that in my first unanimous-consent request. It was something I mentioned in connection with three provisions in the UC that I offered. But I observe, this is not a rider that needs a horse. This is a provision that does not need to wait for Friday. It does not need to wait for next July. It does not need to wait for something else that is moving. It can be done any time.

The reason I offer it is, I would like to see an extension of the current farm bill for a year with the provisions I suggested. If that is not possible, I would like to see us decide to tell farmers what is possible. It ought to be possible for us to deal with the forgiveness of advance deficiency payments. It does not, as I said, need something else coming along to jump on. This is not a cargo looking for a train. This is an idea we ought to advance.

I encourage us, if we cannot do it tonight, let us do it tomorrow. If we cannot do it tomorrow, let us do it the next day.

The one thing I suggest to the Senator from Idaho, when we talk about continuing appropriations and shutdowns—I am delighted there will not be any more shutdowns, and I pray there will not be, because I do not think it serves anyone's interest. Nobody wins. The way we are able to avoid that is the way we are able to convince everybody in this Capitol Building on all sides that they cannot use this as leverage any longer; they cannot threaten someone over a CR—''If you don't have this, we won't enact a CR''—and that is what results in a shutdown.

Let me say, I understand the objection. I expected the objection. My hope is that perhaps tomorrow—I do not know if anybody will be doing unanimous-consent requests tomorrow, but if we do, I have a number of good ideas. This is one of them, and I would like this idea to sort of lead the parade here. We should do the things that both of us would agree on, that both of us think are important for our farmers, that both of us believe would represent good policy. If that is the case, let both of us do it together, either now or tomorrow morning.

I guess since there is an objection now, maybe we can talk about it again tomorrow. Again, I understand exactly what has happened. This, one way or another, needs to get resolved.

The Senator from Nebraska was on the floor, the Senator from Iowa, the

Senator from Idaho, my colleague from North Dakota. All of us have said exactly the same thing. We have said it with fingers pointing in different directions, I guess. That is a habit I hope we get over this month and maybe the rest of the year, not talking so much about what happened but what should happen, what must happen, what must we do to make this a better country.

We all described one common goal today, and that is, we ought to provide an answer to rural America. The Senator from Idaho probably has had the same experience I have. I went to a farm show, and I was talking to a lot of farmers. I was talking to a fellow who sells Ford pickup trucks. He was talking to me. He said, ''You know, I need to find out from you, when on Earth are you going to pass a farm bill?''

I said, ''Why are you so interested in that? Do you have crop acreage out there?''

He said, ''Oh, no, I don't have crops. What I have are farm customers. I have farm customers who were going to buy a pickup who now say, 'I am not going to be able to make this purchase until I find out what the circumstances are going to be for the farm bill.'''

You need to understand it is not just farmers. It is agribusiness. It is people who sell vehicles and supplies. Everybody out there is facing the same kind of problems as a result of this uncertainty.

So my hope is that the expression by all of us in the last few hours might result in some common good here. If we can get together and talk about this, we can probably find a key to unlock this and move ahead and give farmers the answer they deserve.

We only do this once every 5 years. It is pretty hard to foul this up. But, in my judgment, a mistake was made when it was decided to piggyback it on something else that was moving along. That is to piggyback it on reconciliation. We have never done that before. I do not think it is the right thing to do.

What is past is past. The question now is: How do we extract from this and decide to do this the right way?

The interesting thing, I say to the Senator from Idaho, is we have two leaders in this Senate who come from farm country. Senator DOLE, of course, is from a big grain-producing State, and Senator DASCHLE has represented farmers many years from the State of South Dakota.

We have two leaders who know a lot about agriculture. Both of them know a great deal about these issues. I know both of them have tried—in fact, Senator DASCHLE is a cosponsor of the legislation I just discussed and introduced today—to provide some answers.

My hope is all of us can get together and start figuring out a way to bridge this gap and solve this problem. I hope perhaps the Senator and I could talk again in the next day or so and see if we can just incrementally address these issues. Maybe the first increment is the advance deficiency payment.

So, with that, I ask unanimous consent to add Senator EXON as a cosponsor to the legislation that I introduced today.

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

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. CRAIG addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, the Senator from North Dakota and I probably agree more than we disagree on agricultural policy, and I think both he and I recognize the importance of our concerns this afternoon and what we have tried to say from the Senate to the leaders of the Senate and to the President.

The President cannot be allowed to only have rhetoric on this issue. He must show action. He has to come forward, and he has not yet come forward with a farm plan.

Clearly, this morning at the White House, with the discussion among our agricultural leaders, our Senate and House leaders and the Secretary, in all fairness but with no criticism, this administration is without a plan as we speak. That simply has to change if we are to work out our differences on farm policy.

Budget reconciliation, Mr. President, over the years has taken a variety of forms, and it takes those forms as the budget requires it to. Those provisions of the farm bill or farm policy that are in budget reconciliation are those that drive budgets—conservation, farm credit, some of those that are not there. We are not through with those. We will ultimately package a farm bill this year, and I think the Senator from North Dakota and I both recognize that for it to be freestanding on this floor, a very large part of it has to be bipartisan, and we will work at every effort to solve that.

The work that we did earlier this year that found its way into budget reconciliation did get a lot of support. It is not to say that it did not get support. The American Farm Bureau supported it, the National Corn Growers Association supported it, the National Grain Trade Council supported it. I noticed the North Dakota Grain Growers Association lent their support to it, the Iowa Cattlemen, the Iowa Corn Growers. Obviously, my colleague mentioned the majority leader. Well, Kansas was right in there offering the support to it from the Kansas Association of Wheat Growers and bankers and feed and grain associations and Kansas Fertilizer and Chemical Association. It is a bill that offers broad-based support to American agriculture, and I think it is important that the Record show that.

There are disagreements, and there are differences. My colleague from North Dakota and I are tremendously concerned about what has happened in discretionary spending over the last good number of years, to see that direct payments to American agricultural producers from 1986 to today has been reduced in real dollars about 60 percent. The problem we have now is trying to balance all of that out.

Ironically enough, when we gained majority here in the U.S. Congress, we knew that to get the kind of budget control we had to have, we could no longer go to the discretionary side, as my colleagues party has gone for one too many year, and we had to go to entitlements. Even though we brought agricultural spending down, there is no question that that happened with policy change. We are gridlocked here today over entitlement battles. If we are still going to get the budget savings and leave entitlements untouched, I am afraid that my colleague from North Dakota and I are going to be locked together in a battle to protect agriculture.

This administration still wants to take much too much out of discretionary spending and free up or allow relatively untouched a variety of the entitlement areas. What we tried to offer was some balance. There is disagreement at this time, and I hope we can arrive at a balanced budget. The President has finally agreed to 7 years and CBO. But there is a lot of difference out there still.

The one thing I think my colleague and I agree on this evening is the immediacy of the situation with American agriculture. We are not going to see another shutdown. Programs are going to be funded. But how long will they be funded, and how far into the next cropping season? The signals we send now and in the next few months are going to be ever so important, as American agriculture begins to farm and puts together its budgets and farm programs, buys the new pickup, if you will, looks at the new combine, puts the budget together for the fertilizer, seed grain, corn, and all of that. That is what it is all about. I hope that by the weekend, possibly, we can have resolved this issue. Maybe it will come with a CR on Friday, maybe it will not. But I certainly hope that all parties involved will engage and get it resolved so that we can send a critical message to agriculture in this country, which they are now asking for.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, the Senator from Idaho and I have, long ago, worn out our welcome. But I did just want to add a point about the administration. The Senator from Idaho said gingerly that this administration had no farm plan, was not active or engaged in the farm bill debate. I do not want that to pass. We have an Agriculture Secretary, former Congressman Dan Glickman, who comes from Kansas, who was confirmed with unanimous support. He knows agriculture and had served on the House Agriculture Committee. He knows it very well. He is a strong advocate for family

farmers, as is the President. In fact, because I was part of the budget negotiations, Senator EXON and I were involved in many of the negotiations, some at the White House.

I have seen the President's reaction weighing in on the agriculture issues. He very much wants there to be a safety net or a farm program that helps family-size farms in this country. He hired and appointed an Agriculture Secretary who believes that very strongly. I do not want the moment to go and let someone listening say, ''Well, gee, they said nobody down at the White House cares.'' Secretary Glickman, I think, is a terrific Secretary of Agriculture, selected by this President, representing this President, to try to get a better farm program. Hopefully, all of us can work together. There will be no solution to the problem without Secretary Glickman and President Clinton's active involvement. The meeting this morning, I think, was called by Secretary Glickman. They are active, engaged, and involved, and they want to solve this problem.

I hope, along with the Senator from Idaho, that by the end of this week we will have advanced by this discussion today the interest of providing some answers to family farmers in this country, but especially providing the right answers for the long-term.

I yield the floor.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

TWO HEROES

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I would like to talk just briefly about two Americans I want to bring to the attention of my colleagues—two heroes of mine.

I have never met these men. I talked to one them on the phone the other day, a fellow named Robert Naegele. Mr. Naegele started a company called Rollerblade, which some of you may know about. It is the largest in-line skate company in America. I learned about Mr. Naegele and his company in an article I read in the Minneapolis Star Tribune when I was travelling through Minneapolis the other day by plane.

Robert Naegele sold his company 2 months ago. He apparently made an enormous amount of money. He started the company from scratch, ran it, turned it into a $250 million business and then sold it recently. Then, about a week before Christmas, 280 employees of this company began to get letters in the mail from Mr. Naegele and his wife, Ellis. It turns out that he decided to give the people who had worked for his company—the people who worked in the factories and made the skates and made him a very wealthy man—a Christmas bonus equal to $160 a month for every month these folks had worked for the company.

For some of them who had been there the entire 10 years he owned the company, it meant more than $25,000. But he wasn't done. He and his wife had prepaid the income taxes on the bonuses so when these folks opened up their check, totally unexpected, from someone who no longer owned the company, they got a check that was tax free.

What this man was saying to them was: You mattered. You people who worked in the plant and factories and helped make this product, you are the ones who made me successful. You made me some money, and I want to share it with you. What a remarkable story. What a hero!

This guy is out of step with the CEOs in our country who now say the way to the future is to downsize, lay off and cut the ground out from under the feet of people who have worked for a company for 20 years. Mr. Naegele, on the other hand, says to his workers, who are weeping with joy about his unexpected benevolence: ''You matter to me. You made a difference. You made this company successful, and I want to share it with you.''

What a remarkable man! It seems to me if more CEOs in this country would understand what Mr. Naegele understands, this country would be a better place. Our companies could be better able to compete. You would have more loyalty and more job security for people who have spent 10 and 20 years investing their time in a company.

The day after I read the article about Mr. Naegele, I read a similar one. It was about a fellow whose company began to burn down on December 11 in a small town in Massachusetts. The man's name was Aaron Feuerstein. He was about to go to his 70th birthday party—a surprise party that was being thrown for him—when he learned that a boiler had exploded at his textile mill setting off a fire. It injured 27 people and destroyed three of the factory's century-old buildings. His plant employs 2,400 people in an economically depressed area.

The people who watched the mill burn felt that they were going to lose their jobs and lose their futures. When Feuerstein arrived to assess the damage to a business his grandfather had started 90 years ago, he kept himself from crying by thinking back to the passage from King Lear in which Lear promises not to weep even though his heart would ''break into a hundred thousand flaws.'' Mr. Feuerstein said, ''I was telling myself I have to be creative.'' And 3 days after the fire, he had a plan.

According to the Time magazine article:

On the night of Dec. 14, more than 1,000 employees gathered in the gym of Central Catholic High School to learn the fate of their jobs and of the cities of Methuen and Lawrence. Feuerstein entered the gym from the back, and as he shook the snow off his coat, the murmurs turned to cheers. The factory owner, who had already given out $275 Christmas bonuses, and pledged to rebuild, walked to the podium. ''I will get right to my announcement,'' he said. ''For the next 30 days—and it might be more—all our employees will be paid their full salaries. But over and above the money, the most important thing Malden Mills can do for our workers is to get you back to work. By Jan. 2, we will restart operations, and within 90 days we will be fully operational.''

* * * * *

True to his word, Feuerstein has continued to pay his employees in full, at a cost of some $1.5 million a week and at an average of $12.50 an hour—already one of the highest textile rates in the world. And even better than his word, Malden Mills was up and running last week at 80% of its Polartec capacity, thanks to round-the-clock salvage work and the purchase of 15 new machines. ''I haven't really done anything,'' says Feuerstein. ''I don't deserve credit. Corporate America has made it so that when you behave the way I did, it's abnormal.''

I just want to say again that I think Robert Naegele and Aaron Feuerstein are heroes. I think they both recognize what a lot of people in this country have forgotten. A company is its workers. Yes, it is its investors, it is its innovators, it is its scientists, and it is also its workers. Workers matter, and these heroes have done what more American business leaders should do. Too many American businesses now say to those workers, ''You are like a wrench. We use you, and we get rid of you when we choose to.''

What Mr. Naegele and Mr. Feuerstein are saying is that workers are their business. The workers determined whether their businesses were successful. And both of them have committed themselves to their workers. And I say to Mr. Naegele and Mr. Feuerstein that they are American heroes to me, and I wish there were more employers like them in this country.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the two articles I mentioned be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Minneapolis Star Tribune]

IT WAS A SURPRISINGLY GREEN CHRISTMAS FOR ROLLERBLADE EMPLOYEES

(By Dee DePass)

Two weeks ago Rollerblade employee Ann Reader, six months pregnant with her third child, called her husband, Tim, from work sobbing. He immediately thought the worst, she said.

But it was good news for Reader and all of Rollerblade's 280 employees. Former Rollerblade co-owner Robert Naegele and his wife, Ellis, played Santa over the holidays, giving each of Rollerblade's employees thousands of dollars in tax-free money, figured at about $160 for each month of service with the company. Sources familiar with the giveaway estimated the combined gifts to be $1.5 million.

Reader, team programs manager, has worked there for more than 6 years—making

her check worth more than $11,000. None of the employees contacted would confirm the amount of their checks.

''It made me cry,'' said Reader in a shaky voice. ''I think it was so generous of them. It was an amazing gesture.''

Rollerblade spokesperson Deborah Autrey said, ''It was a complete surprise that came out of the blue. People were laughing and crying and hugging. I have never seen people in such a stupor.''

Autrey has worked at Rollerblade for four years. More than half of the employees are warehouse workers with most receiving hourly wages.

Naegele, who was chairman during the phenomenal growth of the 15-year old firm, could not be reached for comment. Two months ago he sold his 50 percent share of Rollerblade to Nordica Inc. of Italy for an undisclosed amount. He bought 50 percent of the in-line skate company in 1985, when sales were only $500,000. Sales in 1994 were $265 million.

In Christmas cards to employees, Naegele wrote that he had reaped great rewards from his Rollerblade investment because of the employees' hard work and that he wanted to show his thanks, Autrey said. Enclosed in the cards were the gift checks, on which the Naegeles paid federal taxes.

''That way the employees did not get hit with a double whammy. It is a tax-free gift,'' said Autrey.

The checks were mailed to employees' homes the week before Christmas. The first arrived on Dec. 21 to an employee who was home on maternity leave. From there word spread among the workers, and later that day it was confirmed by the company's chief executive, John Hetterick, who had only found out the day before.

When the good news reached Matt Majka, 33, the director of product marketing, he immediately phoned his wife, Kym, and asked her to open the mail. When she did, Majka heard sobs. He has been with the company for 11 years, making his check worth an estimated $21,120.

''It was very moving,'' he said.

''It was very heartfelt for us. We were extremely shocked and extremely grateful for his generosity. . . . All the words he talked about for so many years—about teamwork and that we are a family—he put his words into action.''

Majka and his wife have a 4-month-old baby and a 2-year-old son, and the Naegeles' gift went to start a college fund for them, he said. The couple also had a new IBM computer under the Christmas tree.

Reader said she bought bikes for her two children (and a bike baby carrier for the newest family member) and she plans to put some of the money away in savings.

Majka marveled at what the gift meant to scores of his co-workers. ''There are some people who have worked in our warehouse and have been here for a long time,'' he said. ''For some people, they have received a very substantial check, maybe half of their year's salary. It's pretty amazing.'' At least two employees have been there for all of the company's 15 years.

''I happened to talk to Bob [Naegele] later that night,'' Majka said. ''I told him, 'You can't imagine the impact you have had on everyone.' He bellowed and said, 'That is just what I wanted to hear.' He said, 'This is not mine. It is a gift I had to share.'''

[From Time Magazine, Jan. 8, 1996]

THE GLOW FROM A FIRE

(By Steve Wulf)

Methuen, Massachusetts, is a small city not unlike the Bedford Falls of It's a Wonderful Life. Over the years, the working-class town on the border of New Hampshire and Massachusetts has come to rely on the good heart of one man. While Aaron Feuerstein may not look much like Jimmy Stewart, he is the protagonist of a Christmas story every bit as warming as the Frank Capra movie—or the Polartec fabric made at his Malden Mills.

On the night of Dec. 11, just as Feuerstein was being thrown a surprise 70th birthday party, a boiler at Malden Mills exploded, setting off a fire that injured 27 people and destroyed three of the factory's century-old buildings. Because Malden Mills employs 2,400 people in an economically depressed area, the news was as devastating as the fire, according to Paul Coorey, the president of Local 311 of the Union of Needletrades, Industrial and Textile Employees. ''I was standing there seeing the mill burn with my son, who also works there, and he looked at me and said, 'Dad, we just lost our jobs.' Years of our lives seemed gone.''

When Feuerstein arrived to assess the damage to a business his grandfather had started 90 years ago, he kept himself from crying by thinking back to the passage from King Lear in which Lear promises not to weep even though his heart would ''break into a hundred thousand flaws.'' ''I was telling myself I have to be creative,'' Feuerstein later told the New York Times. ''Maybe there's some way to get out of it.'' Feuerstein, who reads from both his beloved Shakespeare and the Talmud almost every night, has never been one to run away. When many other textile manufacturers in New England fled to the South and to foreign countries, Malden Mills stayed put. When a reliance on fake fur bankrupted the company for a brief period in the early '80s, Feuerstein sought out alternatives.

What brought Malden Mills out of bankruptcy was its research and development team, which came up with a revolutionary fabric that was extremely warm, extremely light, quick to dry and easy to dye. Polartec is also ecologically correct because it is made from recycled plastic bottles. Clothing made with Polartec or a fraternal brand name, Synchilla, is sold by such major outdoors clothiers as L.L. Bean, Patagonia, Eastern Mountain Sports and Eddie Bauer, and it accounts for half of Malden's $400 million-plus in 1995 sales.

Even though the stock of a rival textile manufacturer in Tennessee, the Dyersburg Corp., rose sharply the day after the fire, L.L. Bean and many of Malden's other customers pledged their support. Another apparel company, Dakotah, sent Feuerstein a $30,000 check. The Bank of Boston sent $50,000, the union $100,000, the Chamber of Commerce in the surrounding Merrimack Valley $150,000. ''The money is not for Malden Mills,'' says Feuerstein, ''It is for the Malden Mills employees. It makes me feel wonderful. I have hundreds of letters at home from ordinary people, beautiful letters with dollar bills, $10 bills.''

The money was nothing to the workers compared to what Feuerstein gave them three days later. On the night of Dec. 14, more than 1,000 employees gathered in the gym of Central Catholic High School to learn the fate of their jobs and of the cities of Methuen and Lawrence. Feuerstein entered the gym from the back, and as he shook the snow off his coat, the murmurs turned to cheers. The factory owner, who had already given out $275 Christmas bonuses and pledged to rebuild, walked to the podium. ''I will get right to my announcement,'' he said. ''For the next 30 days—and it might be more—all our employees will be paid their full salaries. But over and above the money, the most important thing Malden Mills can do for our workers is to get you back to work. By Jan. 2, we will restart operations, and within 90 days we will be fully operational.'' What followed, after a moment of awe, was a scene of hugging and cheering that would have trumped the cinematic celebration for Wonderful Life's George Bailey.

True to his word, Feuerstein has continued to pay his employees in full, at a cost of some $1.5 million a week and at an average of $12.50 an hour—already one of the highest textile wages in the world. And even better than his word, Malden Mills was up and running last week at 80 percent of its Polartec capacity, thanks to round-the-clock salvage work and the purchase of 15 new machines. ''I haven't really done anything,'' says Feuerstein. ''I don't deserve credit. Corporate America has made it so that when you behave the way I did, it's abnormal.''

Union chief Coorey begs to differ. Says he: ''Thank God we got Aaron.''

THE BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, almost 4 years ago I commenced these daily reports to the Senate to make a matter of record the exact Federal debt as of close of business the previous day. ÷

In that report of February 27, 1992, the Federal debt stood at $3,825,891,293,066.80, as of close of business the previous day. The point is, the Federal debt has increased by more than $1.1 trillion—$1,162,159,313,063.99—since February 26, 1992.

As of the close of business yesterday, Monday, January 22, the Federal debt stood at exactly $4,988,050,606,130.79. On a per capita basis, every man, woman and child in America owes $18,933.07 as his or her share of the Federal debt.

REPORT OF THE STATE OF THE UNION ADDRESS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—PM 111

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was ordered to lie on the table:

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Vice President, Members of the 104th Congress, distinguished guests, my fellow Americans all across our land.

I want to begin by saying to our men and women in uniform around the world, and especially those helping peace take root in Bosnia, and to their families. Thank you. America is very proud of you.

My duty tonight is to report on the State of the Union, not the state of our government but of our American community, and to set forth our responsibilities—in the words of our Founders—to ''form a more perfect union.''

The State of the Union is strong.

Our economy is the healthiest it has been in three decades. We have the lowest combined rate of unemployment and inflation in 27 years.

We have created nearly 8 million new jobs, over a million of them in basic industries like construction and automobiles. America is selling more cars than Japan for the first time since the 1970's, and for 3 years in a row, we have

had a record number of new businesses started.

Our leadership in the world is also strong, bringing new hope for peace. And perhaps most important, we are gaining ground in restoring our fundamental values. The crime rate, the welfare and food stamp rolls, the poverty rate, and the teen pregnancy rate are all down. And as they go down, prospects for America's future go up.

We live in an Age of Possibility. A hundred years ago we moved from farm to factory. Now we move to an age of technology, information, and global competition.

These changes have opened vast new opportunities, but they also present stiff challenges. While more Americans are living better lives, too many of our fellow citizens are working harder just to keep up. And they are concerned about the security of their families.

We must answer three fundamental questions: How do we make the American dream of opportunity a reality for all who are willing to work for it? How do we preserve our old and enduring values as we move into the future? And how do we meet these challenges together, as one America?

We know Big Government does not have all the answers. There is not a program for every problem. We know we need a smaller, less bureaucratic government in Washington—one that lives within its means.

The era of Big Government is over. But we cannot go back to the time when our citizens were left to fend for themselves. Instead, we must go forward as one America—one nation working together, to meet the challenges we face together. Self-reliance and teamwork are not opposing virtues—we must have both.

I believe our new, smaller government must work in an old-fashioned American way—together with all our citizens, through state and local governments, in the workplace, in religious, charitable, and civic associations.

Our goal must be: to enable all our people to make the most of their own lives with stronger families, more educational opportunity, economic security, safer streets, a cleaner environment, a safer world.

To improve the state of our Union, we must ask more of ourselves; we must expect more of each other; and we must face our challenges together.

Our responsibility here begins with balancing the budget in a way that is fair to all Americans. There is now broad bipartisan agreement that permanent deficit spending must come to an end.

I compliment the Republicans for the energy and determination they have brought to this task. And I thank the Democrats for passing the largest deficit reduction plan in history in 1993, which has already cut the deficit nearly in half in just 3 years.

Since then, we have all begun to see the benefits of deficit reduction: lower interest rates have made it easier for business to create new jobs, and have brought down the cost of home mortgages, car payments, and credit card rates to ordinary citizens. Now it is time to finish the job. Though differences remain among us, the combined total of the proposed savings common to both plans is more than enough, using numbers from your Congressional Budget Office, to balance the budget in 7 years and to provide a modest tax cut. These cuts are real; they will require sacrifice from everyone.

But these cuts do not undermine our fundamental obligations to our parents, our children, and our future by endangering Medicare, Medicaid, education or the environment, or by raising taxes on the hardest pressed working families.

I am willing to work to resolve our remaining differences. I am ready to meet tomorrow. But I ask you at least to enact these savings so we can give the American people their balanced budget, a tax cut, lower interest rates, and a brighter future.

We must make permanent deficits yesterday's legacy.

Now it is time to look to the challenges of today and tomorrow. Our Nation was built on challenges, not promises. When we work together to meet them, we never fail. That is the key to a more perfect union: our individual dreams must be realized by our common efforts.

Tonight, I want to speak about the challenges we face as a people.

Our first challenge is to cherish our children and strengthen American families.

Families are the foundation of American life. If we have stronger families, we will have a stronger nation.

Strong families begin with taking more responsibility for our children. It is hard to be a parent today; but it is even harder to be a child. All of us—our parents, our media, our schools, our teachers, our communities, our churches, our businesses, and government—have a responsibility to help children make it.

To the media: I say you should create movies, CD's and television shows you would want your own children and grandchildren to enjoy. I call on Congress to pass the requirement for a ''V'' chip in TV sets, so parents can screen out programs which they believe are inappropriate for their younger children. When parents control what their children see, that's not censorship. That's enabling parents to assume more responsibility for their children. And I urge them to do it. The ''V'' chip requirement is part of the telecommunications bill now pending. It has bipartisan support, and I urge you to pass it now.

To make the ''V'' chip work, I challenge the broadcast industry do what movies have done, to identify your programming in ways that help parents protect their children.

I invite the leaders of major media corporations and the entertainment industry to come to the White House next month to work with us on concrete ways to improve what our children see on television. I am ready to work with you.

I say to those who make and market cigarettes. Every year, a million children take up smoking; 300,000 of them will have their lives shortened as a result. My administration has taken steps to stop the massive marketing campaign that appeals to our children. We are saying: Market your products to adults, if you wish—but draw the line on children.

I say to those on welfare: For too long, our welfare system has undermined the values of family and work, instead of supporting them. Congress and I are near agreement on sweeping welfare reform.

We agree on time limits, tough work requirements, and the toughest possible child support enforcement. But we must also provide child care so that mothers can go to work without worrying about their children. So I challenge Congress: Send me a bipartisan welfare reform bill that will really move people from welfare to work and do right by our children, and I will sign it.

But passing a law is only the first step. The next step is to make it work. I challenge people on welfare to make the most of this opportunity for independence. And I challenge American business to give them a chance to move from welfare to work. I applaud the work of religious groups that care for the poor.

More than anyone else, they know the difficulty of this task, and they are in a position to help. Every one of us should join with them.

To strengthen the family, we must do everything we can to keep the teen pregnancy rate going down. It is still too high: Tonight I am pleased to announce that a group of prominent Americans is responding to that challenge by forming an organization that will support grass roots community efforts in a national campaign against teen pregnancy. And I challenge every American to join them.

I call on American men and women to respect one another. We must end the deadly scourge of domestic violence. I challenge America's families to stay together.

In particular, I challenge fathers to love and care for their children. If your family has separated, you must pay your child support. We are doing more than ever to make sure you do, and we are going to do move. But let's all admit: A check will never be a substitute for a father's love and guidance, and only you can make the decision to help raise your children—no matter who you are, it is your most basic human duty.

Our second challenge is to provide Americans with the educational opportunities we need for a new century.

Every classroom in America must be connected to the information superhighway, with computers, good software, and well-trained teachers. We are working with the telecommunications industry, educators and parents to connect 20 percent of the classrooms in California by this spring, and every classroom and library in America by the year 2000. I ask Congress to support our education technology initiative to make this national partnership successful.

Every diploma ought to mean something. I challenge every community, school, and State to adopt national standards of excellence, measure whether schools are meeting those standards, cut redtape so that schools have more flexibility for grassroots reform, and hold them accountable for results. That's what our Goals 2000 initiative is all about.

I challenge every State to give all parents the right to choose which public school their children attend, and let teachers form new schools with a charter they can keep only if they do a good job.

I challenge all schools to teach character education: good values, and good citizenship. And if it means teenagers will stop killing each other over designer jackets, then public schools should be able to require school uniforms.

I challenge parents to be their children's first teachers. Turn off the TV. See that the homework gets done. Visit your children's classroom.

Today, higher education is more important than ever before. We have created a new student loan program that has made it easier to borrow and repay loans; and dramatically cut the student loan default rate. Through AmeriCorps, our national service program, this year 25,000 students will earn college money by serving in their local communities. These initiatives are right for America; we should keep them going.

And we should open the doors to college even wider. I challenge Congress to expand work study and help one million young Americans work their way through college by the year 2000; to provide a $1,000 merit scholarship for the top 5 percent of graduates in every high school; to expand Pell grant scholarships for deserving students; and to make up to $10,000 a year of college tuition tax deductible.

Our third challenge is to help every American achieve economic security.

People who work hard still need support to get ahead in the new economy—education and training for a lifetime, more support for families raising children, retirement security, and access to health care.

More and more Americans are finding that the education of their childhood simply does not last a lifetime.

I challenge Congress to consolidate 70 overlapping job training programs into a simple voucher worth $2,600 for unemployed or underemployed workers to use for community college tuition or other training. Pass this GI bill for America's workers.

More and more Americans are working hard without a raise. Congress sets the minimum wage. Within a year, the minimum wage will fall to a 40-year low in purchasing power. Four dollars and twenty-five cents an hour is not a living wage. But millions of Americans and their children are trying to live on it. I challenge you to raise their minimum wage.

In 1993, Congress cut the taxes of 15 million hard-pressed working families, to make sure no parents who worked full time would have to raise their children in poverty. This expanded earned income tax credit is now worth about $1,800 a year to a family of four living on $20,000. The budget bill I vetoed would have reversed this achievement, and raised taxes on nearly 8 million of these people. We must not do that.

We need a tax credit for working families with children. That's one thing most of us in this Chamber can agree on. And it should be part of any final budget agreement.

I challenge every business that can possibly afford it to provide pensions for your employees, and I challenge Congress to pass a proposal recommended by the White House Conference on Small Business, that would make it easier for small businesses and farmers to establish their own pension plans.

We should also protect existing pension plans. Two years ago, with bipartisan support, we protected the pensions of 8 million working people and stabilized the pensions of 32 million more. Congress should not now let companies endanger their worker's pension funds. I vetoed such a proposal last year, and I would veto it again.

Finally, if working families are going to succeed in the new economy, they must be able to buy health insurance policies that they don't lose when they change jobs or when someone in their family gets sick. Over the past 2 years, over one million Americans in working families lost their health insurance. We must do more to make health care available to every American. And Congress should start by passing the bipartisan bill before you that requires insurance companies to stop dropping people when they switch jobs, and stop denying coverage for pre-existing conditions.

And we must preserve the basic protections Medicare and Medicaid give, not just to the poor, but to people in working families, including children, people with disabilities, people with AIDS, and senior citizens in nursing homes. In the past 3 years we have saved $15 billion just by fighting health care fraud and abuse. We can save much more. But we cannot abandon our fundamental obligations to the people who need Medicare and Medicaid. America cannot become stronger if they become weaker.

The GI bill for workers, tax relief for education and child-rearing, pension availability and protection, access to health care, preservation of Medicare and Medicaid, these things—along with the Family and Medical Leave Act passed in 1993—will help responsible hard-working American families to make the most of their own lives.

But, employers and employees must do their part as well, as they are in so many of our finest companies, working together, puttting long-term prosperity ahead of short-term gains.

As workers increase their hours and their productivity, employers should make sure they get the skills they need and share the benefits of the good years as well as the burdens of the bad ones. When companies and workers work as a team, they do better. And so does America.

Our fourth great challenge is to take back our streets from crime, gangs, and drugs.

At last, we have begun to find the way to reduce crime—forming community partnerships with local police forces to catch criminals and to prevent crime. This strategy, called community policing, has begun to work. Violent crime is coming down all across America.

In New York City, murders are down 25 percent, in St. Louis 18 percent, in Seattle 32 percent. But we still have a long way to go before our streets are safe and our people are free of fear.

The Crime Bill of 1994 is critical to the success of community policing. It provides funds for 100,000 new police in communities of all sizes. We are already a third of the way there. I challenge the Congress to finish the job. Let's stick with a strategy that's working, and keep the crime rate coming down.

Community policing also requires bonds of trust between our citizens and our police. So I ask all Americans to respect and support our police. And to our police, I say: Our children need you as role models and heroes. Don't let them down.

The Brady bill has already stopped 44,000 people with criminal records from buying guns. The assault weapons ban is keeping 19 kinds of assault weapons out of the hands of violent gangs. I challenge Congress to keep those laws on the books.

Our next step in the fight against crime is to take on gangs the way we took on the mob. I am directing the FBI and other investigative agencies to target gangs that involve juveniles in violent crime and to seek authority to prosecute as adults teenagers who maim and kill like adults.

And I challenge local housing authorities and tenant associations: Criminal gang members and drug dealers are destroying the lives of decent tenants. From now on, the rule for residents who commit crimes and peddle drugs should be: One strike and you're out.

I challenge every State to match Federal policy: to assure that serious violent criminals serve at least 85 percent of their sentence.

More police and punishment are important, but not enough. We must keep more of our young people out of trouble, with prevention strategies not dictated by Washington, but developed in communities. I challenge all communities and adults to give these children futures to say yes to. And I challenge Congress not to abandon the crime bill's support of these grassroots efforts.

