SENATE—*Wednesday, May 13, 1992*

(Legislative day of Thursday, March 26, 1992)

The Senate met at 10:30 a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the Honorable ALBERT GORE, Jr., a Senator from the State of Tennessee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Today's prayer will be offered by guest chaplain, the Reverend Hoyt Winslett, Jr., Episcopal Diocese of Alabama, Tuscaloosa, AL.

PRAYER

The Reverend Hoyt Winslett, Jr., Episcopal Diocese of Alabama, Tuscaloosa, AL, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray:

Father in heaven, as we face our Nation's problems and the pain of people everywhere, we could wish that we were better, wiser, and stronger folk. But we are who we are, and on this day, in this place, it is our job to do the best we can.

Open our hearts to the guidance of Your Spirit, and to one another, that our common decisions may transcend our individual limitations. Help us to be driven not by lust for winning or by fear of losing, but by the strong desire for that which is best in Your sight for our people, our Nation, and Your children everywhere.

Father, bless the men and women of the Senate. Keep them in Your love, strengthen them by Your grace, and give them Your peace.

Through Christ our Lord. Amen.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore [Mr. BYRD].

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, May 13, 1992.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, section 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable ALBERT GORE, Jr., a Senator from the State of Tennessee, to perform the duties of the Chair.

ROBERT C. BYRD,
President pro tempore.

Mr. GORE thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, leadership time is reserved.

The majority leader is recognized.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the Journal of the proceedings has been approved to date; is that correct?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is correct.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

HONORING REV. HOYT WINSLETT, JR.

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, I just want to acknowledge what we just heard, the words of a distinguished constituent and friend of mine, the guest minister, the Reverend Hoyt Winslett, Episcopal minister from my hometown of Tuscaloosa, AL.

I am honored to have the opportunity to serve as one of his U.S. Senators. I think you have seen the caliber of man he is. He has a distinguished academic record. His family has been personal friends of my family for many, many years. We are all honored to have him here in the Senate, especially this Senator from his hometown. Thank you.

MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, there will now be a period for the transaction of morning business not to extend beyond the hour of 1:30 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for not to exceed 5 minutes each. The first hour shall be under the control of the majority leader or his designee.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I designate Senator RIEGLE to control the first hour.

SCHEDULE

Mr. MITCHELL. For the information of Senators, with respect to the schedule for the remainder of the day, the period for morning business will continue until 1:30 p.m., following which debate will begin on the veto message on S. 3, the campaign finance reform bill. There will be a maximum of 4 hours for debate on that message, and a vote on reconsideration of passage of the bill—that is the override of the veto—will occur when all time is used or yielded back.

I expect that vote to occur around 5 p.m., although Senators should be alert to the fact that it could occur at any time prior to 5:30 p.m.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The senior Senator from Michigan is recognized for up to 1 hour.

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. President, I thank the majority leader and the Presiding Officer. I yield the first 15 minutes of the time to myself for the remarks that I will now be making.

TERRIBLE PROBLEMS IN MAJOR URBAN CENTERS

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. President, the purpose this morning in taking this time is to focus upon the terrible problems that we are seeing in our major urban centers across America.

The violence and rioting that we saw in Los Angeles is a very powerful indication of what is out there happening in the communities across America in one form or another. The violence, whether it is the kind that we saw in the beating of Rodney King when he was being subdued by police officers, or whether it is the violence that we saw later in Los Angeles after the verdict in the King trial, the manifestations of this problem are really everywhere.

There was a story the other day here in Washington, DC, about a young child, about 12 years old, a lovely young boy in school here, who was coming home from church with his mother one day and was the victim of a random drive-by shooting in which he was killed. And virtually every night in cities across this country, the manifestations of violence and a deteriorating social order are there for everyone to see. Something has to be done about it.

There is a responsibility for our Federal Government to understand what is taking place in terms of the deprivation, absence of jobs, absence of medical care, absence of adequate education and opportunity, the breakdown of family structure, the fact that our Government itself has turned its attention away from problems here in America, particularly the problems in our urban centers over the last decade or so.

I rise today in two capacities to start this discussion. One is as chairman of the Senate Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs, where we have a responsibility to try to respond as best we can to the urban needs of this country; and also I rise as chairman of the Democratic task force on community and urban revitalization.

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

Our group of Senators has been meeting now for some time and generating recommendations as to what might be done and have forwarded those recommendations to the majority leader, GEORGE MITCHELL. He took those ideas and added others in conjunction with Speaker FOLEY and majority leader GEPHARDT and wrote a letter to President Bush dated May 11, 1992.

I ask unanimous consent that that letter be printed at the end of my remarks.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. RIEGLE. The letter sets forth not only a desire to work together and cooperate with the executive branch to deal with the problems of our urban centers, but also to lay out a series of urgent requirements in areas where attention has to be given, and resources have to be focused. There needs to be a major national strategy applied in this area, with a number of component parts to that strategy, which are laid out in this letter, some of which I will talk about later.

The reason this is most urgent is not just that we have seen the conditions manifesting themselves in Los Angeles—and it may well happen in any other American city at any time—but the fact that our Federal Government has been withdrawing support, and help, and attention from the cities certainly over the decade of the 1980's and now into the 1990's.

During that period of time the focus of our Government increasingly was outside America. It was to help other countries, other places. And in fact today in terms of economic strategy the American Government and the administration has an economic program for virtually every country in the world except our own. There is a plan for Mexico called the free-trade agreement with Mexico. There is a plan for Kuwait. There is a plan for Communist China called the most-favored-nation trading status strategy. There is a plan to help all the parts of the old Soviet Union. There is virtually a plan for every other country in the world except our own.

During the 1980's the help that would have gone to our society and our own people was withdrawn.

Let me give you example of cuts during that period of time. Probably the most basic is job training and employment programs. We all know people should work. If people do not have the skills to be able to survive in the job market they are not going to have jobs or lead decent lives to support their families.

During the 1980's Federal job employment programs were cut by 63 percent. Housing programs—you have to be able to get off the streets or get out of a homeless shelter for any kind of semblance of family structure or order to have a chance to live productive lives. Housing programs at the Federal level during the 1980's were cut over 82 percent.

On community development block grants, we are going to have hearings this afternoon in the Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs Committee, having a meeting of mayors from across the country coming in to testify. I expect they will say, as they have before, that the deep cuts in the development block grants were hurtful to the cities and held back their ability to rebuild themselves and provide a better environment and more job opportunity.

Community development block grants in the eighties were cut about 45 percent. Community services block grants to try to just get the basic services in place out in the communities in the eighties were cut 45 percent, and social services block grants were cut over 38 percent. That is not the worst of it.

General revenue sharing, which was an effort to try to give communities that were in trouble and struggling some financial muscle to try to deal with problems and try to stimulate economic revitalization, job creation, attract businesses, and so forth, was eliminated altogether, just eliminated, completely taken out; cities no longer got that help.

Urban development action grants to try to stimulate targeted major investment opportunities in cities to bring jobs with them and job creation, that was eliminated.

Health planning grants to try to figure how we break this tide of very high, in fact among the highest in the world, infant mortality rates and death rates among youth in our inner city and break that problem were eliminated altogether in the 1980's.

What happened was during that period of time America changed its focus, it turned its back on its own people in the United States, and put the focus overseas in terms of needs of other countries. And that is where the attention has gone and strategy has gone. We have even gone over to fight wars to restore the Emir of Kuwait, for example, to put him back on the throne over there and yet we have been, at the same time during that same decade over the last 10 years or so, withdrawing the support and help for our own people.

Let me give you an example out of today's Washington Post, about as stunning as you would hope to see. We know in order to try to meet the problems of the inner cities today it is going to take a massive application of resources, talent, money, focused investment, health programs, better education, better infrastructure, better crime control, better fight against drugs, all the things it is going to take to really lift our cities up and provide ladders of opportunity so people have a chance to get ahead.

Today on the Washington Post front page it says: "Among L.A.'s Biggest Losses: Jobs, Thousands More Out of Work in City Already Reeling From Recession." It talks about one man here, 34 years old, Danny Jackson, who lost his job where he was being paid $5.25 an hour as janitor. The place where he worked was burned to the ground. He lost that job. So he is out in the unemployment lines and cannot find other work. He is desperate.

There are millions like him who lost jobs in the country—not lost jobs for the same reason, but who cannot find jobs. Even in his case with his job, it does not say here whether he has a family or not but if he does that is a below-poverty wage, even the job he did have before it was just lost.

We need enough jobs to go around in America for all of our people. We need enough jobs. We need an aggressive job strategy for America. That will do more to solve all the other problems than any other single thing we can do.

But as you read through these articles, and you read through the comments that are coming back from the executive branch, they say there is no money. They say there is no resource. Oh, yes, there are a few dribs and drabs here and there. Scrape together a little bit of this and put some clever phraseology on it, weed and seed, enterprise zones, so forth and so on. If there are just words and phrases, not backed up by major muscle programs, it is not going to mean anything. It might sort of help carry the debate down through the next few months and maybe past the election, but it is not going to make any material difference in these communities unless these programs are substantial, are real, the country locks together, business, Government, and citizens to make it all happen.

But so far at least when you look at the resource side of the equation as to whether there is going to be an effort to take and really put the muscle into it, there is no real sign of that. That is what is on page 1.

This relates to what is going on here in America—how do we help our own. If you turn to page 11 of today's Washington Post, and I want to just do that right now because it really makes the point, turn over to page 11. And you look down here at this one article, not very large in relationship to the articles on the front page, and here is what it says. It says "House Panel Approves 20 B-2 Bombers." And then it says this. This is the third paragraph down. "Seeking assurances that $44.4 billion"—$44.4 billion—"will complete the program, the Armed Services Committee is asking defense Secretary Cheney to meet with the committee before the House takes up the defense budget in June."

This is to buy 20 airplanes. These airplanes, these B-2's, by the way, we do

not use them here in the United States. We have a war going on in our own cities but this money is not being spent to deal with the war in America, it is being spent on imaginary problems around the world where the Berlin Wall has come down and the Soviet Union has fallen apart.

Our biggest problem around the world today is economic competition from Japan and Europe and other countries. That is our main threat.

And by the way, B-2 bombers do not do anything to help us combat that economic threat. But the cost of these planes has gone from $434 million apiece, imagine airplanes that cost $434 million. That is a lot of airplane. The price has gone up, up, up. You know what it now costs to build one of these B-2 bombers, $2.3 billion. That is for one plane. They want to build 20 more, $2.3 billion for each one.

As I have added up what the administration has said it is willing to commit in the way of resources to deal with the urban crisis in America, it is less money than to build just one of these B-2 bombers. And yet they say they have got the money not just to build 1 more but to build 20 more.

What are people across America going to say? I do not just mean the people in the inner cities living there with hopelessness and deprivation and no jobs, poor health care and poor education and no prospects for their children, and they pick up this same paper and they read there is no real help for them. But we can pour another $44.4 billion into 20 B-2 bombers against a nonexistent threat to feed the military industrial complex a few more tens of billions of dollars.

What about all the rest of the human needs in this country? What about the senior citizens? What about the urban poor, or what about the rural poor? This is just not a black issue or minority issue, a lot of it is concentrated in the black and Afro-American communities and Latino communities, but there are a vast number of poor whites and other people of other ethnic backgrounds that are caught in this same dilemma. They need help from their Government.

They need their Government to care about them and come down off cloud 9 and look at the real problems facing people every single day where a mother or father is afraid even to send the child out the front door of an inner city residence to go to the school because of violence up and down the streets, and children are being gunned down one after another. I am talking about innocent victims of crime that has nothing to do with them. They just happen to be in the wrong place at the wrong time. Schoolchildren, elementary school-age children. And it is happening every single day in cities across this country and we are doing about this much to deal with it.

What are we doing to deal with this big problem of the need for the B-2 bombers? We are doing this much for the B-2 bombers, we just found $44.4 billion for that. That is not pocket change—$44.4 billion is not pocket change. At a minimum we ought to be prepared to spend, say let us be conservative about it, suppose we just spent 10 percent as much on rebuilding our cities and providing hope for inner city people as we spend on these 20 B-2 bombers.

