Mr. Hays, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1150) to ensure that federally funded agricultural research, extension, and education address high-priority concerns with national or multistate significance, to reform, extend, and eliminate certain agriculture research programs, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 3433. An act to amend the Social Security Act to established a Ticket to Work and Self-Sufficiency Program in the Social Security Administration to provide beneficiaries with disabilities meaningful opportunities to return to work, to extend Medicare coverage for such beneficiaries, and to make additional miscellaneous amendments relating to Social Security.

The message further announced that the House has agreed to the following concurrent resolution, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate.

H. Con. Res. 285. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the President of the United States should reconsider his decision to be formally received in Tiananmen Square by the Government of the People's Republic of China.

At 3:04 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Hays, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has agreed to the following concurrent resolution, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 284. Concurrent resolution revising the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 1998, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 1999, and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2000, 2001, 2002, and 2003.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following concurrent resolution was read and referred as indicated:

H. Con. Res. 285. Concurrent resolution expresssing the sense of Congress that the President of the United States should reconsider his decision to be formally received in Tiananmen Square by the Government of the People's Republic of China; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bill was read the first time:

H.R. 3433: An act to amend the Social Security Act to establish a Ticket to Work and Self-Sufficiency Program in the Social Security Administration to provide beneficiaries with disabiliites meaningful opportunities to return to work, to extend Medicare coverage for such beneficiaries, and to make additional miscellaneous amendments relating to Social Security.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. MURKOWSKI, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 1275. A bill to implement further the Act (Public Law 94-241) approving the Covenant to Establish a Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands in Political Union with the United States of America, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 105–201).

By Mr. MURKOWSKI, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute and an amendment to the title:

S. 1693. A bill to renew, reform, reinvigorate, and protect the National Park System (Rept. No. 105–202).

By Mr. MURKOWSKI, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, without amendment:

H.R. 1460. A bill to allow for election of the Delegate from Guam by other than separate ballot, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 105–203).

By Mr. BENNETT, from the Committee on Appropriations, without amendment:

S. 2137. An original bill making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 105–204).

By Mr. CAMPBELL, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute and an amendment to the title:

S. 2069. A bill to permit the leasing of mineral rights, in any case in which the Indian owners of an allotment that is located within the boundaries of the Fort Berthold Indian Reservation and held in trust by the United States have executed leases to more than 50 percent of the mineral estate of that allotment (Rept. No. 105–205).

By Mr. DOMENICI, from the Committee on Appropriations, without amendment:

S. 2138. An original bill making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 105–206).

By Mr. CAMPBELL, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 1279. A bill to amend the Indian Employment, Training and Related Services Demonstration Act of 1992 to provide for the transfer of services and personnel from the Bureau of Indian Affairs to the Office of Self-Governance, to emphasize the need for job creation on Indian reservations, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 105–207).

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. SMITH of New Hampshire (for himself, Mr. HELMS, and Mr. ASHCROFT):

S. 2135. A bill to amend title 42, United States Code, to protect human life; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GORTON:

S. 2136. A bill to provide for the exchange of certain land in the State of Washington; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. BENNETT:

S. 2137. An original bill making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes; from the Committee on Appropriations; placed on the calendar.

By Mr. DOMENICI:

S. 2138. An original bill making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes; from the Committee on Appropriations; placed on the calendar.

By Mr. THURMOND:

S. 2139. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to issue a certificate of documentation with appropriate endorsement for employment in the coastwise trade for the vessel YESTERDAYS DREAM; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. CAMPBELL:

S. 2140. A bill to amend the Reclamation Projects Authorization and Adjustment Act of 1992 to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to participate in the design, planning, and construction of the Denver Water Reuse project; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

S. 2141. A bill to require certain notices in any mailing using a game of chance for the promotion of a product or service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

S. 2142. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey the facilities of the Pine River Project, to allow jurisdictional transfer of lands between the Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, and the Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation, and the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire (for himself, Mr. HELMS, and Mr. ASHCROFT):

S.J. Res. 49. A joint resolution proposing a constitutional amendment to protect human life; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself, Mr. LOTT, Mr. HUTCHINSON, and Mr. ABRAHAM):

S. Res. 244. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate on the ninth anniversary of the massacre of pro-democracy demonstrators on Tiananmen Square by military forces acting under orders from the Government of the People's Republic of China; considered and agreed to.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire (for himself, Mr. HELMS, and Mr. ASHCROFT):

S. 2135. A bill to amend title 42, United States Code, to protect human life; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

LEGISLATION TO PROTECT HUMAN LIFE

By Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire (for himself, Mr. HELMS, and Mr. ASHCROFT):

S.J. Res. 49. A joint resolution proposing a constitutional amendment to protect human life; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT TO PROTECT HUMAN LIFE

Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. Mr. President, our Nation's founding document, the Declaration of Independence, ultimately proclaimed that the right to life comes from God and that it is unalienable. Life itself, the declaration

held, is the fundamental right without which the rights of liberty and the pursuit of happiness have no meaning. As the author of the declaration, Thomas Jefferson, wrote, ''The care of human life and not its destruction . . . is the first and only object of good government.''

It is important and I think proper to note that without that basic right of life, there is no liberty, there is no opportunity to pursue happiness in any way, shape, or form.

One hundred ninety-seven years after that Declaration of Independence, in 1973, the U.S. Supreme Court violated this most sacred principle of the declaration. In Roe versus Wade, the Supreme Court held that the entire class of unborn children—from fertilization to birth—have no right to life and may be destroyed at will. As we know, the statistics are pretty dramatic. Thirty-five million children since Roe versus Wade were denied the opportunity to be born. Without getting into the reasons or the explanations or the rationale, the result is that 35 million children were denied that right.

In subsequent cases, the Court has zealously guarded the right to abortion that the Court created. The Court has repeatedly rejected all meaningful attempts by the States to protect the unalienable right to life of unborn children since that decision in 1973.

Mr. President, those of us who support the pro-life cause must never lose sight of our ultimate goal. Our objective is very simple. It is not complicated. It is to keep the promise of the Declaration of Independence. There is only one way to do that, Mr. President, and that is to overturn Roe versus Wade and restore to unborn children their God-given right to life, a God-given right that our Constitution. I believe, and certainly the declaration, gave them. And the Court took it away—a court, by the way, that is sworn to uphold the Constitution.