Finally, to reduce crime and violence, we must reduce the drug problem. The challenge begins at home, with parents talking to their children openly and firmly. It embraces our churches, youth groups, and our schools.

I challenge Congress not to cut our support for drug-free schools. People like DARE officers are making an impression on grade school children that will give them the strength to say no when the time comes.

Meanwhile, we continue our efforts to cut the flow of drugs into America. For the last 2 years, one man in particular has been on the front lines of that effort. And tonight I am nominating a hero of the Persian Gulf and the commander-in-chief of the U.S. Military's Southern Command, Gen. Barry McCaffrey, as America's new drug czar.

General McCaffrey has earned three purple hearts and two silver stars fighting for America. Tonight I ask that he lead our Nation's battle against drugs at home and abroad.

To succeed, he needs a force larger than he has ever commanded. He needs all of us. Every one of us will have a role to play on this team. Thank you, General McCaffrey, for agreeing to serve your country one more time.

Our fifth challenge is to leave our environment safe and clean for the next generation.

Because of a generation of bipartisan effort, we have cleaner air and water. Lead levels in children's blood has been cut by 70 percent, and toxic emissions from factories cut in half. Lake Erie was dead. Now it is a thriving resource.

But 10 million children under 12 still live within 4 miles of a toxic waste dump. A third of us breathe air which endangers our health. And in too many communities, water is not safe to drink. We still have much to do.

Yet Congress has voted to cut environmental enforcement by 25 percent. That means more toxic chemicals in our water, more smog in our air, more pesticides in our food.

Lobbyists for the polluters have been allowed to write their own loopholes into bills to weaken laws that protect the health and safety of our children. And some in this Congress want to make taxpayers pick up the tab for toxic waste and let polluters off the hook.

I challenge Congress to reverse those priorities. I say the polluters should pay. We can expand the economy without hurting the environment. In fact we can create more jobs over the long run by cleaning it up.

We must challenge businesses and communities to take more initiative in protecting the environment and make it easier for them to do so. To businesses, we are saying: If you can find a cheaper, more efficient way than government regulations require to meet tough pollution standards, then do it—as long as you do it right.

To communities, we say: we must strengthen community right-to-know laws requiring polluters to disclose their emissions, but you must use the information to work with business to cut pollution. People do have a right to know that their air and water are safe.

Our sixth challenge is to maintain America's leadership in the fight for freedom and peace.

Because of American leadership, more people than ever before live free and at peace, and Americans have known 50 years of prosperity and security. We owe thanks especially to our veterans of World War II. To Senator BOB DOLE, and all the others in this Chamber and throughout our country who fought in World War II and all the conflicts since, I salute your service.

All over the world, people still look to us. And trust us to help them seek the blessings of peace and freedom.

But as the cold war fades, voices of isolation say America should retreat from its responsibilities. I say they are wrong. The threats we Americans face respect no nation's borders: terrorism, the spread of weapons of mass destruction, organized crime, drug trafficking, ethnic and religious hatred, aggression by rogue states, environmental degradation. If we fail to address these threats today, we will suffer the consequences of our neglect tomorrow.

We can't be everywhere. We can't do everything. But where our interests and our values are at stake—and where we can make a difference—America must lead.

We must not be isolationist or the world's policeman. But we can be the world's best peacemaker. By keeping our military strong, by using diplomacy where we can, and force where we must, by working with others to share the risk and the cost of our efforts, America is making a difference for people here and around the world.

For the first time since the dawn of the nuclear age, there are no Russian missiles pointed at America's children. North Korea has now frozen its dangerous nuclear weapons program. In Haiti, the dictators are gone, democracy has a new day, and the flow of desperate refugees to our shores has subsided.

Through tougher trade deals for America, over 80 of them, we have opened markets abroad, and now exports are at an all-time high, growing faster than imports and creating American jobs.

We stood with those taking risks for peace, in Northern Ireland, where Catholic and Protestant children now tell their parents that violence must never return, and in the Middle East, where Arabs and Jews, who once seemed destined to fight forever, now share knowledge, resources, and dreams.

And, we stood up for peace in Bosnia. Remember the skeletal prisoners, the mass graves, the campaigns of rape and torture, endless lines of refugees, the threat of a spreading war—all these horrors have now given way to the hope of peace. Now our troops and a strong NATO, together with its new partners from Central Europe and elsewhere, are helping that peace to take hold.

Through these efforts, we have enhanced the security of the American people. But important challenges remain. The START II treaty with Russia will cut our nuclear stockpiles by another 25 percent; I urge the Senate to ratify it—now.

We must end the race to create new nuclear weapons by signing a truly comprehensive nuclear test ban treaty—this year. We can outlaw poison gas forever, if the Senate ratifies the Chemical Weapons Convention—this year. We can intensify the fight against terrorists and organized criminals at home and abroad, if Congress passes the anti-terrorism legislation I proposed after the Oklahoma City bombing—now.

We can help more people move from hatred to hope, if Congress gives us the means to remain the world's leader for peace.

The six challenges I have discussed thus far are for all Americans. But our seventh challenge is America's challenge to us here tonight: to reinvent our Government and make our democracy work for them.

Last year, this Congress applied to itself the laws that it applies to everyone else, banned gifts and meals from lobbyists. It forced lobbyists to disclose who pays them and what legislation they are trying to pass or kill. I applaud you for that.

Now I challenge Congress to go further: curb special interest influence in politics by passing the first truly bipartisan campaign finance reform bill in a generation.

Show the American people we can limit spending and that we can open the airwaves to all candidates.

And I appeal to Congress to pass the line-item veto you promised the American people.

We are working hard to create a government that works better and costs less. Thanks to the work of Vice-President GORE, we are eliminating 16,000 pages of unnecessary rules and regulations and shifting more decision making out of Washington back to States and local communities.

As we move into an era of balanced budgets and smaller government, we must work in new ways to enable people to make the most of their own lives.

We are helping America's communities, not with bureaucracy, but with opportunity. Through our successful

empowerment zones and community development banks, we are helping people find jobs and start businesses. And with tax incentives for companies that clean up abandoned industrial property, bringing jobs back to the places that desperately need them.

But there are some areas that the Federal Government must address directly and strongly. One of these is the problem of illegal immigration. After years and years of neglect, this administration has taken a strong stand to stiffen protection on our borders.

We are increasing border controls by 50 percent, we are increasing inspections to prevent the hiring of illegal immigrants. And tonight, I announce I will sign an executive order to deny Federal contracts to businesses that hire illegal immigrants.

Let me be clear: we are still a nation of immigrants; we honor all those immigrants who are working hard to become new citizens. But we are also a nation of laws.

I want to say a special word to those who work for our Federal Government. Today, the Federal workforce is 200,000 employees smaller than the day I took office. The Federal Government is the smallest it has been in 30 years, and it is getting smaller every day. Most of my fellow Americans probably didn't know that, and there's a good reason. The remaining Federal workforce is composed of Americans who are working harder and working smarter to make sure that the quality of our services does not decline.

Take Richard Dean. He is a 49-year-old Vietnam veteran who has worked for Social Security for 22 years. Last year he was hard at work in the Federal building in Oklahoma City when the terrorist blast killed 169 people and brought the rubble down around him.

He re-entered the building four times and saved lives of three women. He is here with us this evening. I want to recognize Richard and applaud both his public service and his extraordinary heroism.

But Richard's story doesn't end there. This last November, he was forced out of his office when the Government shut down.

And the second time the Government shut down, he continued helping Social Security recipients, but he was working without pay.

On behalf of Richard Dean and his family, I challenge all of you in this Chamber: never—ever—shut the Federal Government down again.

And on behalf of all Americans, especially those who need their Social Security payments at the beginning of March, I challenge Congress to preserve the full faith and credit of the United States, to honor the obligations of this great nation as we have for 220 years, to rise above partisanship and pass a straightforward extension of the debt limit. Show them that America keeps its word.

I have asked a lot of America this evening. But I am confident. When Americans work together in their homes, their schools, their churches, their civic groups or at work, they can meet any challenge.

I say again: The era of Big Government is over. But we can't go back to the era of fending for yourself. We must go forward, to the era of working together, as a community, as a team, as one America, with all of us reaching across the lines that divide us, rejecting division, discrimination and rancor, to find common ground. We must work together.

I want you to meet two people tonight who do that. Lucius Wright is a teacher in the Jackson, MS public school system, a Vietnam veteran. He has created groups that help inner city children turn away from gangs and build futures they can believe in.

Sgt. Jennifer Rodgers is a police officer in Oklahoma City. Like Richard Dean, she helped pull her fellow citizens out of the rubble and deal with that awful tragedy. She reminds us that, in their response to that atrocity, the people of Oklahoma City lifted us all with their basic sense of decency and community.

Lucius Wright and Jennifer Rogers are special Americans. I have the honor to announce tonight that they are the very first of several thousand Americans who will be chosen to carry the Olympic torch on its long journey from Los Angeles to the centennial of the modern Olympics in Atlanta this summer—not because they are star athletes, but because they are star citizens—community heroes meeting America's challenges—our real champions.

Now each of us must hold high the torch of citizenship in our own lives. But none of us can finish the race alone. We can only achieve our destiny together, one hand, one generation, one American connecting to another.

There have always been things we could do together—dreams we could make real—which we could never have done on our own. We Americans have forged our identity, our very union, from every point of view and every point on the planet. But we are bound by a faith more powerful than any doctrines that divide us—by our belief in progress, our love of liberty, and our relentless search for common ground. America has always sought and always risen to the challenge.

Who would say that, having come so far together, we will not go forward from here? Who would say that this Age of Possibility is not for all Americans?

America is—and always has been—a great and good country. But the best is yet to come. If we all do our part.

Thank you, God bless you, and God bless the United States of America.

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

At 4:12 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Hays, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bills:

H.R. 1606. An act to designate the U.S. Post Office building located at 24 Corliss Street, Providence, RI, as the ''Harry Kizirian Post Office Building.''

H.R. 2061. An act to designate the Federal building located at 1550 Dewey Avenue, Baker City, OR, as the ''David J. Wheeler Federal Building.''

The enrolled bills were signed subsequently by the President pro tempore [Mr. THURMOND].

At 5:31 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Hays, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, without amendment:

S. 1341. An act to provide for the transfer of certain lands to the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian community and the city of Scottsdale, AZ, and for other purposes.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second time by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. HELMS (for himself, Mr. FAIRCLOTH, Mr. HATCH, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. WARNER, Mr. MURKOWSKI, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mrs. KASSEBAUM, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. SPECTER, Mr. KYL, Mr. NICKLES, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. BURNS, Mr. HATFIELD, Mr. HEFLIN, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. LOTT, Mr. ASHCROFT, Mr. KEMPTHORNE, Mr. COCHRAN, and Mr. FRIST):

S. 1520. A bill to award a congressional gold medal to Ruth and Billy Graham; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. DOLE:

S. 1521. A bill to establish the Nicodemus National Historic Site in Kansas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. ABRAHAM (for himself and Mr. LEVIN):

S. 1522. A bill to provide for the transfer of six obsolete tugboats of the Navy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DORGAN (for himself, Mr. CONRAD, Mr. DASCHLE, and Mr. EXON):

S. 1523. A bill to extend agricultural programs through 1996, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. EXON (for himself and Mr. KERREY):

S. Res. 210. A resolution to commend the Cornhuskers of the University of Nebraska at Lincoln for winning both the 1994 and 1995 National Collegiate Athletic Association Football Championships back-to-back; considered and agreed to.

S. Res. 211. A resolution to commend the Cornhuskers of the University of Nebraska at Lincoln for winning the 1995 National Collegiate Athletic Association Women's Volleyball Championship; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. DASCHLE:

S. Res. 212. A resolution to constitute the minority party's membership on the Ethics Committee for the 104th congress, or until their successors are chosen; considered and agreed to.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. HELMS (for himself, Mr. FAIRCLOTH, Mr. HATCH, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. WARNER, Mr. MURKOWSKI, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mrs. KASSEBAUM, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. SPECTER, Mr. NICKLES, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. BURNS, Mr. HATFIELD, Mr. HEFLIN, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. LOTT, Mr. ASHCROFT, Mr. KEMPTHORNE, Mr. COCHRAN, and Mr. FRIST):

S. 1520. A bill to award a congressional gold medal to Ruth and Billy Graham.

THE BILLY AND RUTH GRAHAM CONGRESSIONAL MEDAL AWARD ACT

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I have a bill that Senator FAIRCLOTH and I are joining to offer. It is sponsored by many other Senators. It is at the desk.

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I am not sure I understood what the Senator from North Carolina said. Was the Senator calling up a bill?

Mr. HELMS. This is a bill to authorize a congressional gold medal to Billy Graham and Ruth Graham, his wife of 52 years.

Mr. BUMPERS. Is the Senator calling a bill up for debate and consideration?

Mr. HELMS. No, sir, it is to be appropriately referred.

Mr. BUMPERS. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from North Carolina is recognized.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, before I begin, several Senators have already asked to be identified as cosponsors of this measure.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Utah, Mr. HATCH; the Senator from Wyoming, Mr. SIMPSON; the Senator from Virginia, Mr. WARNER; the Senator from Alaska, Mr. MURKOWSKI; the Senator from Texas, Mrs. HUTCHISON; the Senator from Kansas, Mrs. KASSEBAUM; and Senator ABRAHAM; and Senator SPECTER of Pennsylvania be added as cosponsors, and I ask that the bill be held at the desk until the close of business today for Senators to add their names as cosponsors.

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

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, Senator FAIRCLOTH and I are genuinely honored to offer this legislation to award a congressional gold medal to two wonderful North Carolinians, Dr. Billy Graham and his remarkable wife of 52 years, Ruth Graham. I have known them for years. Billy Graham was born not far from where I was born, and I have known him very, very well since the early 1950's, when I attended his very first crusade right here at the U.S. Capitol in Washington, DC.

When the bill is signed into law, Congress will be paying tribute to a deserving couple who have spent their lives exemplifying the miracle of America—faith in God, morality, charity, and family.

Most Senators have met the Grahams; many are personal friends, as are Senator FAIRCLOTH and I. Billy and Ruth are marvelous servants of the Lord. Anybody even vaguely familiar with the Grahams' witness will agree that Billy's and Ruth's relationships with God, their love for each other and their family, and their deep-seated compassion for humanity are unsurpassed. This is the genuine spirituality that has led literally millions of Americans, and millions of others around the world, to grasp the meaning and hope of salvation.

The incredible millions who have heard the message of salvation through Billy Graham's evangelistic campaigns are testimony to his devout magnetism. For the past half century, more than 100 million people in 180 countries have personally heard Billy Graham's thrilling messages in person when they attended his rallies. Others have worshipped with him by television. An estimated total of more than 2 billion people have worshipped with Billy Graham on television. Countless others have sought spiritual help and counsel through his books, magazines, newspaper editorials, radio broadcasts, and the Billy Graham Training Center at Black Mountain, NC.

The Grahams have responded to the physical needs of people around the world through a legacy inherited from Ruth Graham's father, the distinguished Dr. L. Nelson Bell, who was a missionary to China. Dr. Bell and his family served as medical missionaries to China for nearly 25 years before returning to the Memorial Mission Hospital in Asheville, NC.

Today, the Grahams continue Dr. Nelson Bell's legacy through the ministry of the Ruth and Billy Graham Children's Health Center where the children of western North Carolina and the surrounding area receive special medical care that was unavailable before the advent of the Graham Children's Health Center. Moreover, the Grahams, through their various ministries, have extended their love and their caring by extending their loving and helping hands to the victims of disasters, the medical needy, and the disadvantaged.

Mr. President, it is fitting and proper, I think, for the U.S. Congress to honor Billy and Ruth Graham, who if anybody ever has, they have earned not only the respect of the Congress, they have earned the keys to the kingdom.

Mr. FAIRCLOTH. Mr. President, today Senator HELMS and I will introduce legislation that will authorize the Congress to present a gold medal to Ruth and Billy Graham in honor of their contributions to mankind.

The striking of the medal will have no cost to the taxpayer. Most importantly, all of this effort will benefit children in southern Appalachia and internationally.

Ruth and Billy Graham stand as shining examples of faith, family, morality, and charity. These two great North Carolinians are truly servants of the Lord and His work has been further accomplished through their lifelong efforts.

Dr. Graham's crusades have reached 100 million people in person and over 2 billion worldwide on television. He is America's most respected and admired evangelist. His newspaper columns and books reach legions of people in need of spiritual counseling. And, his loving marriage of 52 years to Ruth Graham is a touching personal achievement.

The Ruth and Billy Graham Children's Center, located at Memorial Mission Hospital in Asheville, NC, is testimony to the difference they have made in lives of others. The center's goal is to improve the health and well-being of children and to become a new resource for ending the pain and suffering of children.

Mr. President, I ask the Senate to quickly act on this honor for Dr. Graham and his wife. The prayers of many deserving children could be answered by this touching tribute to Ruth and Billy Graham.

By Mr. DOLE:

S. 1521. A bill to establish the Nicodemus National Historic Site in Kansas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

THE NICODEMUS NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE ACT OF 1996

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, time, it is said, is the savior and nemesis of history. The savior because it is the very passage of time that creates history. The nemesis because that same passage of time obliterates history. Today, in Nicodemus, KS, a community is waging a losing battle against time. To bolster them in that fight, I am introducing legislation that would establish Nicodemus, KS, as a national historic site.

Kansas is not the first place that comes to mind when people think of the Civil War and reconstruction, but we Kansans know that Kansas is to the Civil War what Sarajevo was to World War I. Border ruffians, the sack of Lawrence, John Brown, and the Pottawatomie massacre are as familiar to Kansas schoolchildren as Fort Sumter and Gettysburg. The guerrilla war that rent bleeding Kansas was the opening skirmish in the armed conflict between abolitionist and slaveholder that ended at Appomattox.

Even less well known is that out of that bitter struggle emerged a period of hope for the newly emancipated. During the 1870's, Kansas was the scene of a great migration of southern blacks seeking their fortune in what some African-American leaders described as

the promised land. One of the most important settlements founded during that time was Nicodemus. From sod burrows carved out of the prairie by the original colonists, Nicodemus flourished into a leading center of black culture and society through the turn of the century.

Today, a cluster of five buildings is all that remains of that once vibrant community. National historic landmark status has not halted the gradual decay of this monument to the struggle of African-Americans for freedom and equality. In fact, in its report entitled ''Nicodemus, Kansas Special Resource Study,'' the National Park Service indicated that ''[i]f Nicodemus is not protected and preserved by a public or private entity, it seems inevitable that the historic structures will continue to deteriorate and eventually be razed.'' It was that finding that prompted my legislation granting the town of Nicodemus, KS, national historic site status.

It is my hope that colleagues will join me in working to save this unique piece of American history.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 1521

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. FINDINGS AND PURPOSES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) the town of Nicodemus, in Kansas, has national significance as the only remaining western town established by African-Americans during the Reconstruction period following the Civil War;

(2) the town of Nicodemus is symbolic of the pioneer spirit of African-Americans who dared to leave the only region they had been familiar with to seek personal freedom and the opportunity to develop their talents and capabilities; and

(3) the town of Nicodemus continues to be a viable African-American community.

(b) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this Act are—

(1) to preserve, protect, and interpret for the benefit and enjoyment of present and future generations, the remaining structures and locations that represent the history (including the settlement and growth) of the town of Nicodemus, Kansas; and

(2) to interpret the historical role of the town of Nicodemus in the Reconstruction period in the context of the experience of westward expansion in the United States.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) HISTORIC SITE.—The term ''historic site'' means the Nicodemus National Historic Site established by section 3.

(2) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 3. ESTABLISHMENT OF NICODEMUS NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established the Nicodemus National Historic Site in Nicodemus, Kansas.

(b) DESCRIPTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The historic site shall consist of the First Baptist Church, the St. Francis Hotel, the Nicodemus School District Number 1, the African Methodist Episcopal Church, and the Township Hall located within the approximately 161.35 acres designated as the Nicodemus National Landmark in the Township of Nicodemus, Graham County, Kansas, as registered on the National Register of Historic Places pursuant to section 101 of the National Historic Preservation Act (16 U.S.C. 470a), and depicted on a map entitled ''Nicodemus National Historic Site'', numbered 80,000 and dated August 1994.

(2) MAP AND BOUNDARY DESCRIPTION.—The map referred to in paragraph (1) and an accompanying boundary description shall be on file and available for public inspection in the office of the Director of the National Park Service and any other office of the National Park Service that the Secretary determines to be an appropriate location for filing the map and boundary description.

SEC. 4. ADMINISTRATION OF THE HISTORIC SITE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall administer the historic site in accordance with—

(1) this Act; and

(2) the provisions of law generally applicable to units of the National Park System, including the Act entitled ''An Act to establish a National Park Service, and for other purposes'', approved August 25, 1916 (16 U.S.C. 1 et seq.), and the Act of August 21, 1935 (49 Stat. 666, chapter 593; 16 U.S.C. 461 et seq.).

(b) COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.—To further the purposes specified in section 1(b), the Secretary may enter into a cooperative agreement with any interested individual, public or private agency, organization, or institution.

(c) TECHNICAL AND PRESERVATION ASSISTANCE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may provide to any eligible person described in paragraph (2) technical assistance for the preservation of historic structures of, the maintenance of the cultural landscape of, and local preservation planning for, the historic site.

(2) ELIGIBLE PERSONS.—The eligible persons described in this paragraph are—

(A) an owner of real property within the boundary of the historic site, as described in section 3(b); and

(B) any interested individual, agency, organization, or institution that has entered into an agreement with the Secretary pursuant to subsection (b).

SEC. 5. ACQUISITION OF REAL PROPERTY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsection (b), the Secretary is authorized to acquire by donation, exchange, or purchase with funds made available by donation or appropriation, such lands or interests in lands as may be necessary to allow for the interpretation, preservation, or restoration of the First Baptist Church, the St. Francis Hotel, the Nicodemus School District Number 1, the African Methodist Episcopal Church, or the Township Hall, as described in section 3(b)(1), or any combination thereof.

(b) LIMITATIONS.—

(1) ACQUISITION OF PROPERTY OWNED BY THE STATE OF KANSAS.—Real property that is owned by the State of Kansas or a political subdivision of the State of Kansas that is acquired pursuant to subsection (a) may only be acquired by donation.

(2) CONSENT OF OWNER REQUIRED.—No real property may be acquired under this section without the consent of the owner of the real property.

SEC. 6. GENERAL MANAGEMENT PLAN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than the last day of the third full fiscal year beginning after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall, in consultation with the officials described in subsection (b), prepare a general management plan for the historic site.

(b) CONSULTATION.—In preparing the general management plan, the Secretary shall consult with an appropriate official of each of the following:

(1) The Nicodemus Historical Society.

(2) The Kansas Historical Society.

(3) Appropriate political subdivisions of the State of Kansas that have jurisdiction over all or a portion of the historic site.

(c) SUBMISSION OF PLAN TO CONGRESS.—Upon the completion of the general management plan, the Secretary shall submit a copy of the plan to—

(1) the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Resources of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 7. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated to the Department of the Interior such sums as are necessary to carry out this Act.

By Mr. DORGAN (for himself, Mr. CONRAD, Mr. EXON, and Mr. DASCHLE):

S. 1523. A bill to extend agricultural programs through 1996, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

FARM LEGISLATION

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, farmers, farm suppliers, farm credit agencies, and bankers are waiting. They need to know what the farm program will be in 1996. Every day that they wait for that answer is another day in which they cannot plan or prepare for planting the 1996 crops.

They are waiting for Congress to act, because the farm bill that was supposed to be debated and adopted in 1995 has not been debated nor adopted.

Congress has a responsibility to farmers to tell them what kind of farm program they will be operating under this spring. Farmers should not be the victims of the failure of Congress to enact a 5-year farm program. It was not their fault that a farm bill didn't get enacted on a timely basis.

We are rapidly running out of time. I would prefer a full 5-year farm bill that provides some fundamental reform to our current farm policies. I believe in providing a solid safety net for our Nation's family farmers, and making preservation and enhancement of our Nation's family farm system as the primary goal of our Nation's farm policy.

But we have not had a real opportunity to debate a multiyear farm bill. Nor have we had full and open hearings and committee meetings in which our Nation's farmers could effectively participate in the shaping of a farm bill. That should have been done last year, but it wasn't.

Today I am introducing legislation to provide a 1-year extension of the farm bill. I am pleased Senators DASCHLE and CONRAD have joined as cosponsors. This is not a perfect solution—but I hope it will get the ball rolling. Farmers deserve an answer about what the farm bill will be.

This bill extends our current farm law, including the Food for Progress program, conservation programs, and commodity programs for the 1996 crop year.

In addition, it provides the full flexibility that our producers have requested for permitted crops. The need for flexibility has been a common feature in almost all of the farm legislation that has been introduced and discussed this past year.

There is no reason why we shouldn't provide that flexibility this crop year, especially in recognition of the higher market prices that we are currently experiencing. This will allow producers to respond to the market signals, while maintaining the loan programs and the basic safety net available to them.

It also provides for forgiveness of advanced deficiency payments related to disaster and prevented planting situations. We need to recognize that the improved market prices do little for those producers who had short crops as a result of cropping problems this past year.

My purpose in introducing the bill today is simply to provide a vehicle for Congress to move rapidly to respond to the needs of farmers as they finalize their planning for this crop year.

I believe a 1-year extension should provide adequate time for Congress to get the farm bill job done. The delay in farm legislation has already been long enough. We should not delay it further.

If, instead of extending the current farm bill, we can on an expedited basis, debate and pass a new 5-year farm bill, then I'm all for it. But we shouldn't delay any longer. One way or another we should give farmers some certainty about the future farm bill.

Mr. President, I listened with interest to my colleague from Iowa. He is someone for whom I have substantial respect. The Senator from Iowa and I, in fact, are co-chairing one of the few bipartisan groups that exist in the Congress, and I am delighted to be doing that. I think he has a vast reservoir of knowledge on agriculture, and I have great respect for him.

I must say I disagree with some of what he just said. I disagree with the characterization of part of this debate. In fact I have sought the floor today for the specific purpose of introducing an extension for 1 year of the current farm bill. I will do that following this discussion.

I would extend the current farm bill for 1 year and make some modifications to it so that we would provide substantial planting flexibility. This is one of the features that the Senator from Iowa mentioned in the other legislation that was considered last year. I think there should be substantial flexibility with respect to any farm program, including the current farm program if it is extended for a year.

We need to give farmers the opportunity to decide what to plant, where to plant, and when to plant on base acres. My proposal to extend the current farm bill for 1 year would provide substantial additional flexibility in planting decisions for family farmers.

I would also propose that we provide a forgiveness for the advanced deficiency payments for those farmers that suffered crop losses. That is also in the legislation that I offer.

The reason I offer this legislation today is not because I think it is necessarily the best choice nor it is my first choice for farm legislation. I hope to get the ball rolling here in the Congress to do something that gives farmers some certainty.

It is now the end of January 1996. A 5-year farm bill should have been agreed to last year. The Senator from Iowa mentioned, and he is absolutely correct, that the Congress had some hearings, and so on, and passed a bill. But Congress passing a bill with a majority of the votes in the House and the Senate is just a series of steps on a long stairway by which legislation becomes law.

That farm legislation was put in the budget reconciliation bill that everybody by last July knew was going to be vetoed. So the exercise to put their farm bill, called the Freedom to Farm Act, in the budget reconciliation bill that everybody knew was going to be vetoed puts us in a position in January of not having farm legislation today.

Again, I respect the notion that it is ''his side'' and ''your side'' and ''our side'' and ''he said'' and ''she said.'' But the fact is, regardless of what happened last year, we end up in January in a situation in which farmers do not know under what conditions they will plant this year. The people who are selling farm machinery do not know the circumstances under which farmers will plant. All the other folks who are concerned about our rural economy do not know what the farm bill will be.

One way or another, it seems to me the Congress, Republicans and Democrats, need to provide an answer. What is going to happen this year when farmers go in the field? Under what conditions will they be planting a crop? What will be the support prices?

It probably does not matter much to the very largest operators. It certainly does not matter to the largest agrifactories in America. It does not matter to corporate farms, the big ones. But it does matter a lot to a man and wife on a family farm out there who are trying to raise a family and who have a very thin financial statement and who, if they come into a year of low market prices, have no price supports. It is not simply a matter of inconvenience. For them it is bankruptcy. It matters to them.

It does not matter to the big operators. They can get by. They can get by a year or two or three. It is the family farmer out there struggling from year to year, just one bad crop away from losing their farm. That is who is deeply concerned with this matter.

Now, what should we do? Well, I'll tell you my first choice. My first choice is for all of us to get together and come up with the best possible series of ideas that all of us have.

There should not be anyone in this Chamber who in a meeting between all of us would not agree that farmers ought to have much more flexibility in planting decisions than they now have. All of us agree on that. So that is one step. Let us agree on that.

There are a number of other steps that we could agree on that would represent the elements of a new farm plan. But I will tell you one area where we will not agree. That is an area where we say that what we want to do is to build a stairway to Heaven. And, Heaven is described as a circumstance where after 7 years there is no safety net for family farms. That stairway to Heaven is not going to happen. It is a definition of Heaven I do not accept.

If you pull the rug out from under family farmers after 7 years there is no heavenly rescue. There is no real safety net. I am sorry but the fact is I wish to see yard lights in rural America. The only way family farm operators will be able to make it is if we have a real safety net when bad years come and international prices drop down and stay down. The only way we will retain a network of family farmers in this country is if we have that safety net.

Some say it does not matter who farms. If it really does not matter who farms, then the agrifactories will farm America from California to Maine. Then we will see what the price of food is. But it does matter for a whole series of social and economic reasons that we retain a network of family farms in this country's future.

How we do that? Well, we do that by writing a farm program. Have we had a very good farm program in the past? No, I do not think so. It is not the kind of farm program I would have written. But we are required to write a new 5-year farm plan.

The farm plan that was offered last year was put into the budget reconciliation bill. Incidentally, that is the first time this has ever happened. I think the Senator would concur with that. We have not previously taken a farm bill and said, ''Oh, by the way, let's dump it into a reconciliation bill and let it travel along on that train.''

That has never happened before. We have always done a farm bill in a separate debate, and then we moved it to the President and he signed it and we had farm legislation. But last year was different. It was put in a bill that everybody by June or July knew was going to be vetoed, and so it was vetoed, and we end up now at the end of January without a farm plan.

My first choice would be for all of us to get together and hammer out some compromise and say let us get the best of all ideas here and construct a farm plan that really does work for family farms.

If we cannot do that, in my judgment, why mess around at all? Our goal should be to try to help family farmers make a decent living when international grain prices collapse and stay down. if we cannot help them in those circumstances, I say get rid of the whole thing.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture was developed and started under Abraham Lincoln with nine employees—nine. Well, it has grown to be a behemoth organization, as all of us know, involved in the lives of farmers in some positive ways and in other ways in a negative way.

If we cannot construct new farm legislation that tries to provide a safety net for family-sized farms, get rid of it all. Shut down USDA. Get rid of the Secretary. Get rid of all the apparatus. Get rid of the program. I am not interested in developing a set of golden arches for the largest agrifactories in this country. They hold no interest for me. They are big enough to manage on their own. They can have their own celebrations when they make a profit. They can compete on their own in the international marketplace.

It is mom and pop out there on the family farm that cannot make it when international prices drop and stay down. They are the ones who lose their dream. All of us have had those calls. I had one not too long ago from a woman who was, with her husband, losing their farm. She began crying on the phone and saying that for 19 years they have tried to make a go of this farm. She said, ''We do not go places on the weekend. We do not go out on Saturday night. Our kids wear hand-me-downs.''

She said, ''We are not people who spend money just for the sake of spending money. We save every dime we can.''

''But,'' she said, ''the fact is we are going to lose our farm, and it has been our dream. It is the only thing we have done since we got out of high school.''

We have all heard those stories from people who are not just losing their farm, but they are losing their dream. The question now for all of us, it seems to me is what can we do? What can we do to help? What can we do to provide a safety net that works for family-sized farmers?

My first choice would be for us to find a range of agreement and pass a new 5-year bill that makes some sense. We would have to do that quickly, within a matter of weeks. I am certainly willing to engage in that process and would like to engage in that process. If we cannot do that, my second choice is to extend the current bill 1 year, provide substantial added flexibility and provide forgiveness of advanced deficiency payments for those who suffered losses. That would give us time. Then farmers could go into the fields to plant knowing under what conditions they are planting and knowing the kind of farm program they will have. This would give us time to wrestle again on a new approach of how do we construct a 5-year plan that will really work?

So I intend to offer today, for myself and a couple of colleagues, an extension of 1 year with some modifications, including substantial flexibility, and forgiveness of the repayment of advance deficiency payments under certain conditions.

Is it the best approach? No, not necessarily. Do we need to provide some answers to farmers? You bet your life. It is not just farmers. It is everybody out there trying to do business. This Congress needs to take action and take action soon.

I hear people say, ''Well, it is so and so's fault. It is somebody else's fault.'' That is not my interest. I am not interested in whose fault it is at this point.

My interest is how do we solve this problem in the next couple of weeks. I think that is what I heard the Senator from Iowa say as well. Let us figure out a way to do it for the farmers who live in Iowa and the farmers who live in North Dakota. For the family operators who are trying to make a living, let us figure out a way that we can answer this problem. We are required to do that.

It is not satisfactory to say, ''Well, we passed a bill. That is the end of our obligation.'' If the bill got vetoed, it is not law. And that is what happened.

We do not have a farm bill. We must, it seems to me, struggle now to find a way to create one or to extend the current program in a way that will be helpful to family farms in our country.