You might look at that and think about it and say, "Well, let's see. If we did that, that would be $4.4 billion. That would sure help." But why should we be squandering all of this money on things that really do not matter and that we do not need when we are turning our backs on the things that do matter and that we do need.

We need civil order in this country, and that is not going to happen if our communities are falling apart and flying apart because of all of the deprivation. You deprive people of a decent way of life and you are going to get chaos. And we are getting chaos. We are getting more and more of the manifestations of a Clockwork Orange Society. That does not have to be our future.

Yesterday, there was a story, however, in the New York Times, written by Johnny Apple, Jr., one of their noted reporters over many years, on page A-18. I want to read you one paragraph. He was talking with some people around President Bush as to what to do about this problem, the urban problem, the problem of the violence, the problem of lack of jobs, and so forth and so on. Now listen to this paragraph.

"What I want," said one of Mr. Bush's top strategists, "is a few more days of this—a simple, clear program with three or [four] points, then get off it. The longer the President seems preoccupied with Los Angeles, the more he and his urban policies become the issue, and that's not good for us."

Now, what did this top strategist for President Bush mean by that? When you read the whole article it means what they want to do is come in with a few attractive sounding buzz words, sort of make it look as if they are going to do something about the problem, maybe sprinkle a few dollars out on the problem, and then basically push that problem off the stage and take the focus somewhere else.

We are talking about the lives of American people. Our inner-city youth are part of our country. They are America's children. They have to matter to us. And if they survive, they are part of our future.

And as Rodney King himself said, "We have to live together. We are here for a period of time together on this planet. We have to learn to live together." I think we can do better than that. I think we ought to care about each other, and we ought to learn to love each other. I think that is what we ought to do.

And, by the way, our founding documents are written around that concept about life and liberty and the pursuit of happiness and of banding together for the good of all, not just for the good of some, not just for people at very high income levels or people with vast family fortunes.

No, the founding documents are written exactly the other way—to try to envision a nation where everybody stands on an equal footing in terms of their importance under our system of law and our system of justice.

I will tell you this. There is very little economic justice today. We cannot have a situation where there is so little economic opportunity and not expect that we are going to have terrible consequences as a result of it.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time initially yielded by the Senator to himself has expired.

Mr. RIEGLE. I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is recognized for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. RIEGLE. We have today in America about 16 million people that we know about who are unemployed and need work. That includes what are called discouraged workers who are so disappointed they have just given up looking, and it includes some people who are working part-time because they cannot find full-time work.

There were some striking examples in the news just recently. There was a situation where they opened a hotel in the city of Chicago and they had about 100 jobs to offer, not terribly high-paying jobs. They had some 15,000 people come out and stand in a raging blizzard, a line stretching for blocks, to try to apply and get one of those handful of jobs.

Or one that was even worse the other night. They interviewed two young men who a year ago were wearing the uniform of this country, fighting in Desert Storm, young men that had been asked to go and serve their country, and did so with distinction. They came back, received parades, which they justly deserved, and now a year later are unemployed, cannot find a job, and are homeless, living in cardboard boxes.

Now how can we let that be America's story? I want those young men to have a chance to work. They are every bit as important as the sons and daughters of the President, the Vice President, every Senator, every House Member, every Cabinet member or anybody else in this country. They deserve a decent chance for economic opportunity. And it happens that the two I speak about are Afro-Americans. They are black. That makes their situation even tougher in America as we all know, be-

cause there is too much racism in our society.

The other day they asked a group of high school students, white students, a hypothetical question: what if they went to bed one night and woke up the next morning and found out they were black in American society, how much money do they think they would have to have to compensate for the fact that they have been changed from white to black.

And the answer was, they would need at least a million dollars.

What are the children saying to us? They understand what is going on. They understand what is going on, and we have to get past that problem. We have to reach out to all of our people. White people particularly have a special obligation and an opportunity and a responsibility of leadership to reach out to people in our society of color. That is part of what it means to be an American, and that is to reach out to every other fellow American.

And that has been part of our problem, and it is part of our problem today. We had a young Afro-American man, quite well known—Blair Underwood—on television in the TV series "L.A. Law," who came up to testify before the Senate Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs Committee. He told us a chilling personal story, not unlike Rodney King.

One day, after filming for his TV program, he was driving back to his very lovely home in the Hollywood Hills area of Los Angeles. And as he was pulling up in front of his own home in a very nice automobile that he owns, a police car came in behind him and a police officer got out and came up and asked him who he was, and what he was doing in that neighborhood. And before he could explain that he was parking his car in front of his own house, the police officer ordered him out of the car, pulled out a gun, made him get on the ground, and threatened him with being shot right on the spot.

Why? There is no question as to why; it was because he was black. And there is no question in my mind as I stand here today and as I have seen, as many others have, so many times the videotape of the beating of Rodney King, there is no doubt in my mind that the reason that he was hit 59 times in 81 seconds was in large part because he was black.

We have got to get past that in America. And it is not just the case of those who otherwise would commit violent acts, whether it is those in uniform or in civilian capacities. You can do violent things without engaging in a violent act. Indifference can be violent, have a violent effect. Drawing a line through somebody's name, a bank not giving equal credit access to a black, potential borrower is a violent act and it starts to wreck their economic prospects and wreck their economic future, and eventually wreck their faith in this country. So those things have to change, and those of us in positions of leadership have a special obligation to speak to it and to speak out about it and to bring about the change.

We have got a program here that we can carry out. I am for enterprise zones.

We are going to have Jack Kemp in tomorrow before the Senate Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs Committee to talk about that issue. And we will have Arthur Fletcher and Jesse Jackson and Jim Rouse as well, all who can bring important perspectives to us after we hear from the mayors in the hearing this afternoon.

But if the enterprise zone is an inner city area does not employ inner-city people, then it does not mean very much. If it is just a building with a certain tax advantage that allows somebody to make money in the name of a self-help program that does not really provide jobs in the inner-city, then it does not mean much. We need a tax base and we need jobs in the inner cities.

In order to have that, as I am sure the Senator from New York will talk about, you have to have family structure.

And in order to have that you have to have the things that allow it to take place. You have to have access to health care. You have to have access to education. And you cannot be shot to death just walking from your house to church or to a store on the corner, as a victim of random violence. But if we can afford $44 billion to build 20 more of these B-2 bombers that we do not need, and which is corporate socialism of the worst kind, then we have the resources that it takes in a material sense to address the problems of our cities.

I do not want one youngster in America, black, brown, yellow, red, or white, to lose the chance for a future because this country is indifferent or looking the other way or too busy helping some other country or some defense contractor, or sending too much money up to the top of the income scale with the outlandish and outrageous tax cuts of the 1980's that favored the wealthiest people of this country. We can do better than that and we have to do better than that.

Our cities are not going to survive. Every city in America today is a powder keg; make no mistake about it. You could have events tonight in any major city in America, and if the rumors start that somehow there was police violence or there was something else that happened in that situation, we can have a replay of what happened in Los Angeles.

We cannot afford to have that happen. We cannot afford to have that happen. And we are smarter than that and, God, I hope we are better than that and more decent than that and that we care about each other, still, in the spirit of our founding documents to want to reach out and help where help is needed.

We have to continue to move. We have to move the health care plan through the Finance Committee. We have to move, again, to end mortgage lending discrimination through the Banking Committee, which we have been doing. We have to renew these programs in job training. They are absolutely vital. If there is not a way to get routed into the job sector of our economy then there is not going to be any real help.

When this country turns its back on a large part of its citizens why is it surprising that the citizens turn around and say the country does not matter to me because the country does not care about me? Who is setting that example in the first instance? Our Government cannot walk away from these problems.

If I may, I am going to yield myself 3 additional minutes and then I am going to yield the floor.

I want to talk for a minute about the racial problem in America. I want to talk about how it started. It started with slave ships over 400 years ago. African families that were doing quite nicely where they lived were taken captive, put in human bondage, locked in the holds of ships, and brought by the hundreds of thousands over to the United States to serve as slaves.

If you have ever seen the drawing of a slave ship, in the hold of the ship they would actually draw an outline on the floorboards of the ship as to where each slave was to go, laying down on the floorboards of the ship so they could get the maximum number of slaves into the ship. In fact, up in the bow of the ship where there is a bend there would actually be a drawing of someone who had to be in that curled-up position so they could get one more slave in the hold of that ship.

When the slave ships came across the ocean—and they normally came into the Caribbean first—if there were children on board the children were the first ones off because they were the ones that most often died on these trips. And any children that survived they took out of the arms of their mothers and their fathers and they dropped them off down in the Caribbean. Then they would come up the southern coast of the United States and next, most often, they would unload the men and they were sold off as slaves at that point. And then finally further up the coast the mothers were dropped off.

Imagine anything as savage and as inhumane as that, to take people into human bondage and to pull children right out of the arms of their mothers in that fashion. That has been the history in this country. And that is what

it is like to have been black in America, to come from that history and not even be seen as being a human being.

We have made some progress since that time, but not enough—not enough. We have to address where this comes from.

Those of us in this country who are white, in positions of leadership—not just in Government but in business and communities, in our churches and wherever—we have to help break down what is left of this racial division, the racial stereotyping. We have to help rescue our cities that are falling apart. There is no investment in infrastructure, no investment in our people, and there is very little hope. That has to change.

People will do something with their lives if they have a chance. It is the job of Government to see that people in America have a chance. The people I talk to, that is all they are asking for, is a chance. They are not asking for a guaranteed outcome. When somebody asks for a job, it is for a chance to work. When we turn our backs on somebody who is asking for a job, and desperately needs a job, we fail them and we fail America. That is the issue here.

So I do not want to just see a few code words for a few days. I want to see the President invested in this in a serious way. He has the capacity to do that. I know this man. If he decides to focus on this issue and put his energy into it, things will happen. I ask him to do that. I will help him do it. I will help him do it as chairman of the Senate Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs Committee. But it has to be done and we cannot wait any longer because we are losing part of America every single day.

It is not right. It is just not right. We do not have to settle for that. Other nations are not settling for that. They are investing in their people. They are putting together strategies to help people lift themselves up to a higher and higher level. We have to do that here in America. That is the task that is before us. We cannot wait any longer.

I do not want to lose one more black child and white child in America to a violent act. Let us protect our children. Let us help them have a decent chance to live, and not in a cardboard box after they come back from fighting in Desert Storm and cannot find a job. We can do better than that in America.

So I ask the administration to make the commitment to do something that is serious about it and repudiate whoever this spokesman was that John Apple was talking about yesterday.

By the way, the writer of this article would do us a favor if he identified who this person is. I would like to know who it is so they can be run out of the Government, or run out of that campaign. Because it is shameful thinking.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the articles to which I referred be printed in the RECORD, and I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARKIN). There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, May 12, 1992]

BUSH CAMPAIGN PLANS

(By R.W. Apple, Jr.)

WASHINGTON, May 11—It has been a turbulent year for the people whose job it is to get George Bush reelected, not at all the kind of stately progress toward an emphatic November victory many of them had expected.

In late January and February, Patrick J. Buchanan was the nemesis. Then, gradually, Mr. Bush rallied and the troubles of Gov. Bill Clinton of Arkansas, the presumptive Democratic nominee, accumulated on several fronts. Polls and politicians concluded that the President, for all his troubles, was a likely winner after all.

Now a third phase has begun, with twin threats to Mr. Bush's ambition to become only the third President since World War II to serve two full terms. With the primary elections coming to a close, quite successfully from his standpoint, Mr. Bush's managers are struggling to come to grips with the putative third-party candidacy of Ross Perot and with the new political agenda generated by the arson and looting that swept Los Angeles 12 days ago.

While some people in the White House debate how sweeping a program Mr. Bush should offer to help cure the problems that underlay the rioting in California, some at campaign headquarters worry that the President may focus too closely on the question.

"What I want," said one of Mr. Bush's top strategists, "is a few more days of this—a simple, clear program with three or points, then get off it. The longer the President seems preoccupied with Los Angeles, the more he and his urban policies become the issue, and that's not good for us."

But others involved in the campaign think it would be a major mistake for the President not to seem deeply involved in trying to alleviate the anxieties that have been stirred by the vivid events in Los Angeles.