In order to keep that hope alive in the Senate today, Mr. President, I am introducing two legislative proposals, and I am pleased and honored that the distinguished Senator from North Carolina, Mr. HELMS, and the distinguished Senator from Missouri, Mr. ASHCROFT, are joining me as original cosponsors of both measures.

Senator HELMS for many, many years—long before my time in the Senate—had the courage to stand here on the Senate floor day after day, week after week, taking insult after insult but supporting the lives of unborn children. I believe history will judge Senator HELMS very prominently in this regard. And Senator ASHCROFT, with less time in the Senate, is certainly a strong proponent and advocate of the right to life of unborn children.

Let me talk specifically about the bills—first, a bill, the Human Life Act of 1998. The human life bill sets forth the findings of Congress that ''the right to life is the paramount and most fundamental right of a person'' and that ''the life of each human being begins at fertilization.'' Based on these findings, and in the exercise of the power of Congress under section 5 of the 14th amendment, my bill establishes that the word ''person,'' as used in the Constitution, applies to all human beings, including unborn children, because, Mr. President, an unborn child is a human being.

I have never been able to understand the rationale, as many times as it has been debated here on the floor, how one can say that an unborn child is not a human being. Remember, if it is a human being, it deserves the right of protection under the Constitution of the United States.

As one Senator, I will freely admit that when fertilization occurred, I was created. There was a sequence of time that occurred after that caused me to be here today, standing on the floor of the U.S. Senate. If it had been interrupted at any stage from that moment of fertilization until today, I wouldn't be here.

The effect of this legislative determination that the unborn child is a human being and, therefore, a ''person'' would be to place unborn children under constitutional shield of due process and equal protection clauses of the 14th amendment. Thus, the right to life of every unborn person would be protected to the same extent that the right to life of all born persons is guaranteed by our Constitution.

Mr. President, today we have seen in this day and this age a number of violent acts: School shootings, violence of children upon children, of children upon parents, terrible violence. I think we have a cultural problem. Most Americans would not deny that.

I think it is fair to say that we need to set an example as adults—those who are supposedly leaders of our country not only here in the Senate, or in the White House, or in the Congress, but also at the head of our communities, our families, whatever else. Whatever the role we may play as parents, as citizens, or husbands, or wives. I think we have a role to set an example. I would ask here on the floor of the Senate my colleagues: Are we setting an example for young people to follow when, at the will of any individual at any time after fertilization occurs, we say or we tolerate that that unborn child's life may be ended? It is an innocent life. It is a life who can't speak here on the floor of U.S. Senate. No child who is unborn has the opportunity to stand up on the floor and say, ''I'd like to live; I'd like to have the opportunity to raise a family, to be a leader, to be a preacher, be a Senator, be a doctor, to cure cancer, to be a teacher, be a good mom, a good dad. I would like to have that opportunity.'' I think they would say if they could speak that they do not have that opportunity.

I think of those 35 million children, I say to my colleagues, since 1973 whose lives have been ended. How many of those children may have lived to find that cure for cancer or may have lived to have made a difference in a life—perhaps one of those lives of those children who took the lives of others? Perhaps one of these children who died may have been a counselor, may have been somebody on the spot who may have made a difference. We will never know, because those 35 million lives are gone—never had the opportunity to be happy, never had the opportunity to be successful, never had the opportunity to live—gone. And we did it. We did it because of that Supreme Court decision. It is wrong.

I am reminded of Abraham Lincoln—a totally different issue but very similar in terms of its scope. Abraham Lincoln didn't take polls when he stood up in the United States of America in the 1860s and said: Slavery is wrong. It is wrong to enslave an American, or any individual, because of the color of their skin. And he spoke out against it. He spoke out eloquently against it, and he didn't take polls. He didn't stand up at a press conference and say to his aide, ''I am going to examine the feelings of my constituents on this. Would you please take a poll and find out whether the majority of the American people favor slavery or oppose slavery?''

I am reminded of what Lincoln said. I don't have the exact quote in front of me. I am going to paraphrase it from memory. He said: They tell me not to oppose slavery in the slave States, because they have left the country, so it is not our concern. They tell me not to oppose slavery in the free States, because we don't need to because they are free. They tell me not to oppose slavery from the pulpit, because it is not religion. And they tell me not to oppose slavery in politics, because it causes too much of a fuss.

Substitute abortion for slavery in each of those four examples and you have the same situation. If we can't oppose it in any of the 50 States, if we can't oppose it in politics, if we can't oppose it in religion, where does that leave the unborn children who will never have the opportunity to stand up here and debate this issue?

The right to life of every unborn person should be protected to the same extent as the right to life of all born persons. How can anybody in America, any Christian in the Judeo-Christian culture of America, not believe that?

I know the insults. I have been the victim of them. I know the taunts. I know the recriminations that come from standing up here and making these comments. But it is nothing—nothing—compared to what those unborn children endure because they have been denied after they have been created by God himself. Man denies them the right to life, that life.

I am reminded of Gianna Jesson, a young woman, perhaps 23 or 24 now, who was aborted. She was aborted. I saw her sing ''Amazing Grace''in front of 1,000 people a couple of years ago in which she said ''I am thankful to my

God to be where I am today, and I forgive my mother.'' Well, I say that is powerful, Mr. President. I have never seen anything to equal it. Not from the lips of any politician or any pastor have I ever seen testimony stronger or more powerful than that young woman crippled by abortion standing up before 1,000 people and singing ''Amazing Grace.'' There was not a dry eye in the place. That woman deserved the right to live. So did every one of those other 35 million children who have been denied.

There is only one way to stop this. We can preach about it. We can talk about it. We can debate it in politics. We can sing, or be quiet and be silent. But there is only way to stop it. We have to change the Court. The Supreme Court is wrong. In 1857, the Supreme Court said in the Dred Scott decision that a slave could not sue in federal court because he was property and not human. Chief Justice Roger Taney made that decision. The Supreme Court is not omnipotent. Roger Taney was wrong in that decision. He was wrong. And *Roe* v. *Wade* was wrong. And we need to change it.

My bill provides that nothing—nothing—in it ''shall prohibit a law allowing justification to be shown for only those medical procedures required to prevent the death of either the pregnant woman or her unborn offspring as long as such a law requires every reasonable effort be made to preserve the lives of both of them.''