It is interesting, people ask me from time to time, ''What is a family farmer? You always talk about family farms. What is a family farmer?'' I always say, ''I don't know what the specific definition of a family farmer is.'' They asked Michelangelo how he sculpted ''David.'' ''I took a big piece of marble and chipped away everything that was not David.''

I suppose if we just chipped away everything that we thought was not a family farm, we could come up with a core definition that we could probably all reasonably agree to on what a family farm is. But we do not have enough money for a farm bill to provide unlimited price supports all the way up the range of production. So let us define a family farm in terms of what we can afford to do to provide a reasonable safety net under a certain increment of production. That is what we attempted to do when we offered something called the Family Farm Security Act, and I think it made a lot of sense.

Some will say, ''Well, that did not pass the Congress.'' That is true; it did not. There are often times when good ideas are not successful the first time.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for an additional 4 minutes.

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

Mr. DORGAN. The Farm Security Act is an approach that does say we are going to retool this farm program so that we are focusing on the people we want to help, the family-sized farm. It would provide a targeted marketing loan with the highest support price for the first increment of production. That is exactly what we ought to do, in my judgment. We were not successful in this past year in doing that. Somewhere in the context of reaching an agreement and in reaching a compromise, I hope some elements of that approach will be considered again.

But, most of all, those of us who come from rural States—Republicans and Democrats, the Senator from Iowa, the Senator from North Dakota, and others,—I think all of us have a responsibility now in the next couple of weeks to urgently press for the Congress and the President to answer the question for family farmers. When they start that tractor up and pull that plow out to begin spring's work in not too many weeks, under what farm program will they be plowing and seeding and harvesting?

It is pretty frustrating for people whose economic lives are on the line to see all of this rancor and all of this wrangling going on in the Congress when all they want are simple answers.

Tonight the President is going to give his State of the Union Address. Someone asked me today, a press person asked me, what do I think the President will say or should say? I said one of the things I hope he addresses, and I think he probably will, is this past year of 1995 when we have seen some of the most truculent, difficult debate resulting in policies that just defy all common sense, of shutdowns and threatened defaults and gridlock. I hope the message from everyone who will speak tonight, the President, who gives the State of the Union Address, and Democrats and Republicans who react to that address, will be it is time to have a New Year's resolution that all of us stop shouting and start listening. It is time we decide no one sent us here to advance the economic or political interests of the political party we belong to. They sent us here to advance the interests of this country.

This is a wonderful country with boundless opportunity and whose best days are still ahead of us, if we in this Congress can decide to do things that are positive for this country. That means a little less feuding and a lot more cooperation. I hope that is part of the speech tonight. I hope it will be. I hope the reaction to that is positive.

Part of that reaction, in my judgment, could be a reaction, even on agriculture and, yes, even on the farm bill, to decide what separates us is a lot less important than what unites us. What unites us in every State that we represent as farm legislators are families out there struggling against the odds to plant a seed that they do not know will grow into a crop. If they do get the seed to grow, they do not know what the price will be or if there will be a price to cover their costs.

Those twin risks are economic risks that can literally kill the dream of family farmers, and literally does kill that dream in tens of thousands of cases every single year. That is what we need to care about. That is the root and genesis of this debate about farm policy.

I know a lot of people do not think much about it and do not care much about farm policy. They think milk

comes from Safeway and butter comes from a carton and pasta comes inside cellophane. But it does come from cows and it comes from a wheat field and it comes from seeds and sweat. It comes from farmers breathing the diesel fumes as they plant and harvest.

This is a lot more important than just theory. This is an economic imperative in rural America that is important to many of us. I hope we can find reason to cooperate. I hope, as my colleagues will look at this piece of legislation, they will consider it. If not the extension of the current program, then let us consider something else that we can agree on that will advance the economic interests of farmers.

I do not share the notion that this in any way jeopardizes anybody's baseline. If it did, I would not be offering it. I am talking about the budget baseline, which my colleague will probably speak more about.

With that, Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Iowa for his attention and for staying. Again, I look forward to the cooperation that we have had on many rural issues. I hope we can cooperate on this issue as the weeks unfold.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. CONRAD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CONRAD. I thank the President. I thank my colleague from North Dakota for his excellent presentation on why it is critically important that we have a farm bill and that we have a set of rules that our farmers know will be in place as they enter into the next crop year.

Let me say that I believe the Senator from North Dakota has introduced something, that while not perfect, is something we are going to have to do in terms of extending the current farm bill so that farmers at least know what the rules of the road are going to be for this next crop year. There has been an absolute failure by this Congress to pass farm legislation that could become law.

Mr. President, the legislation that my colleague has introduced would dramatically increase the flexibility that farmers have and dramatically improve the competitive position of American farmers. I think that is in everyone's interest.

I think the Senator from Iowa is correct when he says that we need to know what farmers can expect. Farmers are right now sitting around their kitchen tables trying to figure out what their strategy for this next year should be, and much is at stake. Their families' livelihoods are at stake. What money the family is going to have for the next year is at stake. Whether or not that farm family is going to be able to meet their bills is at stake. The health of rural economies is at stake. What happens on the Main Streets of every city and town in the heartland of America is at stake.

The economic health of an industry that, along with airplanes, is the biggest producer of a trade surplus for America is at stake. An industry that is one of America's very biggest is at stake. Our competitive position in the world is at stake.

There is a lot riding on this debate and this discussion. The Senator from Iowa is right: We need a plan. Let me say what we do not need is the plan that the Republican Party has advanced in both the House and the Senate. The Republican proposal was for deep and Draconian cuts in farm programs that would dramatically reduce farm income. That has been their plan. Repeatedly Republicans have called for phasing out farm programs, for eliminating that support mechanism that has been the genius of American farm policy.

Mr. President, I believe that represents unilateral disarmament when we are in the midst of a fierce trade fight with other countries who recognize the importance of maintaining their competitive position in agriculture. The last thing we would do in a military confrontation is to engage in unilateral disarmament. Why we would ever do it in a trade fight is beyond me.

Make no mistake, we are in a trade fight in agriculture. Europe, which is our biggest competition, is spending three to four times as much as we are spending to support their agricultural producers.

Let me repeat that. Europe, our chief competitors, are spending three to four times as much as we are spending supporting their producers. Why? Because they understand the critical importance of agriculture to the economic health of their countries, and they do not intend to lose this trade battle. They intend to fight it. They intend to win it, and they think the United States is going to cave in. They think the United States is ready to roll over. They think the United States is ready to throw in the towel.

I have spent hours and hours with the chief trade negotiators for the Europeans, and they have done everything but draw me a picture of what their long-term strategy is. They believe the United States is losing its resolve to fight for agricultural markets, and they are going to win them the old-fashioned way. They are going to go out and buy them, and that is precisely what is happening. We would be fools to allow them to win this battle and see tens of thousands of jobs leave this country because we are not willing to fight.

Mr. President, let us recall what has happened with respect to farm policy this year. On the House side, they had a proposal they called ''Freedom to Farm.'' Most of us would consider it ''Freedom from Farming,'' because if that thing was ever put in place, there would be a whole lot of farmers forced off the land in very short order. It is not ''Freedom to Farm,'' it is ''Freedom from Farming.'' Others have called it ''Welcome to Welfare,'' because what it did was to say that no matter what prices are, farmers would get a payment from the Federal Government for the next 7 years, and then we would wash our hands of farm producers in this country.

That proposal was so radical, it suggested we eliminate the underlying authority passed in 1938 and 1949 to even have farm legislation. That is how radical and how extreme the proposal was on the House side. They could not even get that proposal through the House Agriculture Committee, although it was authored by and offered by the chairman of the House Agriculture Committee. They could not even get it through the relevant committee on the House side. Mr. President, that is how flawed that proposal was.

On the Senate side, they authored legislation that went through the Senate Agriculture Committee on a straight party-line vote after very little debate and very little discussion. Frankly, our colleagues on the other side did not want much debate, did not want much discussion, because they knew that policy was an invitation to liquidation. It would have cut farm support 60 percent in real terms in the seventh year of that proposal. I can just say, for my State, that would have represented an unmitigated disaster.

Interestingly enough, in the Senate, they did not even offer the House ''Freedom to Farm'' proposal for a vote. They did not even offer it for a vote, because they knew it would not enjoy much in the way of support, even in the Senate Agriculture Committee. So, then what happened, they came out on the floor and they stuck the farm legislation in the reconciliation bill.

What does that mean, ''reconciliation''? It is confusing to people. That is where all of the programs are put together in order to meet the budget resolution requirements, and you do not have a separate discussion and debate on the bill itself. It is wrapped into a piece of legislation that contains many other issues.

They did that because they knew they could not pass their farm legislation on its own. Typically, the way we have handled farm legislation is to have a separate bill and a debate and a discussion on that bill and a vote on that bill. They did not want to do it that way. They wanted to wrap it in another package and vote on an entire package, with agriculture being just a small part of it, because they did not want people to be paying very much attention to what that farm policy represented, that was contained in that legislation.

Mr. President, that reconciliation bill was vetoed by the President of the United States. There were many reasons for his veto. There were many elements of that legislation, apart from farm legislation, that called for a veto. But part of the reason he vetoed it was the farm proposals, which the President saw as radical and extreme and as going too far and of putting the United

States at risk of losing the significant advantages it has had in competing for world agriculture markets.

The President of the United States was called on by farmers all across this country to veto that reconciliation bill, and veto it he did. I am proud the President did veto that bill, for reasons other than the farm legislation, but the farm legislation alone would have been enough for me.

I joined those farmers in asking the President to veto that bill. It was terrible policy. It represented unilateral disarmament in this world trade battle, a battle for markets that are critically important to the economic future of this country. It is not just the economic future of America that was at stake, not just our trade situation that was at stake. It was the lives of literally thousands of American farmers at stake.

Very often when I go home to North Dakota, I go to farm families and sit around the kitchen table and talk about the future of agriculture policy and what it means to that family. Over and over this year, farm families have told me, if the policy that is being voted on in Washington, that which was offered by our colleagues on the other side of the aisle, ever became law, they would be finished, they would be out, they would be forced off the land.

I think the best estimate in my State is that we would lose a third of the farmers if that bill ever became law. That is not in the interest of family farmers. That is not in the interest of the economic health of my State. More broadly, I do not think it is in the economic interest of the country.

So I urge my colleagues to closely consider the course my colleague from North Dakota has proposed. I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

Mr. GRASSLEY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ABRAHAM). The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, this summary action would not conflict with the goals of the two Senators from North Dakota who have just spoken, but is to point out where we are.

If, in fact, we have a year extension of the present farm bill, a couple things for certain will happen. First, immediately farmers will have to pay out of their cash flow last year's advance deficiency payment, because grain prices are higher now, at a time when some farmers did not get any crops and do not have that capability. If you have a 1-year extension, as opposed to the Freedom to Farm Act, money that would have gone from the Federal Treasury to the farm economy absolutely will not go.

So I do not quite understand why people on the other side of the aisle say that the ''Freedom to Farm'' agriculture bill is a sure, certain way to kill off the family farmers when their 1-year extension puts no money into agriculture whatsoever and the Freedom to Farm Act would.

What we get with the Freedom to Farm Act is certainty. We know in the bill that the President vetoed, albeit less money than has been spent on agriculture over a long period of time, we know the certainty of $43.5 billion in agriculture programs over the next 7 years. That is $6 billion to $7 billion for 1996 that would go into agriculture that under the Democratic proposal that we have been talking about here in the last hour would not be going to agriculture.

That $6 to $7 billion next year, because of moving toward the marketplace for income from agriculture, will gradually decline probably to $4 billion in the year 2002. But we know right now in the bill that the President vetoed that there would be $43.5 billion going into agriculture. We know that it would be under contract to the individual farmers, and because of that contractual obligation, the same as the annual payment that goes for the Conservation Reserve Program being honored by subsequent budget decisions made by Congress, will not be changed. That $43.5 billion is a sure thing.

Would my colleagues who promote a simple 1-year extension of the existing farm bill say that that 1-year extension brings certainty to agriculture? They are proposing something good for agriculture as opposed to what we Republicans propose of $43.5 billion for certain to go into agriculture? That is what the President of the United States vetoed.

The other thing is, as we delay making decisions for agriculture with a 1-year extension, we are going to be delaying it until 1997. If you have a 2-year extension, you are going to be delaying it to 1998. The way the Congressional Budget Office scores anything in the budget, and as you apply that to agriculture, we could be losing baseline flexibility to do something for agriculture in the near future. We have already lost $8 billion just because the President vetoed the farm bill. It is proposed by the House Agriculture Committee that if we have a 1-year extension, we could lose another $6 billion from the baseline.

Now, for people on the other side of the aisle that want a 1-year extension of the farm bill, how can you say that you are helping agriculture if you are gradually chipping away at the baseline, the fiscal baseline for agriculture in our budget? You say you are a friend of agriculture, and you want to do that? That would not sell in my State to the very same farmers that my friends from North Dakota say that they talked to in the coffee shops.

The other is a simple extension of the 1995 farm bill for 1 or 2 years, which denies the reality of the international trade situation, the environment of the new GATT agreement, which this Congress approved a year ago. The GATT agreement is freeing up trade in agriculture and other commodities so that we are going to have a much more free-trading environment and an agriculture that tends to take more in 1999, 2000, 2001, 2002 than in the early years of the GATT agreement. But we are moving to a point where, by freeing up trade in agriculture, farmers are going to be able to get more money from the marketplace and less from the Federal Treasury. Where I come from, that is what the farmers want. They want to be able to compete. They know that with our efficiency in agriculture, we can compete, we will compete, and the provisions of the Freedom to Farm Act, besides nailing down $43.5 billion from this transition from a Government-regulated agriculture to a free market agriculture, where we can compete in the world market, it also has the flexibility for the farmers to plant according to the marketplace, not according to the political decisions made here in Washington. That means that they are going to be able to plant the number of acres of corn or soybeans—those are the two prominent crops in my State—that fit the marketplace, the realities of the marketplace, not decisions that are made in the U.S. Department of Agriculture downtown by bureaucrats, who are removed from the realities of the marketplace that end up having farmers plant according to the historical bases that there are for corn and other crops on their respective farms.

What a way to make a decision in agriculture. Is that better than the market planting decision that can respond to the marketplace, a planting decision that fits into the reality of the freeing up of international trade, where our farmers can compete very well with any foreign competition?

The first thing is the $43.5 billion. The second is flexibility to plant according to the marketplace. The third point is that we will no longer be setting aside our productive capacity that we have and letting acres of rich farmland lay idle from year to year. We are going to allow every acre to be planted so that we send a signal to all of our competitors around the world that we know there is a growing world demand for exports out there. We are going to compete in that, and we are going to produce to maximum to fill the demand of the marketplace. We are going to do that in a way that is not going to encourage any of the farmers of any of the countries of the world where productivity is not quite as good as ours to plow up their marginal farmlands and put it into productivity because they know we are taking some of our land out of production.

If there is anything about the freedom to farm proposal, it is the absolute certainty that is there. If there is anything about a 1- or 2-year extension of the present farm bill, it is the uncertainty over the period of transition to the free market and the new GATT environment in trade. Second, it is going to take, for certain, money from the farmers of America at the very same time that some of our colleagues are pleading the financial plight of those very same farmers.

So I think common sense dictates giving the farmers as much certainty as you can. They get that with freedom to farm. And it is absolutely not a part of a 1-year extension of the present farm bill.

Mr. EXON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska is recognized.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, would you advise me of the present status of the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We are in morning business.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I am a Senator who has been close to agriculture for a long time. I want to speak with regard to the remarks made preceding my statement by my farm State colleague from the State of North Dakota, Senator DORGAN, and likewise, my farm State Senator next door, CHUCK GRASSLEY, who both are Senators I have worked with for a long time on farm policy.

I think we have an awful lot to do in this particular area. The most significant concern that I have in this regard, Mr. President, is the fact that here we are dilly-dallying on a farm program, and the farmers across the United States of America are justifiably concerned. Many in the South are beginning to plant now. The grain crop farmers in Nebraska and the rest of the major grain-producing States are now preparing to plant. They are trying to work out their financial needs with their bankers. They are totally at a loss and do not know what we are going to do.

I suggest that never before in history have we been so late in deciding what a farm program is going to be in the year that the crop is going to be planted. That has to stop. I do not know how to end this impasse that we have but the impasse must be broken for the good of the food producers of the United States of America.

I happen to feel that probably the best way to resolve this matter in an expeditious fashion, if we could reach an agreement between the two leaders in the Senate to bring up a freestanding farm bill with some kind of restrained debate, something to move things along and then have an up-or-down vote. That would be one way to solve the problem and let the Senate work its will. Whether that is possible or not I do not know at this juncture, but I know that is one of the suggestions that are being mulled over.

The initiative by the Senator from North Dakota today to essentially extend the present farm program for 1 year is not the best of all worlds but it is a whole lot better than no action whatever.

I must say that I have studied with great interest the so-called Freedom to Farm Act and I understand that the sponsors of that measure over on the House side, as the House has the penchant for these days is to say, ''Do it our way or we will not do it at all.'' That is not the way which you handle farm policy or the way we should handle the budget. Certainly, we have 435 Members of the House of Representatives and 100 of us here in the U.S. Senate. We have an obligation to work our will, using the procedures that are in place in both bodies, and we cannot have some people, one, two, or three individuals, say ''Doing it my way is the only way, and I will not do anything unless you do it my way.''

It is not the way to get things done or accomplish anything in a body where you have 435 over there and 100 of us over here, 535 all strongly willed individuals with their own ideas. I suppose it would be self-serving to say, Mr. President, that maybe I should say 534 because the Chair and everybody in the Senate knows this Senator from Nebraska is not a strong-willed individual. I set myself apart from all of the other Members.

With that facetious statement, I come back to the core issue here, and that is we have got to move. I cannot support the so-called Freedom to Farm Act in its present form. Certainly, the Freedom to Farm Act eliminates a great deal of the red tape. It gives the farmers what I like to see them have and what they want. That is to make decisions on their own about where they plant and how they plant it.

That concept is also basically included in a measure that was introduced by the minority leader, Senator DASCHLE, another farm State senator, myself, and my colleague, Senator KERREY from Nebraska, and others, known as the Democratic farm bill. It also incorporates all of those good features of allowing more flexibility on the part of the individual farmer, eliminates a lot of the redtape but does not go as far into what I think is making the farm program a welfare program, as I am very fearful the Freedom to Farm Act would eventually encounter.

Let me cite an example, and I will ask at the appropriate time that the facts be printed in the RECORD. As a farm State Senator who recognizes that our prediction of many of our farmers today, especially those with limited acres on which they farm, continue to be in dire straits, I also cite today the fact that the cattle-producing industry is in deep, deep trouble today. While the Farm Act today or any of the Farm Acts we are talking about is not going to provide any relief basically for the cattle producer, they are part of the important food chain. I simply cite this as a fact. They are in deep, deep trouble today because of the steady decline in the cattle at all levels.

Coming back to the Freedom to Farm Act, I think that the main criticism I have of that act—and once the farmers of the United States fully understand it, I think that they would come out resoundingly against it because in essence it would turn the farm program into a welfare program which is something that they do not want. To say that, Mr. President, and having said that I am a farm State Senator, have fought for good farm programs for a long, long time, I recognize they cost some money but I also recognize that the American public today spend less of their disposable income for food of any industrialized nation in the world. Food is a bargain primarily because of the good work, the production ability and the genius production of our family farmers going to make good food, clean food at more than affordable prices.

However, if we decouple completely the farm program from the marketplace we are marching down a road that I think farmers and the food industry eventually would come to recognize is a big mistake.

The welfare provisions in the so-called Freedom to Farm Act we all should know about, and I cite a typical example which is very accurate. Under the Freedom to Farm Act, which is a step down to phasing out the program in total in 7 years, as I understand it, we will take a typical farm and talk about typical farm, typical numbers. The facts of the matter are that as I indicated, the livestock industry, the beef industry in particular, the pork industry as well, are in deep, deep problems these days. If you go along with the Freedom to Farm Act, that will not be necessarily true of the row crop producers.

I cite, for example, if the Freedom to Farm Act became a reality and if we took, Mr. President, a 500-acre corn farm which is not a particularly big farm, not particularly little farm, but use that as an example, and if that individual farmer planted his 500 acres to corn, under the Freedom to Farm Act, and if that 500-acre farm produces 120-bushel yield, and if the price for corn were, for example, $3.10 a bushel, 500 acres, 120-bushel yield, and a cash price of $3.10, you multiply 500 by 120 bushels and come up with 60,000 bushels. And 60,000 bushels at $3.10 cash price produces $186,000 gross cash income. Not net, but gross cash income. In addition to that figure under the Freedom to Farm Act that same farmer would get from the Government, he would be paid, sent a check by the Government over and above the $186,000 gross for 1996 using 60,000 bushels, he gets a 27-cent payment. That is $16,200 in 1996 that typical farm would receive over and above the $186,000 gross. In 1997, that goes up to 37 cents a bushel for $22,200, which I think could be described as a welfare payment. In 1998, it goes up to 40 cents a bushel or a $24,000 welfare payment.

I simply say that the example that I have used at the cash price of $3.10 for corn producing for the farm that I have outlined, $186,000 in gross cash income, on top of that the individual farmer would receive basically for doing nothing, or to put it another way, the 500-acre farmer with the ability to produce corn, assume that farmer planted nothing, he did not do anything, he just sat

and watched television all day long. Well, he would not get the $186,000 but still under that kind of a scenario that farmer who planted nothing and did nothing would receive $16,200 from the Federal Government in 1996, $22,200 welfare-type payment in 1997, and $24,000 in a welfare-type payment in 1998.

Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent the figures I have just referenced be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. EXON. I simply say that when you look at these kind of facts, I think one would have to conclude that any time you are going to have a welfare payment on top of what I have just outlined here at $3.10 a bushel—I would add that even if corn went up to $5 a bushel or $8 a bushel, which I suspect it will not, but even if it should—under the Freedom to Farm Act, that typical farmer that I just outlined would still receive the $16,000 to $22,000 or $24,000 depending on which year and so on down the road, on top of whatever he got from the marketplace. Therefore, there are dangers, because I happen to feel that when this information comes out, and with the stringent budget terms we are working under now, it would not be long before somebody would come up and say we are not going to do that anymore. Then some of the farmers who signed on to this program as some kind of a cash windfall would be hurt.

We have to have a farm program that gives the farmers some relief from what the situation is now with regard to the payback that they have to make for their advanced deficiency payments. But I think we can get together and work out a reasonable proposal and not one that is embodied in what is generally called the Freedom to Farm Act.

EXHIBIT 1

FREEDOM TO FARM

500 acre corn farm.
120 bushel yield.
$3.10 cash price.
500 acres times 120 bushels equals 60,000 bushels.
60,000 bushels times $3.10 cash price equals $186,000 gross cash income.
Plus Government Payment (whether they plant or not).
1996—60,000 bushels times $.27 payment equals $16,200 welfare payment.
1997—60,000 bushels times $.37 payment equals $22,200 welfare payment.
1997—60,000 bushels times $.40 payment equals $24,000 welfare payment.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 969

At the request of Mr. BRADLEY, the names of the Senator from Maine [Ms. SNOWE] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] were added as cosponsors of S. 969, a bill to require that health plans provide coverage for a minimum hospital stay for a mother and child following the birth of the child, and for other purposes.

S. 1039

At the request of Mr. ABRAHAM, the name of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. COCHRAN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1039, a bill to require Congress to specify the source of authority under the United States Constitution for the enactment of laws, and for other purposes.

S. 1317

At the request of Mr. D'AMATO, the name of the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1317, a bill to repeal the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935, to enact the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1995, and for other purposes.

S. 1364

At the request of Mr. KEMPTHORNE, the name of the Senator from Alaska [Mr. MURKOWSKI] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1364, a bill to reauthorize and amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973, and for other purposes.

S. 1419

At the request of Mrs. KASSEBAUM, the names of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. CONRAD], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN] were added as cosponsors of S. 1419, a bill to impose sanctions against Nigeria.

S. 1439

At the request of Mr. GLENN, the name of the Senator from California [Mrs. FEINSTEIN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1439, a bill to require the consideration of certain criteria in decisions to relocate professional sports teams, and for other purposes.

S. 1480

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1480, a bill to provide for the comparable treatment of Federal employees and Members of Congress and the President during a period in which there is a Federal Government shutdown.

S. 1519

At the request of Mr. DOLE, the names of the Senator from Montana [Mr. BURNS], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. PRESSLER], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. COCHRAN], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. DEWINE] were added as cosponsors of S. 1519, a bill to prohibit United States voluntary and assessed contributions to the United Nations if the United Nations imposes any tax or fee on United States persons or continues to develop or promote proposals for such taxes or fees.

SENATE RESOLUTION 210—TO COMMEND THE CORNHUSKERS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA

Mr. EXON (for himself and Mr. KERREY) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 210

Whereas Dr. Tom Osborne, the winningest coach in college football, has led the Nebraska Cornhuskers to the last five Big Eight titles, a second perfect season, and repeat of the National Championship;

Whereas the Huskers have gone undefeated at 25–0 in the last two seasons and 36–1 in the last three seasons, the most victories ever in that time span for any collegiate team;

Whereas Tommie Frazier, the great Husker quarterback, continued the unmatched Nebraska tradition by being named Most Valuable Player in the last three Championship games and finished his brilliant career with a rushing high 199 yards in the 1996 Fiesta Bowl;

Whereas the Huskers decisively won the Fiesta Bowl becoming the second football team ever in collegiate history to earn a consensus #1 rank in the major polls for two consecutive years;

Resolved, That the Senate commends the Cornhuskers of the University of Nebraska at Lincoln for having won the 1995 National Collegiate Athletic Association Football Championship.

SENATE RESOLUTION 211—TO COMMEND THE CORNHUSKERS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA

Mr. EXON (for himself and Mr. KERRY) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 211

Whereas the Cornhusker Volleyball team under the leadership and experience of Coach Terry Pettit has risen above all others in the volleyball arena;

Whereas Nebraska player Allison Weston was named co-winner of the national Player of the Year Award assisting her National Championship winning teammates in a spectacular season;

Whereas this year's Nebraska team was only the second east of California ever to win the Volleyball Championship Tournament by winning the title match;

Resolved, That the Senate commends the Cornhuskers of the University of Nebraska at Lincoln for having won 1995 National Collegiate Athletic Association Women's Volleyball Championship.

SENATE RESOLUTION 212—TO CONSTITUTE THE MINORITY PARTY'S MEMBERSHIP ON THE ETHICS COMMITTEE

Mr. DASCHLE submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 212

Resolved, That the following shall constitute the minority party's membership on the Ethics Committee for the 104th Congress, or until their successors are chosen:

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN], Vice Chairman;

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID]; and

The Senator from Washington [Mrs. MURRAY].

BUDGET SCOREKEEPING REPORT

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

●Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I hereby submit to the Senate the budget scorekeeping report prepared by the

Congressional Budget Office under section 308(b) and in aid of section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended. This report meets the requirements for Senate scorekeeping of section 5 of Senate Concurrent Resolution 32, the first concurrent resolution on the budget for 1986.

This report shows the effects of congressional action on the budget through January 10, 1996. The estimates of budget authority, outlays, and revenues, which are consistent with the technical and economic assumptions of the 1996 concurrent resolution on the budget (H. Con. Res. 67), show that current level spending is above the budget resolution by $9.5 billion in budget authority and by $13.3 billion in outlays. Current level is $43 million below the revenue floor in 1996 and $0.7 billion below the revenue floor over the 5 years 1996–2000. The current estimate of the deficit for purposes of calculating the maximum deficit amount is $258.9 billion, $13.3 billion above the maximum deficit amount for 1996 of $245.6 billion.

Since my last report, dated December 19, 1995, Congress cleared and the President signed the ICC Termination Act, Public Law 104–88; the Smithsonian Institution Commemorative Coin Act, Public Law 104–96; and further continuing appropriations, Public Law 104–94. These actions changed the current level of budget authority and outlays.

This is my first report for the second session of the 104th Congress.

The report follows:

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
U.S. CONGRESS,
Washington, DC, January 22, 1996.

Hon. PETE V. DOMENICI,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The attached report for fiscal year 1996 shows the effects of Congressional action on the 1996 budget and is current through January 10, 1996. The estimates of budget authority, outlays and revenues are consistent with the technical and economic assumptions of the 1996 Concurrent Resolution on the Budget (H. Con. Res. 67). This report is submitted under Section 308(b) and in aid of Section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended.

This is my first report for the second session of the 104th Congress.

Sincerely,

JUNE E. O'NEILL.

THE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT FOR THE U.S. SENATE, FISCAL YEAR 1996, 104TH CONGRESS, 2D SESSION, AS OF CLOSE OF BUSINESS JANUARY 10, 1996

[In billions of dollars]

	Budget resolution (H. Con. Res. 67)	Current level [1]	Current level/over under resolution
ON-BUDGET			
Budget Authority	1,285.5	1,295.0	9.5
Outlays	1,288.1	1,301.4	13.3
Revenues:			
1996	1,042.5	1,042.5	[2] −0
1996–2000	5,691.5	5,690.8	−0.7
Deficit	245.6	258.9	13.3
Debt Subject to Limit	5,210.7	4,900.0	−310.7
OFF-BUDGET			
Social Security Outlays:			
1996	299.4	299.4	0.0
1996–2000	1,626.5	1,626.5	0.0
Social Security Revenues			
1996	374.7	374.7	0.0

THE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT FOR THE U.S. SENATE, FISCAL YEAR 1996, 104TH CONGRESS, 2D SESSION, AS OF CLOSE OF BUSINESS JANUARY 10, 1996—Continued

[In billions of dollars]

	Budget resolution (H. Con. Res. 67)	Current level [1]	Current level/over under resolution
1996–2000	2,061.0	2,061.0	0.0

[1] Current level represents the estimated revenue and direct spending effects of all legislation that Congress has enacted or sent to the President for his approval. In addition, full-year funding estimates under current law are included for entitlement and mandatory programs requiring annual appropriations even if the appropriations have not been made. The current level of debt subject to limit reflects the latest U.S. Treasury information on public debt transactions.

[2] Less than $50 million.

THE ON-BUDGET CURRENT LEVEL REPORT FOR THE U.S. SENATE, 104TH CONGRESS, 2ND SESSION, SENATE SUPPORTING DETAIL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1996, AS OF CLOSE OF BUSINESS JANUARY 10, 1996

	Budget authority	Outlays	Revenues
ENACTED IN PREVIOUS SESSIONS			
Revenues			1,042,557
Permanents and other spending legislation	830,272	798,924	
Appropriation legislation		242,052	
Offsetting receipts	−200,017	−200,017	
Total previously enacted	630,254	840,958	1,042,557
ENACTED IN FIRST SESSION			
Appropriation bills:			
1995 rescissions and Department of Defense Emergency Supplementals Act (P.L. 104–6)	−100	−885	
1995 rescissions and Emergency Supplementals for Disaster Assistance Act (P.L. 104–19)	22	−3,149	
Agriculture (P.L. 104–37)	62,602	45,620	
Defense (P.L. 104–61)	243,301	163,223	
Energy and Water (P.L. 104–46)	19,336	11,502	
Legislative Branch (P.L. 105–53)	2,125	1,977	
Military Construction (P.L. 104–32)	11,177	3,110	
Transportation (P.L. 104–50)	12,682	11,899	
Treasury, Postal Service (P.L. 104–52)	15,080	12,584	
Authorization bills:			
Self-Employed Health Insurance Act (P.L. 104–7)	−18	−18	−101
Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (P.L. 104–42)	1	1	
Fishermen's Protective Act Amendments of 1995 (P.L. 104–43)		(3)	
Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act Amendments of 1995 (P.L. 104–48)	1	(3)	1
Alaska Power Administration Sale Act (P.L. 104–58)	−20	−20	
ICC Termination Act (P.L. 104–88)			(3)
Total enacted this session	366,191	245,845	−100
ENACTED IN SECOND SESSION			
Smithsonian Institution Commemorative Coin Act (P.L. 104–96)	3	3	
CONTINUING RESOLUTION AUTHORITY			
Further continuing appropriations (P.L. 104–94) [1]	167,467	86,812	
ENTITLEMENTS AND MANDATORIES			
Budget resolution baseline estimates of appropriated entitlements and other mandatory programs not yet enacted	131,056	127,749	
Total current level [2]	1,294,970	1,301,368	1,042,457
Total budget resolution	1,285,500	1,288,100	1,042,500
Amount remaining:			
Under budget resolution			43

THE ON-BUDGET CURRENT LEVEL REPORT FOR THE U.S. SENATE, 104TH CONGRESS, 2ND SESSION, SENATE SUPPORTING DETAIL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1996, AS OF CLOSE OF BUSINESS JANUARY 10, 1996—Continued

	Budget authority	Outlays	Revenues
Over budget resolution	9,470	13,268	

[1] This is an estimate of discretionary funding based on a full year calculation of the continuing resolution that expires January 26, 1996. Included in this estimate are the following appropriation bills: Commerce, Justice, State; District of Columbia; Foreign Operations; Interior; Labor, HHS, Education; and Veterans, HUD. Under this assumption, Public Laws 104–91 and 104–92, providing appropriations for certain activities, have no additional effect at this time.

[2] In accordance with the Budget Enforcement Act, the total does not include $3,401 million in budget authority and $1,590 million in outlays for funding of emergencies that have been designated as such by the President and the Congress.

[3] Less than $500,000.

Notes.—Detail may not add due to rounding.