To move on to other themes too quickly, a senior Republican operative insisted, "will make it look like we don't understand how deep all this runs—not only the frustration of the blacks, which a lot of yuppies who voted for Bush sympathize with, but also the fears of the law-and-order voters, who also helped elect him four years ago." The problem, as he outlined it, is how to avoid letting the riots drive a wedge into the Bush constituency.

That may already have happened to some extent; private polls taken for both parties, as well as a few public polls, show Mr. Bush falling back in the wake of the riots.

But the Perot problems is no less severe, as seen from the Bush camp.

According to one campaign planner, the original intention had been to aim the Republican campaign mainly at the South, where Mr. Clinton was considered a threat in only two or three states on the periphery of the region, at the West, and at the industrial states of the Midwest, which were thought likely to be the main battleground. In the Northeast, only New York seemed likely to the Bush strategists to provide useful hunting grounds.

Now, the planner said, all that has been swept aside and "we're all looking for a new strategic concept that accounts for Perot's strength."

While Bush strategists, especially those from Texas, readily tell stories intended to point up Mr. Perot's alleged authoritarianism and shortness of temper, one who has known him for years said the only day, "He's a master salesman, remember, and he may cause us real trouble."

In an attempt to stop the erosion in Mr. Bush's support, the campaign is studying the possibility of running television commercials created by a new media team, which includes several Madison Avenue experts, well before the fall campaign. One plan would involve a heavy media expenditure before the California primary on June 2, even though Mr. Buchanan is considered more a bother than a threat there; another would schedule Bush ads before, during and after the Democratic National Convention in New York this summer, in an effort to deny most of the usual convention-week lift to Mr. Clinton.

All of these discussions are taking place against a backdrop of considerable personal animosity and organizational confusion. Tensions among some of the principal figures around Mr. Bush are one of the main reasons there is still no detailed set of goals for a second Bush Administration, which many Republican politicians consider a key to victory in November.

For example, it is difficult to overstate the degree of animosity some of the senior campaign personnel feel toward Richard Darman, the tough political infighter who heads the Office of Management and Budget. Many members of the campaign staff are convinced, they say, that he is making it impossible for Sam Skinner, the new White House chief of staff, to pull operations there together as they had counted upon Mr. Skinner to do.

In addition, Mr. Darman is seen as the principal author of the White House compromise with Congress that led to the tax increases that have eaten into the President's popularity. One of Mr. Bush's senior campaign aides said of Mr. Darman last week, "He's hurt the President more than any Democrat."

HOUSE PANEL APPROVES 20 B-2 BOMBERS

President Bush's request to complete the B-2 "stealth" bomber program at 20 planes was approved by the House Armed Services procurement subcommittee yesterday.

Meeting in closed session, the subcommittee agreed that the Air Force cannot spend the money until it proves that the aircraft meets its radar-evading standards and the program will not exceed $44.4 billion.

Seeking assurances that $44.4 billion will complete the program, the Armed Services Committee is asking Defense Secretary Richard B. Cheney to meet with the committee before the House takes up the defense budget in June.

"Not one more dime beyond that," Rep. John R. Kasich (R-Ohio), a B-2 opponent, said of the Air Force's estimate of the total cost.

Lawmakers have expressed concern over increases in the cost of the B-2, from $430 million per plane in January 1987 to $2.3 billion last January.

"This program makes me sick," Kasich said. "It's been a disaster from Day One. . . . Shame on the Air Force for playing these games with us."

In a separate closed-door session the Armed Services research and development subcommittee approved $4.3 billion for the Strategic Defense Initiative, a cut of $1.1 billion from Bush's proposal for fiscal year 1993 but one of the highest overall amounts the panel has ever adopted.

Last year, the panel approved $3.6 billion for SDI, commonly known as "Star Wars."

The subcommittee provided no money for the concept of "Brilliant Pebbles," in which space-based interceptors would search out and destroy enemy missiles.

The Armed Services Committee is expected to adopt the subcommittees' actions today when it finishes writing its version of a post-Cold War defense budget.

The total package is $274 billion, about $7 billion less than Bush proposed in January for fiscal 1993.

The subcommittees also approved:

A reduction in the Air Force's request for the C-17 transport plane. The Pentagon was seeking $2.7 billion for eight planes. The procurement subcommittee approved $1.9 billion for six aircraft. Congressional investigators have said the C-17 is two years behind schedule and $1.5 billion over budget.

A measure forcing the Pentagon to spend about $2 billion from previous budgets for the V-22 Osprey tilt-rotor aircraft. If the department refuses, the budget and staff of the Pentagon's comptroller would be cut by 5 percent for every month the Osprey money is not used. Cheney has tried to cancel the V-22 for the past two years.

[From the Washington Post, May 13, 1992]

AMONG L.A.'S BIGGEST LOSSES: JOBS

(By Michele L. Norris)

LOS ANGELES, May 12.—Danny Jackson sat outside a downtown Los Angeles employment office Monday morning clutching the want ads with one hand and a Bible with the other, unsure which to peruse first as he began his daily search for a new job.

"I figure it's going to take one of those loaves-and-fishes kind of miracles to find work in a city where thousands of people have seen their jobs disappear," said Jackson, 34, who lost his $5.25-an-hour janitorial position when the market where he worked was reduced to ash and rubble.

"Times were tough before the city burnt down. There is no way everyone is going to get a new job."

Economic analysts agree. Possibly as many as 40,000 people were left jobless by the three days of fires and looting that damaged or destroyed more than 5,000 businesses following the Rodney G. King beating case verdict, according to labor analysts. Many of the newly unemployed are expected to return to work quickly as businesses restock, and replace windows. And many employees who work for large drug stores, supermarkets or fast food chains likely will be transferred to other locations while companies rebuild.

But at least 15,000 jobs may be long-term losses, said Art Shaw, chief economist with the Los Angeles Area Chamber of Commerce—a massive burden for a part of town that already had one of the highest unemployment rates in the country.

"Thousands of those jobs are not coming back, at least not quickly. And this is happening at a time when the city is already reeling from the effects of the recession," he said. "I don't see how this city's labor force is going to be able to absorb this many unemployed people, particularly since so many people out of work are unskilled workers who lack adequate transportation."

"I am not sure that Los Angeles—or any other city for that matter—has seen so many people displaced in such a short period of time," said Goetz Wolff, a labor market analyst who was formerly the chief economist for Los Angeles County.

"In just one weekend a large percentage of that area's labor force [between 10 or 20 percent of south-central's work force] was wiped out. We have seen large layoffs in the aerospace industry but there was always some advance warning and the job loss was spread out over time. We haven't seen anything like this, not even with natural disasters," Wolff said.

South-central Los Angeles and surrounding communities were hardest hit by the fires and looting that gutted the area's principal source of employment—retail stores and fast-food chains that provided low pay but steady work.

Entire business districts that once bustled with activity now are fire-gutted ghost towns, cordoned off by wire fences and yellow police tape. In some cases the newly burned-out stores are next to empty lots or graffiti-covered buildings that once housed businesses that never recovered from the 1965 Watts riot.

"These are people who are least able to cope with something like this because any loss in income tends to be devastating," said Jack Kyser, chief economist with the Economic Development Corp. of Los Angeles County. "Where are they going to go?"

A study conducted by the University of Southern California earlier this year found that the unemployment rate for the predominantly black and Latino south-central corridor hovered around 13 percent—well above the 7.1 percent level recorded for all of Los Angeles County in April.

While everyone is waiting for officials to develop a recipe for economic recovery, some individuals have embarked on small-scale programs to help put people back to work. Several Asian restaurateurs are hiring extra cooks, cashiers and waiters, even if they don't need the extra staff, to help Koreans who are suddenly without work. Likewise, several south-central churches have established impromptu job banks for babysitters, auto mechanics and hairdressers who were left jobless after the civil unrest.

The devastation in south-central will likely ripple outward, affecting areas throughout Southern California if tourists decide to steer clear of a region that is traditionally associated with sunshine and glamour. The tourist industry suffered immediately following the civil unrest, with hotels, tour operators and other travel-related services showing a 75 percent loss, according to officials with the Los Angeles Convention and Visitors Bureau.

Tourism is the second highest industry in Southern California, generating more than $7 billion annually. The city's tattered image could undercut travel industry revenue by as much as $2 billion this year, said Gary Sherwin, a spokesman for the bureau.

The riots could have a particularly large impact on the international travel market, where tourists tend to have greater concerns about safety when visiting urban America.

Korea has issued a travel advisory warning its citizens to postpone visits to Los Angeles. Three of Japan's largest travel companies have canceled more than 400 tours to Southern California.

"We are and have been for several years struggling with the question of personal safety," Sherwin said. "This does not help our case . . . especially with CNN broadcasting pictures of a truck driver being pulled from his car and beaten senseless all over the world. We are going to have to try and prevent turning a social disaster into a widescale economic disaster."

For now, the workers left unemployed have overwhelmed unemployment offices and county-run disaster centers, where people are lining up at 6 a.m. looking for relief—financial and sometimes emotional.

Soon Hae left a Mother's Day celebration held in her honor Sunday to visit the disaster relief center in Koreatown, seeking counseling for a husband who had been jabbering incoherently for several days since his gift store was looted and damaged by fire.

On the other side of town, Joyce Washington marched into another disaster center with grocery receipts in hand to seek reimbursement for the food she lost in a three-day power outage during the unrest. "It's bad enough that I lost my job in all this mess, I lost a week's worth of groceries too, and sure as I am standing here someone is going to pay me back," Washington said as she waited in line.

EXHIBIT 1

OFFICE OF THE MAJORITY LEADER,
Washington, DC, May 11, 1992.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We commend you for visiting Los Angeles last week. The presence and concern of the President are important to Americans in a time of crisis.

The events in Los Angeles have focused national attention on the serious economic and social problems in urban areas.

The conditions present in Los Angeles exist in most of our nation's urban areas. They present a challenge to our society. That requires an immediate response to the situation in Los Angeles and a longer term strategy that addresses the fundamental problems in many of our cities.

The creation of jobs, and the opportunity and hope that come with a job, are vital to the recovery of Los Angeles and the renewal of our urban areas. The personal safety of residents of urban areas is crucial to the rejuvenation and vibrancy of neighborhoods.

We know that we and you disagree on some aspects of this matter.

Americans undoubtedly also have different perspectives on the best approaches to these problems. but on one thing we can all agree: No one benefits if differences of opinion paralyze our society's response.

We therefore propose the following actions and invite you to join with us in gaining their enactment.

You have publicly committed $600 million in assistance to those hurt by this disaster, through the Small Business Administration (SBA) and the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). We support your proposal. But, as you know, without supplemental funding, neither the SBA nor FEMA will have enough money to pay for disasters already declared and also help the people of Los Angeles. We ask that you join us in supporting greatly needed funding for SBA and FEMA, as well as for a summer youth jobs program under the Job Training Partnership Act.

We agree that arson, looting and destruction damage the community as surely as any of the underlying causes of urban unrest. The conference report on the crime control bill has been approved in the House and awaits only Senate passage and your signature to become law.

It includes valuable provisions for community-based policing, state and local law enforcement assistance, a provision that will begin to control the proliferating urban arms race that threatens our police, and a range of higher federal penalties for drug-related offenses as well as for capital offenses, including the death penalty. It has the endorse-

ment of every major police organization in the country. Its enactment can send a valuable and immediate signal to all the people of our cities and suburbs that the personal security of law-abiding citizens and the protection of private property are a central element of economic revival in urban areas.

We propose that several provisions of the tax measure which Congress passed and you vetoed in March, be considered again and enacted. These are (1) the creation of urban enterprise zones; and (2) the extension of several expiring tax programs which utilize the private sector to help create jobs, provide better housing, and encourage investments in economically disadvantaged areas.

The bill providing 13 additional weeks of unemployment insurance that we worked out together in February expires on June 13th. We should ensure that unemployment compensation is available for those who are unemployed. Only 40 percent of the jobless qualify for compensation today. When less than 50 percent of jobless workers in a recession qualify for unemployment benefits, the system is not working as intended. We ask you to join us in extending and fixing the unemployment compensation system.

