SEC. 1212. PENALTY FOR UNAUTHORIZED INSPECTION OF TAX RETURNS OR TAX RETURN INFORMATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Part I of subchapter A of chapter 75 (relating to crimes, other offenses, and forfeitures) is amended by adding after section 7213 the following new section:

"SEC. 7213A. UNAUTHORIZED INSPECTION OF RETURNS OR RETURN INFORMATION.

''(a) PROHIBITION.—It shall be unlawful for—

''(1) any officer or employee of the United States or any former such officer or employee,

''(2) any person described in section 6103(n), an officer or employee of any such person, or any former such officer or employee, or

''(3) any person described in subsection (d), (i)(3)(B)(i), (l) (6), (7), (8), (9), (10) or (12), or (m) (2), (4), (6), or (7) of section 6103,

willfully to inspect (as defined in section 6103(b)(7)), except as authorized by this title, any return or return information (as defined in section 6103(b)).

''(b) PENALTY.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Any violation of subsection (a) shall be punishable upon conviction by a fine in any amount not exceeding $1,000, or imprisonment of not more than 1 year, or both, together with the costs of prosecution.

''(2) FEDERAL OFFICERS OR EMPLOYEES.—An officer or employee of the United States who is convicted of any violation of subsection (a) shall, in addition to any other punishment, be dismissed from office or discharged from employment.''

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for part I of subchapter A of chapter 75 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 7213 the following new item:

''7213A. Unauthorized inspection of returns or return information.''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to violations occurring on and after the date of the enactment of this Act.

NOTICE OF HEARING

COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Committee on Rules and Administration will meet in SR–301, Russell Senate Office Building, on Wednesday, May 15, 1996, at 10 a.m., to hold a hearing on campaign finance reform.

For further information concerning this hearing, please contact Bruce Kasold of the committee staff on 224–3448.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate and the public that two oversight field hearings have been scheduled to receive testimony on the Tongass land management plan and the administration of timber sale contracts.

The first hearing will take place on Tuesday, May 28, 1996 at 10:30 a.m., in Ketchikan, AK. Ted Ferry Civic Center, 888 Venetia Avenue, Ketchikan, AL, 99901. The second hearing is scheduled for Wednesday, May 29, 1996, at 9 a.m., in Juneau, AL. Centennial Hall Convention Center, Ballroom 3, 101 Egan Drive, Juneau, AL, 99801.

Because of the limited time available and the interest in the subject matter, and in order to have a balanced hearing, witnesses will be by invitation. Written testimony will be accepted for the RECORD. Oral testimony will be limited to 5 minutes. Witnesses testifying at the hearing are requested to bring 10 copies of their testimony with them on the day of the hearing. In addition, please send or fax a copy in advance to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC 20510. Fax 202–228–0539.

For further information, please contact Mark Rey, Energy and Natural Resources Committee, at 202–224–6170.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be granted permission to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, May 9, 1996, for purposes of conducting a full committee hearing which is scheduled to begin at 9:30 a.m. The purpose of this oversight hearing is to receive testimony on the recent increases in gasoline prices.

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

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask Unanimous Consent on behalf of the Governmental Affairs Committee to meet on Thursday, May 9 at 10 a.m. for a hearing on IRS Oversight.

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

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, May 9, 1996, at 10:00 a.m. to hold an executive business meeting.

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

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Indian Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, May 9, 1996 at 9:30 a.m. to conduct an Oversight Hearing on the impact of the U.S. Supreme Court's recent decision in Seminole Tribe versus Florida. The hearing will be held in room G–50 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

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

THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE WHITEWATER DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION AND RELATED MATTERS

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the special committee to investigate Whitewater Development Corporation and related matters be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, May 9, 1996 to conduct hearings pursuant to Senate Resolution 120.

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CHILDREN AND FAMILIES

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Children and Families of the Committee on Labor and Human Resources be authorized to hold a hearing on Family and Medical Leave Act oversight during the session of the Senate on Thursday, May 9, 1996, at 9:30 a.m.