RULES INHIBIT RETRAINING

●Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, Pete Du Pont, former Member of the House and former Governor of Delaware, chairs the National Center for Policy Analysis. Recently he had an op-ed piece in the Washington Times about giving prisoners skills and giving them a chance to work which I ask to be printed in full in the RECORD.

I don't know how this gets worked out, but there really is a need to face this problem. And it is a need that should be worked out with labor unions and people who are trying to protect other workers.

We hear a great deal about slave labor in China producing things. I remember a conversation I had with the late Chief Justice Warren Burger in which he said there is another aspect of this. First of all, China has nowhere near the numbers of people in prison that we have in prison. But while they are in prison they are required to work and produce things, and it reduces the recidivism rate.

Obviously, the restrictions on freedom in China have something to do with the lower prison rate, but many nations with a great deal of freedom have a tiny fraction of our incarceration rate.

I urge my colleagues to read the Pete Du Pont article. There are no simple answers but the answer we have now is simplistic and wrong.

The article follows:

RULES INHIBIT RETRAINING

Most people would agree that if prisoners learned a skill while they were in jail they could more easily get a job when they got out, and that an ex-prisoner with a job is less likely to commit another crime. Since nearly one-half of people released from prison return to prison within three years, job skills could mean a significant decline in the crime rate.

The problem is that most productive prison work—other than food or laundry work within the prison itself—is against the law.

In 1936, Congress banned convict labor on federal contracts exceeding $10,000 in value. In 1940, the Ashurst-Sumners Act made it a federal crime to transport convict-made goods in interstate commerce. And many state legislatures have enacted laws to prohibit the sale of convict-made goods within their borders. States like New York compromised and adopted the ''state-use'' system, which permitted convicts to manufacture goods for sale to governmental agencies

only, which provides a very limited market for the fruits of convict labor.

These statutes were a form of protectionism—to protect providers of goods and services in the free market from having to compete with convict labor. Small businesses and labor unions view such competition as unfair, and have successfully prevented relaxation of the statutes. When Congress tried to change the laws in 1979, the best it could do was allow prisoner work if they are paid the prevailing wage, labor union officials approve, local labor is unaffected, and no local unemployment is produced. These criteria are nearly impossible to meet, so a mere 1,660 prisoners, out of 1 million, were working under these waivers in 1994.

It was not always this way. In the last century, prisons earned a major part of their daily cost by leasing convict labor to private employers. In 1885, three-fourths of prison inmates were involved in productive labor, the majority working for private employers under contract and leasing arrangements.

By the 1930s only 44 percent worked, and nearly all worked for state industries rather than for private employers. A 1990 Census found that only 11 percent of prisoners worked in prison manufacturing or farming, down from 16 percent in 1984. If part-time work in laundry and food services is included, only about half of prisoners work.

Many prisoners are eager to work, if only to relieve the tedium of prison life. But more important is that the work is good for society in the long run because it reduces crime. A 1983–87 Federal Post-Release Employment Project study confirmed that employed prisoners do better than others without jobs. Prisoners who work have fewer disciplinary problems in prison and lower rates of rearrest; they are more likely to get a full-time job; more likely to quit their job in favor of a better-paying job; and less likely to have their supervision revoked for a parole violation or new crime. In the words of Thomas Townsend, president of the Corrections Industry Association, ''It's a matter of public safety; inmates who have worked in prison, and gained new skills have a significantly better chance of not returning to crime and prison.''

The only disadvantages of more work opportunities for prisoners are the feared competitive effects on local labor markets. But the government's first responsibility is to citizens, not to narrow interest groups. New production benefits all Americans. It raises the demand for their services and creates new goods for purchase. Competition is the strength of our economic system, not a wrong to be righted, so our policies should be breaking down, not erecting, barriers to work—especially when the work will make the streets safer for the rest of us.

Allowing prisoners to work makes sense. Begin by repealing state and federal limitations on inmate pay. Let responsible private businesses competitively bid for the use of prison labor. Let prisons ''profit'' from accepting these contracts. Provide monetary incentives to prisons and their wardens for leading their institutions to self-sufficiency.

It won't be easy for the private-sector bidders, because prison labor is not easy to use. Difficulties include security problems, lack of skills and good work habits, remote prison locations, and poor worker productivity. At least at the beginning, the market value of prisoner labor will be very low and the quality of their work poor. But both will improve as skills improve.

Across the country a million prisoners are serving time in jail. Each month, 40,000 of them are released under mandatory supervision, on parole, or at the conclusion of their sentences. Our streets would be safer and the crime rate lower if these men had a skill, a job, and the beginning of a future.●

TRIBUTE TO REV. WAYNE SMITH

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize Rev. Wayne B. Smith, a man who has served his church, and central Kentucky, for more than 40 years. Reverend Smith is retiring as senior minister of Southland Christian Church in Lexington, which has the area's largest Protestant congregation.

Reverend Smith was 27 years old when he became Southland's founding pastor in 1956. Forty years later he is the only senior minister the church has had and is now one of the most well-known ministers in central Kentucky. Southland Christian has flourished under Reverend Smith, who has a congregation of more than 3,800 plus 50,000 on TV and radio. Known for his sense of humor, Reverend Smith is often referred to as ''the Bob Hope of the ministry.''

Reverend Smith has been named 1 of the 13 most influential people in Lexington. He served two terms as president of the Lexington Ministerial Association and is a past president of the North American Christian Convention. He is also the charter president of the Lexington Bluegrass Breakfast Lions Club.

Many of Reverend Smith's friends and colleagues have praised him for his humility and his many acts of kindness. Upon his announcement of retirement to the congregation, one Southland member said, ''It won't be the same. He is one of those people who you don't replace. There were several people, including me, who had tears in their eyes.''

At a farewell ceremony for Reverend Smith, which attracted a crowd of approximately 7,000, his friends gave testimonial after testimonial praising him for being a great servant of the Lord. In his resignation letter, Smith addressed his congregation saying, ''You have been a wonderful flock; but also * * * my friends. We have never, for even a moment, felt unloved.''

Reverend Smith and his wife Marjorie have two daughters and five grandchildren. Although he is retiring, Reverend Smith won't be able to rest for long as his future plans include speaking engagements and revival meetings across the country.

Mr. President, I would like to pay special tribute to Rev. Wayne B. Smith for his dedicated service to his church, his family, and his community.

HONORING AARON FEUERSTEIN

● Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, after the devastation of a mill fire in Methuen, MA, threatened the community and 2,400 workers who depended on it, Aaron Feuerstein could have turned his back on his employees and closed the factory or moved it out of State. But he chose to stay. He chose to help, and to give something back to those who worked for him. He offered to pay everyone, and he even gave his employees their Christmas bonuses, will pay their health care premiums for 90 days, and is working to open the factory again as soon as possible.

Mr. President, Aaron Feuerstein's extraordinary generosity during this holiday season has moved Massachusetts and the Nation, and made all of us believe again in the power of community and the real spirit of America. What he has done to help so many families will never be forgotten, and I know that my colleagues in the Senate join me in congratulating him for setting an example of loyalty, leadership, and compassion which is too often lacking in contemporary American society.

He has shown us what true success in business is all about, and what our economy is all about. It's about helping people and families to prosper and to grow together—build together and work together toward a common goal.

The news reports of the reactions of Aaron's workers to his generosity are heartwarming; and the warm response of his loyal employees is a tribute to him and should be the greatest holiday gift anyone could receive.

Mr. President, Aaron Feuerstein has earned a special place in our hearts, and has set a new standard for American corporate leadership.

I have joined with the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts and the Massachusetts congressional delegation in pledging to do what we can, at the Federal level, to help this factory and community recover from this catastrophic fire, and I know that my colleagues in the Senate will join me in congratulating Aaron for showing America that loyalty is an essential ingredient not only in business but in the life of a community.

Mr. President, I ask that a recent editorial from the Boston Globe by David Nyhan about the generosity of Aaron Feuerstein be printed in the RECORD.

The editorial follows:

THE MENSCH WHO SAVED CHRISTMAS

(By David Nyhan)

Were it not for the 45-mile-an-hour winds ripping out of the Northwest, the sparks that they carried and the destruction they wrought, Aaron Feuerstein today would be just another rich guy who owned a one-time factory, in a country full of the same.

But the fire that destroyed New England's largest textile operation Monday has turned this 70-year-old businessman into a folk hero. If a slim, determined, devoutly-Jewish textile manufacturer can be Santa Claus, then Feuerstein is, to 2,400 workers whose jobs were jeopardized by the fire.

The flames, so intense and widespread that the smoke plume appeared in garish color on TV weathermen's radar maps, presented Feuerstein with a stark choice: Should he rebuild, or take the insurance money and bag it?

Aaron Feuerstein is keeping the paychecks coming, as best he can, for as long as possible, while he rushes to rebuild, and restore the jobs a whole valley-full of families depend upon.

Everybody got paid this week. Everybody got their Christmas bonus. Everybody will get paid at least another month. And Feuerstein will see what he can do after

that. But the greatest news of all is that he will rebuild the factory.

The man has a biblical approach to the complexities of late-20th-century economics, capsulated by a Jewish precept:

''When all is moral chaos, this is the time for you to be a mensch.''

In Yiddish, a mensch is someone who does the right thing. The Aaron Feuerstein thing. The chaos was not moral but physical in the conflagration that began with an explosion and soon engulfed the four-building Malden Mills complex in Methuen, injuring two dozen workers, a half-dozen firemen and threatening nearby houses along the Merrimack River site.

The destruction was near-absolute. It is still inexplicable how no one perished in a fast-moving firestorm that lit up the sky. This was one of New England's handful of manufacturing success stories, a plant that emerged from bankruptcy 14 years ago. The company manufactures a trademark fabric, Polartec fleece, used extensively in outdoor clothing and sportswear by outfits such as L. L. Bean and Patagonia.

The company was founded by Feuerstein's grandfather in 1907, and its history over the century has traced the rise, fall and rise again of textile manufacturing in New England mill towns.

Most of the textile makers fled south, leaving hundreds of red brick mausoleums lining the rocky riverbeds that provided the waterpower to turn lathes and looms before electricity came in. The unions that wrested higher wages from flinty Yankee employers were left behind by the companies that went to the Carolinas and elsewhere, to be closer to cotton and farther from unions.

The Feuerstein family stuck it out while many others left, taking their jobs and their profits with them. The current boss is one textile magnate who wins high praise from the union officials who deal with him.

''He's a man of his word,'' says Paul Coorey, president of Local 311 of the Union of Needleworkers, Industrial and Textile Employees. ''He's extremely compassionate for people.'' The union's New England chief, Ronald Alman, said: ''He believes in the process of collective bargaining and he believes that if you pay people a fair amount of money, and give them good benefits to take care of their families, they will produce for you.''

If there is an award somewhere for a Compassionate Capitalist, this man should qualify, hands-down. Because he is standing up for decent jobs for working people at a time when the vast bulk of America's employer class is chopping, slimming, hollowing-out the payroll.

Job loss is the story of America at the end of the century. Wall Street is going like gangbusters, but out on the prairie, and in the old mill towns, and in smalltown America, the story is not of how big your broker's bonus is this Christmas but of how hard it is to keep working.

The day after the fire, Bank of Boston announced it will buy BayBanks, a mega-merger of financial titans that will result in the elimination of 2,000 jobs. Polaroid, another big New England employer, announced it would pare its payroll by up to 2,000 jobs. Across the country, millions of jobs have been eliminated in the rush to lighten the corporate sled by tossing overboard anyone who could be considered excess baggage by a Harvard MBA with a calculator for a heart.

Aaron Feuerstein, who went from Boston Latin High School and New York's Yeshiva University right into the mill his father owned, sees things differently: The help is part of the enterprise, not just a cost center to be cut.

''They've been with me for a long time. We've been good to each other, and there's a deep realization of that, that is not always expressed, except at times of sorrow.''

And it is noble sentiments like those, coming at a time when they are most needed, that turns times of sorrow into occasions of triumph.●

VICTIMS RESTITUTION ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 1995

● Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, I ask that the text of my bill, S. 1504, the Victims Restitution Enforcement Act of 1995 be printed in the RECORD.

The text of the bill follows:

S. 1504

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Victims Restitution Enforcement Act of 1995''.

SEC. 2. PROCEDURE FOR ISSUANCE AND ENFORCEMENT OF RESTITUTION ORDER.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 3664 of title 18, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''§ 3664. Procedure for issuance and enforcement of order of restitution

''(a) For orders of restitution under this title, the court shall order the probation service of the court to obtain and include in its presentence report, or in a separate report, as the court directs, information sufficient for the court to exercise its discretion in fashioning a restitution order. The report shall include, to the extent practicable, a complete accounting of the losses to each victim, any restitution owed pursuant to a plea agreement, and information relating to the economic circumstances of each defendant. If the number or identity of victims cannot be reasonably ascertained, or other circumstances exist that make this requirement clearly impracticable, the probation service shall so inform the court.

''(b) The court shall disclose to both the defendant and the attorney for the Government all portions of the presentence or other report pertaining to the matters described in subsection (a) of this section.

''(c) The provisions of this chapter, chapter 227, and Rule 32(c) of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure shall be the only rules applicable to proceedings under this section.

''(d)(1)(A) Upon application of the United States, the court may enter a restraining order or injunction, require the execution of a satisfactory performance bond, or take any other action to preserve the availability of property or assets necessary to satisfy a criminal restitution order under this subchapter. Such order may be entered in the following circumstances:

''(i) Prior to the filing of an indictment or information charging an offense that may result in a criminal restitution order, and upon the United States showing that—

''(I) there is a substantial probability that the United States will obtain a criminal restitution order;

''(II) the defendant has or is likely to take action to dissipate or hide the defendant's property or assets; and

''(III) the need to preserve the availability of the property or assets through the requested order outweighs the hardship of any party against whom the order is entered.

''(ii) Upon the filing of an indictment or information charging an offense that may result in a criminal restitution order, and upon the United States showing that the defendant has or is likely to take action to dissipate or hide the defendant's property or assets.

''(iii) Upon the conviction, or entry of a guilty plea, to an indictment or information charging an offense that may result in a criminal restitution order, and upon the United States showing that the defendant may take action to dissipate or hide the defendant's property or assets or that an order is necessary to marshal and determine the defendant's property or assets.

''(B) An order entered pursuant to subparagraph (A) shall be effective for not more than 90 days, unless extended by the court for good cause shown or unless an indictment or information described in subparagraph (A)(ii) has been filed.

''(2)(A) Except as provided in paragraph (3), an order entered under this subsection shall be after notice to persons appearing to have an interest in the property and opportunity for a hearing, and upon the United States carrying the burden of proof by a preponderance of the evidence.

''(B) The court may receive and consider, at a hearing held pursuant to this subsection, evidence and information that would be inadmissible under the Federal Rules of Evidence.

''(3)(A) A temporary restraining order may be entered without notice or opportunity for a hearing if the United States demonstrates that—

''(i) there is probable cause to believe that the property or assets with respect to which the order is sought would be subject to execution upon the entry of a criminal restitution order;

''(ii) there is a substantial probability that the United States will obtain a criminal restitution order; and

''(iii) the provision of notice would jeopardize the availability of the property or assets for execution.

''(B) A temporary order under this paragraph shall expire not later than 10 days after the date on which it is entered, unless—

''(i) the court grants an extension for good cause shown; or

''(ii) the party against whom the order is entered consents to an extension for a longer period.

''(C) A hearing requested concerning an order entered under this paragraph shall be held at the earliest possible time, and prior to the expiration of the temporary order.

''(4)(A) Information concerning the net worth, financial affairs, transactions or interests of the defendant presented to the grand jury may be disclosed to an attorney for the government assisting in the enforcement of criminal restitution orders, for use in the performance of that attorney's duties.

''(B)(i) An attorney for the government responsible for the prosecution of criminal offenses, or responsible for the enforcement of criminal restitution orders, may obtain and use consumer credit reports to—

''(I) obtain an order under this section;

''(II) determine the amount of restitution that is appropriate; or

''(III) enforce a criminal restitution order.

''(ii) This subparagraph does not limit the availability of grand jury subpoenas to obtain such credit reports.

''(iii) Upon conviction, such reports may be furnished to the United States Probation Service.

''(e)(1)(A) Within 60 days after conviction, and in any event not later than 10 days prior to sentencing, the attorney for the United States after consulting with all victims (when practicable), shall promptly provide the probation service of the court all information readily available to the attorney, including matters occurring before the grand jury relating to the identity of the victim or victims, the amount of loss, and financial matters relating to the defendant.

''(B) The attorney for the government shall, if practicable, provide notice to all victims. The notice shall inform the victims of the offenses for which the defendant was convicted, the victim's right to submit information to the probation office concerning the amount of the victim's losses, and the scheduled date, time, and place of the sentencing hearing.

''(C) Upon ex parte application to the court, and a showing that the requirements of subparagraph (A) may cause harm to any victim, or jeopardize an ongoing investigation, the court may limit the information to be provided to or sought by the probation service of the court.

''(D) If any victim objects to any of the information provided to the probation service by the attorney for the United States, the victim may file a separate affidavit with the court.

''(2) After reviewing the report of the probation service of the court, the court may require additional documentation or hear testimony. The privacy of any records filed, or testimony heard, pursuant to this section shall be maintained to the greatest extent possible and such records may be filed or testimony heard in camera.

''(3) If the victim's losses are not ascertainable by the date that is 10 days prior to sentencing as provided in paragraph (1), the United States Attorney (or the United States Attorney's delegee) shall so inform the court, and the court shall set a date for the final determination of the victim's losses, not to exceed 90 days after sentencing. If the victim's losses cannot reasonably be ascertained, the court shall determine an appropriate amount of restitution based on the available information. If the victim subsequently discovers further losses, the victim shall have 60 days after discovery of those losses in which to petition the court for an amended restitution order. Such order may be granted only upon a showing of good cause for the failure to include such losses in the initial claim for restitutionary relief.

''(4) The court may refer any issue arising in connection with a proposed order of restitution to a magistrate or special master for proposed findings of fact and recommendations as to disposition, subject to a de novo determination of the issue by the court.

''(5) In no case shall the fact that a victim has received or is entitled to receive compensation with respect to a loss from insurance or any other source be considered in determining the amount of restitution.

''(f) Any dispute as to the proper amount or type of restitution shall be resolved by the court by the preponderance of the evidence. The burden of demonstrating the amount of the loss sustained by a victim as a result of the offense shall be on the attorney for the Government. The burden of demonstrating the financial resources of the defendant and the financial needs of the defendant and such defendant's dependents shall be on the defendant. The burden of demonstrating such other matters as the court deems appropriate shall be upon the party designated by the court as justice requires.

''(g)(1)(A) In each order of restitution, the court shall order restitution to each victim in the full amount of each victim's losses as determined by the court and without consideration of the economic circumstances of the defendant.

''(B) If—

''(i) the number of victims is too great;

''(ii) the actual identity of the victims cannot be ascertained; and

''(iii) or the full amount of each victim's losses cannot be reasonably ascertained; the court shall order restitution in the amount of the total loss that is reasonably ascertainable.

''(2) The restitution order shall be for a sum certain and payable immediately.

''(3) If the court finds from facts on the record that the economic circumstances of the defendant do not allow and are not likely to allow the defendant to make more than nominal payments under the restitution order, the court shall direct the defendant to make nominal periodic payments in the amount the defendant can reasonably be expected to pay by making a diligent and bona fide effort toward the restitution order entered pursuant to paragraph (1). Nothing in the paragraph shall impair the defendant's obligation to make full restitution pursuant to paragraphs (1) and (2).

''(4) Notwithstanding any payment schedule entered by the court pursuant to paragraph (2), each order of restitution shall be a civil debt, payable immediately, and subject to the enforcement procedures provided in subsection (n). In no event shall a defendant incur any criminal penalty for failure to make a restitution payment under the restitution order because of the defendant's indigency.

''(h)(1) No victim shall be required to participate in any phase of a restitution order. If a victim declines to receive restitution made mandatory by this title, the court shall order that the victim's share of any restitution owed be deposited in the Crime Victims Fund in the Treasury.

''(2) A victim may at any time assign the victim's interest in restitution payments to the Crime Victims Fund in the Treasury without in any way impairing the obligation of the defendant to make such payments.

''(3) If the victim cannot be located or identified, the court shall direct that the restitution payments be made to the Crime Victims Fund of the Treasury. This paragraph shall not be construed to impair the obligation of the defendant to make such payments.

''(i) If the court finds that more than 1 defendant has contributed to the loss of a victim, the court may make each defendant jointly and severally liable for payment of the full amount of restitution or may apportion liability among the defendants to reflect the level of contribution to the victim's loss and economic circumstances of each defendant.

''(j) If the court finds that more than 1 victim has sustained a loss requiring restitution by a defendant, the court may issue an order of priority for restitution payments based on the type and amount of the victim's loss accounting for the economic circumstances of each victim. In any case in which the United States is a victim, the court shall ensure that all individual victims receive full restitution before the United States receives any restitution.

''(k)(1) If a victim has received or is entitled to receive compensation with respect to a loss from insurance or any other source, the court shall order that restitution shall be paid to the person who provided or is obligated to provide the compensation, but the restitution order shall provide that all restitution of victims required by the order be paid to the victims before any restitution is paid to such a provider of compensation.

''(2) Any amount paid to a victim under an order of restitution shall be reduced by any amount later recovered as compensatory damages for the same loss by the victim in—

''(A) any Federal civil proceeding; and

''(B) any State civil proceeding, to the extent provided by the law of the State.

''(3) If a person obligated to provide restitution receives substantial resources from any source, including inheritance, settlement, or other judgment, such person shall be required to apply the value of such resources to any restitution still owed.

''(l) The defendant shall notify the court and the Attorney General of any material change in the defendant's economic circumstances that might affect the defendant's ability to pay restitution. Upon receipt of the notification, the court may, on its own motion, or the motion of any party, including the victim, adjust the payment schedule, or require immediate payment in full, as the interests of justice require.

''(m)(1) The court shall retain jurisdiction over any criminal restitution judgment or amended criminal restitution judgment for a period of 5 years from the date the sentence was imposed. This limitation shall be tolled during any period of time that the defendant—

''(A) was incarcerated;

''(B) was a fugitive; or

''(C) was granted a stay that prevented the enforcement of the restitution order.

''(2) While within the jurisdiction of the court, if the defendant knowingly fails to make a bona fide effort to pay whatever amount of restitution is ordered by the court, or knowingly and willfully refuses to pay restitution, the court may—

''(A) modify the terms or conditions of the defendant's probation or supervised release;

''(B) extend the defendant's probation or supervised release until a date not later than 10 years from the date the sentence was imposed;

''(C) revoke the defendant's probation or supervised release;

''(D) hold the defendant in contempt; or

''(E) increase the defendant's sentence to any sentence that might originally have been imposed under the applicable statute, without regard to the sentencing guidelines.

''(n)(1) An order of restitution may be enforced—

''(A) through civil or administrative methods during the period that the restitution lien provided for in section 3613 of title 18, United States Code, is enforceable;

''(B) by the United States in the manner provided for in subchapter C of chapter 227 and subchapter B of chapter 229;

''(C) by the United States regardless of whether for the benefit of the United States, in accordance with the procedures of chapter 176 of part VI of title 28, or in accordance with any other administrative or civil enforcement means available to the United States to enforce a debt due the United States; or

''(D) by any victim named in the restitution order as a lien pursuant to section 1962 of title 28.

''(2) A conviction of a defendant for an offense giving rise to restitution under this section shall estop the defendant from denying the essential allegations of that offense in any subsequent Federal civil proceeding or State civil proceeding, regardless of any State law precluding estoppel for a lack of mutuality. The victim, in such subsequent proceeding, shall not be precluded from establishing a loss that is greater than the loss determined by the court in the earlier criminal proceeding.''.

(b) TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.—The item relating to section 3664 in the analysis for chapter 232 of title 18, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''3664. Procedure for issuance and enforcement of order of restitution.''.

SEC. 3. CIVIL REMEDIES.

Section 3613 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the heading, by inserting ''or restitution'' after ''fine''; and

(2) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking ''A fine'' and inserting the following:

''(1) FINES.—A fine'';

(B) by redesignating paragraphs (1) and (2) as subparagraphs (A) and (B), respectively, and indenting accordingly; and

(C) by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

''(2) RESTITUTION.—(A) An order of restitution shall operate as a lien in favor of the United States for its benefit or for the benefit of any non-Federal victims against all property belonging to the defendant or defendants. The lien shall arise at the time of the entry of judgment or order and shall continue until the liability is satisfied, remitted, or set aside, or until it becomes otherwise unenforceable. Such lien shall apply against all property and property interests owned by the defendants at the time of arrest as well as all property subsequently acquired by the defendant or defendants.

''(B) The lien shall be entered in the name of the United States in behalf of all ascertained victims, unascertained victims, victims entitled to restitution who choose not to participate in the restitution program and victims entitled to restitution who cannot assert their interests in the lien for any reason.

''(3) JOINTLY HELD PROPERTY.—(A)(i) If the court enforcing an order of restitution under this section determines that the defendant has an interest in property with another, and that the defendant cannot satisfy the restitution order from his or her separate property or income, the court may, after considering all of the equities, order such jointly owned property be divided and sold, upon such conditions as the court deems just, regardless of any Federal or State law to the contrary.

''(ii) The court shall take care to protect the reasonable and legitimate interests of the defendant's innocent spouse and minor children, especially real property used as the actual home of such innocent spouse and minor children, except to the extent that the court determines that the interest of such innocent spouse and children is the product of the criminal activity of which the defendant has been convicted, or is the result of a fraudulent transfer.

''(B) In determining whether there was a fraudulent transfer, the court shall consider whether the debtor made the transfer—

''(i) with actual intent to hinder, delay, or defraud the United States or other victim; or

''(ii) without receiving a reasonably equivalent value in exchange for the transfer.

''(C) In determining what portion of such jointly owned property shall be set aside for the defendant's innocent spouse or children, or whether to have sold or divided such jointly held property, the court shall consider—

''(i) the contributions of the other joint owner to the value of the property;

''(ii) the reasonable expectation of the other joint owner to be able to enjoy the continued use of the property; and

''(iii) the economic circumstances and needs of the defendant and dependents of the defendant and the economic circumstances and needs of the victim and the dependents of the victim.''.

SEC. 4. FINES.

Section 3572(b) of title 18, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''(b) Any fine, special assessment, restitution, or cost shall be for a sum certain and payable immediately. In no event shall a defendant incur any criminal penalty for failure to make a payment on a fine, special assessment, restitution, or cost because of the defendant's indigency.''.

SEC. 5. RESENTENCING.

Section 3614 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting ''or may increase the defendant's sentence to any sentence that might originally have been imposed under the applicable statute'' after ''imposed''.●

ERNEST L. BOYER

●Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, in the early part of December, the Nation lost one of the finest public officials it has ever had, Ernest L. Boyer, who was a commissioner of education under President Carter and head of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

I have had the opportunity of working with him on a number of issues. He was a genuinely fine human being and an unusually competent and dedicated public servant.

Those of us who worked with him know that in addition to everything else, he was simply ''a nice guy.''

His loss is a huge loss to the Nation.

I was pleased with the editorial comment of the Washington Post which I ask to be printed in full in the RECORD.

The article follows:

[From the Washington Post]

ERNEST L. BOYER

The progress of ''education reform'' is always hard to track: Where are all these ''reforms'' going, and how can we tell when they get there? One of the few voices that helped answer the latter question was that of Ernest L. Boyer, who died last week. Mr. Boyer, head of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, had been commissioner of education under President Carter and before that the president of the State University of New York. He was once introduced to a Washington gathering as ''a man who has never had an unpublished thought.''

But Mr. Boyer's real contribution, in a debate that tends to be by turns faddish and cacophonous, was not just to be widely heard but to cling tenaciously over the years to a few simple principles. One was that the high school diploma should mean something: Schools, school systems and state legislatures should cease giving graduation credit for shopping-mall-style electives or ''business math'' and insist on solid fare such as four years of English, two of algebra, history in place of ''social studies.''

That insistence prevailed in enough places and has been in effect long enough to have produced results, as high schools report toughened standards and a few colleges say students are better prepared. Another strongly held Boyer view was that early childhood education and nutrition made a dramatic difference in children's futures; yet another, that the large schools so popular in the 1960s and 1970s were bad for students who, especially in urban systems and at the critical junior high school level, were suffering already from a lack of adult attention in their lives. ''Too often when students 'drop out,'" he wrote, ''nobody has ever noticed they had 'dropped in.'"

These ideas, neither complicated nor trendy, can be all the harder to focus public attention on for their lack of drama. But they need to be stated, and stated over and over as the wave of ''education reform'' launched by the 1983 report called ''A National At Risk'' gets increasingly diffuse and degenerates into political quarreling. More than anything else, education—real education that gets somewhere—implies long and low-key effort, sustained attention to the child at hand. Mr. Boyer was such an educator, whose patience and consistency carried as much influence as the quality of the ideas he put forward.●

CARMEN AND VINCENT AITRO

● Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize two exemplary citizens from the State of Connecticut, Carmen and Vincent Aitro. These two men, twin brothers, have worked tirelessly to help their community and to improve the lives of Connecticut's youths. The Aitro brothers have a long-standing history of dedication to the New Haven area community-service organizations.

Carmen and Vincent Aitro have used sports to instill positive values and principles into the young people they involve. They have directed or coached numerous teams and athletic organizations in sports, including baseball, basketball, and softball. Many of their teams excelled on the field, winning numerous league and State championships. The young people coached by the twins have received invaluable benefits, not just in terms of athletic skills, but also, more importantly, skills and attitudes that will aid and guide them throughout their lives.

The Aitro brothers have already been recognized by their community. They have served on the board of directors of many organizations, among which are the Walter Camp Football Foundation, the New Haven Boys and Girls Club Board of Managers, and the Commissioner of the New Haven Housing Authority. The honors Carmen and Vincent have accrued are numerous, but include The Dante Club Old Timers Award, the Andy Papero Bronco League Man of the Year, the Boys Club Alumni Gold Ring Award, and the Walter Camp Award.

Therefore, Mr. President, I believe that these two outstanding individuals should be commended for their many years of service and dedication. These are two men who truly made a difference through their accomplishments, and their nature of generosity and selflessness will long be remembered.●

ARTHUR M. WOOD, JR.

● Mr. MACK. Mr. President, I rise today to honor Arthur M. Wood, Jr., who will be awarded the Institute of Human Relations Award on February 20, 1996 by the southwest Florida chapter of the American Jewish Committee. The award is given annually to a member of the community who best exemplifies what the institute stands for—building mutual respect and understanding among America's diverse population groups.

Arthur M. Wood, Jr. was born in Chicago on October 11, 1950. After growing up in northern Illinois and southern California, he graduated from Princeton University with a B.A. degree in

English in 1972. In 1975, he received his master's degree from Northwestern University's Kellogg Graduate School of Management with a concentration in finance, marketing, and organizational behavior.

Art was appointed president of Northern Trust Bank in 1987. Since that time he and his wife Peggy, a former vice president of J. Walter Thompson Co., helped raise millions of dollars for philanthropies in the Sarasota area.

Art's continuous involvement in the community has included philanthropies and civic causes of all sizes and scope. He chairs the Van Wezel Foundation and is a former treasurer. He is chairman of New College Foundation; and a member of the Asolo Center's board of directors. He is past chairman of the Sarasota Memorial Hospital Century Foundation and the past president of the United Way of Sarasota. He is chairman of the Out-of-Door Academy and a former board member of Florida West Coast Symphony, the Salvation Army, and the Education Foundation. He was chairman of the 1990–91 United Way Campaign and has served on the advisory boards of Sarasota Ballet and Girl's Inc. He also cochaired the 1991 French Film Festival with his wife Peggy.

In addition to his individual efforts, he has participated in and supported Peggy in her many charitable endeavors, which include, but are not limited to, the following: chair of the 1995 New College Auction, chair of the 1994 Circus Gala at Ringling Museum, chair of the 1994 Sarasota Opera's Youth Festival, chair of the 1992 Memorial Hospital Cartoon Classic, chair of the 1991 New College Library Association Mistletoe Ball, chair of the 1990 Family Counseling Center's benefit, and chair of the 1989 Orchid Ball.

Mr. President, as you can see Art has not limited his benevolence to specific organizations, instead his influence is felt across the entire Sarasota community. He has done more charitable work in 10 years than most of us could hope to do in a lifetime. The great State of Florida is a better place because of Art Wood's commitment to his community. Mr. President, I will conclude by commending the southwest Florida chapter of the American Jewish Committee, especially the committee's president Robert Rosenthal and director Harriet Abraham, for their dedication in recognizing this year's recipient of the 1996 Human Relations Award, Arthur M. Wood, Jr.●

A CENTURY OF NOBLE SERVICE: COMMENDATION OF THE ENFIELD VOLUNTEER FIRE DEPARTMENT ON THE OCCASION OF ITS CENTENNIAL ANNIVERSARY

● Mr. DODD. Mr. President, never has the noble spirit of voluntarism been more important than it is today. And nowhere in the Nation is the spirit of self-reliance and gritty determination a more integral part of life than it is in New England. Voluntarism and self-reliance came together in 1896, when the citizens of Enfield, CT, formed the volunteer Enfield Fire Department, and they are alive and well in the department's service today. And so it is my pleasure to offer my commendation to the brave men and women of the Enfied Volunteer Fire Department who have served and protected Enfield for 100 years.