People need jobs. The Surface Transportation Act of 1991 provided the largest public works authorization in our history. Nearly all of the required money is in a Trust Fund. States have indicated that they could use another $1 billion on approved projects this year. States will be able to spend the full $25.7 billion authorized for the next fiscal year. We urge you to revise your FY 1993 budget request to provide for the full authorization. This would increase available funds by $3.6 billion.

In addition, the Housing Reauthorization bill now pending in Congress, including the Community Development Block Grant, and the Head Start Summer Program, will create jobs and empower urban residents by providing increased affordable housing and expanding local community development activities.

We can improve on this beginning, first, with consultation, among Members of the Congressional Black Caucus, community leaders in Los Angeles and other affected urban areas; and, second, by recognizing that other long-term measures, now stalled because of politics or paralysis, must be broken free and moved to the front of the nation's agenda. Specifically, we refer to the need for cooperation between the Executive Branch and Congress on behalf of broad-based economic growth that will provide jobs, opportunity and justice for all Americans. It has often been said, and we would do well to remember today, that a good job is the best social program for everyone in our society.

These measures, by themselves, will not solve all the problems. Much more will be needed. But we believe they represent an important start.

Without order, there cannot be the stable communities that nurture stable families. The foundation for personal responsibility is formed only within a stable family structure. There is a broad core of agreement between us on which we can build, and we write you in the same spirit you expressed in a news conference before leaving to visit Los Angeles.

You told Americans then that the challenge is not one of assigning blame, but whether we, as a country, have done enough for those left behind. You said you were not satisfied that we had. We share these sentiments.

Americans need to know that their President and Congress, whatever their differences, can work together to meet urgent national needs. We want to do so. We believe we can. We believe incentives for economic growth and restoration; the urgent need to combat crime and random violence; and a deeper commitment by government, business, and individuals to constructive, supportive family policy; all these constitute a common ground.

We invite you to join us in moving expeditiously in a bipartisan fashion on these important initiatives.

Sincerely,

GEORGE J. MITCHELL.
THOMAS S. FOLEY.
RICHARD A. GEPHARDT.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARKIN). The Senator reserves the remainder of his time. The Senator from New York is recognized.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I believe I have been asked by the distinguished chairman to speak for 10 minutes in a sequence he has organized this morning on urban affairs.

Mr. RIEGLE. I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized for 10 minutes.

HELP FOR OUR CITIES

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Twenty-seven years ago in the Journal America, which is published by the Jesuits in New York—this was 1965—I wrote that—

From the wild Irish slums of the 19th-century Eastern seaboard to the riot-torn suburbs of Los Angeles, there is one unmistakable lesson in American history: a community that allows a large number of young men to grow up in broken families, dominated by women, never acquiring any stable relationship to male authority, never acquiring any set of rational expectations about the future—that community asks for and gets chaos. Crime, violence, unrest, disorder—most particularly the furious, unrestrained lashing out at the whole social structure—that is not only to be expected; it is very near to inevitable. And it is richly deserved.

There is no great purpose in simply restating that observation, save to say that it was true in 1965 in the aftermath of the Watts riots and it is true today in the aftermath of the Los Angeles riots. What I find a little difficult to understand—or to welcome, perhaps, is the term—is our sudden rediscovery of a problem, a situation that has been there for 30 years and has steadily gotten worse.

Those of us who have tried to make that argument are only very intermittently heard. The Washington Post only this morning finds room on the Metro page to tell us that five teenagers were shot in a drive-by shooting yesterday afternoon near the District's Eastern High School about 30 minutes after school let out. Eastern High School, Mr. President, is about 20 blocks from here. Five young black males were shot by other, we cannot doubt, classmates. One young lady who was standing by was shot, incidentally. The other four were in a car. They drove away. The police and the medical workers finally found them sitting on a step. I quote this passage:

"You don't need to know anything else from me—I'm gonna take care of this myself," the rescue worker quoted an 18-year-old with a bullet lodged in his head as saying when police tried to question him about the gunmen.

This riot has been going on most every night and every weekend for 30 years. It is not a racial issue; it is a class issue. I tried to make that point in the journal America 27 years ago. For what it is worth, in 1809 an editor in Pittsburgh suggested that a charitable fund be organized to buy 12 houses in Pittsburgh, such that one could be burned down each month by the local rioting community and a civic festival could be made out of it instead of the random violence that these slums have always had. We discover them intermittently. We do nothing about them partly because we do not know a great deal.

The other day, the head of the Congressional Budget Office was quoted in an article by Mr. Rosenbaum saying that the dynamics of demography, economics, and other matters are such that we have no idea what to do about this situation; none. Mr. President, I will ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks. Our head of CBO, to whom we have delegated all the other mysteries of our age and our work, tells us, "Senators, you do not know what you are doing; you do not know what you are doing."

I do not know that I disagree. Why do we not ask Mr. Reischauer to come and explain to us what he meant when he said, "I have no idea what to do."

At the same time, the most important thing to observe at this moment is that we have no resources. If resources are an issue, we do not have any. And it is no accident, Mr. President, that we do not have any, but a deliberate act of Government, in which this body acquiesced, which this body to this day seemingly cannot understand.

Let me give you, if I may, a brief account of a time when I was, for a brief period, staff director of the Urban Affairs Council of the White House of President Nixon. His first action when he came to office was to establish an Urban Affairs Council. In 8 month's time, with the help of George Shultz, then Secretary of Labor; Robert Finch, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare; George Romney, Secretary of Housing and Urban Development—great, great men in office—the President put together a set of proposals to deal with the urban problems.

May I tell you what those proposals were, Mr. President? The first was guaranteed income. A guaranteed income, I say to the Senator from Michigan. We first have a guaranteed income for everybody. Then we would have revenue sharing with the Federal Government and the cities. Then we would completely revise our job training.

Such was the hubris of this body, this Senate, and the wild miscalculations of

the so-called advocacy groups, that we turned down the guaranteed income as not big enough. The idea will not be touched upon in this debate. Revenue sharing did pass, but then we lost in the 1980's.

There was an interesting thing. I wrote a book about the debate in the White House and in the administration over a guaranteed income called "The Politics of a Guaranteed Income," a 559-page book describing Arthur Burns' principal opposition to this idea. He was counsel to the President. In 559 pages—I would like my friend from Michigan to hear this—in 559 pages, there turned out to be 34 lines having to do with the cost of guaranteed income. The question was whether you wanted to spend money. The money was a given if you thought the idea was a good one.

In 1981. people came to this city and deliberately set about destroying the capacity of the Federal Government to respond to these issues with anything like the resources that might be needed. David Stockman was part of that effort. Starve the beast it was called. But then he realized what was happening and he said: The Reagan administration's refusal to accept the need for new revenues when the need became obvious "was a willful act of ignorance and grotesque irresponsibility." He said: "In the entire 20th century history of the Nation, there has been nothing to rival it.

At that time, Mr. President, I would come to this floor and talk about that measure. Unrivaled in the entire 20th century history as Mr. Stockman says, an act of ignorance and grotesque irresponsibility. I would come to this floor and talk about it and say it was willful. They had an idea, starve the beast. And no one understood a word we were saying. It was beyond the reach of our imaginations. In his absolutely magnificent book, "Sleepwalking Through History," Haynes Johnson has a footnote about Stockman. He says:

Moynihan was the first to charge that the Reagan administration "consciously and deliberately brought about" higher deficits to force congressional domestic cuts. Moynihan was denounced and then proven correct—except that the cuts to achieve balanced budgets were never made, and deficits ballooned ever higher.

Mr. RIEGLE. Will the Senator yield at that point? If the Senator will yield, I recall another part to that story. My understanding is that when they did the first economic models of the supply-side economic approach that the Senator just described, the huge tax cuts, the notion that we would have this massive increase in revenues to Government, and so forth, that the numbers went into the computer, the computer ran, came back out and said, no, we would have a disaster, we would have huge deficits, that the Government could not meet its basic needs. Because it did not work, they went back in and basically jimmied the computer; in other words, they changed the program in such a way that the computer was told to come out with a favorable answer to make the numbers look good even though they knew, in fact, this would not set off the kind of economic miracle they were advertising.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. It is very important. This is a very important subject. If we do not get this straight, all the rest is flawed. Ask Mr. Darman. He was there. Mr. Stockman, in his book says he realized and he said, "Oh, my God, it is a disaster." That if all of the Reagan plan was implemented you might get more real economic growth but no gain in Federal revenues.

Then he said inspiration came. If we have that disaster, it will force the craven politicians of the "Second Republic," a phrase they used, to cut the welfare state to the bone, to get rid of it. And they will have to cut.

Then a third stage, he said. They did not cut. Reagan would not cut. He describes those scenes where he would give Mr. Reagan a quiz on a program. He would say this is a program, this is what it does, this is what it costs, should we get rid of it, keep it as it is, cut a little. The President would say cut a little bit. And then he would say oh, my God, we are going into this deficit $50 billion, $100 billion, $200 billion, as far as the eye could see. He was wrong; $400 billion, as far as the eye could see.

Ask Mr. Darman. He was there. He said when they decided they would not get new revenues and they would not cut old programs, that it was a willful act of ignorance and grotesque irresponsibility. I quote Mr. Stockman, a member of the Cabinet: "In the entire 20th century history of the Nation there has been nothing to rival it."

Why not ask Mr. Darman?

I thank the Senator.

Mr. RIEGLE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the aforementioned article be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

[From the New York Times, May 10, 1992]

CONCERN, CASH, BUT NO ACCORD ON URBAN WOES

(By David E. Rosenbaum)

WASHINGTON, May 9.—Despite trillions of dollars spent over the years on thousands of different Government social programs, politicians and scholars are no closer to agreement today than they were a generation ago about the best ways to lift people out of poverty and make the cities better places to live

Experts at universities and research institutes and in Government agree that if a consensus could be reached about which programs have worked, the country would embrace those solutions, regardless of cost. But enormous ideological and political differences inhibit such a consensus, and the gulf has widened in the aftermath of the riots in Los Angeles.

"The position all along," said Donald F. Kettl, a political scientist at the University of Wisconsin, "is that we cannot agree on what it means that something works or doesn't work. The goals are always multiple and confused and vague. Conservatives look at it from one perspective, liberals from another. What people at the national level thought were mistakes, people at the local level often liked. Everything is just much more complicated than we ever thought."

In a few instances over the years a consensus emerged about what needed to be done, and in those cases the country responded. Take the elderly.

Thirty years ago, half of all Americans over 65 had no medical insurance, a third of the aged lived in poverty and millions avoided destitution only by living with their children.

Since then, with little complaint or political controversy, people's taxes have been repeatedly raised and the money has been spent on the elderly to the point where Social Security retirement benefits, health insurance under Medicare, nursing home payments under Medical and additional income supplements to the aged poor amount to well over one-third of the entire Federal budget.

Today, nearly everyone over 65 has medical insurance, the poverty rate among the elderly is substantially lower than it is for Americans as a whole and a vast majority of older people are financially self-sufficient.

The attacks from the Bush Administration in the last week to the contrary, the programs of the 1960's and 1970's have had other distinct successes.

Before the civil rights laws of 1964 and 1965, no major American city had ever had a black mayor, and there were only a couple of hundred black elected officials nationwide at all levels of government. More than 90 percent of the black adults in some cities were not registered to vote.

Now, blacks vote in about the same proportion as whites, and New York, Los Angeles, Chicago, Philadelphia, Detroit, Atlanta and Cleveland are among the many cities that have or have had black mayors.

In the early 60's, only one-third of the children 3 to 5 years old attended nursery school of kindergarten. Now, preschool programs are available to almost all children those ages.

Still, few people would argue that the nation's cities are better off. Old problems like poverty, crime, illegitimacy and violence seem to have worsened. New plagues like AIDS, crack and homelessness are pervasive.

So if the social programs succeeded in some respects, they failed in many others. More important, central questions increasingly seem to become irreconcilable the longer they are debated: how to strike a balance between work and welfare, to insure poor children a solid education, to put the jobless to work, to provide adequate housing for all, to fight crime while preserving civil liberties.