I am also introducing a joint resolution that would submit the human life amendment to the States for ratification as part of the Constitution of the United States. Specifically and more directly, I am introducing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to protect the lives of unborn children. It has been done before. It has been introduced before, and it has gone nowhere. It doesn't mean that it should not be introduced again and again and again and again until somehow, someway the message is received in this country that we have to protect the lives of these innocent children.

Let me explain why I am proposing a human life amendment in addition to the human life bill. If the human life bill were to be enacted into law and its constitutionality upheld by the Supreme Court, it could be weakened or repealed by some Congress of the future. But a human life amendment to the Constitution could not be altered or repealed except by another constitutional amendment. Thus, my human life amendment would provide more durable protection to the fundamental right to life of unborn children.

Like the human life bill, the human life amendment restores the word ''person'' in the Constitution to its original and natural meaning by making clear that it includes all human beings—all human beings—born and unborn.

I have witnessed the birth of three of my children. It is a privilege that I am glad I had. I will tell you something. There is no difference between the 15 or 20 minutes before the child was born, when it was in the womb and I could not see it, and 15 or 20 minutes after the child was born when I saw my daughter and my two sons for the first time. There is no difference. Why is it right and proper under the law to kill that child 20 minutes or 20 days or 20 months before that wonderful time when the child comes into the world? Why is it right to do that and wrong to do it 20 minutes or 20 months or 20 years after? It is wrong in both cases. It is wrong in both cases.

So the human life amendment includes the same language as the bill regarding medical procedures required to prevent the death of either the pregnant woman or her unborn offspring.

I introduce these two legislative proposals and I realize as I stand here today that there is not sufficient support in the Congress to restore legal protection of the right to life of unborn children in this country, but I believe ultimately we will prevail. When the abolitionists stood in this Chamber in the 1820s and the 1830s and the 1840s and they said that slavery was wrong, they did not prevail either, but ultimately they did because they were right. And we are right. It is wrong to take the lives of unborn children, and someday, someway, somehow, the American people are going to come to realize this, and they are going to throw everybody out of here who will not support the changing of that court. That is what they are going to do.

One of our Nation's greatest Presidents, in my estimation, Ronald Reagan, had the same confidence that the right-to-life cause someday will prevail. He believed it deep into his being. I can remember meeting personally with President Reagan and discussing this issue with him. I know how deeply he felt about it, and I also know the attacks he had, but I would ask my colleagues who somehow are a bit timid to stand up; when this issue comes up, they hide, many of them. They are worried about the political repercussions. Well, those repercussions of politics are not as bad as what Gianna Jesson went through when she was aborted. Here is what Reagan said 14 years ago in a book called ''Abortion and the Conscience of the Nation.''

> Despite the formidable obstacles before us, we must not lose heart. This is not the first time our country has been divided by a Supreme Court decision that denied the value of certain human lives.

This is a reference to what I talked about earlier.

> The Dred Scott decision of 1857 was not overturned in a day, or a year, or even a decade. At first, only a minority of Americans recognized and deplored the moral crisis brought about by denying the full humanity of our black brothers and sisters; but that minority persisted in their vision and finally prevailed. They did it by appealing to the hearts and to the minds of their countrymen, to the truth of human dignity under God. From their example, we know that respect for the sacred value of human life is too deeply ingrained in the hearts of our people to remain forever suppressed.

Mr. President, I close by addressing my colleagues in the Senate. Each one of us, every one of us, started out in life as an unborn child. We were once, all of us, very small human beings living in our mother's wombs. As President Reagan wrote, ''Abortion concerns not just the unborn child, it concerns every one of us,'' because we would not be here if our parents had made that awful decision.

The English poet, John Donne said, ''Any man's death diminishes me, because I am involved in mankind; and therefore never send to know for whom the bell tolls; it tolls for thee.''

''It tolls for thee.''

My colleagues, regardless of where you have stood on abortion in the past, regardless of the acrimonious debate, regardless of the hard feelings, regardless of the political pressures, the contributions, the political attacks, I urge you to search your conscience and to search your soul and ask yourself, is it right, is it really right to kill an unborn child?

I am not interested in hearing about all of the social conditions of the person who is having the child. That is another issue. I am not asking you to comment about the plight of that child when it is born. That is another issue. I am asking you to think, reach down in your souls like you would have if you stood on this floor in 1840 talking about slavery, if you were an abolitionist. I am asking you to search your soul and I am asking you to say, Is it right; is it right? And if it is not right, then you have an obligation to support this amendment and to help me to right a wrong.

I am pledging here today in this Chamber that as long as I am a Senator, and as long as I am alive, I am going to work for the passage of this amendment. I have two cosponsors this morning. That is all I have. But I know there are more people who agree with me in both political parties. Frankly, I am going to be talking to them, every one of them. It is not an in-your-face situation. This is an in-your-heart situation—not the face, the heart. Is it right or is it wrong? If you can look me in the eye and tell me it is right to take the life of an unborn, innocent child, then I will not bother you anymore. But if you don't tell me that, then I am going to keep on bothering you and try to get your support.

I hope you will decide to join me in cosponsoring both of these measures and place the lives of the unborn children of our Nation once again under the protection of our great Constitution. The only way to do that, in my opinion, is through the amendment.

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, in America today, a great debate—a great division—exists over the issue of abortion. For some, abortion is about the so-called ''right to choose.'' For others, it is ultimately about control. For me, it is about something completely different. It is about life.

Abortion is, at its core, about the destruction of an innocent human life; a life that is unique in the history of the world—formed and shaped in the image of God; a life that has never been and will never be again.

''Abortion,'' said the late Mother Teresa, ''is the great destroyer.'' And so it is. More than thirty-five million lives have been lost in the terrible years since Roe versus Wade became the law of the land. It is a tragedy unmatched in modern times. For mother, for father, for child, abortion is never a real resolution. It is but a temporary answer that inflicts a permanent pain. It is a wound that does not heal; a wound, alas, that cannot heal.

Senator SMITH and I come to the floor this morning to stand against abortion and to stand for life. For we believe that the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution protect every person's ''life.'' The protection designed by James Madison and adopted by the People is universal in scope. Its protection is unequivocal. It admits of no exception. ''No Person shall . . . be deprived of life.''