At a time when our society is seeking real role models for our children, we can with confidence point to our Nation's volunteer firefighters as true heroes. The galant members of the Enfield Volunteer Fire Department, both past and present, have selflessly devoted themselves, day in and day out, to saving the lives and livelihoods of their neighbors. Without these dedicated individuals, the community of Enfield would be at a tremendous loss.

No matter what is required of them, Enfield's volunteer firefighters stand ready to help. Whether responding to an emergency, or preventing emergencies from happening in the first place, all the department's activities are executed with the highest caliber of professionalism. Indeed, the firefighters make a difference every day, conducting safety lessons in schools and throughout the community to teach kids and others about fire prevention.

Mr. President, the men and women of the Enfield Fire Department have faithfully served and protected Enfield, contributing tens of thousands of hours, for a century. Those who served yesterday, serve today, and will serve tomorrow, are truly a tribute to the State of Connecticut. I am proud of the work done by these fine citizens, and as they celebrate their centennial, wish them another hundred years of valiant duty.●

DRUG LEGALIZATION

● Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, yesterday the New York Times ran a piece noting that the lead story in the next issue of the National Review is going to call for the legalization of drugs. The rationale for this argument is that the war on drugs has failed and that the only solution is to declare defeat and turn the asylum over to the inmates.

I am not sure just what information the folks at the National Review are using, but the facts are flawed and the argument is dumb and irresponsible.

Mr. Buckley, the author of the piece, is safe in making such arguments because he personally does not plan to use drugs. No one of his immediate acquaintance is likely to start using dangerous drugs. And I doubt that he will encourage any teenage members of his family to use drugs. So the consequences of his advocacy will not be felt personally. Instead, the burden of his ideas will be borne by countless families whose kids—the most at-risk population—will fall victim to the consequences of drug abuse. The costs will also be borne by the public purse, as we have to treat the walking wounded.

Although there is no public support for the idea of legalization, and none in the Congress, some of our culture elite—left and right—keep raising the idea as if it had some intellectual merit. Nothing could be farther from the truth. I am therefore submitting for the RECORD a longer statement on the common mistakes made in the legalization argument that I hope will help in closing this latest chapter in foolishness.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT BY CHARLES E. GRASSLEY: DRUG LEGALIZATION

I have been increasingly concerned about the tendency in some quarters to promote the legalization of drugs in this country. If there is any idea that is essentially without merit and without public support, it is that this country should entertain seriously the notion that dangerous drugs should be legalized and made widely available. Drug legalization is truly an invitation to the Mad Hatter's Tea Party.

Unfortunately, many in the media and in our cultural elite, who have a disproportionate access to public communication and opinion outlets, have once again started to advocate some form of legalization. While this advocacy is not likely to lead to a major change in public policy, it can and does have an adverse influence on thinking about the dangers of drug. It sends a mixed message about the dangers of use that is particularly harmful when it touches our young people.

As Bill Bennett and Joe Califano noted recently, drugs are illegal because they are dangerous, they are not dangerous because they are illegal. Legalization advocates, however, deploy a variety of arguments on behalf of their position that ignore this essential fact. They all too often resort to scare tactics, misrepresent reality, or skip over inconvenient facts. I think that it is important to set the record straight.

There are a number of misconceptions about our efforts to deal with the drug problem. It is important to understand these and the common arguments used to promote them in order to arrive at a reasoned and reasonable understanding of what the drug problem is about. One of the first points to note is that our last drug epidemic—during the 1960s, 1970s, and early 1980s—was the result of arguments made by some that drugs were really not a problem and that everyone would feel better, live better, and prosper from the self-administration of dangerous drugs.

The claim, made with considerable fervor, was that drugs were liberating and that only a repressive society would prevent people from achieving their true potential. By the late 1980s, we finally came to realize just what a cruel hoax, a big lie, these claims were. We are still trying to cope with an addict population from that ear, a period that has left us with a legacy of lives blasted by drug use, a cost that is borne by families and the public purse. We cannot afford to ignore this lesson, to repeat a disaster based on the enthusiasms of a few.

Mistake #1: Prohibition doesn't can't work. Efforts to keep people from using drugs, like alcohol prohibition, only encourages the idea of forbidden fruit, increases crime, and will always fail.

The argument that prohibition doesn't work relies on a collective amnesia about

this country's experience with alcohol prohibition between 1920 and 1934. In the first place, Prohibition did not make the use of alcohol illegal, only its manufacture and sale over a certain strength. It was, in effect, a control regime legalizing personal use. This effort came at the end of a very long history in this country of trying to reduce the consumption of alcohol from dangerous heights. The modern parallel is with the efforts to reduce tobacco use.

Second, Prohibition did not lead to a major increase in violent crime, as is often claimed. The major increase, particularly in violent crime in this country, came between 1900 and 1910, well before the prohibition movement. Violent crime remained fairly stable or declined during Prohibition. While it is true that crime rates decreased after Prohibition this was not the result of ending Prohibition. Nor did Prohibition create organized crime. Major organized crime groups existed well before alcohol prohibition and they prospered after it ended.

Third, major health problems, such as cirrhosis of the liver and alcohol-related psychoses, declined sharply during Prohibition. Alcohol consumption, even though it was not illegal, also declined sharply. It increased in the years following the repeal of Prohibition, as did the associated health problems.

Fourth, it is important to remember also that alcohol, unlike dangerous drugs, had wide social acceptance and a long history of use. Alcohol can also be used by most people without creating impairment, either temporary or long term. Marijuana, cocaine, and heroin have no such long history of popular public use or acceptance, and their use is solely for the purpose of intoxication. In fact, the public has opposed these substances once they learned how dangerous and destructive they were. This is also true historically in this country and internationally. No society today has a legalization regime for dangerous drugs.

In addition, it is clear that control efforts, when reinforced by serious law enforcement, prevention, and education programs do deter use, especially among young people. Our own recent experience illustrates how effective we can be. After decades of increasing use in this country, we reversed the trend of drug use when, beginning in the mid-1980s, we decided to just say no and to get serious about doing something. Overall drug use, apart from addicts, declined by more than 50 percent; cocaine use by 70 percent. Unfortunately, more recently, as we have moved away from these serious programs we have seen a return to use in the most at-risk population—teenagers.

Mistake #2: Legalization will mean less crime because the profit motive is removed and we will lock fewer people up when we make our drug laws more humane

First, most prisoners in state and Federal prisons are not there for drug offenses as their first or major offense. Most offenders are in jail for violent or repeat offenses. Of these, despite the wildy exaggerated numbers often cited, only 10 percent of Federal prisoners and 17 percent of state inmates committed their crimes to obtain drugs. Indeed, research shows that most career criminals came to drug use after starting their criminal activities, not before. Legalization will not greatly reduce the crime rate, especially for violent crimes. Indeed, in so far as the pharmacological effects of drugs, particularly cocaine and other stimulants, exacerbate violent tendencies, legalization will produce far greater violent crime rates as the number of ''legal'' addicts soars.

Second, the vast majority of prisoners serving time from drug offenses are not there for use but for trafficking—individuals whose actions destroy lives and menace neighborhoods.

Third, legalization will not end black markets for drugs, unless we are prepared to legalize drug use for all ages down to the age of 6 or 7. Only the most radical legalization advocates want to see kids using drugs. But to leave any population out of a legalization regime means leaving a black market. Crime will not simply disappear nor will the organizations that are currently trafficking in illegal drugs.

Mistake #3: Legalization will mean a healthier climate in which controlled drug use will provide quality control and monitored use

This argument misses or misrepresents the issue. The issue is not whether we make drugs, which are inherently dangerous to use, more pure, but whether we permit their use at all. Britain led the way in trying to treat dangerous drug use as a therapeutic problem, regulating addicts through doctors' care. This was not an open drug policy for anyone to use drugs but a policy just for addicts. The result was a disaster. It did not prevent the spread of drug abuse. It only made doctors complicit in the act of promoting an addiction for which they had no cure. In effect, it reversed the normal doctor-patient relationship, putting doctors in the position of making their patients worse off. As a result, in Britain, addiction soared, addicts got worse not better, and the black market flourished. Similar experiences have visited similar efforts in other countries. Now, it seems that Switzerland is experimenting with a variation of this approach. The results are likely to be a similar disaster, making the government and the medical community complicit in spreading addiction.

It is also important to keep in mind, that dangerous drugs are not synonymous with other controlled pharmaceuticals. The latter are controlled but they also have a therapeutic purpose. Dangerous drugs have no medical purpose. They are addictive and destructive. To argue that these drugs should be self-administered with the only control being over their quality is to argue for a massive increase in the addict population, adding an even greater burden to an overtaxed health-care system. In effect, the legalization argument requires society to endorse a self-destructive behavior and then requires society to provide perpetual care to the victims at public expense.

Mistake #4: Deterrence does not work

When you talk to former addicts or those who have given up use, one of the most important reasons they give for their decision to quit or seek treatment was the threat of criminal prosecution, the difficulty of acquiring drugs, and the cost. When drugs are perceived as expensive, dangerous and wrongful to use, difficult to get, and involve a risk of criminal prosecution, potential users forego use, and many current users quit. This remains true even though most enforcement efforts focus not on users but on violent offenders and drug traffickers.

No program to prohibit drug use can be universally effective. Although we have long-standing laws against child abuse or murder or theft, these have not prevented any of these acts completely. No one doubts their importance, however, or the role they play in discouraging yet more of these actions than if they were not prohibited.

Mistake #5: Legalizing drugs will remove the ''Forbidden Fruit'' appeal of drugs, which leads most new users, especially the young, into use

If this is a valid argument, then anything that society prohibits for the general good would succumb to the same argument. Forbidding child abuse encourages child abuse. Prohibiting murder encourages it. This is the logic of the argument. In fact, the reverse in the case. We educate people's understanding of what is rightful or wrongful to do by the laws that we declare and enforce. Even during Prohibition, when use was legal, the simple message sent by society that use was bad caused significant drops in use. Whenever we have enforced our drug laws and backed these up with education and prevention programs endorsed by our civic and cultural leaders, we have seen use decline and young people forego use. When we ignore this simple reality we see kids returning to drug use.

Unless one contemplates making cocaine and heroin routinely available to 12–18 year olds, something even few legalizers argue, then legalization will not remove the so-called ''Forbidden Fruit'' appeal. It will only add the idea that society condones use while continuing to prohibit access to the most at-risk population. Just the absence of a clear message on drug use in the last few years has seen teens returning to use in disturbing numbers. A legalization message would have devastating results.

Mistake #6: Drug use is a purely personal choice. It is a victimless crime. The state has no right to keep people from using drugs

The idea that an individual who uses drugs does so in some vacuum that affects no one else is another one of those fictions that obscures the facts. In the first place, drug users don't stay home. They go to work and play with the rest of us. They use the highways, they drive the school buses and trains, they fly the planes. They also encourage others to use, thus spreading the problem.

People under the influence of dangerous drugs are more prone to workplace accidents, are more likely to have highway accidents, are more prone to use violence in public and family disputes, and are at greater risk for health care than are non-users. Addicts are far more likely to lose control over their own lives, and are more in need of public intervention. A considerable percentage, perhaps as many as 60 percent, of the homeless are drug and alcohol addicts. Some 2 percent of live births in this country—over 100,000 babies—are born addicted with lifelong disabilities because their mothers used. Conservative estimates of the yearly social costs of drug addiction at current levels run around $70 billion. These costs are borne by families and the public purse. The number of users and consequently the number of addicts would soar under a legalization regime, compounding all the problems we currently have. There is no such thing as a purely private use of drugs without consequences. There is no known cure for addiction. A choice for legalization would be a self-inflicted disaster.

Mistake #7: Since alcohol and tobacco are legal, and cause far more harm than dangerous drugs, we should make heroin, cocaine, etc., legal to be consistent. Doing so would not increase the number of users significantly

Here is the legalization argument at its most outrageous. What people are asked to accept is the idea that because we have substances generally available that already cause major harm—tobacco and alcohol—we should add dangerous drugs to the occasions for woe for the sake of consistency. What the argument says is that since we have one major problem we should make it worse by adding another. Who are we kidding?

In order to rescue this logic from being completely ludicrous, people are asked to believe a further assertion: that under a legal regime there won't be an increase in users. Really? Let's look at what we are being asked to believe. We are going to make drugs cheaper and freely available. We are going to

see them aggressively marketed by the producers. We are going to have society condone the use of addictive substances. But, we are not going to see a significant increase in use. Such is our understanding of human nature?

We saw what happened with drug use in this country in the 1960s and 1970s when we allowed the de facto legalization of drugs, condoning personal use and not enforcing our laws. That partial legal environment caused a dramatic increase in use. Can anyone doubt the effects if we condoned use outright? We cannot afford this kind of logic.

These are by no means the only myths. Others hold that drug laws are racist—which is another big lie, but even if true it is hardly an argument for making drugs legal; that the health consequences of personal use are exaggerated; or that drug laws lead to locking up lot of innocent people. None of these arguments can sustain serious attention or thought. Nor is there any major public support for drug legalization. The argument is pressed by only a few, some liberal, some conservative. To make the argument requires, however, suspension of judgment, a willingness to accept assertions over facts, and a professional absence of mind that ignores experience.

Unfortunately, while the argument for legalization has little public support, it is a major agenda item of many of our cultural elites. They have a disproportionate influence on our public discourse, on our radios and television, in the movies, in music and the arts. This means they have a disproportionate influence on the most at-risk population for drug users—our young people. By helping to obscure the message of the dangers of drug use, by encouraging it as part of a ''liberated'' life style, they contribute directly to use. When our political leaders remain silent they aid and abet this. The result in the 1960s made the point. Our recent experience confirms it: When you replace ''Just Say No'' with ''Just Say Nothing'' or ''I didn't inhale,'' you are opening the door to trouble.●

NO RIGHT WAY TO DO WRONG

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, someone called my attention to an editorial in the Omaha World-Herald on the subject of gambling. I hope before long we will authorize a Commission to look at what we should do about this subject nationally. But the editorial in the Omaha World-Herald, which I ask to be printed in full in the RECORD, may be a cause for some reflection.

The article follows:

[From the Omaha World-Herald, Nov. 19, 1995]

NO RIGHT WAY TO DO WRONG

As we were musing recently about the inability of some local officials to say no to the gambling industry, we recalled what Howard Buffett, then a Douglas County commissioner, said when the city-county keno issue came up for a vote in 1991.

''To me, it's clearly wrong,'' he said. ''I don't think there's any right way to do what you think is wrong.'' Buffett said government shouldn't condone a practice that undermines the work ethic. He was the only county commissioner to oppose the deal.

Regrettably, Buffett is no longer part of county government. He resigned in 1992 and moved to Illinois to take a new job.

Buffett didn't stop being concerned about gambling. In Illinois, he helped campaign against the spread of riverboat gambling. A friend in Massachusetts heard about his efforts and asked him to write down his views on gambling and government for use in a Massachusetts anti-gambling effort.

The views he set down were again on target.

America was built on hard work, commitment and honesty, he said. Gambling reduces productivity and ''cannibalizes existing industry.'' It spawns political corruption—the bigger it gets, the more government cooperation it requires. When profits drop, some governments have lowered the tax rates the gambling industry pays, thus putting more pressure on other taxpayers.

Gambling doesn't pay its own way. Taxpayers are stuck with social problems. In Illinois, Buffett said, government must spend $3 to $6 for public safety, regulation and other gambling-related items for each $1 it receives in gambling revenue.

Gambling deceives and misleads. Promoters deceptively portray everyone as a winner in advertisements that ''help wring billions of dollars from the most vulnerable 'customers' possible—the poor and the addicted.'' Teen-agers bet up to $1 billion a year. An estimated 8 percent of the nation's adolescents are problem gamblers.

''The state,'' Buffet wrote, ''should not even allow gambling, much less conduct it.''

He's right. His article contains a challenge for government officials. Portraying government-sponsored gambling as a lifelong investment, he asked: ''Is it an investment that you will be proud to hand down to the next generation?''

With the exception of Mayor Daub, few officials of Omaha and Douglas County have indicated that they have as clear a view. They should think about Buffett's challenge. Will they indeed be proud of what they are leaving their children and grandchildren?●

COMMEMORATING THE ANNIVERSARY OF ROE VERSUS WADE

<=>?@ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRSTUVWXYZ[]—abcdefghijklmnopqrstuvwxyz

● Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, January 22, 1996, commemorated the 23d anniversary of the Nation's landmark abortion rights decision Roe versus Wade. The Supreme Court's decision in Roe established constitutionally based limits on the power of the Government to restrict the right of a woman to choose to terminate a pregnancy.

The right to choose has never been under such fierce attack. In this Congress, the U.S. House of Representatives has waged an all-out attack on a woman's right to choose. They have continuously voted to restrict a woman's fundamental right to choose by:

Attempting to undermine the Accreditation Council on Graduate Medical Education [ACGME] revised requirements for residency training in obstetrics/gynecology with an anti-choice amendment. Currently, in order to address the acute shortage of abortion providers, the revised policy requires OB/GYN programs to provide training in abortion procedures. However, there is a conscience clause for individuals and institutions that have moral or religious objections to abortion. The anti-choice amendment would treat those institutions that qualify under the exemption clause as though they were accredited for purposes of Federal reimbursements, even though they did not provide the training.

Giving States the option to refuse to provide Medicaid funding for abortions in cases or rape and incest.

Attempting to criminalize for the first time the performance of a specific abortion procedure. This measure also passed in the Senate.

Rejecting an amendment by Representative PATRICIA SCHROEDER to allow money from the anticrime block grants to be used for protection at abortion clinics.

Rejecting an amendment by Representative HOKE to allow money from the anticrime block grants to be used for enhancing security in and around schools, religious institutions, medical or health facilities, housing complexes, shelters to other threatened facilities.

Adopting an amendment by Representative CHRIS SMITH which codified the Mexico City Policy, which prohibits U.S. funding of any public or private foreign entity that directly or indirectly performs abortions except in cases of rape, incest, or when the life of the woman is endangered.

Rejecting an amendment by Representative ROSA DELAURO which would strike language in the Defense authorization bill prohibiting military personnel and their dependents from obtaining abortions at overseas military bases using their personal funds to pay for the procedure.

Rejecting a substitute amendment by Representative DELAURO to the Dornan amendment to prohibit abortions at overseas military facilities unless the life of the woman is endangered and if the Government is reimbursed with private money for any costs associated with the abortion.

Rejecting an amendment by Representative HOYER to delete a provision in the Treasury-Postal Service appropriations bill that would prohibit Federal employees or their families from receiving abortion services through their Federal health insurance policies except when the life of the woman would be endangered. The Senate passed this measure but added an exception for the life of the mother and rape and incest.

Rejecting an amendment by Delegate NORTON to strike from the Commerce, Justice, State appropriations bill provisions that prevent funds from being used to perform abortions in the Federal prison system except in cases of rape or when the woman's life is endangered. The Senate passed this measure, which was vetoed by President Clinton and its future is uncertain.

Adopting an amendment by Representative GREENWOOD prohibiting funding under title X for abortions or directed pregnancy counseling.

Pro-choice Senators have waged a vigorous effort as have grass-roots activists, but we are outnumbered in too many votes in this anti-choice Congress.

Now H.R. 1833 is on the President's desk. It would make it a criminal offense to perform a rare abortion procedure used to protect women in late term pregnancies. Doctors who have used this procedure have testified these very rare abortions are undertaken

only in the most tragic of circumstances and that the procedure may be the only alternative to save women's lives or to prevent serious, long term health consequences.

President Clinton has indicated his intent to veto this bill, and I urge him to stand firm in his belief that to outlaw a procedure used by physicians out of deep concern for both the mother and the fetus would be wrong and a direct violation of Roe versus Wade, which held that a woman's life and health must always be considered by any governmental entity which regulates abortion.●

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 24, 1996

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that immediately following the joint session of Congress this evening, the Senate stand in adjournment until the hour of 5 p.m. on Wednesday, January 24; that immediately following the prayer, the Journal of proceedings be deemed approved to date, no resolution come over under the rule, the call of the calendar be dispensed with, the morning hour be deemed to have expired, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and there then be a period for morning business until 5:30, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 5 minutes each.

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

RECESS

Mr. CRAIG. I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess under the previous order until the hour of 8:40 p.m. this evening, at which time the Senate will proceed as a body to the Hall of the House of Representatives to hear the State of the Union Address.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:33 p.m., recessed until 8:38 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. DEWINE).

CONSTITUTING MINORITY PARTY'S MEMBERSHIP ON THE ETHICS COMMITTEE

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 212, the resolution be agreed to, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

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

So the resolution (S. Res. 212) was agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 212

Resolved, That the following shall constitute the minority party's membership on the Ethics committee for the 104th Congress, or until their successors are chosen:

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN], Vice chairman;

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID]; and

The Senator from Washington [Mrs. MURRAY].

JOINT SESSION OF THE TWO HOUSES—MESSAGE OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now proceed to the Hall of the House of Representatives.

Thereupon, at 8:38 p.m., the Senate, preceded by the Secretary of the Senate, Kelly D. Johnston, and the Sergeant at Arms, Howard O. Greene, Jr., proceeded to the Hall of the House of Representatives to hear the address by the President of the United States.

(The address by the President of the United States, this day delivered by him to the joint session of the two Houses of Congress, appears in the proceedings of the House of Representatives in today's RECORD.)

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 5 P.M. TOMORROW

At the conclusion of the joint session of the two Houses, and in accordance with the order previously entered into, at 10:15 p.m., the Senate adjourned until Wednesday, January 24, 1996, at 5 p.m.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

LEADERSHIP FOR THE NEXT AMERICAN CENTURY

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1996

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring to the attention of my colleagues a speech delivered late last week by Secretary of State Warren Christopher. Mr. Speaker, we are at the start of an election year, and we can expect partisanship to increase in the House. However, I hope all Members will temper their partisan views when it comes to foreign policy. To that end, I urge all of my colleagues to read Secretary Christopher's speech, delivered last week at the John F. Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University. In the speech, the Secretary reviews the past year in foreign policy, when there were certainly a number of major accomplishments, and sets out the challenges the administration has set for itself for 1996. The Secretary also reviews the guiding principles of the administration's policy. I believe the speech makes absolutely clear what is driving U.S. foreign policy: the U.S. national interest. I hope my colleagues will take the time to read it.

LEADERSHIP FOR THE NEXT AMERICAN CENTURY

(by Warren Christopher)

Let me begin by thanking Joe Nye not only for giving me that warm introduction, but for laying to rest one persistent canard about this fine institution. It used to be said in some circles that the Kennedy School was a plot to infiltrate the federal government. Joe Nye's appointment proves that the opposite is true: the federal government is in fact a plot to infiltrate the Kennedy School.

A year ago, I met with you to explain the guiding principles of this Administration's foreign policy and our priorities for 1995. I am here today to assess a remarkable period of achievement for American diplomacy and to discuss our main objectives for 1996.

The end of the Cold War has given us an unprecedented opportunity to shape a more secure world of open societies and open markets—a world in which American interests and ideals can thrive. But we also face serious threats from which no border can shield us—terrorism, proliferation, crime and damage to the environment.

This is not the end of history, but history in fast-forward. Eight decades ago, when this century's first Balkan war ended, it took an international commission to piece together what had happened. Now, images of violence in Sarajevo are beamed instantly around the world. Six decades ago, it took several years for the Great Depression to become a global disaster. Now, an economic crisis in Mexico can disrupt the global economy in the blink of an eye.

In this time of accelerated change, American leadership must remain consistent. We must be clear-eyed and vigilant in pursuit of our interests. Above all, we must recognize that only the United States has the vision and strength to consolidate the gains of the last few years, and to build an even better world.

Six years after the fall of the Berlin Wall, some still think that we can escape the problems of the world by building walls around America. But the evidence of the last three years should settle the debate about America's role in the world. Because President Clinton has rejected the path of retreat, we have forged a record that proves the enduring value of American leadership and American engagement.

The President, with help from internationalists in both parties, has made the United States the world's driving force for peace. Think of it. Had we not led, the war in Bosnia would continue today, wasting innocent lives, threatening a wider war and eroding the NATO Alliance. Had we not led, there would not be the prospect of comprehensive peace in the Middle East. And there would be scant hope for reconciliation in Northern Ireland.

Without American leadership, thugs would still rule in Haiti, and thousands of Haitian refugees would be trying to reach our shores. The Mexican economy would be in free-fall, threatening our prosperity and harming emerging markets and the global economy. We would not have made the kind of progress on the fullest possible accounting of American POWs and MIAs that allowed us to recognize Vietnam. We would not have gained the indefinite extension of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty—the most important barrier against the spread of nuclear weapons. And North Korea could be building nuclear bombs.

The lesson in clear. If we lead, we can sustain the momentum that defeated communism, freed us from the danger of nuclear war, and unfurled freedom's flag around the world. Our strength is a blessing, not a burden. President Clinton is determined to use it wisely and decisively.

Our strength simply cannot be maintained on the cheap. And yet for a year now, the President and I have been fighting those forces in Congress who would cut our foreign affairs budget so deeply that we would have to draw back from our leadership—closing important embassies, shutting down peacekeeping, and self-destructively slashing our international programs. These are not responsible proposals. They would weaken America precisely when we must remain strong, precisely when other nations are looking to us for leadership. They betray a lack of appreciation for what America has accomplished in the last 50 years and a lack of confidence that our great nation can shape the future.

The recent shutdown of the U.S. government was particularly troubling to me because it eroded our international reputation for reliability and integrity. In my recent travels abroad, I have been struck by the far-reaching consequences of the shutdown. For leaders and ordinary citizens in many parts of the world, it seemed as if the most powerful nation in the world was closing for business. Our failure to pay our bills and our employees was conduct not worthy of a great nation. It must not happen again.

Three weeks ago, I was described in the pages of *Newsweek* as a ''true believer that America must be involved in the world.'' I plead guilty. I came of age after World War II, in the years our leaders made the investments whose benefits all of us are reaping today. I am not a politician. But I do have a bias: for the kind of foreign policy that makes America a reliable and principled leader; a bias for a foreign policy that projects America's unique purpose and strength. I hope that every candidate who aspires to the presidency will keep these important guideposts in mind.

Our commitment to provide leadership is the first of the central principles guiding our foreign policy that I outlined here last year. A second principle I enunciated then is the need to strengthen the institutions that provide an enduring basis for global peace and prosperity. These institutions, such as the United Nations, NATO, and the World Bank, help us to share the burdens and costs of leadership. This year, a top priority will be working with Congress to meet our financial obligations to the UN as it undertakes an essential program of reform.

A third principle is that support for democracy and human rights reflects our ideals and reinforces our interests. Our dedication to universal values is a vital source of America's authority and credibility. We simply cannot lead without it. Our interests are most secure in a world where accountable government strengthens stability and where the rule of law protects both political rights and free market economies. That is why we have provided such strong support for courageous reforms in nations like South Africa, Mexico, and the new democracies of Central Europe. That is why we are so pleased that there have been sixteen inaugurations following free elections in this hemisphere in the three years we have been in office. This year, another important goal will be to help the War Crimes Tribunals establish accountability in the Former Yugoslavia and Rwanda for two of the greatest tragedies of this decade.

A fourth principle is the critical importance of constructive relations with the great powers. These nations—our allies in Europe and Japan, as well as Russia and China—have the greatest ability to affect our security and prosperity.

In the last few years, some have said that the United States and Europe would inevitably drift apart. We have proved them wrong. Our common action in Bosnia has dramatically reinforced the transatlantic alliance and has opened new prospects for lasting European security cooperation. And the New Transatlantic Agenda agreed by the United States and the European Union in Madrid last month will not only expand our economic ties but enhance coordination on political and security challenges around the world.

With Japan, we are also putting each pillar of our alliance—security, economic, and political—on a sound basis. A year-long review of our relationship, which Joe Nye led with Assistant Secretary Winston Lord, has revitalized our security ties. We have reached 20 market access agreements which have contributed to the recent sharp decline in our bilateral trade deficit.

We have also pursued our interest in strengthening our cooperation with Russia and China, at a time when both countries are undergoing difficult transitions.

From the beginning of his Administration, President Clinton has recognized that only by engaging with Russia could we protect

our national interests. Our strategy has produced concrete benefits for the security of the American people. We have achieved massive reductions in nuclear arsenals and made nuclear materials more secure. By working with Russia, we have advanced our goals of peace in Bosnia and the Middle East.

Of course, it is easy to enumerate our differences with Russia, such as on nuclear cooperation with Iran and the war in Chechnya. This week's events provide more evidence that the current military approach in Chechnya will only deepen that war. The cycle of violence can end only through negotiations.

But as I have said before, I do not have the luxury of making a list of differences with Russia and then walking away. My job is to build areas of agreement and to develop policies to manage our difference.

Back in 1993 in my first major speech as Secretary of State, I observed that Russia's struggle to transform itself would be long and hard, and that success was by no means assured. That remains my judgment today. On the plus side, four years into the post-Soviet period, Russia's economy is increasingly governed by market principles. Free elections, unthinkable a few years ago, are becoming a fact of life. But Russia has not yet overcome the ruinous legacy of seven decades of communism—a legacy visible in crime, corruption, and poverty.

Recent events reflect troubling signs of Russian reform under strain. The Russian people face an important choice in the June Presidential election. In the final analysis, only they can choose their leaders and determine their future. Our obligation—the American obligation—is to promote democratic values and democratic institutions and to pursue our national interests at all times.

When I meet with new Russian Foreign Minister Primakov, I will tell him that the United States is determined to continue working with Russia on the many common challenges we face. I will, however, make it clear that Russia's integration with the institutions of the West, which is in our mutual interest, depends on Russia's willingness to abide by international norms and to stay on the path of reform.

Turning to China, we also have a profound stake in helping to ensure that that powerful nation pursues its modernization in ways that contribute to the overall security and prosperity of the region—for our own sake and in the interest of our key allies and friends. That is why we are pursuing a strategy of engagement. It is designed to integrate China into the international community and to enhance our cooperation on such common problems as the North Korean nuclear program, drug trafficking and alien smuggling.

We continue to have important differences with China on such issues as human rights, proliferation and trade. In recent months we have come through a rocky period in our relations with China. The United States is ready to restore positive momentum to our relationship. We have reaffirmed our ''one-China'' policy and we reject the short-sighted counsel of those who seek to isolate or contain China. China's President has said that his country, too, seeks a positive relationship. Let me be clear: The United States will do its part, but if we are to build a lasting productive relationship, China has a responsibility to take meaningful steps to address areas of our concern and to respect internationally accepted principles.

In the coming year, we will give special emphasis to three main objectives: first, pursuing peace in regions of vital interest to the United States; second, confronting the new transnational security threats; and third, promoting open markets and prosperity.

A year ago, the war in Bosnia was the greatest unresolved problem we face. Nothing is yet assured in Bosnia of course. But by joining the use of force to diplomacy, we have transformed a situation some considered hopeless into one in which rebuilding, reconciliation, and justice are all possible. The President's visit to our troops last week reminded us again of the uncommon spirit and confidence they bring to their mission.

The peace agreement we forged in Dayton means that we can look beyond four years of horror—the concentration camps, the ethnic cleansing, the hunger and death. In 1996, our immediate challenge is to implement the military and civilian aspects of the Dayton agreement. We expect all parties to comply fully with their obligations under that carefully negotiated agreement.

It is important to recognize that success in Bosnia will also have broad implications for our goal of an integrated Europe at peace. Our actions in Bosnia have proven that NATO is here to stay as the guarantor of transatlantic security. Without NATO's action, it is clear this war would continue today.

The very nature of the coalition we have forged and are leading in Bosnia has historic implications. This is the first time that soldiers from every power and region of Europe will serve in the same military operation. Russians and Lithuanians, Greeks and Turks, Poles and Ukranians, British, Germans and French, have joined with Americans and Canadians to share the same risks, under the same flag, to achieve the same noble goal. As we help overcome the divisions of Bosnia, we also help overcome the division of Europe itself.

The mission in Bosnia will give some of our new partners in the Partnership for Peace a chance to show that they can meet the challenges of membership in an enlarged NATO Alliance. The process of enlargement is already making NATO a force for stability and democracy in the east. We have made it clear to our partners that to gain NATO membership, they must consolidate democratic reforms, place their armed forces under firm civilian control, and resolve disputes with their neighbors.

It is in central and eastern Europe that the greatest threats to European security—ethnic conflict, proliferation, and poverty—must be faced. That is why it would be irresponsible to lock out half of Europe from the structures that ensure security and prosperity on the continent. That is why the European Union is moving forward with its own plans to add members. NATO enlargement should proceed on roughly a parallel track.

We recognize that as Russia redefines its international role, NATO enlargement must proceed in a gradual, deliberate and transparent way. But Russia should understand that the Alliance with which it is working so closely in Bosnia does not threaten its security. Indeed, we continue to encourage Russia to construct a long-term, special relationship with NATO.

In the Middle East, American leadership is also indispensable. Today, for the first time in half a century, we stand on the threshold of ending the Arab-Israeli conflict. A comprehensive peace between Israel and its immediate neighbors, and indeed with the entire Arab world, is no longer a dream, but a realistic possibility.

I have just returned from my 16th trip to the region. Last week I was with King Hussein of Jordan on the day he dedicated a trauma unit to the late Prime Minister Rabin—it's hard to believe, but that was in a hospital in Tel Aviv. Few events more vividly capture how much the landscape of the region has changed. What is more, in just two days, almost a million Palestinians will vote in the first free elections in the West Bank and Gaza.