LEADERS ARE AT A LOSS

Americans and the politicians they elect would love to have the inner cities flourish and to allow the people who live there to enjoy the fruits that nourish most Americans, said Robert D. Reischauer, director of the Congressional Budget Office and Congress' chief staff economist.

The difficulty, said Mr. Reischauer, whose academic specialty is social policy, is that no one knows how to do it. "The economic and demographic and political forces that

have been undermining the vitality of our inner cities are so overwhelming," he said, "that policies of the sort we've engaged in really can't stem the tide."

Nearly all politicians and scholars agree that the main Federal welfare program, Aid to Families with Dependent Children, has been at best seriously flawed and at worst disastrous. Almost no one defends rules that force families to split to qualify for welfare before they are eligible for Medicaid, the health care program for the poor.

But conservatives and liberals disagree so fundamentally on what a welfare program should be that many attempts to reform A.F.D.C. have failed for lack of consensus.

WELFARE'S CENTRAL CONFLICT

Conservatives worry most about poor people's becoming dependent on welfare generation after generation and never bothering to fend for themselves. Liberals are most concerned that benefits are not high enough to enable the poor to live in dignity.

Almost everyone agrees that those who can work should work. but jobs in the inner cities are scarce, and a basic conflict has never been resolved: On one hand, if welfare benefits are withdrawn when poor people take jobs, then there is little incentive to work, because the difference between what they can earn and their welfare payments is small. On the other hand, if they are allowed to keep a good part of their welfare checks when they go to work, then they have considerably more income than people they are working with side by side who have never been on welfare.

One reason Federal aid to the elderly has been so universally accepted is that the aged are not expected to work, so the trade-off between work and benefits does not arise.

Like many other conservatives, Stuart M. Butler, director of domestic policy studies at the Heritage Foundation, a Washington research institute, believes that the Aid to Families program is so fraught with misguided incentives that it has poisoned almost all Government social programs.

BRIGHT SPOTS

"Walk around the inner cities if you dare to, and all you see are people on the street corners not expected to do anything," Mr. Butler said. "The men would be crazy to look after their families and the women would be foolish to take a job because the welfare benefits would run out."

But even most ardent conservatives concede that some Government programs have basically been successes, like Head Start for poor preschool children and the Job Corps, the residential work-training program for the most seriously disadvantaged youth.

And other scholars have found small but valuable programs around the country. One, in Chicago, has helped thousands of poor black families move from the inner cities to better lives in federally subsidized housing in the suburbs. Another, called Youth Build, now in eight cities, has poor young men learn construction skills by restoring buildings. These programs rely on at least some Federal money, but they are locally organized and might not be applicable nationwide.

Some Government programs have distinctly failed. No one today defends the high-rise public housing projects that were built in the 1950's.

WHEN GOOD YIELDED BAD

Other programs had unintended adverse consequences. The urban renewal grants of the 1950's and 60's placed modern buildings in the downtowns of cities, but in the process neighborhoods were destroyed and families were displaced. In the end, much more housing was lost than gained.

And the interstate highway program, the most important public works project in American history, facilitated the abandonment of the cities.

Many people now live in better housing because of Federal aid like rent subsidies, but the money has always been so short that only a small portion of poor people could benefit. On balance, developers and landlords have probably been the real winners from Federal housing programs.

Employment training programs have also had mixed results. They have been especially beneficial for many women but have failed most young black men. Most of the jobs programs have been guilty of "creaming," giving training to the best-qualified applicants, who would probably have succeeded without the special training.

"The problems are just so intractable," said Tom Joe, director of the nonprofit Center for the Study of Social Policy in Washington." "I hate to say it, but the programs that work, the ones that really work, are those that get people out of the inner city."

Mr. HOLLINGS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan has 13 minutes remaining.

Mr. RIEGLE. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from South Carolina.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina is recognized for 3 minutes.

(The remarks of Mr. HOLLINGS pertaining to the introduction of S. 2702 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan has 9 minutes and 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. RIEGLE. I yield that to the Senator from Maine, the majority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished majority leader is recognized.

BICENTENNIAL OF THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY

Mr. MITCHELL. I am pleased to join my colleagues today in marking the 200th anniversary of the formation of the Democratic Party of the United States. I commend Senator SANFORD, the distinguished Senator from North Carolina, who has organized this commemorative occasion. He has come to symbolize, in his personal integrity and commitment to the ideal of equal justice and equal opportunity for all Americans, what I believe is best about the Democratic Party and the democratic process in our society.

The Democratic Party is the world's oldest political party. There is good reason for that. The reason is that the Democratic Party is an inclusive, diverse party whose principles are drawn from the same roots that guided the men who wrote our Constitution.

Our Nation has seen enormous change in the two centuries since its founding. The vision of the Founders was profound as to the structure of Government. The vision of the Founders about the nature of our society was limited by their times. As a result, we have a founding document, a Constitution, which is clear as to guiding principles, silent on specific policies.

The Democratic Party, born in the same years as the Constitution itself, created by the very same men—James Madison was the principal author of the Constitution and a founder of the Democratic Party—was endowed from its origins with the moral clarity and democratic principles which underlie the Constitution.

Our Constitution does not directly dictate specific social or economic policies. That is a task of the political parties. And that is the task the Democratic Party has performed for the Nation since its beginnings.

The principles of political liberty, democratic inclusion, the principles of diversity, of the greatest good for the greatest number, are the principles that have shaped the Democratic Party at its best.

Our party's diversity has sometimes been the source of dissension inside the party and out. Some claim that only a firmly fixed, inflexible set of goals can provide a guideline for a political party. Others have suggested that diversity of opinion reflects a lack of philosophy and absence of clarity and purpose.

Those criticisms sound plausible. Will Rogers got a good laugh when he said, "I am not a Member of an organized political party—I'm a Democrat." But they are mistaken, because our diversity and differences are one of our strengths as a party. Our principles depend on no fashionable temporary philosophy of economics or Government, no litmus test to satisfy one or another faction within or without.

Our guiding principles are derived from the enduring strengths and traditions of the American nation.

Democratic principles are the principles of an equal voice for all participants.

Democratic principles respect the liberty of individual conscience and tolerance for the liberties of others. The Democratic principles guide us to seek a common ground with all Americans, not to exclude those who are different.

Democratic principles guide us in seeking to extend a helping hand to the vulnerable in our society, for we know what injures any one American injures the Nation.

The Democratic Party throughout its history and our Nation's history has been the party of expanded opportunity.

It is the Democratic Party which champions a broader franchise which encourages every American to vote, including those who have never before voted.

It is the Democratic Party which has worked to vindicate the civil rights of black Americans, Asian Americans, and all others excluded from the full privileges of citizenship.

Today it's fashionable for many to talk about opportunity. But Democrats have been expanding real opportunities for more than 50 years.

Within the lifetimes of Members of the Senate, 9-year-old American boys worked in coal mines and 10-year-old girls worked in textile mills. Democrats changed that. We passed child labor laws and now American boys and girls are in school, where they belong.

Within the lifetimes of many in the Senate, most Americans who reached the age of 65 could look forward only to a few years of poverty and misery, and the loss of self-respect.

Democrats changed that. We passed Social Security and Medicare to help elderly Americans keep their dignity and self-respect.

Within the lifetimes of most of the Members of the Senate, American rivers were open sewers and the sky in some cities was dark with pollution. We Democrats changed that. We passed environmental laws that cleaned up our rivers and began the cleanup of our air.

Less than five decades ago, within the lifetime of almost every Member of the Senate, American Armed Forces, the men and women who braved the battles and fought for our Nation, often at the risk of their lives, served in regiments that were segregated. A Democratic President changed that.

Like any human organization, the Democratic Party has sometimes betrayed its principles, sometimes strayed from its central beliefs, sometimes made mistakes at times. But in the longer span of American history, no institution, no organization has done as much, as consistently and as effectively to preserve the principles of democratic representative government on which our Nation is founded; none has done more to promote the grand instruction in the Preamble of the Constitution: "* * * to establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defence, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity.* * *"

It is the Democratic Party which seeks today to establish the recognition that the rights of women are as securely protected by the Constitution as the rights of men.

It has been the Democratic Party which fought to empower the workers of America, to ensure that they share in the material prosperity of America.

It was the Democratic Party which has fought for the opportunity for the children of plumbers and bricklayers to go to college with the sons and daughters of industrialists and Governors.

We are not perfect. Challenges face us in the next century that we cannot even envision today. The needs of Americans in the next decade will not be the same as their needs in the last. Change in the larger world will be reflected by change at home.

But the enduring principles of political liberty, inclusion, respect for diversity, the fidelity to our founding document are an assurance that the Democratic Party of the future will respond to those unknown challenges as it has to those in our past.

Mr. President, I yield the floor. I again commend the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. FOWLER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia is recognized under his own for up to 5 minutes.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as if in morning business for 10 minutes, under the time of the Senator from North Carolina, if necessary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina has 1 hour of time reserved.

Mr. SANFORD. The Senator from Georgia certainly has as much time as the Senator from Georgia needs, approximately 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia is recognized for 10 minutes on the time reserved for the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. FOWLER. I thank the Chair. I thank the Senator from North Carolina, and join the majority leader in commending his leadership in arranging his tribute to the 200th anniversary of the Democratic Party.

Our party, Mr. President, is one of our country's oldest institutions. Founded 200 years ago by Thomas Jefferson and James Madison, it is the oldest political party on our planet.

It seems to me this would be reason enough to pause and reflect, but I do submit that the principles on which this party was founded are more important, more relevant, more crucial than ever to our country, and indeed to the world in which we live.

I do not think we have to look far back in the history to see this. The people, the countries of the world, from Central America to the former Soviet Union, are embracing greater citizen participation in government. They are rejecting those who would covet crowns and mitres—as in the words of Jefferson—when they covet those titles and privileges under the cover of communism or in some other guise.

We also know that the first Republicans in this country where what we now call Democrats. Our party adopted the name used as an epithet, applied with contempt to the Jeffersonians, by the more aloof Federalists. Our party adopted the name of Democrat as a sign of pride that we stand on principle with the people, that we are the party created 200 years ago to give the people greater voice and greater control of their representative government.

It is more important than ever that the party of Jefferson and Jackson hold to its traditions. It is a tradition we can be proud to be part of. It is unfortunately a tradition which was recently attacked by the President of the United States, and we should not hesitate to defend it.

The President blamed the problems of America today on many Democratic programs of 30 years ago. There is no doubt that plans and programs must change with the times as our people change and our world changes. But I prefer to stand by Lyndon Johnson's principles, the use of a period of prosperity in our country to wage a war on poverty, to try to do something for the less fortunate of those, our brethren. I think those efforts compare favorably with what we saw in the 1980's, where our potential prosperity as Americans was applied to no purpose.

I would stand by the Democratic Presidents of our century: Woodrow Wilson, the first American President with a true world vision; Franklin Roosevelt, who applied the power of public office and public institutions to bring our country out of economic decline; John F. Kennedy, champion of public spirit, and public service; Jimmy Carter, from my State, a model of citizenship—in or out of the Presidency.

I think this kind of purpose and principle is a far cry from the cause of some of our country's problems. I think if we take this time to look at the roots of the Democratic Party, it will tell us much about the problems we face in Government today. I know it will show us that the history of our party is interwoven with the history of our country, that we have risen and fallen with its fortunes and shared its vitality.

The Democratic Party was founded to increase direct popular control over the Government, to widen the right of suffrage, and to limit the power of the Federal Government.

Any Senator who holds a town meeting in his or her State today will tell you these issues are very much alive with the people of our country, who think Government is too far away. They want to bring their representatives back to the communities they represent.

It is very much alive on the floor of this institution, as we seek to limit the influence of big money campaign contributions on the conduct of Government.

It is very much alive as we look for ways to bring people back into the voting booths, those people who believe in self-government, but who are disenchanted with the system as it stands. These are the important issues for our Republic, just as they were 200 years ago.

When we look at the sources of popular discontent—which none of us in this body would deny, and that we all

must answer to the people back home, the people of our country—we may indeed see social programs that need to be revamped and revitalized. That does not mean it is time to ignore our social conscience. It means we have to invest our public resources more wisely to better our country and, yes, that is the tradition of the Democratic Party.