As this is the Constitution's ''plain meaning,'' I believe our proposed Human Life Act is a legitimate exercise of Congressional power under Section Five of the Fourteenth Amendment. However, while I support a statutory approach, I would, as I said before Senator East's Judiciary Subcommittee in 1981, go farther. For I also believe it necessary to amend the United States Constitution to restore its original meaning.

Mr. President, the Supreme Court's efforts to create an abortion jurisprudence from whole cloth demonstrate the difficulty of deviating from the view that life begins at conception. Every judicial effort to establish a time when constitutional protections magically kick in has been undermined by medical reality.

Earlier this year, I held a Constitution Subcommittee hearing to mark a profoundly sad occasion—the 25th anniversary of Roe versus Wade. At that hearing, we heard testimony about the relentless progress of medical technology in pushing forward the date of viability.

More recently, we have learned how judges in striking down bans on partial birth abortions have undermined birth as a clear line for when the constitutional protection for life begins—effectively legalizing infanticide.

Clearly, the Supreme Court, unguided by any constitutional text, has written themselves into a position that is legally, medically and morally incoherent. The experience of the past twenty-five years confirms the desperate need for the legislation and the proposed amendment we introduce today.

In thinking about this morning, I was reminded of my first run for Congress. I supported a Human Life Amendment in 1972—fully a year before Roe versus Wade was handed down. In 1981, as Missouri Attorney General, I argued before the United States Supreme Court on behalf of the unborn in Planned Parenthood versus Ashcroft. As Governor, I signed the pro-life law which became the basis for the Webster decision. And so, like Senator SMITH and Senator HELMS, I am not a newcomer to this debate.

But I stand before the Senate this morning not to discuss my past, but to talk about our future—about the kind of America we want to have in the next century.

Abortion makes a statement not only about the life of the unborn child, it makes a statement about the life it leaves behind. Sadly, it sends a message that life is expendable: life that is too young, too old, ailing, or tenuous. It says, ''You are worthless.'' It says, ''You are not important.''

To all who might hear my voice, I say, ''That is not the kind of statement America wants to make.'' It is not the message American wants to send. It is not the kind of America we want to be. Recall Deuteronomy, ''I have set before thee this day, life and death, blessing and cursing; therefore, choose life that both thou and thy seed may live.'' That both thou and thy seed may live, Mr. President. For an America that can be again—America the beautiful.

By Mr. GORTON:

S. 2136. A bill to provide for the exchange of certain land in the State of Washington; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

I–90 LAND EXCHANGE LEGISLATION

● Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, in 1984, I spoke in this Chamber to champion passage of a bill that would dramatically expand the Alpine Lakes Wilderness Area. The bill became law, and the wilderness area now boasts more than 390,000 acres of alpine and subalpine forests, 450 miles of trails, more than 500 lakes and countless peaks and pinnacles. It offers year-round opportunities for hikers, campers, skiers, fishermen, or those who simply want time away from urban life. It is arguably one of Washington's favorite recreational sites.

Today, I introduce legislation that would dramatically enhance the value of this recreational and environmental jewel—a bill to complete the I–90 Land Exchange between the Forest Service and Plum Creek Timber Company. The land exchange would bring up to 60,000 acres of forest land adjacent to the wilderness area into public ownership, creating a stretch of publicly owned forest from the southern border of the wilderness area to I–90.

Plum Creek would trade up to 60,000 acres of its land on the I–90 corridor of the Central Cascades for up to 40,000 acres of Forest Service land in three different forests. The benefits of the exchange are immense. It will place into public hands some of the last large blocks of privately owned old growth forest and increase publicly owned spotted owl habitat by 22,000 acres. It will bring into public ownership 14 miles of Pacific Crest Trail. It would eliminate much of the complicated checkerboard land ownership pattern, under which public and private entities each owns every other square mile of land. And it will fulfill a long-sought priority of Washington's environmental community—the public acquisition of prized sites such as Silver Creek, Scatter Creek, and Thorp Mountain.

There is a long history of controversy surrounding these lands. Although the land exchange has been under consideration in one form or another for more than a decade, this is the closest it has ever come to completion.

Conservationists began pushing for a resolution to the checkerboard ownership pattern back in the late 1970's. In 1986, the Forest Service and Plum Creek considered an exchange in the Silver Creek basin, the heart of the land exchange package under consideration today.

In 1988, with the support of local environmental groups and Plum Creek, a legislative proposal to complete the exchange was brought to Congress. When the bill was not considered, the Forest Service and Plum Creek launched an attempt to complete the exchange administratively. However, the listing of the spotted owl put the project on hold.

Since that time, some parcels have been acquired using the Land and Water Conservation Fund, but with such limited federal resources and such a vast amount of land, an exchange has proven to be the only way to bring a final resolution to the Central Cascades' checkerboard.

In fact, the Conference Report that accompanied the 1996 fiscal year appropriation for the Forest Service stated:

> The managers continue to encourage strongly the use of land exchanges as a way in which to protect important recreational or environmentally significant lands, in lieu of the Federal Government acquiring lands. The managers believe that land exchanges represent a more cost-effective way in which to do business and encourage the Forest Service to give high priority to those exchanges either nearing completion, or where land management decisions are made particularly difficult due to checkerboard ownership.

In August of 1995, Plum Creek and the Forest Service went back to the drawing board, and agreed to initiate the I–90 exchange. By mid-June of 1996, when Plum Creek signed a 420,000 acre Habitat Conservation Plan, Plum Creek and Secretary Glickman entered into a two year agreement to finish the exchange. Plum Creek agreed to withhold harvest on most of the exchangeable lands worth approximately $200 million during the two-year period, and although that deadline has now passed, Plum Creek agreed to extend it through the end of this year.

But we're still running out of time. If we fail, we will lose this opportunity to maximize the public benefits of this exchange. Neither Plum Creek nor the

Forest Service has the financial resources to continue endlessly this process. No one can reasonably expect Plum Creek to have the patience to continue on with this arduous and difficult process indefinitely.

If the I–90 Land Exchange is not completed by year's end, the exchange will begin to fall apart under the weight of an endless appeals process and litigation battles that could go well into the next century. And it's not reasonable to expect Plum Creek to sustain operations on the exchangeable lands through the indefinite and uncertain appeals process.