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

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

DEFENSE OF MARRIAGE ACT

• Mr. COATS. Mr. President, today I am pleased to cosponsor Senator DOLE's and Senator NICKLES' bill (S. 1740) defining marriage as a legal union between one man and one woman.

Marriage is the institution that civilizes our society by humanizing our lives. It is the social, legal, and spiritual relationship that prepares the next generation for its duties and opportunities. A 1884 decision of the Supreme Court called it ''the sure foundation of all that is stable and noble in our civilization.''

The definition of marriage is not created by politicians and judges, and it cannot be changed by them. It is rooted in our history, our laws, our deepest moral and religious convictions, and our nature as human beings. It is the union of one man and one woman. This fact can be respected or it can be resented, but it cannot be altered.

Our society has a compelling interest in respecting that definition. The breakdown of traditional marriage is our central social crisis—the cause of so much anguish and suffering, particularly for our children. Our urgent responsibility is to nurture and strengthen that institution, not undermine it with trendy moral relativism.

The institution of marriage is our most valuable cultural inheritance. It is our duty—perhaps our first duty—to pass it intact to the future.

The distortion of marriage is sometimes defended as a form of tolerance. But this represents a fundamental misunderstanding, both of marriage and tolerance.

I believe strongly in tolerance, not only for the peace of society, but because it is the proper way to treat others. As individuals, we should never compromise our moral convictions. But we should always treat others with respect and dignity.

A government, however, has another duty. All law embodies some moral consensus. No society can be indifferent to its moral life, because there are consequences for us all.

Every government must set certain standards as sign posts. It must create expectations for responsible behavior. Not every lifestyle is equal for the purpose of the common good. This does not mean the persecution of those who fall short of the standard, but it does mean giving legal preference to that

standard. A tolerant society does not need to be an indifferent society.

A government that values freedom can permit some things that it would not encourage or condone. But a government must also promote things that are worthy examples and social ideals.

Government cannot be neutral in the debate over marriage. It has sound reasons to prefer the traditional family in its policies. As social thinker Michael Novak has written:

> A people whose marriage and families are weak have no solid institutions . . . family life is the seedbed of economic skills, money habits, attitudes toward work and the arts of independence.

When we prefer traditional marriage and family in our laws, it is not intolerance. Tolerance does not require us to say that all lifestyles are morally equal, only that no individual deserves to be persecuted. It does not require us to weaken our social ideals. It does not require a reconstruction of our most basic human institutions. It does not require special recognition for those who have rejected the standard.

It is amazing and disturbing that this legislation should be necessary. It is a sign of the times, and an indication of a deep moral confusion. But events have made this definition essential. The preservation of marriage has become an issue of self-preservation for our society. I strongly urge my colleagues to support this measure.●

TRIBUTE TO NANCY CHUDA

● Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I am pleased today to announce my intentions to introduce in the near future, a bill that will help protect the children of this country from the harmful effects of environmental contaminants. I can not think of a more appropriate time of the year than the time we recognize the special achievements of mothers, to focus this Nation's attention on protecting the health and safety of our children. Mr. President, I am working hard on this piece of legislation, not only because I am a mother, but because I want to pay tribute to one exceptional mother. This mother knows the intense sadness of losing her child.

This very special mother lives in my State and I am proud to call her my friend. Three years ago, Mrs. Nancy Chuda came to visit me to ask for help. Her little girl, all of 5 years old, had died of cancer—a nongenetic form of cancer. No one knows why or how or what caused little Colette Chuda to become afflicted. She was a normal, beautiful girl in every way. She liked to draw pictures of flowers and happy people. One thing is certain, she was blessed to have two wonderful parents. Nancy and Jim Chuda, despite their grief, chose to turn their own personal tragedy into something positive. They have labored endlessly to bring to the country's attention the environmental dangers that threaten our children. They want to make sure that what happened to their Colette will not happen to another child. No mother should have to go through what Nancy Chuda went through. If future deaths can be prevented, I know we all will be indebted to the tremendous energy and perseverance of Nancy Chuda.