For the last decade or more, unfortunately, we have seen a society where the rich grew richer, the poor grew poorer, where citizens drifted further from their Government, which, as I noted, they believed was run too much by campaign contributions.

I know that we can profit from what Andrew Jackson said about the role of Government in bringing about a better society, and one that will not breed disgruntlement or erupt in unrest.

Here are Andrew Jackson's words:

> Distinctions in society will always exist under every just government. Equality of talents, of education, of wealth, cannot be produced by human institutions. For the full enjoyment of the gifts of heaven and the fruits of superior industry, economy and virtue, every man is equally entitled to protection by law. But when the laws undertake to add to those natural advantages artificial distinctions—to grant titles, gratuities and exclusive privileges to make the rich richer and the potent more powerful—the humbler members of society * * * who have neither the time nor the means of seeking favor for themselves, have a right to complain of the injustice of government.

I do not think I need to add anything to prove what a vital force the Democratic Party has been in the development of the values of our country, or what a model it has been for other countries striving to bring about just representation in their Government.

This is a great tradition, a great heritage, one that all Americans can be proud to be part of and one which those of us who serve today must strive to be worthy.

I thank my friend from North Carolina.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

A DAY WORTH REMEMBERING

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Georgia for his very wise comments and his observations on what the Democratic Party has meant to this Nation. I certainly thank the majority leader for the comments that he has brought to this Chamber.

Mr. President, it was 200 years ago today that the wheels of our two-party system were set into motion. On May 13, 1792, under the leadership of Thomas Jefferson, the author of the Declaration of Independence, and James Madison, who was central in the writing of the Constitution and the Bill of Rights, the oldest popular party in the history of the United States, and indeed in the history of the world, was created, and with it, the foundation of the two-party concept in America.

In this day of disenchantment with political parties, political outrage with congressional Members, both Republican and Democratic alike, I believe there is a more urgent need than ever to examine the history of both parties, to come to a clearer understanding as to why our country has chosen to govern largely through the two-party system since the birth of these parties hundreds of years ago.

We have stuck with it, and why? Because the concept evolved into the best system available to ensure free government, government "by the people and for the people." To be certain it is not flawless, as is witnessed by the recent scandals spread throughout the newspapers and the public outcries of voters to throw the rascals out.

We have political newcomers and virtual unknowns joining in the Presidential and congressional races, declaring no party allegiance as proof of their virtue, and being touted as heroes by those who know little about their actual ideas and proposals for change or governing.

So why has the Democratic Party held on for 200 years, and the Republican Party for nearly that long? I believe it is due to a commonness of goals. Thomas Jefferson described the goals of his new Democratic Party as focusing on "the increase in direct popular control over the government, the widening of the right of suffrage, the limitation of the power of the Federal Government, and the conservation of the powers reserved for the States by the Constitution."

That is what he wrote as he established why he thought we needed this concept of political parties, groupings of people with differing ideas about how government should be run.

Today, we still strive to find the best balance between the States and the Federal Government, between the leaders and the public.

Another powerful reason for the staying power of our two-party system is an obvious one: Government benefits from having a good argument. This system has worked quite successfully to ensure that there is some give and take in our Government, that the minority cannot simply be steamrollered by the majority opinion. The governments that have 10 or 15 parties have not worked as well. The two-party system also ensures a degree of consensus, assures that a wide array of views are sure to be heard, instead of lost in the din.

In his book, "A Democrat Looks at His Party," Dean Acheson wrote the following about the Democratic Party, which I believe applies to the Republican Party as well:

> If all of the interests which are comprised in the Democratic party were fragmented into separate parties and spent their impact directly on the legislative body, the result might well be either the irresolution and narrowness of electoral will * * * or the submersion of these many interests by a dominant one. * * * But the Democratic party performs through its own processes a preliminary accommodation and regulation of various and different interests before the legislative process begins, or as part of it, and by this develops policies and programs national in their scope and base. There is another highly relevant characteristic of this diverse association covering so many different areas, interests, types of supporters, and points of view. A personality which can gain acceptance of his leadership in this party is apt to be a strong one, one calculated to win national acceptance and one equipped to exercise national leadership.

Therefore, we must conclude that a party must not be so exclusive or represent interests so isolated that it excludes all others; it must be large enough to incorporate many different viewpoints if it can hope to wage any influence or garner wide acceptance for the governing process.

These ideas are hardly new, Mr. President. They are the same thoughts that provoked Thomas Jefferson and James Madison to become leaders in the movement to develop a party dedicated to the betterment of and the fair and equitable treatment of the general populace, as opposed to a government concerned only with the rights of those who could afford to get involved. The principles that began the Democratic Party are the same principles of freedom and democracy that are at the very heart of our country as a democratic nation.

It is for this reason that I believe it is truly worthwhile to recognize and appreciate the full value of the 200th anniversary of the Democratic Party. The birth of the Jeffersonian Democratic Party should not be looked upon as a historical event to be celebrated exclusively by today's Democrats. This is not simply a chance for the Democrats to slap each other on the back and congratulate ourselves on what a fine party we are. This is a chance for Democrats and Republicans alike to reflect on the history of our political party system, to trace its roots and origins, and to pay tribute to our forefathers who had the foresight to create a political system in which all voices, no matter how large or small, could be heard.

The evolution of the Democratic Party can be traced back to the early 1790's. In a letter to President George Washington, then-Secretary of State Thomas Jefferson first acknowledged the emergence of his new political party, writing:

> I have determined to make the subject of a letter what for some time past has been a

subject of inquietude to my mind, without having found a good occasion of disburthening itself to you in conversation, during the busy scenes which occupied you here. Perhaps, too, you may be able in your present situation, or on the road, to give it more time and reflection than you could do here at any moment. * * * The republican party, who wish to preserve the government in its present form, are fewer in number; they are fewer even when joined by the two, three, or half dozen anti-federalists, who, though they dare not avow it, are still opposed to any General Government; but, being less so to a republican than a monarchial one, they naturally join those whom they think pursuing the lesser evil.

By referring to the Republican Party—now known as the Democratic Party—in his letter, Jefferson confirmed any suspicions that the growing number of opponents of the Federalist Party were indeed forming their own party. The Jeffersonian Republicans, led by Thomas Jefferson and James Madison, while staunch opponents of the Federalist Party, did not adhere to the views of the anti-Federalists, whose members were opposed to any general government. Jefferson and Madison desired an organized form of government, but one which balanced power between the leaders and the general public, allowing the States to exercise as much authority as possible without the interference of the Federal Government.

The seeds for discontent had been sown when newly elected President Washington appointed Alexander Hamilton as his Secretary of the Treasury and Thomas Jefferson as his Secretary of State. The two Cabinet members experienced fundamental differences of opinion in their interpretations of the Constitution and their ideas of how the Federal Government should be run. Hamilton was a strong advocate of an aristocratic Federal Government, while Jefferson believed that such a government would only serve to make the elite prosper, while keeping down the general citizen and the general hardworking new citizen of a new nation.

Jefferson's courage in moving away from Hamilton's ideas of governing is significant not only because of its link to the beginnings of the Democratic Party; it is also important for the reason that before President Washington's first term, there had been no real political parties. Washington had not run for the Presidency on a party platform, nor had he adopted any political party to which he pledged allegiance. The formation of political parties had been discouraged as divisive and as vehicles for corruption.

In fact, President Washington had spoken out on this very issue. Party spirit, he feared, "serves to distract the Public Councils and enfeeble the Public administration. It agitates the Community with ill-founded jealousies and false alarms, kindles the animosity of one party against another, forments occasionally riots and insurrection. It opens the door to foreign influence and corruption, which finds a facilitated access to the government itself through the channels of party passions." He did note, however, that there was "an opinion that parties in free countries are useful checks upon the Administration of the Government and serve to keep alive the spirit of Liberty. This within certain limits is probably true. * * * But in those of the popular character, in Governments purely elective, it is a spirit not to be encouraged. * * * A fire not to be quenched; it demands a uniform vigilance to prevent its bursting into a flame, lest instead of warming it should consume."

Now we can look back in the history and see that the irony in Washington's speech, of course, is that it was considered by many to be a partisan and Federalist-inspired speech in itself—it was indeed one emerging party speaking of and to another emerging party—because it served as yet another marker of the growing strength of the now Democratic Party, the Republicans, as a power to be reckoned with. Indeed, we needed this kind of exchange between groups favoring different points of view.

Party lines were being clearly drawn and defined around this time, and the beginnings of a workable political party system, one which challenged and debated all sides to an issue, were falling firmly into place.

Thus, 200 years of the Democratic Party began, and shortly thereafter, our Nation was well into a two-party system that continues to this day.

What then, of our political system today, and all of the anger, frustration, and discouragement being vented in the papers and in the polls? Is this two-party system on its last leg? Is it sick beyond repair? On the contrary—all indications, in my opinion, seem to be that this system is alive and well and kicking and all right.

We cannot imagine the kind of disorder that would come if it were not for the concept of political parties and, although a great many writers are suggesting that the party is over, that no longer are parties needed, more than ever a nation that gets so much information from an ever-broadening system of media, needs to have the kind of discipline for organizing different opinions that the party system provides.

Because we do hear the voices of our citizens, saying "We won't take any more of your astronomical campaign budgets." "We won't stand for congressional perks." We are forced to look in the mirror, check our behavior and stay in line with the will of the people. If we do not, then these same voices can and will mobilize their votes and send us packing—and that, Mr. President, is as it should be.

"What about modern day partisan bickering?" you may ask, and you would be right to ask. It is true that perfectly good bills have lived and died at the hands of petty partisan politicking on both sides of the two-party system. I have no remedy to cure this problem. But I would be inclined to argue that the benefits of debating out an issue—being forced to view a piece of legislation with new eyes, from a new point-of-view, and perhaps even hammering out a deal between the two parties—outweigh the disadvantages of such a system. I am also convinced that the majority of Senators and Congressmen are committed to working toward amicable solutions of legislative disputes, and are as frustrated by political stalemates as is the rest of the American public.

So my message to those concerned about the direction of our two-party system is this—examine the history of our political system in America and you will come away, I believe, with hope, not discouragement. It may not be perfect, but it is working, and it has worked throughout our history.

The celebration of this bicentennial is not about partisan politics—it is about the political party system as a whole in America, and it is about the debt that our current national political system owes to Thomas Jefferson, owes to James Madison, owes to the emerging party in 1792, first called Republican and then called Democratic, but always looking to expand Government to serve all of the people. This is a day, Mr. President, well worth remembering for all Americans.

Mr. President, there are several other Senators who have indicated a desire to speak during this period. I simply will say a few words extemporaneously awaiting their arrival. I will be ready to relinquish the floor immediately if there is someone else who cares to speak on this subject.

Mr. President, I have brought us up to the Great Depression and the beginning of Franklin Roosevelt. I would like to, now, yield to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee, whatever time he cares to use.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. AKAKA). The Senator from North Carolina has 23 minutes left.

The Chair recognizes the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SASSER].

Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, I thank my friend from North Carolina for yielding to me. He has brought us historically up to the time of one of the greatest Presidents in the history of the Nation; to the time of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, certainly the greatest President of the 20th century.

But I am going to take us back, Mr. President, about 100 years, to the time of another great President. That President was Andrew Jackson of Tennessee.

Before I do, let me say just a word about what is occurring here today.

We are discussing the history of the oldest political party in the United

States, many say the oldest ongoing political party in Western democracy. The roots of that political party, the Democratic Party, reach back to Thomas Jefferson. Jefferson was a man who held a deep and abiding faith in this new, young Republic and in its people. He had a faith in economic justice, a faith in the ability of the American men and women to determine their destiny and to shape their own country.

Thomas Jefferson was a man of extraordinary brilliance and almost clairvoyant perception. I well remember—and I am sure the distinguished Senator from North Carolina will remember—back in the 1960's, when another young and dynamic Democratic President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, had a gathering at the White House of all of the great writers and scholars and intellectuals of the day. They gathered there for dinner, and John Kennedy addressed the group. He said something to this effect: My friends, this is the greatest sum of intellect that has been in the White House since Thomas Jefferson dined alone. Perhaps that is correct.