To put it bluntly, if the exchange is appealed, this current opportunity will be lost forever and we won't have another chance to acquire such a large block of some of Washington's premier forest land.

That's why I am introducing this bill. We need to keep all options open for finishing the land exchange on time. I understand that both Plum Creek and the Forest Service are still committed to the administrative process, and that's important. With the introduction of this bill and companion legislation in the House by Congressman DOC HASTINGS, we now have two options for finishing this land exchange on time and getting the most value out of the trade.

Ultimately, public support or public opposition will determine the outcome of the exchange, regardless of how it is completed. Passing a bill though Congress and earning the President's signature demands public support.

The building blocks are in place. In March, Washington State Governor Gary Locke wrote to President Clinton urging completion of the exchange by the end of the year. The State Legislature unanimously passed a resolution in support of the exchange. Recreational enthusiasts see the long-term value of bringing these lands into public ownership. Environmentalists recognize the value of blocking up these lands to create a habitat corridor for wildlife and to protect some of the last large blocks of privately owned old growth forest. And major newspapers have endorsed it.

Earlier this spring, the Seattle P–I described the dire consequences if this land swap was not completed this year. The PI–'s editorial stated: ''None of the land exchanges is apt to satisfy everyone involved. But if the lands are not consolidated, however imperfectly, it will be next to impossible to preserve them effectively for salmon or wildlife habitat. And that's a real lose-lose.''

Under the administrative process, however, it only takes one voice of opposition to file an appeal and kill the proposal for good.

The lands package outlined in this bill is not final as discussions and negotiations continue back in Washington state. I appreciate that all parties are at the table working towards a lands package that everyone can support, and I know from experience that these discussions take time and patience.

Mr. President, let me emphasize once more that the legislation I am introducing today is only a placeholder. It represents a starting point—albeit an excellent one—to achieve a consensus-based end product. I encourage the parties now at the table to continue their efforts and to expedite the completion of this large and vital exchange.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CLOSE LAND TRADE OR EVERYONE LOSES

The parties to the Plum Creek timberland swap need to conclude their negotiations and get on with the next such trade.

The company, the Forest Service and environmentalists have spent more than two years negotiating a land swap in the Cascades that involves 100,000 acres now scattered in unmanageable public and private checkerboard ownership. The Sierra Club in particular gets high marks for taking a leadership role in making a priority of consolidation of checkerboard forest lands in this state.

But company officials now say that if the deal isn't closed by the end of the year, it's off. They have 20 percent of their harvestable timber base in this state tied up in the swap.

They also say they may go to Congress to get the deal immunized from lawsuits. That could poison environmental groups' enthusiasm for such trades in the future.

Conservationists and other groups are accusing the firm of high-handed tactics. They also complain that the deal doesn't give them all they want.

Not many such deals do. But this one leaves nearly everybody who wants something from Plum Creek better off than if the deal falls through and the company makes good on its threat to start logging the stands conservationists want to preserve.

If the deal doesn't go through, the company plans to build logging roads in 53 different areas. If it does, that number will be reduced to eight.

None of the land exchanges is apt to satisfy everyone involved. But if the lands are not consolidated, however imperfectly, it will be next to impossible to preserve them effectively for salmon or wildlife habitat.

And that's a real lose-lose.●

By Mr. THURMOND:

S. 2139. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to issue a certificate of documentation with appropriate endorsement for employment in the coastwise trade for the vessel *Yesterdays Dream*; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

CERTIFICATE OF DOCUMENTATION FOR THE VESSEL ''YESTERDAYS DREAM''

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce a bill to direct that the vessel, *Yesterdays Dream*, official number 680266, be accorded coastwise trading privileges and be issued a coastwise endorsement under 46 U.S.C. sections 12106 and 12108.

This vessel was purchased in 1984 by Duncan MacRae of Columbia, SC, for a pleasure boat. In attempting to establish a charter service, he discovered that the boat could not be used in a chartering business because the vessel was foreign built. For this reason, the boat did not meet the requirements for coastwise trading privileges in the United States. When Mr. MacRae bought his boat, he was unaware that it could not be legally used for its intended purpose.

Therefore, Mr. MacRae is seeking a waiver of the existing law because he wishes to use the vessel for charters. If he is granted this waiver, he intends to comply fully with U.S. documentation and safety requirements. The purpose of the legislation I am introducing is to allow *Yesterdays Dream* to engage in the coastwise trade and fisheries of the United States.

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. 2139

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

SECTION 1. CERTIFICATE OF DOCUMENTATION.

Notwithstanding section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920 (46 U.S.C. App. 883), section 8 of the Act of June 19, 1886 (24 Stat. 81, chapter 421; 46 U.S.C. App. 289), and sections 12106 and 12108 of title 46, United States Code, the Secretary of Transportation may issue a certificate of documentation with appropriate endorsement for employment in the coastwise trade for the vessel YESTERDAYS DREAM, United States official number 680266.

By Mr. CAMPBELL:

S. 2140. A bill to amend the Reclamation Projects Authorization and Adjustment Act of 1992 to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to participate in the design, planning, and construction of the Denver water reuse project; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

DENVER WATER REUSE WATER AUTHORIZATION

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, I take the time today to introduce a bill that will help millions of water consumers throughout my state. The Denver Water Department has developed a unique plan to re-use non-potable water for irrigation and industrial uses. This bill would simply authorize the Denver Water Department to access federal funds to assist in the implementation of this plan. The Mayor of Denver has fully endorsed this legislation. I am delighted to assist the Mayor and the great City of Denver.

Denver Water Department serves over a million customers and is the largest water supplier in the Rocky Mountain region. Due to uncertain water supplies in the semi-arid west, it is critical to make wise use of every drop of water. With this in mind, over the past several years Denver Water has developed a plan to treat and reuse some of its water supply for uses not involving human ingestion, such as irrigation and industrial purposes. In this manner, Denver will stretch its

water supply without the cost and potential environmental disruption of building new reservoirs. It will also ease the demand on fresh drinking-quality water supplies.

The Denver Nonpotable Reuse Project will treat secondary wastewater, that is water which has already been used once in Denver's system. It is an environmentally and economically viable method for extending and conserving our limited water supplies. The water quality will meet all Colorado and federal standards. The water will still be clean and odorless, but since it will be used for irrigation and industrial uses around the Denver International Airport and the Rocky Mountain Wildlife Refuge, the additional expense to treat it for drinking will be avoided.