Now we must work to complete the circle of peace in the Middle East. The key lies in achieving a breakthrough between Israel and Syria. Both sides believe the United States is critical to this effort. Under our auspices, Israel and Syria are now holding intensive negotiations on Maryland's eastern shore. Although there is much work still to be done, we are crossing important thresholds and we seek an agreement in 1996. The United States is determined to help complete this historic task.

We will also continue our efforts to resolve conflicts and build security in other regions. We will pursue initiatives in places such as Northern Ireland, Haiti, Cyprus, Angola, Burundi, Peru and Ecuador. We will strengthen the foundations of peace and security in the Asia-Pacific region by deepening our security cooperation with our treaty allies, and through our participation in the very promising ASEAN Regional Forum. And in this hemisphere, we will build on the new level of political cooperation we achieved at the Summit of the Americas in Miami.

Our second major area of focus this year is to continue to take on new challenges to global security. As the President emphasized in a landmark UN speech last October, transnational threats like proliferation, terrorism, international crime, drugs, and environmental damage threaten all of us in our interdependent world.

We will continue working to stop the spread of weapons of mass destruction, the gravest potential threat to the United States and our allies. Thirty-three years ago, the nuclear powers took what President Kennedy called a ''step backward from the shadows of war'' by signing the Limited Test Ban Treaty. Now we must complete a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty in time to sign it this year. And this year we must ratify the Chemical Weapons Convention.

We must also lock in deep reductions in the nuclear arsenals of the United States and the countries of the former Soviet Union. I urge the Senate and the Russian Duma to ratify the START II Treaty, which will remove an additional 5,000 warheads from the arsenals of our two countries.

Our regional nonproliferation efforts are also vital. It is critical that North Korea's nuclear program stays shut down and on the way to the scrap heap. And pariah states like Iraq, Iran and Libya must be stopped in their efforts to acquire weapons of mass destruction. The information that UN inspectors have uncovered on Iraq's biological program is chilling. It is now clear that Saddam Hussein possessed biological weapons and was on the verge of using them against civilians in the Gulf War. These revelations are an urgent reminder that Saddam remains a menace and that sanctions against Iraq must be maintained.

President Clinton has also put the fight against international criminals, terrorists and drug traffickers at the center of our foreign policy. We are determined to continue our drive to put such international predators out of business. We have taken unprecedented steps against the Cali cartel and many of its leaders are now behind bars. We will continue to deny terrorists and drug kingpins access to their assets; we will put decisive pressure on governments that tolerate such organizations; and we will step up operations attacking crime and drugs at their source.

Protecting our fragile environment also has profound long-range importance for our country, and in 1996 we will strive to fully integrate our environmental goals into our diplomacy—something that has never been done before. We will seek further reductions

in greenhouse gases and press for Senate approval of conventions on biodiversity and the Law of the Sea. Working closely with the Vice President, I have also focused on how we can make greater use of environmental initiatives to promote larger strategic and economic goals. That means, for example, encouraging joint water projects in the Middle East, increasing environmental cooperation with our global partners, and helping our environmental industries capture a larger share of a $400 billion global market.

The third element of our agenda is to build on the economic achievements that will be a lasting legacy of the Clinton Administration. President Clinton's personal leadership on NAFTA, the Urguay Round, APEC and the Summit of the Americas, has made the United States the hub of an increasingly open global trading system. This year, our watchword is implementation—making sure that the trade commitments and agreements we have reached produce concrete opportunities so that American companies and workers can compete abroad on a level playing field. In the Asia-Pacific region through APEC, with the European Union through the Transatlantic Marketplace, and in this Hemisphere through the Miami process, we are removing barriers to trade and investment and opening markets for U.S. exports. We also remain committed to obtaining fast-track authority to negotiate Chile's accession to NAFTA.

As this presidential election year begins, we are hearing once again from those who preach the dangerous gospel of protection and isolation. America and the world went down that road in 1930s—and our mistake fueled the Great Depression and helped set the stage for the Second World War. Shutting America off from the world would be just as reckless today as it was six decades ago. As President Clinton said at the beginning of his Administration, ''we must compete, not retreat.''

Ladies and gentlemen, everywhere I go, I find that the nations of the world look to America as a source of principled and reliable leadership. They see American soldiers bridging rivers and moving mountains to help peace take hold in Bosnia. They see us working for peace in the Middle East and for security in Korea. They see us negotiating trade agreements so that every nation can find reward in emerging markets. They see the most powerful nation on earth standing up for persecuted peoples everywhere, because we believe it is right and because those who struggle for freedom represent the future.

The world sees us as an optimistic people, motivated by a broad view of our interests and driven by a long view of our potential. They follow us because they understand that America's fight for peace and freedom is the world's fight. At the end of the American century, President Clinton is determined that we continue to act in the highest traditions of our nation and our people.

The President's answer to the voices of isolationism is clear. We can no more isolate our nation from the world than we can isolate our families from our neighborhoods, or our neighborhoods from our cities. As a global power with global interests, retreat is not a responsible option for the United States. We must continue to lead. If we do, the end of this millennium can mark the start of a second American century.

A BILL TO PROVIDE SIMILAR TAX TREATMENT FOR SECTION 501(C)(3) BONDS AS THAT PROVIDED TO GOVERNMENT BONDS

HON. AMO HOUGHTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1996

Mr. HOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleague from California, Mr. MATSUI, as well as a number of other colleagues, in introducing the Nonprofit Organizations Tax-Exempt Bond Reform Act of 1996. This is an important piece of bipartisan legislation that would help solve a problem that has been growing since the law was changed in 1986. Basically, the problem is one where a number of section 501(c)(3) organizations are now at the $150 million limit on outstanding bonds. The limit was established by the 1986 Tax Reform Act. The proposed legislation would remove this cap and allow bonds issued by 501(c)(3) organizations to be treated similarly to those issued to finance direct State or local government activities—as they were permitted to do before the 1986 change. Similar corrective legislation has been considered and/or passed by prior Congresses, although not to the point of being enacted into law.

The concept of an exempt person, that existed under the Code bond provisions before 1986, would be reenacted. An exempt person would be defined as first, a State or local governmental unit or second, a section 501(c)(3) organization, when carrying out its exempt activities under section 501(a). Thus, bonds for section 501(c)(3) organizations would no longer be classified as private activity bonds. Financing for unrelated business activities of such organizations would continue to be treated as a private business use for which tax-exempt financing is not authorized.

As exempt persons, section 501(c)(3) organizations would be subject to the same limits as State and local governments on using their bond proceeds to finance private business activities or to make private loans. Additional restrictions on the bonds issued by such organizations would be repealed. The bill would make no amendments, other than technical conforming amendments, to the present-law arbitrage restrictions, the alternative minimum tax-exempt bond preference, or the provisions generally disallowing interest paid by banks and other financial institutions on amounts used to acquire or carry tax-exempt bonds.

The principal beneficiaries of the bill would be private, nonprofit colleges and universities. These institutions provide substantially identical educational services to those provided by governmental higher education institutions. In order to have a consistent tax policy of providing like treatment for similarly situated persons, the tax-exempt bond rules should provide comparable access to tax-exempt financing for these entities.

The main provision in the proposed legislation is to remove the $150 million per-institution limit on outstanding nonhospital qualified 501(c)(3) tax-exempt bonds. This provision was intended as a limit on tax arbitraging of college and university endowments. Other present-law tax-exempt bond restrictions for example, the arbitrage rebate requirement and public approval, bond maturity, hedge bond, and advance refunding restrictions, adequately address this concern. In addition, the concern that private colleges and universities engage in tax arbitraging of their endowments reflects a misunderstanding of the restrictions governing endowments. Most State laws prohibit depletion of endowment corpus. Further, approximately 65 percent of endowment funds nationally is subject to donor-imposed restrictions on the uses for which even the income may be used.

Finally, the other beneficiary would be nonprofit health care providers who are also subject to the $150 million cap. A growing number of health care providers are delivering medical services in a cost-effective manner outside of the hospital setting. Yet, providers like community health clinics, skilled nursing facilities, and ambulatory care facilities are limited by the $150 million cap per institution in outstanding tax-exempt bonds. Also, as alternative health care facilities and hospitals form integrated health care delivery systems, the cap hinders the consolidation of these entities. The cap actually acts as a barrier to these mergers, because after a merger there would be a single $150 million limit.

The proposed legislation generally would apply to bonds issued after the date of enactment.

We welcome the support of our colleagues in cosponsoring this important legislation.

INTRODUCTION OF THE NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS TAX-EXEMPT BOND ACT OF 1996

HON. ROBERT T. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1996

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my good friend from New York, Congressman HOUGHTON, in the reintroduction of this important legislation. This bill will remove the $150 million limit on outstanding bonds that can be issued by 501(c)(3) nonprofit organizations and will allow bonds issued by 501(c)(3) organizations to be treated similarly to those issued to finance direct State or local government activities.

Nonprofit organizations such as colleges and health care providers have traditionally used tax-exempt financing for the construction, renovation, and modernization of facilities used for activities related to the nonprofit's mission. Prior to the 1986 Tax Reform Act, this financing was generally available to all qualified 501(c)(3) organizations in recognition of the public purpose they serve.

Placing a $150 million cap on these nonprofits has had unintended and unforeseen consequences. For example, the restriction on tax-exempt financing has prevented private colleges and universities from improving their educational facilities and research capabilities. Currently, the capital renewal and replacement needs of colleges and universities exceed $60 billion of which one-third is urgently needed for repairs and renovation. The National Science Foundation has reported that for every $1 spent to maintain research facilities, an additional $3.50 was deferred. Our Nation needs to improve its educational and research facilities given that our work force and businesses must compete in an everchanging global economy.

Health care providers are also subject to the $150 million cap. A growing number of health care providers are delivering medical services in a cost-effective manner outside of the hospital setting. Yet, providers like community health clinics, skilled nursing facilities, and ambulatory care facilities are limited by the $150 million cap per institution in outstanding tax-exempt bonds.

Additionally, as alternative health care facilities and hospitals form integrated health care delivery systems, the $150 million cap hinders the consolidation of these entities. The cap actually acts as a barrier to these mergers. After a merger, the surviving institutions would have a single, $150 million limit.

Any bond issuance which exceeded this limit could become taxable retroactively to their date of issuance, an event that would constitute a default under the typical covenants governing nonhospital 501(c)(3) bonds.

I have sponsored or cosponsored similar legislation in past Congresses but I remain hopeful that with the bipartisan support the legislation enjoys that it can move forward in this Congress.

VICTORY IN THE PACIFIC TRIBUTE

HON. ROBERT K. DORNAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1996

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay an overdue tribute to the organizers of the Victory in the Pacific ceremony, which was held in Orange County's Pacific Amphitheatre on August 17, 1995.

Orange County is home to some 60,000 veterans of one of the most noble and horrible conflicts, the Second World War. No doubt a large portion of these heroes saw action in the Pacific theater of operations, fighting against the tyranny of imperial Japan. On August 17 of last year, they came together in solemn remembrance of the battles, campaigns, and final victory of half a century ago.

Mr. Speaker, I was unfortunately unable to attend this historic event. However, I was lucky enough to be presented with an honorary program, as well as a news article from the August 25, 1995, issue of Flight Jacket, a newspaper published by my Semper-Fi neighbors at Marine Corps Air Station, El Toro. In order to describe this event in the detail it deserves, I ask unanimous consent to enter this article into the RECORD.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I wish to pay special tribute to the men and women who put together this fine event, especially those members of the Orange County Veterans Advisory Council, chaired by William C. Manes, and the Victory in the Pacific Committee, chaired by Hal Camp. They have done an outstanding service, not only to our World War II heroes, but to all Americans who have ever worn the uniform of our armed services. God willing, we will never take our freedom for granted, because events like this will always remind us of the terrible price we as a nation have paid in the past, and may be asked to pay in the future, in order to ensure our liberty. We will never forget those who fought for freedom, for without them, we as a people would simply not exist.

CELEBRATING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE VICTORY IN THE PACIFIC

(By Sgt. Matthew B. Fitzgerald)

COSTA MESA, CA.—Veterans, active duty servicemembers, civilians and their family members celebrated America's 50th Anniversary Remembrance of World War II, ''Victory in the Pacific,'' at the Orange County Pacific Amphitheater here Aug. 17.

There are approximately three million veterans in California. About one-third of these veterans, approximately 832,000 Californians, are veterans of WWII—many of whom participated in operations in the Pacific Theater, according to retired Marine Col. Jay R. Vargas, director, Department of Veterans Affairs, California.

''Sixty-three thousand citizens of Orange County served in uniform during World War II,'' he said.

''This celebration honors the contributions of those men and women, not only in the war, but also and perhaps more importantly, in the post-war period. It is also the result of the hard work they contributed to building peace and prosperity upon their return from the war's battlefields,'' said Col. Vargas.

Colonel Vargas, who received the Medal of Honor for action in Vietnam, represented Governor Pete Wilson. The Governor proclaimed 1995 as the ''Year of the Veteran'' in California.

Six guest speakers gave eulogies remembering the six military leaders of the Pacific campaigns. Two of the Pacific commanders honored were Marine Gen. Holland M. Smith, by MGen. Paul A. Fratarangelo, commander, Marine Corps Air Bases, Western Area, and Army Gen. Douglas MacArthur, by Army MGen. Robert A. Lame, commanding general 63rd Army, Reserve Command.

''Holland McTyeire Smith, the epitome of the warrior-Marine, never closed his eyes very long. As 'The Father of Modern Amphibious Warfare,' his eyes, always blazing with the guts and fire of success (hence the name 'Mad'), saw his Marines to victory in the Pacific during World War II,'' said MGen. Fratarangelo.

Major Gen. Fratarangelo said it was a deep honor for him to be able to share with those who attended the enormous contributions of Gen. Smith to ''Corps and country'' during World War II.

The day's events also included a wreath-laying ceremony. Thirty-five wreaths in honor of the military leaders were placed on stage by state and national political leaders, military leaders, representatives of the allied governments involved in the Pacific Theater and Medal of Honor recipients from the Pacific Campaigns.

Another honored veteran who attended was Medal of Honor recipient, retired Army Col. Lewis L. Millett, a combat veteran of World War II, Korea and Vietnam.

As company commander of Company E, 27th Infantry Regiment, then Capt. Millett led his 100 men in three days of bayonet assaults against the North Koreans on hill 180, Soam-ni, North of Oson, South Korea, Feb. 4, 5 and 7, 1951.

Colonel Millett told his men, ''Fix bayonets and follow me!''

On the third day of fighting, Millett had lost a total of nine of his men, while he and his company had destroyed approximately 157 North Koreans. For these actions, he was awarded the Medal of Honor.

''We had ammo, and when I was charging, I'd be firing, trying to pin the enemy down until I got down in the trenches with them. That's when we used the bayonets,'' Millett said.

''There were about 20 killed by bayonet alone,'' he said.

According to Millett, when President Harry S. Truman placed the medal around his neck, the president told him, ''I'd rather have this than be president.''

Colonel Millett also received a Silver Star, Bronze Star and four Purple Hearts during his military career.

The Marine Corps Recruit Depot San Diego Band provided the patriotic music for the day. Some of the tunes the band played were the service songs, ''Taps,'' ''Stars and Stripes Forever'' and the ''National Anthem.''

''It was good to see veterans still appreciate our country, the lives they lived through the military and share the experiences they have gone through,'' said LCpl. David B. Amos, tuba player, MCRD Band, MCRD San Diego.

Another guest and veteran who attended was former Army military policeman and bugler first class Fred Hummer, a Fountain Valley, Calif., resident. In 1916, Hummer enlisted in the Army during World War I at the age of 17. He wore a replica of his original WWI Army uniform.

When Hummer enlisted, his recruiter told him that the Army needed buglers, not infantrymen. After joining, Hummer's unit, D Company, 22nd Infantry, was sent to El Paso, Texas, to assist in the capture of Francisco ''Pancho'' Villa, a Mexican rebel.

Hummer spent the remainder of his four years of service in the Army as a bugler at Fort Hundleton, N.Y., according to an Army Times article.

For the past 78 years, Hummer has kept the same bugle and plays for veteran's celebrations and memorials regularly.

One veteran who played the cornet for willing ears was Eugene M. Cianflone. He served as a Machinist Mate 3rd Class with Landing Ship Tanks 274 and participated in the invasions of Kwajalien, Marshall Islands with the 2nd Marine Division, and Saipan, Marianna Islands, with the 4th Marine Division.

''I have been playing for over 65 years, and always for veterans,'' Cianflone said. ''This is the one place where they really appreciate the music,'' he added.

The impact of the war seemed to leave many profound memories in the hearts and minds of those who served.

''From the grim morning hours of Dec. 7, 1941, until the moment of triumph on Sept. 2, 1945, America and her allies waged a valiant struggle for freedom against the forces of despotism,'' said Governor Wilson, in a letter to the 50th Anniversary Commemorative Committee. ''That struggle was waged across an ocean dotted with places known by the then unfamiliar names of Guadalcanal, Iwo Jima, Saipan, Coral Sea and Bataan. Today, half a century later, those names are synonymous with the valor and sacrifice that are the hallmark of the Second World War.''

IN APPRECIATION OF ROBERT D. BLONDI

HON. GLENN POSHARD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1996

Mr. POSHARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. Robert D. Blondi of Benton, IL. He has touched the lives of those in his community through his dedicated service as a businessman, supporter of the Democratic Party and football referee. Due to ill health he has recently left his position with the Community Building Service, and I join his many friends there in extending my thanks and best wishes for his tireless efforts.

Mr. Blondi was born on August 3, 1922. Beginning his career with Immediate Cleaners,

he went on to own and operate the Chester City Dairy Store as well as handle the insurance needs of the citizenry as an agent for Prudential. He has contributed his leadership abilities to numerous organizations, including the Benton Methodist Church, Elks Lodge, and Lions Club. A loyal Democrat, his support of party activities has never wavered.

Despite this record of achievement, he is perhaps best known for his skill and longevity as a high school and college football referee. Calling his first game in 1942, Mr. Blondi blew his whistle for 46 years, well into his sixth decade. Thus he began a distinguished legacy of Blondi officials. His son Bobby, Jr. put on the striped shirt for the first time in 1968, and the two worked in tandem for 20 years. And this year, Mr. Blondi's grandson Robby has joined his father, becoming the third generation of Blondi referees. This record of community service is a testimony to the generosity of self that has come to define the entire Blondi family.

Mr. Speaker, in sports it is often said that the good official is the one that is never noticed. In this case, however, such anonymity will not do. Robert Blondi has given much to the people of Benton. His example is one that we can all look to with pride, and do our best to emulate. It is a privilege to represent him in the U.S. Congress.

TRIBUTE TO DR. JAMES E. THOMPSON

HON. DAVID E. BONIOR

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1996

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Dr. James E. Thompson. Dr. Thompson celebrated his 30th anniversary as the minister of the North Broadway Church of Christ in Mount Clemens, MI on Sunday, January 21, 1996.

It is my sincere pleasure to congratulate Dr. Thompson on what I am sure is a proud anniversary. Dr. Thompson began his service to the Lord more than 40 years ago and the congregation in Mount Clemens has been fortunate to have him for the past three decades. The devotion he has displayed to his faith and the community over these years is an inspiration.

Many people depend on the emotional, educational, and spiritual support provided by their minister. Too often, many human needs are simply left unsatisfied in the secular world. Dr. Thompson has conscientiously attempted to see these needs met. Whether conducting a Sunday morning service, counseling congregation members, preparing others to become ministers, or speaking on the radio, he has dedicated his life to the Lord's work.

I am always impressed by the many people committed to improving our communities. In addition to his many responsibilities as a minister, Dr. Thompson has also served as a member of the Board of Education of the Mount Clemens School District and he is currently the vice chair of the city's Zoning Board of Appeals. It is a privilege to pay tribute to someone such as Dr. Thompson who has taken on more than his share of responsibility and is so well respected by the members of the community.

I commend Dr. Thompson for his work and faith and wish him continued success in his role as a spiritual and community leader. I ask my colleagues to please join me in offering heartfelt congratulations to Dr. James E. Thompson on this momentous milestone. May he continue to inspire through his leadership.

SALUTE TO REV. DR. JOSEPH D. PATTERSON OF PHILADELPHIA

HON. THOMAS M. FOGLIETTA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1996

Mr. FOGLIETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to salute Rev. Dr. Joseph D. Patterson on the occasion of his installation service as president of the Black Clergy of Philadelphia.

On January 14, 1996, the Hickman Temple A.M.E. Church will proudly join with Dr. Joseph Patterson on the occasion of his installation service. Dr. Patterson is beginning his second consecutive term as president of the Black Clergy of Philadelphia. He has served the Hickman Temple A.M.E. Church for 32 years in many capacities from pastor of Hickman Temple A.M.E. Church to president of the Philadelphia African Methodist Episcopal Church Preacher's Meeting and now president of the Black Clergy of Philadelphia. He was appointed advisor to the Pennsylvania State House of Representatives, and is an active member of the Union League.

Reverend Patterson is not only a distinguished pastor, but he has also been involved in many community activities. Patterson is a trustee at Cheyney University, board member of the Philadelphia Industrial Development Corp., board member of the Governance Council at Misericordia Hospital and Reverend Dr. Patterson serves as chairman of the empowerment zone for the West Philadelphia's project. Reverend Patterson has recently retired from the board of education in Chester, PA, where he served with distinction for 32 years.

I proudly join with the congregation of the Hickman Temple A.M.E. Church, friends, family, and the Philadelphia community today in celebrating the installation of Rev. Dr. Joseph Patterson as president of the Black Clergy of Philadelphia. I wish Reverend Patterson, pastor of Hickman Temple A.M.E. Church, and the black clergy the very best as together they continue their service to the Philadelphia community.

TRIBUTE TO CATHOLIC SCHOOLS ACROSS THE NATION

HON. CHARLES E. SCHUMER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1996

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues and all New Yorkers to join me in honoring America's Catholic schools from January 28 through February 2. Serving as the cornerstone of many communities throughout Brooklyn and Queens, Catholic schools have enhanced the lives of many students interested in receiving a first-rate education. Those Catholic schools located in and around my district are well-known for their rigorous curriculum, while lacing a strong emphasis on leadership skills, community service, and moral integrity. Graduates from Catholic schools are well prepared for the challenges of adulthood.

As our Nation enters a new century, the U.S. economy will become more globalized, thus accelerating the demand for technology-driven skills in the job market. It is extremely important for our Nation's youngsters to be prepared for tomorrow's workplace. I am confident those receiving a Catholic education will be ready to meet these challenges.

Communities in Brooklyn and Queens have established a solid reputation for encouraging boys and girls of all backgrounds to receive a Catholic education to fulfill their goals. Many who attend Catholic schools often go on to become community leaders, judges, doctors, public officials, and respected teachers. I am proud to serve in the House of Representatives with other Members who studied in Catholic schools. As our Nation's success is constantly measured by its academic strength and moral fiber, the high quality of instruction and guidance provided at Catholic schools will continue to make a positive impact on the world. I salute all the teachers, students, and parents who value the merits of a Catholic education.

HONORING CHIEF OF THE MILFORD FIRE DEPARTMENT, WILLIAM A. HEALEY

HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1996

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, today it is my pleasure to honor a distinguished citizen from my district, Chief William A. Healey. After 50 years of exemplary service, Chief Healey is retiring from the Milford Fire Department.

In 1945, Bill Healey followed in the distinguished footsteps of his father and grandfather by joining the Milford Fire Department as a volunteer member of the Fort Trumbull Beach Company 2. After serving with distinction in the U.S. Navy, Bill Healey returned to the Milford Fire Department and was appointed a career member in 1950. Bill's courage, leadership ability, and commitment to public service led to numerous promotions and commendations over the years. For example, he received the prestigious Ralph Ryder Fireman of the Year as a lieutenant for his role in directing a difficult automobile extrication, as well as numerous meritorious service awards and community service awards. In 1973, after serving as a battalion chief, deputy chief, assistant chief and fire marshal, Bill Healey was appointed chief of the Milford Fire Department. He has held this position for the past 22 years, earning the respect and gratitude of all Milford citizens.

During his lengthy and impressive tenure with the department, Chief Healey has presided over many changes, including the reorganization of the department in the 1980's, in order to make services more effective and cost-efficient. Chief Healey is known for his innovative leadership and his commitment to protecting the safety of Milford residents. His leadership has saved numerous lives and resulted in a fire department that has a sterling

reputation for its ability to respond to emergency situations. Chief Healey has also been called upon numerous times to lend his expertise to the State of Connecticut, including serving on the first E–911 Commission to implement the E–911 system throughout the State.

Despite his many responsibilities, Chief Healey has always devoted many hours to community service. He has coached and managed in both the Milford Junior Major and Babe Ruth football leagues, and served in the Milford Rotary Club for 21 years, including a stint as president. He and his wife, Marion, have contributed so much of their time and energy to making the city of Milford a better and safer place to live.

It has been my great honor to know and work with Chief William Healey over the years. His commitment to public service is unparalleled, and I am delighted to have this opportunity to commend him for 50 years of distinguished work. He will be sorely missed both by his colleagues and Milford residents. I wish Bill many years of good health and happiness in his retirement.

A VISION OF EMPOWERMENT IN A TROUBLED WORLD

HON. FRANK PALLONE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1996

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, January 27, 1996, the Quinn Chapel African Methodist Episcopal Church in Atlantic Highlands, NJ, will hold its 17th annual women's day luncheon. This year's guest speaker is the Reverend Dr. W. Franklyn Richardson, the pastor of Grace Baptist Church in Mt. Vernon, NY, and a religious leader of national and international renown.

Dr. Richardson, a man with a vision of empowerment for African-American people, will no doubt provide an inspiring message. As pastor of Grace Baptist Church, a post he assumed in 1975, and through numerous other clerical, civic and community organizations, Dr. Richardson has sought to provide spiritual sustenance reaching far beyond the walls of the church. A native of Philadelphia, Dr. Richardson was ordained at the age of 19, becoming pastor of the historic Rising Mount Zion Baptist Church in Richmond, VA. In addition to leading the congregation of more than 500 parishioners, Dr. Richardson also established outreach services to the surrounding economically and socially depressed community. In his current pastorate, Dr. Richardson is responsible for pastoral and administrative duties of more than 3,000 parishioners, with a multiministerial staff. Under his leadership, a $4.2 million restoration and expansion of the church facilities has taken place, membership of the church has more than tripled and community outreach programs have increased.

Since 1982, Dr. Richardson has served as the general secretary of the National Baptist Convention USA. The National Convention consists of more than 30,000 churches and 8 million Baptist members across the country. He is a member of the General Council of the Baptist World Alliance and the governing board of the National Council of Churches, representing more than 400 million Christians from 150 countries. Dr. Richardson has traveled and preached on six continents, and has served as a member of the 1980 Preaching Team of the Foreign Mission Board of countries on the continent of Africa. In 1990, Ebony magazine listed him on its Honor Roll of Great Preachers.

Dr. Richardson is featured each Sunday at 7 a.m. on the Grace Radio Ministry, heard throughout New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut. He serves as adjunct faculty member to the Certification Program in Christian Ministry at the New York Theological Seminary. He is the author of ''The Power of The Pew,'' and edited and wrote the introduction to ''Journey Through a Jungle'' by the late Dr. Sandy F. Ray. He was a contributing author to ''The State of Black America'' on church and economic empowerment. A graduate of Virginia Union University and Yale University School of Divinity, Dr. Richardson has received honorary degrees from seven colleges and universities throughout the United States. He serves on numerous boards and commissions. Dr. Richardson is married to the former Inez Nunally, and they have two children.

Mr. Speaker, Quinn Chapel started out as Paul Quinn A.M.E. Zion Church at Riceville in Navesink, NJ. In the winter of 1850, Julia Stillwell and her children had experienced religion at the white M.E. Church in Riceville but wanted to belong to an African-American church. The early services were held at the home of Julia Stillwell. The Reverend Moses M. Hall was sent as the pastor. In the spring of 1851, fundraising began to purchase land on which to build a church edifice, and the cornerstone for the Paul Quinn Chapel of Riceville was laid on November 26, 1852. Eli Hall was the first pastor. The cornerstone for the present chapel was laid in the spring of 1894. In later years, a parsonage and educational wing were built.

Quinn Chapel's current pastor, the Reverend Alyson Browne Johnson comes from a long line of preachers—both male and female—in her family. The family's lineage goes back to Rev. Browne Johnson's great-great-grandmother, Evangelist Mattie Stewart. A graduate of Bloomfield College and Drew University Theological School, she was ordained a deacon in 1975 and an elder in 1977 in the New York Conference of the African Methodist Episcopal Church. Rev. Browne Johnson has served in many community and religious capacities and has received numerous awards. She serves as general secretary of African Methodist Episcopal Women in Ministry and is editor of its newsletter, ''Bricks Without Straw.'' She is a charter member of the South African Leadership Development Program. Her ministerial career has been distinguished by numerous firsts, including the first woman to pastor each of the charges she has been assigned. Rev. Browne Johnson is the proud mother of two children.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor and a pleasure to pay tribute to Quinn Chapel AME Church, its great leader the Reverend Alyson Browne Johnson and their distinguished guest, the Reverend Dr. W. Franklyn Richardson.

BOSNIA AND ''THE HORROR OF THE LAND MINES''

HON. ROBERT K. DORNAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1996

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include for the RECORD the following article by a marine veteran from the Vietnam war, Tom Evans, on the horror of land mines. After visiting our troops in Germany over the New Year's holiday as they prepared for deployment into Bosnia, I can personally attest to the concern they and their families have over this hidden but very dangerous weapon on the Balkan battlefield. The Research and Development Subcommittee of the House National Security Committee will hold hearings on this issue this week, January 24, 1996. I urge everyone to heed the warning of Tom Evans and join us on the National Security Committee as we try to develop a response to the growing threat of land mines.

THE HORROR OF THE LAND MINES

(By Tom Evans)

American troops in Bosnia will face land mines. The folks at home who are sending the troops ought to be sure they understand what that means, Unfortunately, we as a nation have had all too much experience.

Thirty years ago the Viet Cong frequently buried mines in populated areas where American troops walked. Troops were often funneled into columns by narrow rice paddy dikes and trails.

The most commonly used enemy mine in my battalion's area of operations was called the ''Bouncing Betty.'' It bounced waist-high before exploding. To teen-age American Marines and soldiers it was the most demoralizing type of mine. And it was American-made. We had supplied them to our allies, the South Vietnamese army, but the Viet Cong captured them. American Marines were forever bitter toward their allies for that.

In the area we called the ''Street Without Joy,'' a few miles northwest of the imperial capital city of Hue, mine detectors we rarely used on operations until somebody stepped on a mine. We assumed it was because the patrol just moved too slowly behind an engineer sweeping the long-handled dish along the ground. In fact, there was a joke in the Marine infantry. Question: What's the best mine detector the Marine Corps has? Answer: The Model PFC, one each.

The first American I saw killed stepped on a ''Bouncing Betty'' mine. He was Bernard Fall, a civilian author and one of the foremost Western authorities on Vietnam at that time. Almost 20 years later I found a photo in the National Archives of Fall taken moments after he died in February 1967. The picture, taken by a combat photographer, would never have been taken of a serviceman, but Fall was a civilian. The picture was so terribly graphic that it was marked ''Not To Be Released For Publication.'' Since it was declassified by the time I saw it, I planned to order a copy and someday show my then-1-year-old son what war really looked like. But I never did.

Unfortunately, I witnessed other mine incidents also. Some of the victims lived, at least for a while. There were three sounds we came to dread: the ''ca-rumph?'' sound of the mine explosion; the call ''Corpsman [or medic] up!''; and if the young, shocked Marine was still alive, sometimes ''Mother!'' or ''Mama!''

Recently I attended my Vietnam battalion's reunion. Some of us discussed the terror of walking down a path that might be

mined. Usually the earth is an infantryman's friend. He digs a fighting hole—the deeper he digs, the safer he is. But with mines, the earth is the enemy.

A machine gunner in our unit stepped up onto a rice paddy dike on a bounding-type mine and froze when he heard the click. An engineer disarmed the mine underneath his foot, and Reader's Digest wrote up his story. But his story of survival was one in a million.

Also, there is no enemy to fire back at when a mine explodes. The nearest villagers might suffer the infantrymen's wrath.

When we send troops into Bosnia and say they will be exposed to land mines, we should know what they are getting into.

HAPPY 80TH BIRTHDAY TO LINCOLN GORE

HON. GLENN POSHARD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1996

Mr. POSHARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay special tribute to Mr. Lincoln Gore on the occasion of his 80th birthday. His has been a great example of the American life, one centered on the premises of family, community, and service to country. It is with great respect that I wish him happy birthday.

''Linc'' has been a resident of West Frankfort, IL, since his birth on February 12, 1916. The 7th of 12 children, Mr. Gore has long known the pleasures of a large family. He married Nellie Little and began his own family in 1940 with the first of his three children. Mr. Gore currently has nine grandchildren and three great grandchildren, with the expectation of two new additions in the near future. Linc's love of family was perhaps best evidenced when he risked his life in an explosion at the Orient No. 8 Mine. Mr. Gore reentered the mine to help save his brother-in-law who was still trapped inside.

As much as he has received from his family, Mr. Gore has returned even more to West Frankfort and the United States of America. Currently retired from the State of Illinois and the city of West Frankfort, Linc, a long-time Democrat, has served as a precinct committeeman for the last 20 years. He is also a member of St. John the Baptist Catholic Church and the West Frankfort Moose Lodge. And when his country needed him, he answered the call and served with the Army in Europe during World War II.