Jefferson believed in the self-contained yeoman, the self-sufficient farm, a free and vibrant country building on the native resources of its people, its land and its character. That was the Jeffersonian vision. That has always been, I think, the faith and credo of the Democratic Party.

But this morning the distinguished Senator from North Carolina, Mr. SANFORD, asked that I give special attention to Andrew Jackson who, as I said earlier, is a native son of Tennessee, whose legacy is very dear to our hearts in the Volunteer State.

While Thomas Jefferson was the architect who designed the political house of the Democratic Party, it was Andrew Jackson who brought the people.

Jackson strode into office on March 4, 1829. And he said in ringing tones, in his first inaugural address, "the majority is to govern."

We accept that statement simply as a matter of fact today. Who would disagree with it? That is conventional wisdom; that is commonplace. But in 1828 that view was revolutionary, not just in the United States but all across the Western World. Because those were the days of the great revolutions that were sweeping across Central Europe, and many considered the idea that the majority would govern to be radical, revolutionary, inappropriate, and something that simply could not work.

But for Jackson, majority rule was the only true meaning of liberty, of freedom, of equality under the law. He refused to believe, as James Madison and other thinkers of his time feared, that a virtuous people in a democracy would inadvertently permit tyranny; that the people could not be trusted to be the captain on the deck of their own ship of state; that they represented a threat to themselves, simply because they had neither the intellectual capacity, the education, the capacity to govern themselves; that they should be governed by an elite.

Jackson rejected that soundly.

He rejected it in the name of the small hill farmers of North Carolina, of Tennessee. He rejected it in the name of the hunters and the trappers of the West. He rejected it in the name of the soldiers and the militia that had fought so valiantly at his side in the War of 1812, and his voice boomed these words on the date of his inauguration: "The people are sovereign. Their will is absolute."

Jackson campaigned all across the country on that philosophy, and it was not just vote-getting rhetoric. It was not the "read my lips" of the day. It was a genuine belief that the future of this Nation depended solely on democratic popular rule. That was the foundation on which the freedom of our people must finally rest. And we know today as we see the 20th century coming to a close, that that was also the belief on which the freedom of tens of millions, indeed hundreds of millions of people in the 20th century really depended; the view that a great Nation, called the United States of America, believed and fought for democratic popular rule, not just for itself but for freedom-loving peoples everywhere. Those were the views of President Andrew Jackson when he came to the White House in 1829.

I must confess, Mr. President, as a Tennesseean, I have a very zealous admiration for the seventh President whose home, the Hermitage, is not too distant from where I live in Nashville, TN. And the people adoringly call him Old Hickory.

As I was educated in the public schools of the State of Tennessee, I learned early in life that Andrew Jackson is an American hero in a class all by himself. He was extraordinarily courageous and tough and energetic, a man of great character, who overcame adversity as a child seeing both his mother and his father perish at an early age.

He could fight a duel better than any man in his day, I say to my friend from North Carolina, and when he strode into the White House in 1829, he carried the pistol ball in his body of those who had fired at him in times past. He was a military leader who never knew defeat. And when Andrew Jackson, with his ragged band of militia and hunters, not a professional soldiers in the crowd, defeated the British outside New Orleans in the War of 1812, it was, indeed, the world turned upside down in military history. Here was a ragtag band of Americans defeating the finest, best-equipped, best-led regiments of His Majesty's army, the finest army in the world at that time; an extraordinary feat of military prowess.

And of course, Andrew Jackson was a great democratizer. I must confess that the exact meaning of that word, democratizer, eluded me when I first studied that in the grade schools of Tennessee.

But not until much later in life, when I came to serve on the Senate Budget Committee, did I discover the ultimate reason to admire Andrew Jackson. He came to the Presidency in 1829 and promised not only to balance the Federal budget, but to pay off the national debt, and during the 8 years of his administration, he did both. So when Andrew Jackson left the office as President of the United States, he left the American people with a Treasury that was indebted to no one.

Jackson said, and I think there is much merit to this: "The national debt is a national curse, and my vow, if elected President, shall be to pay the national debt."

And that is precisely what he did. He was a man who made great promises in his campaigns, but he carried out those promises. When he was elected, the national debt was $58 million—$58 million, I say to my friend from North Carolina. The Navy spills that much aircraft fuel every day, I suspect, on the decks of aircraft carriers and airfields around the world. But that was a very sizable amount of money in that day, and by the time Jackson left office, the Federal Treasury was in a surplus.

And today in 1992, that achievement could not be more relevant. The man who brought the people to the Democratic Party brought a commitment to fiscal responsibility. That is the history of the Democratic Party, Mr. President. It is a history of fiscal responsibility. That has been our enduring legacy.

Yes, in recent years occupants of the White House have been less vigilant in guarding that legacy, but I think the time has come for the Democratic Party to reclaim it.

When you think about it, preserving our heritage as the party of fiscal responsibility, as Andrew Jackson defined it, should not be that difficult. After 13 years of fiscal irresponsibility under Republican administrations, the national debt of this country has grown from 20 percent of gross national product when Ronald Reagan took office to over 66 percent of the gross national product today. A shameful disgrace. What a legacy to leave to generations yet unborn. The national debt has almost doubled in the 3½ years since George Herbert Bush became President. It will hit some $4 trillion this year.

So I say to my colleagues, let there be no confusion about which is the party of fiscal responsibility and which is not. It is the party of Andrew Jackson of Tennessee.

I say that this country is long overdue for a good dose of Andrew Jackson's fiscal rigor.

Jackson left other legacies as well. He created the national convention process, something we take for granted today. But it came into being because of Andrew Jackson. And the party platform. He felt that a political party ought to have a statement of its beliefs. He will always be known to the world as the man who turned the Founding Fathers' theory of democracy into a real, living, breathing democracy for all of our people.

Under Jackson, real political power was transferred from politicians who were of the elite to the voters. That was his lasting gift to the country that he loved so much. That was Jackson's genius. For all the world, Andrew Jackson was the representative American of his day.

Now, like all great men, he was a man of contradictions. He was a defender of States rights, of limited Government, but he was passionately devoted to the Union. Without military knowledge or military training, he defeated the finest army on the face of the globe in his day and won the greatest military victory of his era, the Battle of New Orleans.

What a joy it was for the American people who had seen British soldiers march into their own Capitol and seek to burn the very building we are standing in today, who had seen a British marine major get into the seat of the Speaker of the House of Representatives and put his muddy boots on the Speaker's desk and laugh at the young Republic and ask his fellow British marines, "Shall we burn it or not?" And they all voted yes. And they marched around to burn the Capitol of the United States.

So what a joy it was to this small, young, aspiring Nation to read that Andrew Jackson had defeated the British armies and routed them in New Orleans. What a thrill. And they knew that this young country was here to stay because it defeated the greatest military power of its day.

Andrew Jackson's writings and his statements were not as scholarly as those of Jefferson or Madison because he did not have the education and the advantages that they had had. But in his writing can be found the most profound defense of popular government ever expounded. Andrew Jackson was a poor orphan boy with little formal education, but he ascended to the highest office of the land. And this young orphan Nation ascended with him.

When the British admiral, Alexander Cochrane, was preparing to attack New Orleans during the War of 1812, he boasted, "I will be eating Christmas dinner in New Orleans." Andrew Jackson, sitting around the campfire with his ragged troops, heard the boast and coldly replied, "It may be so, but I shall have the honor of presiding at that dinner."

Jackson did preside at that dinner, and he presided over a nation for 8 formative years during its young life, 8 years that spawned a 150-year legacy of democracy, of freedom, of striving for equality. And perhaps the most definitive tribute to Andrew Jackson's greatness is that his ideas are very much alive today.

As we celebrate the 200th anniversary of Andrew Jackson's Democratic Party, we will all do well to recall his genius and to restate our faith and our creed because it is so profoundly at odds with the political winds of the moment.

We Democrats think it is time to reinvest in this country of ours, to reinvest in our land, to reinvest in our people, in our industry, in our cities. We Democrats believe, just as Jackson and Franklin Roosevelt believed, that we have a right to freedom from fear; we have a right to freedom from anxiety; we have a right to expect a health system that meets our needs without impoverishing us; we have a right to an education system that prepares our children for the challenges they will face in adulthood.

We Americans are an optimistic people. We have always believed that the next generation will do better than the last. And I am sorry to say that now, perhaps for the first time in our history, we have a generation that feels they will not do as well as that that preceded them.

Those youngsters who are graduating from college now, who are graduating from Duke University, I say to my friend, Senator SANFORD, who served with such great distinction as president of that great university for many years, sense that their lot in life will not be as substantial, their future not as promising as those of their parents. And I say that that is a tragedy.

So we Democrats think it is time to reinvest in our country, to reinvest in our land.

We believe we have a right and our children have a right to become the Nation that Thomas Jefferson dreamed of. We have a right to become the nation that Andrew Jackson struggled for. We have a right to become the Nation that Franklin Roosevelt and Harry Truman and John Fitzgerald Kennedy sought to build. The heritage of the Democratic Party, our principles, our traditions, our history, that must also be our future—it is the future that will guarantee a life of satisfaction, and a life of meaning to generations to come.

No real understanding of the history of this country or the future of this democracy is possible without a clear knowledge of the history of the Democratic Party and those who have led it. The history of this Nation, and the progress that it has made, and the history of the Democratic Party are so closely intertwined that they cannot be separated.

Mr. President, I want to commend the work of the commission. I want to commend the work of the distinguished Senator from North Carolina. The Senator from North Carolina has made an enormous contribution during his almost 6 years of service here in the U.S. Senate. He has made an enormous contribution not just to the Senate, but to the country, throughout his entire life. As a young paratroop officer in the Second World War, he jumped out of airplanes, into occupied France, fighting the great war to save democracy, to save us from fascism, militarism, nazism. Later in life, he went on to be the most progressive Governor that the State of North Carolina had ever had.

So I want to pay tribute to my friend from North Carolina, thank him for his work, and for providing me a period here to speak in behalf of his service.

SALUTE TO SENATOR TERRY SANFORD

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I want to make some remarks today on a very important subject. I would not be here today nor would the rest of us, I think, who have addressed a rather significant milestone in our country, were it not for the leadership of my friend and colleague from the State of North Carolina, TERRY SANFORD.

Nice things have just been said about Senator SANFORD by our colleague from the State of Tennessee. I associate myself with the remarks made by the Senator from Tennessee with regard to the thanks, the appreciation, the understanding and, yes, the love that we all have for our talented and dedicated colleague from North Carolina.

I salute him once again for not only what he has done for the country and for his State, but for the Democratic Party that he has nurtured for a long, long time.

SENATOR TIMOTHY E. WIRTH

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, before I make some remarks, on how the Democratic Party has reflected on my life and therefore hopefully favorably on the Nation, let me talk for just a moment, if I might, about a very talented younger Democrat that has recently announced that he is not running for reelection, to the dismay and the disappointment of this Senator. He comes from somewhat of a different generation than my friend from North Carolina, Senator SANFORD, and this senior Senator from Nebraska. But I think TIM WIRTH of Colorado will leave his mark where he served with distinction in the House of Representatives before coming to the U.S. Senate.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that an op-ed piece by Senator

WIRTH in the May 12 edition of the Washington Post be printed immediately following my remarks on this subject.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, here is a young Democrat that I hope will carry on. Maybe he will be back to carry on. But he has announced that he will not be a candidate for reelection. If we talk about the processes that we are weighing today and looking for the future leadership of the country, both from the Republican Party and from the Democratic party, we should recognize that we have suffered a loss with TIMOTHY WIRTH and other of his vintage that have decided not to continue to seek public service.

I thought that Senator WIRTH's insight in the article just referenced was one of the best op-ed pieces, most on point, of any that I have ever seen.

Let me quote from the first two or three paragraphs of this that I think maybe puts into perspective some of the dilemma that faces people in public office today. I quote:

On the day that I announced in Colorado that I would not run for a second term in the U.S. Senate, I handed out a long and detailed explanation of my decision, an evaluation of Senate life, my place in it, my aspirations, discontents and goals. This was followed by a press conference and a lengthy question-and-answer period with the press. So should I have been surprised when a Denver reporter, having just heard me read my statement and my many reasons for terminal frustration, asked me privately after the press conference if I were sick? Code word: AIDS.