The nonpotable project is constructed in three phases and ultimately will result in an additional useable water supply of 15,000 acre feet. The use of the nonpotable water for irrigation and industrial customers will free potable water supplies for up to 30,000 homes.

Construction will include a treatment plant and a distribution system that is separate from the potable water system. Phase I will serve customers in the vicinity of the reuse plant, including a Public Service Company power plant, other industrial users and other public areas. Phase II will add irrigation for parks and golf courses in the former Stapleton Airport and the recently closed Lowry Air Force Base redevelopment areas. The Rocky Mountain Arsenal, which is being converted to a national wildlife refuge, will also use the reuse water to maintain lake levels on-site and to provide water for wildlife habitats. Phase III will service existing parks as well as new development of a commercial corridor leading to the Denver International Airport. With the construction of Phase II, the irrigation, heating and cooling, and car washing facilities at Denver International Airport will convert to reuse water, where a dual distribution system has already been installed.

This plan would benefit many Coloradans, and would help relieve many of the water burdens faced in the Denver region. Again, I'd like to thank Mayor Webb for his support, and I am hopeful this bill can be quickly passed and put into effect.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the Mayor's letter and the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2140

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

SECTION 1. DENVER WATER REUSE PROJECT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Reclamation Projects Authorization and Adjustment Act of 1992 (43 U.S.C. 390h et seq.) is amended—

(1) by redesignating sections 1631, 1632, and 1633 (42 U.S.C. 390h–13, 390h–14, 390h–15) as sections 1632, 1633, and 1634, respectively; and

(2) by inserting after section 1630 (43 U.S.C. 390h–12p) the following:

"SEC. 1631. DENVER WATER REUSE PROJECT.

''(a) AUTHORIZATION.—The Secretary, in cooperation with the appropriate State and local authorities, may participate in the design, planning, and construction of the Denver Water Reuse project to reclaim and reuse water in the service area of the Denver Water Department of the city and county of Denver, Colorado.

''(b) COST SHARE.—The Federal share of the cost of the project described in subsection (a) shall not exceed 25 percent of the total cost.

''(c) LIMITATION.—The Secretary shall not provide funds for the operation or maintenance of the project described in subsection (a).''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) The table of contents in section 2 of the Reclamation Projects Authorization and Adjustment Act of 1992 (43 U.S.C. prec. 371) is amended—

(A) by redesignating the items relating to sections 1631, 1632, and 1633 as items relating to sections 1632, 1633, and 1634, respectively, and

(B) by inserting after the item relating to section 1630 the following:

''Sec. 1631. Denver Water Reuse Project.''.

(2) Section 1632(a) of the Reclamation Projects Authorization and Adjustment Act of 1992 (as redesignated by subsection (a)(1)) is amended by striking ''1630'' and inserting ''1631''.

(3) Section 1633(c) of the Reclamation Projects Authorization and Adjustment Act of 1992 (as redesignated by subsection (a)(1)) is amended by striking ''section 1633'' and inserting ''section 1634''.

(4) Section 1634 of the Reclamation Projects Authorization and Adjustment Act of 1992 (as redesignated by subsection (a)(1)) is amended by striking ''section 1632'' and inserting ''section 1633''.

CITY AND COUNTY OF DENVER,
Denver, CO, May 15, 1998.

HON. BEN NIGHTHORSE CAMPBELL,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR CAMPBELL: Please accept this letter as a statement of my support of the Denver Water Nonpotable Reuse Project. Your willingness to sponsor this worthwhile legislation adding the Denver project to the Title XVI authorized list is appreciated by the City and County of Denver. Nonpotable reuse has been identified as a critical element in the Denver Water Department's recent Integrated Resource Plan. Coupled with conservation and system refinements, it forms the core of the water supply needs for the Denver system for the next 20 years.

As you are well aware, the water resources in Colorado are limited and valuable. Reuse conserves potable water sources. This project will help to fulfill Denver's obligations under water decrees that provide for the importation of water from the Colorado River Basin. Those obligations require Denver to exercise reasonable steps which, in view of legal limitations and economic feasibility, provide for the reuse of imports so as to reduce or minimize Denver's demands on Colorado River sources.

Yours truly,

WELLINGTON E. WEBB,
Mayor.

By Mr. CAMPBELL:

S. 2141. A bill to require certain notices in any mailing using a game of chance for the promotion of a product or service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

HONESTY IN SWEEPSTAKES ACT OF 1998

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, today I introduce the Honesty in Sweepstakes Act of 1998.

Every day millions of senior citizens and other innocent consumers receive sweepstakes announcements that boldly announce that they have just won millions of dollars or some other prize, perhaps a luxury cruise, when in fact they have not. Millions of Americans also receive cashier's check look-alikes, made out to their name, and written for thousands of dollars, as a ploy to get them to purchase some product or service. But upon close scrutiny, these cashier's check look-alikes are actually worthless.

These two tactics are some of the most pervasive deceptive direct mail marketing ploys being used today. Theses slick direct mail marketing ploys prey directly upon the better elements of the American character: optimism, good nature, trust, and natural tendency to accept things at face value.

The recent increase of news reports detailing how American consumers are being deliberately misled into believing that they have just won a huge prize, only to find out later that they were taken advantage of, clearly shows that the problem is getting worse. All across our country, families' home mail boxes are being stuffed with increasingly deceptive direct mail marketing ploys, and senior citizens are particulary vulnerable to these deceptive tactics.

Something needs to be done to restore honesty in sweepstakes.

This legislation has two key provisions. The first ensures accuracy and honesty in direct mail sales promotions that use sweepstakes or other games of chance to entice consumers to buy their products or services. The second provision promotes honest forthrightness when cashier's check look-alikes are used in direct mail sales promotions. Together, this legislation's two key provisions will benefit American consumers, the U.S. Postal Service, and the direct mail marketing industry.

First, my bill will protect American consumers from deceptive marketing practices. It will accomplish this by requiring that direct mail marketers provide consumers with honest, up-front and clear disclosure of what is being sent to their mail boxes. These new disclosure standards will enable consumers to quicky separate mail that is truly important from mail that is deceptively designed to look important by masquerading as something that it is not.