Mr. Speaker, we all can learn a great deal from the example of Mr. Gore. His has been a life of love, duty, and honor. I wish him many more years of happiness as he celebrates his birthday.

TRIBUTE TO ROSALIE MARIE DEBEAUSSAERT

HON. DAVID E. BONIOR

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1996

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a good friend, Rosalie Marie DeBeaussaert. Rose, as she is known to her friends, was honored this past week by her colleagues at a retirement dinner which they hosted in honor of her many years of service. Rose retired this past October from the Utica community schools.

Rose is the kind of person who believes in family and taking an active role in one's community. She has lived her entire life fulfilling these responsibilities. She is the mother of five, grandmother to six, and was the devoted wife to the late Henry DeBeaussaert. The inherent need to sacrifice for the good of the family was something Rose learned early in life since she was 1 of 14 children. Hard work, commitment, and taking responsibility for one's self and others were values her parents instilled which she successfully passed on to her own children. In fact, it is because of these values that I became acquainted with Rose through her son Ken. Ken is a respected Michigan State senator who has worked with me since before my first election to Congress.

After her children were grown, Rose began taking care of other people's children when she started working for the Utica community schools. She worked at almost every school in the district helping prepare meals for the many hungry students. She retired as kitchen manager from Utica High School where she had worked for many years. During her working days she also helped care for her fellow workers by serving as a local steward in her union.

Through all these years she has also remained committed to her faith. As a member of the Altar Society at St. Isidore Parish she has held various offices over many years.

While I know she will be missed by her colleagues, their loss is her family's gain. I am sure Rose is excited to be spending more time with family and friends. Rose is a role model to all who know her and she deserves all the best in retirement. I ask that my colleagues join me in offering heartfelt congratulations and a sincere thank you for a job well done.

SALUTE TO REV. SAMUEL AMOS BRACKEEN OF PHILADELPHIA

HON. THOMAS M. FOGLIETTA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1996

Mr. FOGLIETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay special tribute to Rev. Samuel Brackeen, founder and pastor of the Philippian Baptist Church to congratulate him on his many years of service to the Philadelphia community.

Reverend Brackeen, educated at Paul Quinn College, Oberlin Graduate School of Theology, University of Pittsburgh in Pennsylvania, and Vanderbilt University, began his tenure with the Philippian Baptist Church over 30 years ago. He is founder of the Progressive National Baptist Convention and the Baptist Global Mission Bureau. Reverend Brackeen has dedicated his life to improving the plight of his people in many areas.

Reverend Brackeen has also played a vital role in many programs in the Philadelphia community as the vice president of the Pittsburgh N.A.A.C.P. branch, chairman of the civil rights committee and chairman of the Centre Avenue Y.M.C.A. Reverend Brackeen has been active in religious and community projects, holding memberships in various organizations for community betterment. He has served as the Philadelphia community finance chairman and board member of the Columbia Y.M.C.A., executive director of the Helping Hand Committee Inc. and board member of Nannie Helen Burroughs School. In Philadelphia, he has been active in the fight against police brutality, The 400 Ministers' Campaign, the fight for job opportunities, and the bettering of educational opportunities for African-Americans. Currently, Reverend Brackeen is an incorporator and director of the United Bank of Philadelphia, the only black commercial bank in Pennsylvania.

I hope my colleagues will join me today in congratulating the Reverend Samuel Brackeen for his many years of service with the Philippian Baptist Church and the Philadelphia community. I wish the Reverend Samuel Brackeen and the Philippian Baptist Church the very best as they continue their service to the Baptist community in Philadelphia.

TRIBUTE TO FIREFIGHTER JAMES B. WILLIAMS

HON. CHARLES E. SCHUMER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1996

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and pay tribute to a courageous public citizen, Mr. James B. Williams, a firefighter who faithfully served the community of Far Rockaway for 12 years until he lost his life on January 5, 1996, in a raging fire. Among his colleagues, Mr. Williams was admired and respected as one of the best firefighters in New York. Many of his comrades from Ladder Company 121 worked with him side by side for many years, often placing their trust in Mr. Williams to save their own lives when caught in danger. Most importantly, the people of Far Rockaway remember him best as a man who fearlessly devoted his life to saving the lives of many Queens residents. His remarkable record of service to the Rockaways has been duly recognized as he received several accolades for his bravery. These honors include two citations of merit in 1991 from the New York Fire Department's Holy Name Society for saving the life of a 43-year-old man, and for rescuing two young children trapped in a smoke-filled apartment building.

During that windy and blustery night of January 5, Mr. Williams made the extra effort to search for any victims left behind in a burning apartment building. During this act of valor, Mr. Williams lost his life. Capt. John T. Rokee and Brian Gallagher, who accompanied Mr. Williams into the blaze, described it as a blowtorch of flames, making the mission especially treacherous. Yet James Williams charged on.

Mr. Williams, killed in the line of duty at the age of 38, will be remembered as an American hero who made an indelible impression on those who witnessed his indomitable will to help others. The legacy of Mr. Williams' bravery on that chilly night will certainly live on among his family, friends, and neighbors. I offer my condolences to his wife and children as they proudly revere the memory of their courageous father and husband. He was a true leader who served our community with the utmost distinction. I ask my colleagues to join me and the people of Queens in observing a moment of silence to honor the tireless energy and courage of Mr. James Williams. He will live long in all of our hearts and minds.

HONORING ARTHUR T. BARBIERI ON HIS 80TH BIRTHDAY

HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1996

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, New Haven Democratic Town Chairman Arthur T. Barbieri will celebrate his 80th birthday. It is with great pleasure that I rise today to salute this incredible individual, who has contributed so much to the city of New Haven.

Born and raised in New Haven, Arthur Barbieri began his career in public service in 1951, when he was elected to the position of town clerk. Two years later, at the age of 37, he became the youngest New Haven Democratic chairman ever, a position he would hold for the next 22 years. During this time, Arthur earned a sterling reputation for his skill in advocating for and developing programs that would benefit the city. The renovation of the New Haven Coliseum, the Connecticut Tennis Center, and the children's hospital at Yale-New Haven are a living legacy to Arthur Barbieri's commitment to rejuvenating his beloved hometown. In 1988, after the death of Town Chairman Vincent Mauro, Arthur once again heeded the call of both his party and his city, and resumed the position of town chairman. Arthur also continues to serve as a member of the Democratic State Central Committee, providing, as always, sage advice and insightful leadership.

Arthur Barbieri has been an inspiration and a mentor to me over the years and also worked closely with my mother and father, Alderman and Alderwoman Ted and Luisa DeLauro. On a few occasions we found ourselves on opposite sides of an issue, but no one ever doubted his wisdom, leadership, and commitment to the city of New Haven. Indeed, it is difficult to measure the magnitude of Arthur's contributions, for he has played a major role in so many different projects and has guided the careers of so many local, State, and Federal officials, including President Clinton.

It is with great pleasure that I commend Arthur T. Barbieri for a lifetime of achievement. I join his wife, Marion, his family, and his many friends in wishing Arthur a very happy 80th birthday. Arthur truly embodies the past, present, and future of New Haven politics, and it is deepest hope that we will have the benefit of his wisdom and kindness for many more years to come.

''PAPA JACK'' THOMPSON, THE ONGOING HISTORY OF A GREAT AMERICAN

HON. RANDY ''DUKE'' CUNNINGHAM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1996

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride and honor that I rise to share the news of a most important milestone in the life of an extraordinary American. Today Mr. Lawrence Thompson—known better to his grandkids as ''Papa Jack''—turns 109 years old. By spending his birthday at Disneyland in Anaheim, CA, Papa Jack has become the oldest first-time visitor to that famous place of eternal youth.

To know Papa Jack is to know a slice of American history. His father was a doctor for the King and Queen of Hawaii when he was born in '87—1887, that is. He watched the first steamboats arrive around the Hawaiian Islands and sent clothing to a far-off place called San Francisco after hearing that a terrible earthquake had devasted the city. He later moved to San Francisco and then south to Los Angeles. A proud American and a great patriot, he continues to salute every American flag that he happens upon.

Papa Jack later moved on to Rancho Bernardo in north San Diego County, where he was the area's lawnbowling champion at 99 years young. I am proud to say that I serve as this fine American's Representative in Congress.

At 1 p.m. today, Papa Jack becomes a kid again at the Magic Kingdom during a special birthday celebration. Let us all join the good people at Disneyland as well as Papa Jack's son, his grandchildren and their children on this special day to commend an inspiring example of a citizen and his lasting love for the United States of America.

SALUTING THE DORSEY HIGH FOOTBALL TEAM

HON. JULIAN C. DIXON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1996

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, as an alumnus of Susan Miller Dorsey High School, I rise with considerable pride to call to the attention of the House the Dorsey High School football team which recently won the Los Angeles City 4–A High School Football Championship.

My congratulations to Coach Paul Knox under whose exceptional leadership the Dorsey Dons completed another exciting and successful season. The challenges facing our inner-city schools are enormous. However, the faculty and administrators of Dorsey High School are to be praised for their hard work in meeting these challenges by developing scholars as well as athletes. Much credit also belongs to their principal, Dr. Jerlene Welles, for forging an academic team whose mission is preparing our youth for the biggest championship game of all; the game of life.

This year's football championship game was an exciting, hard-fought defensive struggle in which the Dorsey Dons defeated the San Pedro Pirates 10 to 8. The game was highlighted by an outstanding performance by Dorsey tailback Raymont Skaggs, who grabbed a screen pass from quarterback Marvin Gomez, and, breaking a tackle, ran 57 yards down the sideline for a touchdown in the first half of the game.

Dorsey carried their 7 to 0 lead into the fourth quarter, when San Pedro cornerback Antonio Dominguez intercepted a pass at the Dorsey 31-yard line. San Pedro quarterback Melvin Yarbrough followed later with a 15-yard touchdown pass to tight-end Tim O'Donnell. A two-point conversion gave San Pedro a 8 to 7 lead.

The winning score was set up when Dorsey's Che Britton recovered a fumble on San Pedro's 47-yard line. The Dons moved the ball to the 15-yard line, where Dorsey Coach Knox asked kicker Juan Zianes to do something he had been unable to do all season; kick a field goal. With the championship on the line, Zianes proved equal to the task, delivering a low line drive that barely cleared the crossbar. It was good enough to put Dorsey back in the lead 10 to 8.

However, San Pedro fought back; forcing a Dorsey fumble on their own 24-yard line with 1:41 to play. With the help of three pass interference penalties and one illegal procedure penalty, the Pirates quickly moved the ball to midfield. Facing third down and 20, Yarbrough found Pirate receiver Mark Pappas for a gain of 19 yards and 10 inches. It was now fourth down with 2 inches needed for a first down to extend the drive. Only 25 seconds were left in the game.

San Pedro Coach Mike Walsh decided not to go for the first down, and let the clock run down to 3 seconds, setting up a 38-yard field goal attempt to win the game. The kick was blocked. Dorsey won the game, and the championship.

1995 QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

HON. ANTHONY C. BEILENSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1996

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to share with my colleagues the results of the survey I sent to the residents of the district I represent last July, which over 15,000 people answered. I found the questionnaire enormously valuable in learning how my constituents feel about Federal spending priorities and other controversial matters before Congress, and I thought other Members would also find these results interesting.

The questionnaire asked respondents to show how they would cut the Federal budget by choosing from a list of 39 categories, covering virtually all Federal spending. A majority of those responding supported cutting spending in only eight areas: defense, civil service and military pensions, food stamps, Aid to Families with Dependent Children, foreign aid, farm subsidies, general government, and Congress.

The results also showed strong support for most ''safety net'' programs: to more than one-quarter, and in most cases fewer, respondents favored cutting Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, unemployment compensation, Supplemental Security Income [SSI], or child nutrition.

In addition, there was solid support for programs that provide health, safety, and quality-of-life services: only 10 percent to 20 percent of respondents supported cutting transportation, law enforcement, health research, public health, environmental protection, national parks, disaster assistance, water resource projects, science research, or food and drug safety.

Clearly, there was strong opposition among the respondents to most of the spending cuts being promoted by the Republican majority in Congress. However, the one large category of Federal spending that a majority would like to see cut—defense—is one of the few areas

that would escape cuts under the Republican budget plan.

The results also pointed to strong opposition to several other issues being promoted by the Republican leadership in Congress, such as weakening environmental protection laws, repealing the ban on assault weapons, allowing Government-sanctioned prayer in public schools, and curbing access to abortion. However, on the matter of immigration control, significant majorities supported two proposals that have more support among Republican than Democratic Members: denying automatic citizenship to U.S.-born children of illegal immigrants, and reducing the number of legal immigrants admitted to the United States each year.

The complete resulted of the survey follow:

CONGRESSMAN ANTHONY C. BEILENSON'S 1995 QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

HOW WOULD YOU CUT FEDERAL SPENDING?

From a list of the programs and activities financed by the federal government, you were asked to indicate which ones you favored cutting. Here are the results:

PROGRAM/SPENDING AREA

[In order of percentage of federal budget/amount of spending]

	1995 Percentage of Federal spending (approx.)	1995 spending in billions (est.)	Percentage who support cutting
Social Security	22	$334	25
Defense	18	270	53
Interest on the national debt	15	234	(2)
Medicare (health care for the elderly)	10	154	24
Medicaid (health care for the poor, and nursing home care)	6	88	25
Federal civilian and military pensions	4	65	55
Transportation (highways, mass transit, railroads, airports, and safety)	3	38	16
Food stamps	2	26	55
Education and student financial aid	2	26	28
Housing subsidies	2	26	48
Supplemental Security Income (payments to impoverished elderly and disabled)	2	25	17
Unemployment compensation	1	22	25
Veterans' benefits	1	20	15
Aid to Families with Dependent Children (welfare)	1	17	55
Law enforcement, FBI, courts and prisons	1	16	14
Foreign aid	(1)	14	74
Space program (NASA)	(1)	13	40
Farm subsidies	(1)	13	73
Job training and employment-related services	(1)	13	27
General government (IRS, customs, etc.)	(1)	13	56
Health research	(1)	12	14
Community and regional development	(1)	12	43
Public health	(1)	10	13
Child nutrition (includes school lunch program)	(1)	8	27
Environmental protection and toxic waste clean-up	(1)	7	20
Energy conservation, research and development	(1)	6	22
National parks, forests and wildlife refuges	(1)	5	13
Disaster assistance	(1)	5	12
Water resource projects	(1)	4	14
Science research	(1)	4	16
Head Start	(1)	4	30
Congress	(1)	2	69
International peacekeeping	(1)	2	47
Food and drug safety	(1)	1	11
National service program (AmeriCorps)	(1)	0.50	33
Border Patrol	(1)	0.46	5
National Endowments for the Arts and Humanities	(1)	0.33	41
Public broadcasting (TV and radio)	(1)	0.29	33
The White House	(1)	0.20	46
Other	1	19	31
Total	100	1,530	

(1) Indicates less than 1% of the budget.
(2) Cannot be cut unless borrowing is cut.

Environmental protection: Do you support relaxing environmental protection laws?

Yes: 33%

No: 67%

Assault weapons: Do you support repealing the ban on assault weapons?

Yes: 21%

No: 79%

Illegal immigration: Do you support eliminating the automatic granting of citizenship to U.S.-born children of illegal immigrants?

Yes: 83%

No: 17%

Legal immigration: Do you support reducing the number of people who are allowed to legally immigrate to the U.S. each year?

Yes: 77%

No: 23%

School prayer: Do you support a Constitutional amendment that would permit government-sanctioned prayer in public schools?

Yes: 36%

No: 64%

Business subsidies: Do you support efforts to reduce tax breaks and programs that subsidize American businesses?

Yes: 66%

No: 34%

Abortion: Do you think Congress should act to restrict access to abortion?

Yes: 22%

No: 78%

DOONESBURY COUPON

HON. PATRICIA SCHROEDER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1996

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents, Tom McIntosh, has accurately remarked on efforts by this Congress to obliterate our country's natural resources.

Using a Doonesbury cartoon that clearly demonstrates current efforts by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to sell our forests and wilderness areas, Mr. McIntosh's observations, along with Garry Trudeau's national call, are right on the dot.

Mr. Speaker, my constituent's concern for the protection of our environment—for the sake of his granddaughter's future—is quite compelling, and quite real, and I am inserting both the Doonesbury coupon and Mr. McIntosh's comments into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

Aurora, CO, January 23, 1996.

MR. SPEAKER: After reading the Doonesbury cartoon in my 01/14/96 newspaper, I too want to enter my bid for your sale of America's resources for fractions of a penny on the dollar.

I didn't see a lot number, but mark me down for a bid on the capitol and both wings of it. I want to use all of the hot air (a valuable thermal resource) to help reduce the winter heating bills for various Minnesotans and Alaskans, plus residents of Maybell, CO. I bid $25.

As for Lot number 193—Wilderness mineral rights—with an approximate street value over $1 billion, I'll up the suggested bid of $1,200 to $1,201. As a deserving good citizen, I'll dutifully pay my capital gains (After you reduce capital gains taxes to a pittance) when I complete the sale to Exxon and Newmont Mining, plus a little leftovers for 3M.

Oh, let's not forget Lot number 147, the Alaskan old-growth forests. The suggested bid of $1.60/tree seems a little high, what with the transportation costs and all. How about $1.45? Would you mark me down for two dozen?

I missed some of the other lots. Perhaps you can send me a catalog.

Now seriously, Mr. Speaker:

What Mr. Trudeau is obviously alluding to in his cartoons of the past two weeks is the absolutely ridiculous liquidation of this nation's most precious and most-difficult-to-replace natural resources by Congress. Have you folks no conscience and no shame? I for one would like to know that Kayla, my beloved grand-daughter will be able to live in this country without having to breathe through an oxygen mask and wear a lead-lined pants-suit to protect her from the environmental hazards brought on by the reckless actions of the 1996 Congress. Would you all please get real????

Sincerely,

TOM MCINTOSH.

U.S. NATURAL RESOURCES LIQUIDATION AUCTION BID FORM

To: Rep. Newt Gingrich.

☐ Yes! I would like to bid on some of the choice national assets now being liquidated by Congress.

Lot #147—Alaskan Old-Growth Forests

Opportunity to clear-cut 500-year-old trees. Valued at $50,000 a tree; suggested bid: $1.60 a tree. My Bid: _____

Lot #183—Wilderness Mineral Rights

Opportunity to mine pristine wilderness area. Valued at $1 billion+; suggested bid $1,200. My Bid: _____

Lot #275—Prime Western Grazing Land

Opportunity to denude taxpayer-maintained range land. Market value: $10.30 per cow and calf per month. Suggested bid: $1.61. My Bid: _____

Name: _____

Street: _____

City: _____ State _____ Zip _____

Signature: _____

Send To: The Speaker of the House, U.S. Congress, Washington, D.C. 20515; or Call: (202) 225–3121; or Fax: (202 225–7733.

MEMORIAL TRIBUTE TO DELORA JONES-HICKS

HON. DONALD M. PAYNE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1996

Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the death of Delora Jones-Hicks has deprived the Nation of a woman of great magnitude and capacity. To those of us who knew her personally and to those who did not, there could be no finer example of conscientious humanity. She was a woman of principle. She always looked for and welcomed the good; and when she did not find it, she tried to encourage its development.

Delora Elizabeth Crews was born to Lynwood Crews and Elizabeth Rogers Crews in Kittrell, NC, on April 29, 1937.

The family moved to East Orange, NJ, in 1942. A graduate of East Orange public schools, she was educated in the fields of social science and health administration at Rutgers University, New Brunswick and Newark campuses; New Jersey School of Alcohol and Drug Abuse Studies at Rutgers University; Bucknell University; and C.J. Post College at Long Island University.

With the late George ''Specs'' Hicks, she cofounded New Well, New Jersey's first private treatment center for drug addicts, with chapters in Newark, Passaic, Atlantic City, and Morristown. She served as a trustee and grants writer for the organization for more than 20 years, until its closing in 1989.

Delora was director of women's training for the Business Industrial Coordinating Council in

Newark during the 1960's. She also served for 1 year as the Community Liaison for the Newark Pre-School Council. She was secretary for the Newark-Essex Congress of Racial Equality [CORE] during the 1960's, and was active in the Newark Black Power Conference, as well as the political election of Newark's first African-American mayor, Kenneth A. Gibson.

In 1968, she joined the staff of Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey, as a writer for the department of public relations on the Newark campus. Delora also held the position of manager, division of concerts and lectures, in the early to mid-70's. As manager, she brought to the campus and to the larger community renowned artists such as Sarah Vaughn, Yehudi Menuhin, the Russian pianist O. Yablonskaya, and the great Count Basie Orchestra.

Delora was an officer or chairman of the Organization of Black Faculty and Staff [OBFS] at Rutgers-Newark for nearly 15 years. She played a vital role in the naming of the campus center after Paul Robeson, Rutgers' distinguished alumnus. She spearheaded the annual celebration of Black History Month and the Martin Luther King, Jr., celebration, bringing to the campus such notable speakers as Amiri Baraka, Douglas Turner Ward, Linda Hopkins, Judge Bruce Wright, and Rev. Joseph Lowery.

During her tenure as chair of OBFS, the number of blacks on faculty and staff as well as student enrollment increased. She was the heart and soul of OBFS—always vigilant, never giving up the fight to improve the status of blacks, women, Latinos, and the disadvantaged on campus. She launched the Justice William O. Douglas Award, a tribute to and recognition of the contribution of Caucasians to the cause of equal justice. With her love for knowledge and respect for education, Delora had an abiding affection for students, particularly law students, especially those who sought her out for advice, encouragement, and motivation to continue the journey.

Delora briefly joined the staff of the Graduate Department of Public Administration at Rutgers-Newark, where she established and edited the first newsletter for the department, the M.P.A. Newsletter. She rejoined the staff of public information where she remained until her retirement in 1993.

Delora was a member of the Newark Arts & Culture Committee, the NAACP, and served as a trustee on the Boys' and Girls' Clubs of Newark. Delora traveled abroad extensively in African countries such as Ethiopia, Kenya, Tanzania, Egypt, Somalia, Sudan, and to Spain, England, Greece, and widely throughout the United States.

Delora was affectionately known as ''Big D'' to family and friends. In 1955, she married the late Charles Jones, Jr., of East Orange. The Union produced four children, Pamela Sawab, Erica Jones, Leila Bardaji, and Channing Jones. In 1986, she married the late George Hicks of Newark. She has six grandchildren, Farrakhan, Gibran, Al-Sawab, Elyse, Nicole, and Cayla. She was the sister of the late Lynwood Crews, Jr., and the late Regina Crews. She leaves her mother, Elizabeth, her children and grandchildren, sons-in-law, Sergio and Sawab, and a host of dearest friends, Erma and Oliver Brown, Kathy Brunet, Bob Clarke, Mae Curtis, Evelyn Green, Hilda Hidalgo, Irene Laini James, Adele Kaplan, Clement Alexander Price, and Norman Samuels, among others.

Delora and the way she lived her life should be examples for all of us. I would like to commend to the annals of American history these remarks and an article that appeared in New Jersey's statewide newspaper, the Star-Ledger on January 19, 1996. Columnist Robert J. Braun in this tribute to Delora truly captured the essence of this remarkable woman.

[From the Star-Ledger, Jan. 19, 1996]

NEWARK HEROINE ALWAYS PREFERRED THE COLOR HUMAN

(By Robert J. Braun)

No pastels for Delora Jones-Hicks.

They wouldn't suit her, and besides, that's what she told her friends when they came to visit her in her last days.

She wanted to be buried in a purple dress and she wanted flowers in bright colors, reds and blues and yellows and oranges with lots of greens to set them off. All from different florists, so they would not look the same.

Her friends averted their eyes and one would say, ''Oh, come on, Delora, who's talking about a funeral?''

That's when she gave that look. God had sculpted Delora's broad face so the edges of her lips ended in dimples that made her look as if she were always suppressing a smile that was about to erupt in uproarious laughter.

She knew, the look said. She fought cancer for five years and it was time for her friends to help her with the funeral she wanted.

That purse-lipped expression served Delora well because it served her friends well. No matter how angry they were, or sad, or confused, when they came to her and saw she was about to smile, they smiled, too.

''Oh, shush,'' Delora would say. ''It's not that bad.'' Then she would laugh and things never were that bad once you talked to Delora.

She wasn't much for calling attention to herself or wanting to see her name in print. Despite that, Delora did more to make life in Newark livable than a dozen more familiar names. She did it by being a friend.

All right, so that sounds hokey and, in a way, there was something about Delora that was hokey. Someone at her funeral said she had this ''Sunday morning going to church lady with the white gloves'' side to her.

That does not explain how she defused one racial crisis after another at Rutgers in Newark or how she fought to ensure that the campus got its fair share from the people who ran things in New Brunswick.

It doesn't explain her leadership of the local Congress of Racial Equality or an organization representing black students, staff and faculty at Rutgers-Newark.

She was eulogized by blacks and whites and Hispanics, but some who spoke struggled with useless pre-packaged categories. Amiri Baraka called her a ''middle-class sister'' with a ''street side.'' No, that's wrong. She was bigger than class, than race, than the streets.

Historian Clement Price came close when he said she was concerned ''about the state of her race and that, of course, was the human race.'' She was ''fervently loyal to her friends . . . and her friendship was uncluttered.''

Uncluttered by race, by rhetoric, by obsession with slights and symbols, by the armor we have fashioned to keep us from seeing one another.

Her only armor was this: Her eyes did not stop at the color of skin or the texture of hair. She fought hard, but people were never her enemies. They had children, just as she did, she would say. They had parents. They got sick and they worried about money. They might be wrong, but they were still people.

When the Rutgers administration wanted to dump her old boss, Malcolm Talbott, the vice president for Newark, she asked her friends to support him.

This was strange. Talbott was a Midwest WASP, who looked like a Prussian general and spoke like an Oxford don. Yet Delora knew he was good for Newark. Besides, he was her friend.

So, while her bosses in Rutgers were telling the world why Talbott had to go, she was in a back office on the phone, telling the same people why he should stay. He stayed—and the people in New Brunswick never knew the provenance of all his support.

Nor did Talbott. Her friendship was uncluttered by the expectation of return. She was known for the thank-you notes she sent—''Thank you' were her two most favorite words.'' Price said—but she never expected to be thanked.

Price said she had a ''voice from another time and another place,'' a reference to an odd, lispy accent no one, not even her children, could identify. Not Southern, although she was born in North Carolina; not Newark, although she spent most of her life here. Just Delora.

It was from another time and place, and we don't know the accent because we haven't been there yet. If the pathology of how we live in a savagely divided time and place somehow were cured, we might all speak with her accent.

She died Jan. 4, and was buried in a snowstorm. Mourners, faces hidden by hats, scarves and umbrellas, passed by, each dropping a flower. When the last left, an uproarious profusion of reds and blues and yellows and oranges laughed at the blinding white of snow veined through with black trees.

No pastels for Delora Jones-Hicks.

TRIBUTE TO CLAIRE E. FREEMAN: 1996 BLACK PROFESSIONAL OF THE YEAR

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1996

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, on February 17, 1996, officers, members and friends of the Black Professionals Association [BPA] will gather in Cleveland, OH, for the Sixteenth Annual Scholarship and Awards Gala. The event is sponsored by the BPA Charitable Foundation. The Black Professionals Association was the dream of William Wolfe, the former president of the Greater Cleveland Urban League, who, in 1976, invited black professionals to join together to discuss mutual issues of concern. The organization was officially chartered in 1977.

Over the years, the Black Professionals Association has been the voice for its membership on the social, economic, and legislative issues facing the community and the Nation. The Greater Cleveland community has also benefited from the organization's professional development seminars, mentoring programs and voter registration activities. The Sixteenth Annual Scholarship and Awards Gala marks the continued success of this distinguished organization.

One of the highlights of the BPA Charitable Foundation gala is the selection of the 1996 Black Professional of the Year. This year's honoree is Claire E. Freeman, the chief executive officer of the Cuyahoga Metropolitan Housing Association. Ms. Freeman is more

than deserving of this special recognition from her friends and colleagues. I rise today to share with my colleagues some background information regarding this outstanding individual.

In 1990, Claire Freeman assumed the post of chief executive officer of the Cuyahoga Metropolitan Housing Authority [CMHA]. In this post, she manages a $100 million operating budget, a $318 million construction modernization budget and a work force of 1,500 employees. Under Ms. Freeman's leadership, CMHA has received recognition as having the greatest rate of positive change after being operationally and financially troubled for over 15 years. Her efforts signal a strong commitment to the community and its residents. Claire Freeman has also taken a special interest in the youth of our community. She is meeting an important challenge of guaranteeing safe, drug-free housing for our children and their families. Further, she is a role model and mentor to youth throughout the community.

Mr. Speaker, prior to coming to Cleveland, Claire Freeman served as Assistant Secretary for Administration at the Department of Housing and Urban Development. Before joining HUD, she was Deputy Assistant Secretary for Civilian Personnel Policy for the Department of Defense. At the Defense Department, Ms. Freeman was recognized for instituting an executive leadership program which continues to be a premier succession planning vehicle at the agency. Claire Freeman is a graduate of the University of Southern California with a master science degree in urban and regional planning. She earned her bachelor's degree in sociology/history from the University of California at Riverside.

Claire Freeman is also an active member of the community. She holds memberships on many local boards and commissions, including the Housing Authority Insurance Co., Council of Large Public Housing Authorities, and the Department of Defense Quality of Life Task Force. She is also the recipient of professional and civic awards which include the Ernest J. Bohn Outstanding Public Administrator Award; U.S. Small Business State/Local Business Advocate Award; and the Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Award in Housing.

Mr. Speaker, I take special pride in saluting Claire Freeman on the occasion of her selection as the 1996 Black Professional of the Year. As a past recipient of this distinguished award, I am aware of the commitment and dedication which this honor signals. Claire Freeman has been a tireless champion and leader for the Greater Cleveland community. We applaud her commitment, and wish her much continued success. I also extend my best wishes to the entire membership of the Black Professionals Association.

STATEMENT BY AMBASSADOR JOSEPH VERNER REED

HON. ROBERT G. TORRICELLI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1996

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to give special recognition to the remarks of the Honorable Joseph Reed, Under Secretary General of the United Nations, presented on behalf of Dr. Boutos-Ghali, the Secretary General of the United Nations, at the Second World Parliamentarians' Conference in Gifu, Japan, in September.

I am sure we all agree that the United Nations' admirable goal of striving to promote and support democratization throughout the world deserves our wholehearted support.

Ambassador Reed's contributions to the work of the United Nations continue to serve as an inspiration. Ambassador Reed has held several senior-level positions in the United Nations, in addition to serving as the Chief of Protocol from 1989 to 1991 and United States Ambassador to the Kingdom of Morocco from 1981 to 1985.

I submit Ambassador Reed's speech in Japan for my colleagues to review.

STATEMENT BY AMBASSADOR JOSEPH VERNER REED AT THE SECOND WORLD PARLIAMENTARIANS' CONFERENCE FOR THE SUPPORT OF THE UNITED NATIONS

Excellencies, Ladies and Gentleman, I feel privileged to be here today on behalf of the Secretary-General of the United Nations, Dr. Boutros Boutros-Ghali, who sends best wishes and greetings. The Secretary-General and all of us at the United Nations are grateful for the valuable support you have given us, in good times and in bad times. The Secretary-General has asked me to share the following with you.

When the first Parliamentarians' Conference for the support of the United Nations was held in January 1992 in Tokyo, the United Nations was entering a new phase. Gone were the bipolar tensions of the cold war. In their place came renewed commitment to the United Nations—to the great common goal of a peaceful and cooperative international system.

It soon became clear, however, that more than renewed commitment would be required. A massive transformation would be needed to enable the organization to fulfill the goals of the charter in a dramatically different world environment.

Some three years later, the process of transition continues. Significant and substantial progress has been made. But there is a need for further, substantial reform. The fiftieth anniversary year of the organization offers us an opportunity to complete this process, and bring this period of transition to a successful close.

It is in this context that you have gathered here in the Gifu for the Second World Parliamentarians' Conference for the Support of the United Nations.

You have discussed and reached new consensus on the role of the United Nations in many key areas: disarmament and peace; sustainable development and the environment; the United Nations and Asia and the Pacific; and the involvement of citizens and non-governmental organizations.

Today, the Secretary-General has asked me to take these moments with you to discuss another area of United Nations work: promoting and supporting democratization.

The end of the cold war confrontation and the emergence of globalization continue to drive a wave of democratization. Since 1989 the United Nations has received requests for electoral assistance from more than sixty member states. These requests, from nearly one-third of the organization's membership, testify to this new impulse toward democratization.

The United Nations today is in the forefront of promoting and supporting democratization around the world. The emphasis is on democratization as a process, and democracy as an objective.

Individual societies decide if and when to begin the process of democratization—to move toward a more participatory system of political governance. And throughout democratization, each society decides the nature of the process and its pace.

Like the process of democratization itself, democracy can take many shapes and forms. It can be assimilated by any culture.

The benefits brought by democracy make it a compelling objective for those societies on the path of democratization.

Democracy supports stability within societies by mediating between competing points of view. It fosters respect between states, reducing the chances of war. It creates responsive government that respects human rights and legal obligations. And it favours the creativity and cooperation that permit social and economic progress.

The United Nations is adapting to the new and increasing demands of member states for support in democratization.

On 7 December 1994, in its Resolution 49/30, the General Assembly requested the Secretary-General to study ways and mechanisms in which the United Nations system could support the efforts of governments to promote and consolidate new or restored democracies. The Secretary-General was asked to submit a comprehensive report thereon to the assembly at its fiftieth session.