Mr. President, science has shown us that children are special. They are not simply a smaller version of you and me. They are still growing, many of their internal systems are still in the process of developing and maturing, and, of course, their behavior is different. Studies show that they breathe faster. They come in contact with numerous objects in their quest to learn and explore the world around them. They eat differently—children consume foods in different amounts in proportion to their body weight. I can remember, when I was a kid, I ate mayonnaise sandwiches and I consumed whole boxes of cereal while watching TV. Today, there are more questions than ever with respect to children's developmental health. And Mr. President, I am sad to say there are very few answers.

The factors behind the special environmental risks that children face need special attention. A recent study issued by the National Academy of Sciences (NAS) reported on the effects of pesticides in the diets of infants and children. The study concluded that the Federal Government is not doing enough to protect our children from exposures to pesticides. The NAS study essentially confirmed what many in the regulatory community were already worried about. Although we may have the highest quality and the safest food in the world, the fact is that risk assessments of pesticides and toxic chemicals do not differentiate clearly enough between the risks to children and the risks to adults.

It has been estimated that up to one-half of a person's lifetime cancer risk may be incurred in the first 6 years of life. There is currently not enough information to know exactly how to account for all of the differences when conducting a risk assessment. We need to know more about what health risks our children are exposed to. We need to collect exposure data not only on our children's diets, but also, on our children's exposure to air pollutants and surface pollutants. The fact is that we do not have the data that allows us to quantify and measure the differences between how adults and children respond to environmental pollutants.

The absence of this data often precludes effective government regulation of environmental pollutants. In my bill, I intend to change this. We must ensure that our regulators have the data they need to be able to assess the risks of these substances to children. This would let them do their job of protecting our most vulnerable sector of society from environmental pollutants.

Although most people associate pesticide use with agriculture, children may be exposed to far greater health risks by other common uses of pesticides such as lawn and garden uses, household uses, and fumigation uses in schools.

Children come in contact with pesticides and other toxic substances, not only from the food they eat, but from the air they breathe, and the surfaces they touch. In communities with contaminated air, improving overall air quality for disease prevention is of vital importance. Some studies suggest that pediatric asthma is on the rise and is exacerbated by air pollution. Pollutants from tobacco smoke, stoves and fireplaces, household cleaners and paints, even glues and the synthetic fabrics used in furniture are all thought to be contributing factors. One EPA study showed that 85 percent of the total daily exposure to toxic chemicals comes from breathing air inside the home.

I firmly believe that citizens have a right to know what substances they are involuntarily subjected to, whether they live next to a farm or in the heart of South-Central Los Angeles. My bill will require pesticide applicators to keep records and submit reports to the EPA. Subsequently, EPA is directed to publish annual bulletins informing citizens of the types and amounts of pesticide chemicals that are being used in and around their neighborhood, in their apartment buildings, and most importantly in their schools. My bill would give parents the ability to make informed decisions to protect their family. Public health and safety depends on its citizens and local officials knowing the toxic dangers that exist in their communities.

EPA's Toxics Release Inventory [TRI] collects chemical release information from manufacturing and several other industries. It is the Nation's most popular and highly successful community right to know program. TRI is generally well supported through voluntary compliance of industry. The program has prompted many companies to set ambitious pollution reduction goals as well as voluntary restrictions and improvements. My bill will apply a similar philosophy to other kinds of environmental contaminants. I am betting on the same outcome emerging from applicators and users of pesticides and believe this will benefit everyone concerned.

I strongly support the administration's policies over the past few years to place greater emphasis and attention on the environmental health issues that affect children. I especially applaud the Environmental Protection Agency for taking the lead. Last year EPA made it an agencywide policy to consider the risks to infants and children consistently and explicitly in every regulatory decision. EPA's stance has inspired me to include its policy in my bill and to expand its philosophy to other Federal agencies charged with regulating toxic substances and environmental pollutants. The factors behind the special environmental risks that children may face