Second, the bill helps the Postal Service do its job better. This bill will strengthen the Postal Service's efforts by enabling it to halt the delivery of deceptive mass mailings. This legislation will reassure the American people that the Postal Service is on their side, and not on the side of those who would

use the Postal Service to deliver deceptive marketing ploys.

Finally, this legislation will benefit the direct mail marketing industry as a whole. It will enhance the public image of the majority of direct mail marketers that are honest by compelling companies that use deceptive marketing practices, and whose activities taint the entire industry, to either clean up their act or get out. For many years, direct mail marketers have successfully sold their products without resorting to deception. Let's return to those days.

The Honesty in Sweepstakes Act is built on a solid foundation of precedents. The key principle for the sweepstakes portion of this legislation is based on the way in which lotteries clearly disclose important information, like the total chances of winning. As for achieving the same goal for the printed materials used in direct mail marketing, this honesty is achieved through requiring the disclosure to be printed on top and in easy to read font sizes. It is also similar to food labeling, letting you know what is inside the product. The cashier's check look-alike portion of this bill is founded on precedent in current law that allows the Postal Service to dispose of, or otherwise refuse to deliver, government look-alike materials. My bill simply expands this current statutory provision to include cashier's check look-alikes.

This bill addresses deceptive sweepstakes in two important ways. First, it requires an announcement to be clearly printed on the face of the envelope to state that ''This is a sweepstakes. You have not automatically won.'' This announcement must be clearly printed in a large 16 point font, or in an even larger font in some circumstances, so that it is crystal clear and easy for everyone to read. Many of our nation's seniors will especially benefit from this large font size requirement. Second, this bill requires that important information be printed clearly on the top of the first page of enclosed material, including the chances of winning the big prize being promoted and that no purchase is necessary to participate. For cashier check look-alikes, this bill calls for a 16 point font notice that ''This is not a check. This has no cash value.'' The days of deceptive marketers burying all of the important information and other disclaimers in fine print are numbered.

Enforcement is triggered by the consumers themselves. When people receive sweepstakes and cashier's check look-alikes that do not meet the honesty guidelines laid out in this bill, they should contact the Post Office and register a complaint. These consumer complaints can then trigger a postal investigation of the materials in question. If the Postal Service finds that the materials do not live up to the Honesty in Sweepstakes guidelines, the Postal Service can then dispose of the mail accordingly, either by disposing of it or returning it to the sender. As a result, marketers who are not complying with the Honesty in Sweepstakes standards will then take a loss on the production and postage costs associated with that mailing. Needless to say, the company will quickly learn its lesson and produce marketing materials that are more forthright and honest.

I have consulted with the Attorneys General of both my home state of Colorado, and of the state of Florida, which is in the forefront of the effort to fight deceptive sweepstakes practices. These two offices expressed support for both this bill's goals and new approach. The Attorneys General were also glad to hear that this bill contains a clause stating that nothing in this bill will preempt state law. This important clause gives each of our respective states the freedom to enact its own additional guidelines as it sees fit. I appreciate the helpful feedback and support these two states' Attorneys General have shown.

For too long, too many of our senior citizens and other innocent consumers have been victimized by deceptive sweepstakes and cashier's check look-alikes. This bill will end this practice, and I urge my colleagues to support its passage.

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. 2141

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

SECTION 1. NOTICE REQUIRED ON MAILINGS USING GAMES OF CHANCE.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Honesty in Sweepstakes Act of 1998''.

(b) NOTICE REQUIRED.—Section 3001 of title 39, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (j) and (k) as subsections (k) and (l), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (i) the following:

''(j)(1) Matter otherwise legally acceptable in the mails that constitutes a solicitation or offer in connection with the sales promotion for a product or service that uses any game of chance of winning anything of value (including any sweepstakes) shall not be carried or delivered by mail, and may be disposed of as the Postal Service directs, unless such matter in conspicuous and legible type in contrast by typography, layout, or color with other printing on its face, in accordance with regulations which the Postal Service shall prescribe—

''(A) bears on the envelope the following notice: ''This is a game of chance (or sweepstakes, if applicable). You have not automatically won.'', or a notice to the same effect in words which the Postal Service may prescribe; and

''(B) bears on the top of the first page of enclosed printed matter the following notice: 'This is a game of chance (or sweepstakes, if applicable). You may not have automatically won. Your chances of winning are (insert applicable mathematical probability). No purchase is required either to win a prize or enhance your chances of winning a prize.', or a notice to the same effect in words which the Postal Service may prescribe.

''(2) Matter otherwise legally acceptable in the mails that constitutes a solicitation or offer in connection with the sales promotion for a product or service that uses any matter resembling a negotiable instrument shall not be carried or delivered by mail, and may be disposed of as the Postal Service directs, unless such matter bears on the face of the negotiable instrument in conspicuous and legible type in contrast by typography, layout, or color with other printing on its face, in accordance with regulations which the Postal Service shall prescribe the following notice: 'This is not a check (or negotiable instrument). This has no cash value.', or a notice to the same effect in words which the Postal Service may prescribe.

''(3) The notices described under paragraphs (1) and (2) shall be printed in a font which is the larger of—

''(A) 80 percent or more of the size of the largest font otherwise used in the matter; or

''(B) a 16-point font.

''(4) Nothing in this subsection shall preempt any State law that regulates advertising or sales of goods and services associated with any game of chance.''.

By Mr. CAMPBELL:

S. 2142. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey the facilities of the Pine River Project, to allow jurisdictional transfer of lands between the Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, and the Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation, and the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

VALLECITO RESERVOIR TRANSFER LEGISLATION

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, today I introduce a bill that will allow the Bureau of Reclamation to transfer the title to the Vallecito Reservoir in southwestern Colorado to the Pine River Irrigation District. This transfer has been developed after close consultation and extensive meetings with the Pine River Irrigation District, the Bureau of Reclamation, the U.S. Forest Service and the Southern Ute Indian Tribe.

This bill contributes toward my ongoing goal of developing local cooperation and control of public resources, while addressing the concerns of managing site-specific resources, recreation, and environmental protection. It fits with my long-held belief that we need to downsize the role of the Federal Government, while allowing the State and local entities which are most affected to manage valuable resources.