The Secretary General is now preparing the report. Outlines for a comprehensive approach are emerging. Such an approach will enable the United Nations to offer support for democratization that begins at the earliest possible stage. It could then continue on through assistance in democratic elections, and in the building of institutions which support democratization.

For democratization to take root within a society, it must have indigenous support. The United Nations assists member states in building such support by helping to promote a culture of democracy. This can mean assistance to political parties and movements; support for a free and independent media; or assistance in civic education.

Such efforts, combined with electoral assistance, can help member states firmly on the road to democratization. In this regard, recent United Nations achievements in Cambodia, El Salvador and Mozambique deserve wider recognition and attention.

Electoral assistance to member states is a new phenomenon. The Under Secretary-General for Political Affairs now serves as focal point for electoral assistance requests, with the help of the newly-created electoral assistance division.

Beyond holding free and fair elections is the evident need for societies to prepare the institutional ground in which democratization can take root. The United Nations offers a wide variety of assistance in this area, drawing substantially upon its work in development and human rights. The United Nations today is helping member states to create democratic structures of Government—or to strengthen existing ones. It is helping to enhance the rule of law. To improve accountability and transparency. To build national capacity. And to reform the civil service.

This comprehensive approach, now taking shape, reflects the changing nature of requests by member states for support in democratization. It also underscores the need for other actors to contribute. Regional organizations, non-governmental organizations, citizens, the private sector, the academic community, parliamentarians such as yourselves—all have an essential and complementary role to play.

Many of you in this audience, through such organizations as the Interparliamentary Union, or Parliamentarians for Global Action, already provide international support for democratization processes. You help promote a culture of democracy and human

rights. You provide electoral assistance. You facilitate the creation and operation of representative institutions. You are valued partners of the United Nations in the effort to promote and support democratization.

We are convinced that the efforts of states to democratize will find greater stability and an increased likelihood of success when democratization extends to the international arena.

Globalization confronts governments everywhere with new pressures. Some are economic, political and military pressures from above. Others are pressures exerted from below by local, ethnic or grass-roots organizations.

These pressures are often mutually reinforcing. Citizens suffering the local effects of problems transnational in scope—such as drug trafficking or environmental degradation—are demanding solutions from their national governments. To meet these demands, governments must increasingly seek solutions through cooperative arrangements or participation in international organizations.

The new pressures on governments are thus paving the way for an unprecedented democratization of international relations. This process must be recognized, supported and advanced. The institutions and norms of democracy, at the international level, can provide governments with the means to manage global pressures. They can help governments to provide an enabling environment for their citizens.

For the United Nations, democratization of the international system has become a new priority. Already, the reform of the organization, including the decentralization of decision-making, has taken place.

This reform needs to be met by reform in the intergovernmental organs of the United Nations. And, in the relationships between those organs and the other elements of the U.N. system. Progress in this area has been slow. But these are difficult and complicated issues. The Secretary-General is determined that they should receive their full share of debate.

There are many other ways in which the United Nations can promote the democratization of the international system. By supporting a free, independent and responsible media, worldwide, the United Nations helps to preserve the principal venue for dialogue and debate within and among nations.

International law is a powerful tool for the democratization of the international system. It promotes mutual respect among nations and peoples. It provides an analytical framework for approaching problems of mutual concern. It offers a powerful basis for multilateral action. The United Nations provides a forum and mechanism for the advancement of international law.

Global conferences, convened by the United Nations, create relevant constituencies. They bring together all the state and non-state actors concerned. This not only contributes to the legitimacy and effectiveness of the programmes of action produced. It strengthens participation in decision-making on world affairs. It reinforces democratic principles at the international level.

The efforts of the United Nations to improve cooperation with actors outside the United Nations system have a similar effect. I refer here again to regional organizations, non-governmental agencies, citizens, the private sector, the academic community and parliamentarians. In all areas of work—for peace, development or democratization—cooperation with these actors increases efficiency and effectiveness. And, it strengthens democratic principles and practices.

During this time of transition, improving cooperation with parliamentarians has taken on an even greater urgency.

Making the transition to a new international era is no simple task. The new challenges are complex, difficult, and at times, dangerous. Around the world, United Nations personnel are asked to confront unprecedented situations—all too often without sufficient resources or mandates.

The United Nations needs its member states and their peoples to recognize the complexity of today's challenges. In the task of communication, you, as parliamentarians, can play an indispensable role. You are an essential link between the United Nations and international public opinion. You are uniquely placed to help build recognition, understanding and support for the United Nations and its work.

Communication must flow both ways. If the new international system is to be legitimate, responsive and effective, all must take part in its creation. As direct representatives of the wills and aspirations of your constituents, you can carry their voices to the international arena. You can help ensure their participation.

As such, you, parliamentarians, are also a motive force for the democratization of the international system. And you can bring to bear on world affairs your commitment to dialogue, discussion and agreement—to democratic principles and cooperation.

Today, at the conference, you are fulfilling all of these important roles. You are helping to build support for the United Nations. You are bringing the views of your constituents to the international arena. You are giving strength to democratic principles in the practice of world affairs.

On behalf of the United Nations, the Secretary-General has asked me to express our deep appreciation to the foundation for the support of the United Nations, to the Gifu City government, and to the Gifu Prefecture.

Government for sponsoring this important event. This sponsorship testifies to the longstanding commitment of the people of Japan—as individual citizens, through their local and national governments, and through regional organizations—to support the United Nations and its ideals, and to participate in its work.

To all of you parliamentarians, assembled in this great and beautiful city of Gifu, the Secretary-General extends his sincere appreciation for your efforts. And we look forward to your continued participation as we strive to construct a workable international system for today, and for tomorrow.

Ladies and gentlemen, in conclusion, allow me a few words on an event which is close to my heart and, I am sure, close to your heart: the golden jubilee of our world organization.

As we prepare for the fiftieth anniversary of the United Nations, let us recall the opening words of the charter: ''We the peoples of the United Nations . . .''. We all of us—are the United Nations. The United Nations is now and increasingly will be, what we choose to make of it.

Knowledge about the United Nations is thus ever more important for people everywhere. With the active commitment of people, the United Nations and continue to play its indispensable role for peace and security, social and economic progress, and global human development.

Let us take up the challenge of the next fifty years. It is in our power to use the United Nations as a force for fundamental transformation to a world of peace and enduring prosperity. Let this be the starting point for taking your United Nations on the road to the future.

I thank you for your attention.

ENGLISH AS OUR OFFICIAL LANGUAGE

HON. BILL EMERSON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1996

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in order to bring to the attention of this distinguished body an editorial which recently appeared in the Southeast Missourian, a daily newspaper located in my congressional district. The editorial, entitled ''Official Language for Missouri,'' praises the recent efforts in the Missouri legislature to establish a policy of conducting the State's business in English. The paper's discerning commentary notes that the supposed beneficiaries of multilingual government are not at all served by programs that operate in as many as 11 different languages across the State. In my view, Congress would be wise to listen to this kind of counsel, as well as to the enormous interest among folks on the State and local levels who understand the important role of English as our common language.

Legislation which I have introduced, H.R. 123, the Language of Government Act, affords Congress the opportunity to eliminate the high social and economic costs of multilingual government, and I believe it time to respond to the public's broad support of this initiative. One hundred ninety-three Members of this Chamber have cosponsored H.R. 123, and momentum continues to build.

I commend to your attention the full text of the editorial.

OFFICIAL LANGUAGE FOR MISSOURI

The issue of making English the official language has returned to the Missouri General Assembly this year. Bills have been introduced in both houses to mandate the use of English only in all state documents. Currently, some state documents are printed in as many as 11 languages.

The state effort mirrors attempts in Congress to make English the official government language. Such laws in no way intend to force anyone to speak or use English exclusively. Millions of Americans with non-English-speaking backgrounds wouldn't be impeded in their choices of how they communicate privately. What the bills would do is limit government to English rather than the potential 327 languages recognized in the United States by the Census Bureau.

Arguments that driver's license applicants, voters, welfare recipients and others who benefit from government programs are best served by catering to diverse languages don't hold up. As has been the case throughout American history, immigrants generally choose on their own to learn to speak and write English. And polls indicate more than 85 percent of Americans support the English-only concept for government.

The push to adopt English as the official language of Missouri government won't be easy. Residents who support this idea could help advance the cause by contacting their legislators and other elected officials.

RECOGNITION OF THE SHREWSBURY HIGH SCHOOL CONGRESSIONAL RESOLUTION PROJECT

HON. RICHARD E. NEAL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1996

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to a group of high school students from Shrewsbury, MA. Over the last several months this group has been engaged in the drafting and promotion of a congressional resolution calling for a greater dedication to AIDS education and prevention programs in America's schools.

Led by their high school teacher Rick Marchand, these 23 students have been meeting 3 times a week for several months on this project. In that time, they have received commendations from both bodies of the Massachusetts State Legislature, the Massachusetts Commissioner of Education and also, AIDS Project Worcester, one of the leading AIDS support organizations in the State. Below, I have inserted a copy of the above cited resolution.

It should be noted however, that this publication of their document is not the end of the student's ambitious undertaking. The involved students at Shrewsbury High School intend to continue promoting their resolution by circulating advocacy petitions among their peers and by posting this venture on the internet, in an effort to attract local, national and international support.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me today in commending this group for their laudable and industrious efforts on behalf of an interesting and worthwhile project:

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to encourage Congress to endorse all current funding mechanisms that provide for AIDS research, support and prevention programs. Said resolution shall inspire Congress to design or support additional funding concepts that nurture innovative education and prevention concepts for teenagers across America.

Whereas the teenagers of America feel that communities that do not provide HIV/AIDS education for their teenagers are at risk. The uninformed and uneducated part of America's youth will result in an increase in the number of HIV infections and the deaths of millions of innocent people. The World Health Organization predicts that by the year 2000, the virus will have attacked thirty to forty million people around the world.

Whereas according to estimates provided by The World Health Organization, HIV/AIDS victims are costing an average of $150,000 each. By the year 2000, six trillion dollars will be needed to provide adequate health care for these individuals.

Whereas teenagers across America believe effective education can help others make smart choices. These choices could mean the difference between life and death.

Whereas HIV/AIDS education for high school students across the country is inadequate. In some communities the lack of education is caused by poor public perception, as well as misconceptions about the HIV/AIDS virus.

Whereas we the students of Shrewsbury High School in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, respectfully request the Congress to form a partnership with communities across the nation. This partnership will be to assure quality and effective HIV/AIDS educational programs.

TRIBUTE TO LANGSTON HUGHES INSTITUTE AND THE LEADERSHIP OF DR. ORA LEE DELGADO AND ANTHONY DELGADO

HON. JACK QUINN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1996

Mr. QUINN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor two of western New York's most dedicated community activists, Dr. Ora Lee Delgado and Mr. Anthony Delgado, upon the announcement of their retirement from full-time status at the Langston Hughes Institute. Dr. and Mr. Delgado have dedicated an impressive 47 combined years of community service to the arts and cultural center. As the western New York community will attest, the Delgados have been the guiding force behind the Langston Hughes Institute. It is with heartfelt gratitude that I and the western New York community thank Dr. Ora Lee Delgado and Mr. Anthony Delgado for their contribution in making the institute what it is today.

The Langston Hughes Institute was named after the most prolific and probably best known of modern African-American writers. As a leading minority not-for-profit corporation in the Buffalo area, Langston Hughes Institute provides a vital range of services to the community. Specifically: educational, cultural, and assistance programs with an African-American focus. The primary objective of the Institute is to create a positive self-image and instill motivation in the community's youth.

The Langston Hughes Institute has been established as the premiere arts and cultural center in western New York due to the efforts of Ora Lee Delgado and Anthony Delgado.

I join with their family, colleagues, friends, and the entire western New York community in recognition of the Delgado's outstanding dedication and years of distinguished community service.

HONORING NORTH MIAMI POLICE DEPARTMENT OFFICER OF THE YEAR, FELIX GUADARRAMA

HON. CARRIE P. MEEK

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1996

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, Officer Felix Guadarrama has been selected by a committee of his peers to be the North Miami Police Department's Officer of the Year, 1995. I am certain you will agree with me that Officer Guadarrama is a fitting choice. His actions on the force since 1990 have distinguished him as an officer of valor.

During 1995, Officer Guadarrama received numerous commendations from his supervisors, the community, and other police agencies. Many noted his compassion, expertise, and judgement in handling chaotic situations. His superiors credit Guadarrama with saving the life of the victim of a violent attack.

In addition to his daily activities, Officer Guardarrama serves on the North Miami Police honor guard and is assigned to the motorcycle unit. He actively raises money for the Police Officers' Assistance Trust Fund and has represented the department in motorcycle escorts at local prestigious events like the recent Summit of the Americas.

Thank you, Officer Guadarrama for your bravery and diligence in the line of duty. You are certainly a credit to our community.

CONGRATULATIONS TO THE THOMASVILLE BULLDOGS

HON. HOWARD COBLE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1996

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, the Thomasville Bulldogs have done it again. On December 11, 1995, the Bulldogs of Thomasville High School captured the 1995 North Carolina 2-A Football Championship with a 16–0 victory against Clinton High School. Not only was this the school's first perfect football season, but Thomasville became the first prep club in North Carolina to win 16 games in 1 year.

To top off a perfect season, head coach Allen Brown was named the Associated Press Coach of the Year in North Carolina. Coach Brown now has three State championships to his credit and a total of six trips to the State finals since 1983. Coach Brown, who has compiled a 220–72–2 career record during his 23 seasons at Thomasville, told the Thomasville Times that this year's team was a special group. ''They worked so hard and they deserved what they got. I'm in a great community for football and we have a great group of kids.''

The entire sixth district of North Carolina is proud of the winning tradition that the Thomasville football squad has established under the leadership of Coach Brown and his staff. Congratulations to athletic director/head coach Allen Brown, assistant coaches Roger Bryant, Billy Freeman, Dan Medlin, Ed Courtney, Bob Mattow, Avery Cutshaw, Benjie Brown, and Chuck Parks, Kemp Harvey, and each member of the team. Best wishes to Terrance Baxter (10), Ryan Jarrett (11), Chad Tobin (12), Stephon Gladney (13), Lamont Leak (14), Gary Robinson (15), Nick Means (16), Stephen Lindsay (17), Jaun Alford (18), Tevin Watkins (19), Monta Burton (20), Damion Scott (21), Anthony Anderson (22), Damian Henderson (23), Brian Davis (24), Dusty Fant (25), Teron Alford (30), Dewayne Burgess (31), Jermaine Kilby (32), Craig Thomas (33), Kinte Huntly (40), Dishun Huntley (41), Reggie Pegues (42), Ricky Smith (43), Barry Hare (44), Nagayle Carroll (45), Antwaine Neely (50), Andre Cannon (51), Todd McComb (52), Walker Miller (53), Eric Hawkins (55), Preston James (60), Tavon Cooper (61), Andreas Kersey (63), Chris Hawkins (64), Jeff Hayes (65), Samuel Hairston (66), Tim Bottoms (67), Steve Calvo (70), Carl Leak (71), Gary Cooper (72), Jonathan Ross (73), Wes Crowell (74), David Sheffield (76), Travis Davis (77), Khari Baker (80), Kenny Thomas (81), Corey Borders (82), Dygeal Redfern (83), Chris Nicholson (84), Phillip Keels (85), Brian Fritts (86), Gary Bowers (87), Terry Everhart (12), and James Beasley (83). Thanks also goes to the team managers, Matthew Bryant, Nick Harvey, Patrick Small, and Jonathon Yokley, as well

as P.A., Steve Eller, and scoreboard attendant, Casey Medlin.

To principal Wayne Thrift and to all of the students, faculty, families, and fans of Thomasville High School, we extend our congratulations on capturing the State high school 2-A football championship. Best of luck to the Bulldogs for another successful season in 1996.

THE 104TH CONGRESS WELCOMES EMILY ALEXA FIELDS

HON. MICHAEL G. OXLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1996

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to share some joyous news with you and all my colleagues. Our good friend, JACK FIELDS of Texas, recently welcomed a new addition to his family—a daughter, Emily Alexa, born in Houston on Thursday, January 18.

I know you and all my colleagues join me in congratulating JACK and his lovely wife, Lynn, on Emily's birth. Emily was born at 3:01 p.m. CST on Thursday at Methodist Hospital in Houston, and, thankfully, both Lynn and Emily are feeling fine. Emily weighed 8 pounds, 12 ounces and was 20 inches in length.

As you know, JACK announced last month that this will be his last term in Congress. In his retirement announcement, JACK made clear his desire to spend more time with his family—Lynn, Josh, Jordan, and now, Emily.

I know you join with me, Mr. Speaker, in extending to the Fields family our congratulations and our very best wishes on this joyous news.

THE CHOICE IS YOURS

HON. JERROLD NADLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1996

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize BMG Entertainment and commend them for their Black History Month Campaign, ''The Choice Is Yours.'' The campaign seeks to expand voter registration and education, and participation in the National Marrow Donor Program.

BMG Distribution, a unit of BMG Entertainment, designed this campaign to highlight the importance of civic participation for African-Americans in the political and social arenas.

''The Choice Is Yours'' campaign will offer African-Americans and others the opportunity, at various retail music outlets across the country, to register to vote and to join the National Bone Marrow registry. Through a user-friendly format, the project will work to make young people educated, aware registered voters, and potential bone marrow donors.

''The Choice Is Yours'' campaign is an excellent example of what can be accomplished when the for-profit and non-profit sectors pool their energies and resources in order to help involve citizens and save lives. I am proud to recognize that this unique BMG Black History Month campaign will be initiated in my State of New York on February 1, 1996 and I commend BMG for all their efforts.

IN HONOR OF STATE SENATOR JOSEPH F. ANDREA

HON. THOMAS M. BARRETT

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1996

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, today I pay tribute to one of Wisconsin's outstanding public servants, State Senator Joe Andrea. Joe's public service began in the U.S. Navy. On the local level Joe has served Kenosha, WI for 30 years as a constable, county supervisor, State assemblyman, and State senator, always with his trademark smile and sense of humor. And as a former telephone company employee for 31 years and president of the Communication Workers of America Local 5510, he has served his community well.

Joe has set the standard for constituent services for all elected officials. Knowing the people in this community and making sure he knows their concerns is Joe's top priority. He deeply believes that people are most important and it has been his life service to listen to them.

His legislative accomplishments are many. He was the father of the Life Means Life sentencing bill in Wisconsin, the trout stamp bill in 1983, and a key player in the creation of the utility holding company bill. He brought the Dairyland Dog Track to Kenosha creating hundreds of jobs for the area. Needed transportation projects and a tourist center have found their way to the Kenosha area with Senator Andrea's backing. In addition, economic vitality has come back to Kenosha with Joe Andrea's assistance.

Mention his family and you'll see Joe react with pride. He has been married for 43 years to his wonderful wife, Olivia. He is the father of four successful children and a grandparent to four beautiful grandchildren.

Joe has been honored and recognized many times over the years. He holds an honorary degree from Carthage College. He has even had a street, a regional cancer center, a lake, and a racedog named after him. On January 15, Joe received the Gateway Technical College Humanitarian Award. It is my great honor to add my congratulations to State Senator Joe Andrea on this occasion and for a lifetime of achievements.

A TRIBUTE TO JIM PAGE

HON. NICK J. RAHALL II

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1996

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Mr. Jim Page, who on January 3, 1996, retired after a long and distinguished career with the U.S. Forest Service and his position over the last 9½ years as Supervisor of the Monongahela National Forest in West Virginia.

It is sad, but true, that many in this body these days take pride in denigrating Federal employees, especially those in uniform. I will not be a party to those antics, and committed public servants like Jim Page illustrate the degree of professionalism that swells the ranks of many agencies such as the Forest Service.

Since June 1986, Jim served with distinction and dedication as the Supervisor of the Monongahela National Forest. He now retires after serving the public as an employee of the Forest Service for 33 years. Starting his career with the Forest Service as a temporary employee at the Wallawa-Whitman National Forest in Oregon during June of 1959, Jim Page ultimately served in 12 forest units including stints in various capacities at the Chugach and the Tongass National Forests in Alaska, the Clearwater in Idaho, the Cherokee in Tennessee, the Ouachita in Arkansas, and the Daniel Boone in Kentucky.

I have been extremely proud to have had the honor to know and work with Jim Page. To say the least, I am dismayed that he is retiring. His humor, patience, fortitude, and vision will be sorely missed.

In conclusion, it is my understanding that Jim and his wife Sarah may move back to their native State of North Carolina. He will bring with him a wealth of memories from his years with the Forest Service, and he will bring with him our friendship and respect.

On behalf of myself and Jim Zoia of my staff, we wish Jim and Sarah Page the very best.

HONORING ATHENA KROMIDAS

HON. GARY L. ACKERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1996

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join with constituents of the Fifth Congressional District and the members of the St. Nicholas Greek Orthodox Church in Flushing, NY in celebrating the 10th anniversary of service of Mrs. Athena Kromidas, principal of the church's Greek Afternoon School.

Mrs. Kromidas has long promoted the role of the Greek community educator who strives to instill into our youth an effective education based upon Hellenic traditions. Through her efforts, parents have taken an increased measure of involvement in their children's education. She has guided the Greek-American parents of the Greek Afternoon School to mold their children into citizens who will have a positive impact upon our entire community.

A native of the island of Chios, Mrs. Kromidas has consistently worked to perpetuate the Hellenic roots of second and third generation Greek-American children. She strongly believes in having her pupils remember their roots as a way of establishing and supporting their faith. In 1994, Mrs. Kromidas, in cooperation with a local public high school, was successful in establishing a course in the modern Greek language.

As a person who has toiled in the vineyards of selfless dedication to the community, Mrs. Kromidas has consistently struggled to infuse a strong and dynamic sense of family values and tradition into the entire school community. There already exists a growing list of both students and families who have credited this most outstanding educator with bringing stability and success to their lives.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join with me in recognizing Mrs. Athena Kromidas for an inspiring decade of dedication and devotion to the children and parents of our community.

TRIBUTE TO GEORGE SEARIGHT

HON. GEORGE W. GEKAS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1996

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, I would like the House of Representatives today to pay special tribute to a man whose legacy continues to affect a great many people in the 17th Congressional District. I consider myself lucky to have had the honor to have known George Searight. And although George passed away 18 months ago, the memory of him remains alive and vibrant with those who knew and loved him.

George Searight was a Susquehanna Township Commissioner in Dauphin County, PA, in my 17th Congressional District. He also served on the township civil service commission for nearly 20 years. He held leadership roles in the Pennsylvania Pharmaceutical Association and was a veteran of the U.S. Navy. George was both a leader and a role model in his community, and he will always be remembered as such.

I can fairly state that substantially all of my experience with the pharmaceutical industry was derived from my continued association with George Searight. And all of my contacts with and about the industry will forever be colored by my association with George. I will always remember George as a good friend, someone who was always willing to dedicate himself and his time to a good cause, and a local leader who set an example for all to follow. He has been missed.

At this time, I would like to submit into the RECORD "A Tribute to George H. Searight," done on June 24, 1994, by Richard T. Englehart of the Capital Area Pharmaceutical Association.

A TRIBUTE TO GEORGE H. SEARIGHT

Last evening we attended the viewing and this morning the funeral of an old friend, George Searight. As testimony to the number of people who knew and loved George, the funeral home, the church and the route to the cemetery all required extra police to direct the crowds. The fire and police departments of his beloved Susquehanna Township honored him with many of their vehicles and personnel in attendance.

I am enclosing a copy of the obituary which appeared in the Harrisburg paper. This is a wonderful description of George, but it does not really tell the whole story. We know him mostly for his involvement in activities of CAPA and PPA. But even here, I am sure that many did not realize how totally George was involved. In CAPA, his days go back many years. His father was very active in the old DCL (Dauphin-Cumberland-Lebanon County Pharmaceutical Association), the forerunner of CAPA. So George was indoctrinated in the local association at a very early age.

Not only has George been our treasurer longer than most of us can remember, but he has also been responsible for bringing in more new members than anyone else (George seemed to know everyone connected with pharmacy or pharmaceutical sales.). He knew when anyone was sick or in the hospital, so he reported as the Flower and Sick committee. He was on the Student Loan committee. He and Jerry Smith formed the best social and convention committee (Frick and Frack) of any local association in the state. He made all the arrangements for all of our monthly meetings. He was a Vice-President of PPA. He stopped in at the PPA office probably at least once a week just to see how things were going and to see if anything needed to be done. If ever there was a job to be done we could count on George to volunteer for it.

I believe that all of us who knew George Searight have been very fortunate. Ike and I have know him for many years. I knew him in Junior High School. We roomed together one year at PCP&S. We double dated with George and June at college. He was an usher in our wedding. He was a friend.

He truly loved what he was doing for pharmacy, and he was totally dedicated to the associations he represented.

But most of all, George loved his family and friends. Our hearts and our prayers go out to June and the sons he loved so much.

We shall miss him greatly.

Tuesday, January 23, 1996

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate and House met in joint session to receive the President's State of the Union Address.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S291–S330

Measures Introduced: Four bills and two resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 1520–1523, and S. Res. 210–211. **Pages S313–14**

Measures Passed:

Commending the University of Nebraska Football Team: Senate agreed to S. Res. 210, to commend the Cornhuskers of the University of Nebraska at Lincoln for winning both the 1994 and 1995 National Collegiate Athletic Association Football Championships back-to-back. **Pages S302–03, S321**

Commending the University of Nebraska Volleyball Team: Senate agreed to S. Res. 211, to commend the Cornhuskers of the University of Nebraska at Lincoln for winning the 1995 National Collegiate Athletic Association Women's Volleyball Championship. **Pages S303, S321**

Ethics Committee Membership: Senate agreed to S. Res. 212, to constitute the minority party's membership on the Ethics Committee for the 104th Congress. **Pages S321, S330**

Messages From the President: **Pages S309–13**

Messages From the House: **Page S313**

Statements on Introduced Bills: **Pages S314–21**

Additional Cosponsors: **Page S321**

Additional Statements: **Pages S321–30**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 2:30 p.m., and adjourned at 10:15 p.m., until 5 p.m. on Wednesday, January 24, 1996. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on page S330.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

PROFESSIONAL SPORTS

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee concluded hearings to examine challenges facing the future of the professional sports industry, after receiving testimony from Paul Tagliabue, National Football League, New York, New York; Jerry Richardson, The Carolina Panthers, Charlotte, North Carolina; David Falk, Falk Associates, Washington, D.C.; Peter S. Roisman, Advantage International, McLean, Virginia; Marc Ganis, Sportscorps Ltd., Chicago, Illinois; Kenneth Shropshire, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia; and Andrew Zimbalist, Smith College, Northampton, Massachusetts.

WHITEWATER

Special Committee to Investigate the Whitewater Development Corporation and Related Matters: Committee resumed hearings to examine issues relative to the Whitewater Development Corporation, receiving testimony from William Lyon, Lyon Folder Company, Fordyce, Arkansas.

Committee will meet again on Thursday, January 25.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Bills Introduced: 7 public bills, H.R. 2864–2870; 1 private bill, H.R. 2871; and 1 resolution, H.J. Res. 157 were introduced. **Page H774**

Report Filed: One report was filed as follows: H. Res. 340, waiving points of order against the conference report on S. 1124, Department of Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 (H. Rept. 104–451). **Pages H772–74**

Speaker Pro Tempore: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he designates Representative Goodling to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H739**

Recess: House recessed at 1:33 p.m. and reconvened at 2 p.m. **Page H746**

Constructed Water Conveyances: On the call of the Corrections Calendar, the House passed and sent to the Senate, amended, H.R. 2567, to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act relating to standards for constructed water conveyances. **Pages H750–57**

Suspensions: House voted to suspend the rules and pass the following bills:

Medals to Ruth and Billy Graham: H.R. 2657, to award a congressional gold medal to Ruth and Billy Graham (passed by a yea-and-nay vote of 403 yeas to 2 nays, Roll No. 13); **Pages H757–60, H765–66**

Saddleback Mountain-Arizona settlement: S. 1341, to provide for the transfer of certain lands to the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community and the city of Scottsdale, Arizona (passed by a recorded vote of 403 ayes to 1 no, Roll No. 14)—clearing the measure for the President; and **Pages H761–63, H766**

Technical corrections in Native American laws: H.R. 2726, amended, to make certain technical corrections in laws relating to Native Americans (passed by a recorded vote of 407 ayes, Roll No. 15). **Pages H763–67**

Recess: House recessed at 4:43 p.m. and reconvened at 8:48 p.m. **Page H767**

President's State of the Union Message: President Clinton delivered his State of the Union message before a joint session of Congress. He was escorted to and from the House Chamber by a committee composed of Senators Dole, Lott, Cochran, Nickles, Thurmond, Daschle, Ford, Mikulski, Kerry of Massachusetts, Kerrey of Nebraska, Reid, Rockefeller, Dorgan, Breaux, Dodd, and Exon; and Representatives Armey, DeLay, Boehner, Cox of California, Dickey, Hutchinson, Gephardt, Bonior, Fazio, Kennelly, Thornton, and Lincoln. **Pages H767–72**

The message was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered printed as a House document (H. Doc. 104–168). **Page H772**

Senate Messages: Message received from the Senate today appears on page H739.

Quorum Calls—Votes: One yea-and-nay vote and two recorded votes developed during the proceedings of the House today and appear on pages H765–66, H766, and H766–67. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: Met at 12:30 p.m. and adjourned at 10:20 p.m.

Committee Meetings

CONFERENCE REPORT—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION

Committee on Rules: Granted, by voice vote, a rule waiving all points of order against the conference report to accompany S. 1124, Department of Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996, and against its consideration. The rule provides that the conference report shall be considered as read. Testimony was heard from Chairman Spence.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 24, 1996

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Foreign Relations, Subcommittee on African Affairs, closed briefing on Ambassador Albright's recent trip to Africa, 10 a.m., S–116, Capitol.

Select Committee on Intelligence, closed business meeting, on pending intelligence matters, 2 p.m., SH–219.

House

Committee on Commerce, Subcommittee on Commerce, Trade, and Hazardous Materials and the Subcommittee on International Economic Policy and Trade of the Committee on International Relations, joint hearing on H.R. 2579, Travel and Tourism Partnership Act of 1995, 1 p.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, to continue hearings on the White House Travel Office, 11:30 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Committee on National Security, Subcommittee on Research and Development and the Subcommittee on Military Procurement, joint hearing on the research and development response to the landmine threat in Bosnia, 2 p.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, executive, to consider pending business, 2 p.m., HT–2M Capitol.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

5 p.m., Wednesday, January 24

Senate Chamber

Program for Wednesday: After the transaction of any morning business (not to extend beyond 5:30 p.m.), Senate may consider conference reports, if available, and any cleared legislative and executive business.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

12 noon, Wednesday, January 24

House Chamber

Program for Wednesday: Consideration of the conference report on S. 1124, Department of Defense Authorization (rule waiving points of order).

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Ackerman, Gary L., N.Y., E64
Barrett, Thomas M., Wis., E64
Beilenson, Anthony C., Calif., E58
Bonior, David E., Mich., E55, E57
Coble, Howard, N.C., E63
Cunningham, Randy ''Duke'', Calif., E58
DeLauro, Rosa L., Conn., E55, E58
Dixon, Julian C., Calif., E58
Dornan, Robert K., Calif., E54, E56
Emerson, Bill, Mo., E62
Foglietta, Thomas M., Pa., E55, E57
Gekas, George W., Pa., E65
Hamilton, Lee H., Ind., E51
Houghton, Amo, N.Y., E53
Matsui, Robert T., Calif., E53
Meek, Carrie P., Fla., E63
Nadler, Jerrold, N.Y., E64
Neal, Richard E., Mass., E63
Oxley, Michael G., Ohio, E64
Pallone, Frank, Jr., N.J., E56
Payne, Donald M., N.J., E59
Poshard, Glenn, Ill., E54, E57
Quinn, Jack, N.Y., E63
Rahall, Nick J., II, W. Va., E64
Schroeder, Patricia, Colo., E59
Schumer, Charles E., N.Y., E55, E57
Stokes, Louis, Ohio, E60
Torricelli, Robert G., N.J., E61

Congressional Record The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed at one time. ¶Public access to the Congressional Record is available online through *GPO Access,* a service of the Government Printing Office, free of charge to the user. The online database is updated each day the Congressional Record is published. The database includes both text and graphics from the beginning of the 103d Congress, 2d session (January 1994) forward. It is available on the Wide Area Information Server (WAIS) through the Internet and via asynchronous dial-in. Internet users can access the database by using the World Wide Web; the Superintendent of Documents home page address is http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs, by using local WAIS client software or by telnet to swais.access.gpo.gov, then login as guest (no password required). Dial-in users should use communications software and modem to call (202) 512–1661; type swais, then login as guest (no password required). For general information about *GPO Access,* contact the *GPO Access* User Support Team by sending Internet e-mail to help@eids05.eids.gpo.gov, or a fax to (202) 512–1262; or by calling (202) 512–1530 between 7 a.m. and 5 p.m. Eastern time, Monday through Friday, except for Federal holidays. ¶The Congressional Record paper and 24x microfiche will be furnished by mail to subscribers, free of postage, at the following prices: paper edition, $112.50 for six months, $225 per year, or purchased for $1.50 per issue, payable in advance; microfiche edition, $118 per year, or purchased for $1.50 per issue payable in advance. The semimonthly Congressional Record Index may be purchased for the same per issue prices. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, directly to the Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily Congressional Record is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the Congressional Record.