For the past twenty-five years, the District has managed the Vallecito Reservoir for the Bureau of Reclamation. This bill will allow the District, which has developed extensive expertise and knowledge, to purchase the reservoir which they manage. The concerns of the public are addressed through provisions which require certain conditions be met before the title can be transferred. Once the transfer is complete the Pine River District will continue to manage the reservoir in compliance with State and Federal law.

This bill is a companion bill to H.R. 3715 introduced in the House of Representatives by our colleague Congressman SCOTT MCINNIS. The House already has held a hearing on this legislation. Therefore, I am hopeful that the Senate can move rapidly to complete this transfer.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 834

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] was added as a cosponsor of S. 834, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to ensure adequate research and education regarding the drug DES.

S. 1252

At the request of Mr. D'AMATO, the name of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. LIEBERMAN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1252, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the amount of low-income housing credits which may be allocated in each State, and to index such amount for inflation.

S. 1309

At the request of Mr. KERRY, the name of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1309, a bill to provide for the health, education, and welfare of children under 6 years of age.

S. 1325

At the request of Mr. FRIST, the name of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBB] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1325, a bill to authorize appropriations for the Technology Administration of the Department of Commerce for fiscal years 1998 and 1999, and for other purposes.

S. 1392

At the request of Mr. BROWNBACK, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. SMITH] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1392, a bill to provide for offsetting tax cuts whenever there is an elimination of a discretionary spending program.

S. 1413

At the request of Mr. LUGAR, the name of the Senator from Washington [Mr. GORTON] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1413, a bill to provide a framework for consideration by the legislative and executive branches of unilateral economic sanctions.

S. 1481

At the request of Mr. DEWINE, the names of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] and the Senator from Maine [Ms. COLLINS] were added as cosponsors of S. 1481, a bill to amend the Social Security Act to eliminate the time limitation on benefits for immunosuppressive drugs under the medicare program, to provide for continued entitlement for such drugs for certain individuals after medicare benefits end, and to extend certain medicare secondary payer requirements.

S. 1868

At the request of Mr. NICKLES, the name of the Senator from Maine [Ms. COLLINS] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1868, a bill to express United States foreign policy with respect to, and to strengthen United States advocacy on behalf of, individuals persecuted for their faith worldwide; to authorize United States actions in response to religious persecution worldwide; to establish an Ambassador at Large on International Religious Freedom within the Department of State, a Commission on International Religious Persecution, and a Special Adviser on International Religious Freedom within the National Security Council; and for other purposes.

S. 1903

At the request of Mr. THOMAS, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. NICKLES] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1903, a bill to prohibit the return of veterans memorial objects to foreign nations without specific authorization in law.

S. 2078

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. KEMPTHORNE] was added as a cosponsor of S. 2078, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for Farm and Ranch Risk Management Accounts, and for other purposes.

S. 2128

At the request of Mr. STEVENS, the names of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SHELBY] and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. ASHCROFT] were added as cosponsors of S. 2128, a bill to clarify the authority of the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation regarding the collection of fees to process certain identification records and name checks, and for other purposes.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 94

At the request of Mr. ABRAHAM, the name of the Senator from Maryland [Ms. MIKULSKI] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Concurrent Resolution 94, a concurrent resolution supporting the religious tolerance toward Muslims.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 101

At the request of Mr. ABRAHAM, the names of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. FEINGOLD], the Senator from Maine [Ms. SNOWE], the Senator from Florida [Mr. MACK] and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. HUTCHINSON] were added as cosponsors of Senate Concurrent Resolution 101, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the President of the United States should reconsider his decision to be formally received in Tiananmen Square by the Government of the People's Republic of China.

SENATE RESOLUTION 235

At the request of Mr. AKAKA, the names of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. ABRAHAM], the Senator from Illinois [Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN] and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. LIEBERMAN] were added as cosponsors of Senate Resolution 235, a resolution commemorating 100 years of relations between the people of the United States and the people of the Philippines.

SENATE RESOLUTION 244—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE ON THE NINTH ANNIVERSARY OF PRO-DEMOCRACY DEMONSTRATORS ON TIANANMEN SQUARE

Ms. COLLINS (for herself, Mr. LOTT, Mr. HUTCHINSON, and Mr. ABRAHAM) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 244

Whereas in the spring of 1989, thousands of students demonstrated in Tiananmen Square in Beijing in favor of greater democracy, civil liberties, and freedom of expression in the People's Republic of China (PRC);

Whereas these students' protests against political repression in their homeland were conducted peacefully and posed no threat to their fellow Chinese citizens;

Whereas on the evening of June 4, 1989, these students were brutally attacked by infantry and armored vehicles of the People's Liberation Army (PLA) acting under orders from the highest political and military leadership of the PRC;

Whereas hundreds of these students were killed by the PLA in Tiananmen Square on June 4, 1989 for offenses no more serious than that of seeking peacefully to assert their most basic human, civil, and political rights;

Whereas many of the leaders of the student demonstrations thus attacked were subsequently imprisoned, sought out for arrest, or otherwise persecuted by the Government of the PRC;

Whereas during or shortly after the brutal assault of June 4, 1989, at least 2,500 persons were arrested for so-called ''counter-revolutionary offenses'' across China and dozens of persons were executed;

Whereas the Chinese government has never expressed grief for its actions on June 4, 1989, still imprisons at least 150 persons in connection with the Tiananmen Square demonstrations, and has continued to deny its citizens basic internationally-recognized human, civil, and political rights;

Whereas the Government of the PRC, as detailed in successive annual reports on human rights by the United States Department of State, still routinely and systematically violates the rights of its citizens, including their rights to freedom of speech, assembly, worship, and peaceful dissent; and

Whereas the Tiananmen Square Massacre has become indelibly etched into the political consciousness of our times as a symbol both of the impossibility of forever denying a determined people the right to control their own destiny and of the oppressiveness and brutality of governments that seek to do so: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That, in the interest of expressing support for the observance of human, civil, and political rights in China and around the world, it is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the United States Government should remain committed to honoring the memory and spirit of the brave citizens of China who suffered and died in Tiananmen Square on June 4, 1989 for attempting to assert their internationally-recognized rights; and

(2) supporting the peaceful transition to democratic governance and the observance of internationally-recognized human, civil, and political rights and the rule of law in China should be a principal goal of United States foreign policy.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Senate shall transmit a copy of this resolution to the President.