Should I have felt my blood begin to boil when another Colorado journalist wanted to know—again with the microphones off—whether a "financial scandal" was about to break over my head? After all, I had already read that morning the account in The Washington Post stating that among the reasons why I was leaving was a supposed affection for the House Bank and overdrafts from it, which would be crippling burdens to carry in my reelection campaign.

This off-the-wall, off-the-mark press speculation confirmed the judgment that led me to call it a political day: It has become nearly impossible, in Congress or outside it in the press, for public officials to carry on sustained, serious discussions of the fundamental challenges Americans must understand and, through their government, rise to meet.

Sensation-seeking in the media has trivialized civil discourse.

All the foregoing was a quote from Senator WIRTH's article that I have referenced.

I am mindful of the fact that in the last couple of days, Mr. President, I have been asked by several members of the press about a recent complaint that I made with regard to the amount of money that we are spending on reconditioning elevators. And I have referenced the fact that I thought that the amount of money that is being spent on some of those elevators and some of the carpeting and some of the woodwork that is going into those elevators, that have nothing whatsoever to do with safety, was not wise in this day of speculation about whether or not we are trying to be careful with the taxpayers' money.

But I am looking forward to the time when I can really make a big splash in the press because I want to alert the press now that hopefully I can have some secretaries from our office in bikinis with me in the elevator with the press in full attention, and if they can get a picture of something like that, because somehow if the news media today can put sex or the idea of sex in with wasteful spending, you really have a story that might, just might bring about a Pulitzer Prize to some of the people that are supposed to be doing a job in covering the press.

I only bring that up, Mr. President, because of what we are seeing today with regard to trivializing of the many important matters that face us, not the least of which I think is the recent vote on the floor of the Senate when this Senator led an effort that was well thought out and took a lot of time to put together to come up with some cut in the national defense expenditures of the United States. And it made hardly a peep in the national news media because there was no waste, fraud, and abuse connected with it.

Unfortunately, we did not have the billing of something to do with sex. If we can get that kind of frosting to put on the cake, you are always going to get the cake placed in the center window for most people to see. If some of the people that we are talking about today had to go through those things in the past, maybe they would not have made the great contribution that we are all pointing to today. Some of the leaders of the Democratic Party in the past certainly clearly are going down in history as ones who made significant contributions to the United States of America.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Washington Post, May 12, 1992]

TIME FOR A NEW CREW IN WASHINGTON

(By Timothy E. Wirth)

On the day that I announced in Colorado that I would not run for a second term in the U.S. Senate, I handed out a long and detailed explanation of my decision, an evaluation of Senate life, my place in it, my aspirations, discontents and goals. This was followed by a press conference and a lengthy question-and-answer period with the press. So should I have been surprised when a Denver reporter, having just heard me read my statement and my many reasons for terminal frustration, asked me privately after the press conference if I were sick? Code word: AIDS.

Should I have felt my blood begin to boil when another Colorado journalist wanted to know—again with the microphones off—whether a "financial scandal" was about to break over my head? After all, I had already read that morning the account in The Washington Post stating that among the reasons why I was leaving was a supposed affection for the House Bank and overdrafts from it, which would be crippling burdens to carry in my reelection campaign.

This off-the-wall, off-the-mark press speculation confirmed the judgment that led me to call it a political day: It has become nearly impossible, in Congress or outside it in the press, for public officials to carry on sustained, serious discussions of the fundamental challenges Americans must understand and, through their government, rise to meet.

Sensation-seeking in the media has trivialized civil discourse. Too many print editors and television anchors underestimate the capacity of their readers and viewers to absorb and be absorbed by complicated policy questions. Inevitably, such judgments become self-fulfilling. The budget deficit, the hole in the ozone layer, health care costs, poverty, crime and dropout rates all increase, all get their 15 minutes of fame, and all drop off the screen to be supplanted by transitory alarms that are reported with equal weight and importance.

Attention-deficit is the disorder of the day. I grew not just hoarse from shouting but increasingly frustrated that so much of the nation's press—the crucial intermediary between government and the governed—spends so little time working to make representative government work. The House Bank, a political sideshow, is more widely reported and better understood than either our national debt or the underlying economic confusion that has fed its alarming growth.

After 12 years in the House of Representatives, I went to the Senate in 1987 hoping to find it a more effective forum for inquiry, reflection and consensus-building. By reputation, its pace was more deliberate than that of the House and its members less disposed to grandstanding. I found a different reality; an unsteadying diet of petty partisan maneuvering, ego clashes and legislative ambushes mounted by single-issue zealots who can make the fate of liability insurance within the aircraft industry or the eccentricities of a handful of avant-garde artists seem the most urgent of legislative questions. And all of this in a country whose leader refuses to lead, who does not seem to have a sense of where he wants the country to go, and whose lack of direction in turn pervades the whole government.

The House controls itself through rules that limit not only the time of floor debates but, sometimes too narrowly, their content as well. The Senate is supposed to operate on collegial lines, to do much of its formal business by unanimous consent. When comity collapses, as it decisively has during the past decade of divided government, an undisciplined Senate becomes a mine field where the ability to maneuver counts far more than the capacity to legislate with vision for the future. In such an arena, moreover, various concentrations of moneyed interests increasingly form impassable barriers to action. Against their veto power, initiative falters; posturing more and more takes the place of substantive discussion and decision. Nowhere is this more evident than in the recent action to sustain high levels of defense spending despite the dramatic changes in the geopolitical landscape—a victory for defense contractors, a loss for our children.

The culture of the institution in this sense reflects all too well the culture of a profoundly distracted society. "Headline News" would be an oxymoron in any age except the one where the answer to information overload is a soundbite, where supermarket tabloids and docudramas enjoy almost equal credibility and where "Read My Lips" sums up an entire political credo.

There may be a chance this election year to break that downward spiral. The gathering protest—focused on the failure of government to deliver needed services at reasonable cost or to adjust priorities in a world of breath-taking change and on the perceived arrogance and distance of public officials—will sweep a large number of new men and women into office in November. Let's hope they are vigorous and idea-oriented as were those who rode earlier waves in 1934, 1946, 1958 and 1974. Let's pray, as Rep. Vin Weber (R-Minn.) said so well, that they arrive promising to do more than give their parking place to a homeless person or not to use a House Bank that is already out of operation.

They will be angry. Let's hope they'll be idealistic. And let's make certain that they get heard. The press could pave the way for their arrival and for the changes they could set in motion by focusing now on the content, not just the conflict, of their campaigns. That would be a worthy role for the fourth branch of government. Who knows? Such reporting might even interest and involve viewers, readers and voters in the work of renewing America's democratic experiment.

DEMOCRATIC PARTY'S 200TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I talk today about an organization that is near and dear to my heart. An organization on whose behalf I have worked for and been a part of for many decades. I am speaking, of course, about our Democratic Party.

Today marks the 200th anniversary of the Democratic Party and I would like to take a few minutes to discuss its proud history.

Like most of the Democratic Members of this body, I have attended and spoken at literally dozens of Jefferson-Jackson Day dinners. It is most fitting that those annual events are named after what are essentially the two most important founders of the Democratic Party.

It was through the efforts of Thomas Jefferson that the Democratic Party began in the early 1790's. In fact, it was through his efforts that political parties as we now know them were begun, since during George Washington's terms as our President, political parties were not significant factors in the political life of our country.

It has often been said that the Democratic Party is the most unorganized, organized political party in the country. Looking back two centuries ago, it appears that little has changed. First, there seems to be a considerable amount of debate regarding just when the Democratic Party was created, although many observers pinpoint a letter written on May 13, 1792, by Thomas Jefferson as being the first reference to the party.

Second, the Democratic Party had a hard time getting its name straight as it was initially called the Republican Party, then the Democratic-Republican Party, and finally the Democratic Party which was made official in the party's convention in 1840.

The Democratic Party has always considered itself to be the party of the people but it was not until the election of Andrew Jackson to become President in 1828 that the people really took hold of their own Government.

I suppose that every Democrat has his or her favorite Democratic Party hero and I would like to spend some time talking about my own, President Harry S. Truman. Visitors to my office know that one of my favorite portraits, and one that is prominently displayed in my office, is that of Harry S. Truman in his military uniform mounted on a horse.

Harry S. Truman was born in my neighboring State of Missouri on May 8, 1884. His parents gave him the middle initial "S" but no middle name. When he was still a boy, his family moved to Independence, MO, near Kansas City.

Harry S. Truman served our country during World War I where he commanded an artillery battery in France. After the war, he continued his service in the Army Reserves where he eventually reached the rank of colonel.

He was first elected to public office in 1922 as the county judge of Jackson County, MO. He won a reputation for honesty and efficiency which later paid off when he was elected to the U.S. Senate in 1934. He was reelected in 1940. It is interesting in this time of declining defense expenditures that as a Senator Harry Truman created what was known as the Truman Committee which investigated defense spending and uncovered billions of dollars of waste and inefficiency. And that was during wartime.

In 1944, President Franklin Roosevelt was to be elected for a record fourth term. But many believed that it was likely that President Roosevelt would not live through that entire term. As a result, the nomination for the Vice Presidency took on enormous importance.

Democratic leaders were split in their support for Henry A. Wallace, Justice William O. Douglas, and southern favorite James F. Byrnes. Senator Truman emerged from the field as a compromise candidate and was elected on the second ballot by his party.

Jonathan Daniels once wrote that, "Truman was nominated by men speculating beyond the death of Roosevelt who knew what they wanted but did not know what they were getting." They no doubt got much more than they bargained for.

President Roosevelt died less than 3 months into his fourth term and, as expected, Vice President Truman became President Truman. After being sworn into office, President Truman remarked that he "felt like the Moon, the stars, and all the planets had fallen on me." Indeed the task before him was enormous as our country was still fighting World War II.

President Truman, but a few months later, was called upon to make what is surely one of the gravest decisions ever made by a President of our country. He was informed in July 1945 that we had successfully tested the first atomic bomb. President Truman authorized the use of atomic bombs on the Japanese cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki in early August of that year. Japan agreed to end the war shortly thereafter.

President Truman in a radio address to the American public explained, "Having found the bomb, we have used it. We have used it against those who attacked us without warning at Pearl Harbor, against those who have starved and beaten and executed American prisoners of war, against those who have abandoned the pretense of obeying international laws of warfare. We have used it in order to shorten the agony of war, in order to save the lives of thousands and thousands of young Americans." I was one of those young Americans.

After the war ended, President Truman initiated the Marshall plan to economically assist the war-damaged nations in Europe. At the same time, the Truman doctrine was developed to contain communism and to place the United States as the world leader in the fight for freedom.

One of the most famous political photographs of all time is that of President Truman holding a newspaper with the headline "Dewey Defeats Truman." That picture was the culmination of the Presidential campaign of 1948 in which President Truman was given little chance for reelection. But his spunk and fighting spirit, as shown by a whistle stop campaign across our Nation, resulted in arguably the biggest upset in the history of our Presidential campaigns.

As an interesting sideline to this story, I note that one of the candidates defeated by President Truman was Gov. STROM THURMOND of South Carolina now a colleague and friend of mine in the Senate.

President Truman's second term was nearly as eventful as his first. In 1949, the United States joined with eight other nations to form the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, or NATO, which has played a major role in the defense of Europe for over four decades.

When Communist forces from North Korea invaded South Korea on June 25, 1950, President Truman was called upon once again to lead our country at a time of war. He quickly decided to intervene to save the independence of South Korea and committed United States troops in that effort. According to President Truman, that was the hardest decision of his political career.

Of course, the most famous saying of President Truman's was "the buck stops here" which was printed on a plaque that sat on his desk. That is a

saying that our current President and for that matter our current Congress should reestablish.

President Truman decided not to seek reelection in 1952. He left office on January 20, 1953, and retired to his home in Independence. He died on December 26, 1972.

On this 200th anniversary of the Democratic Party, my thoughts go to Harry S. Truman, for he truly stands among the great leaders of all time of not only the Democratic Party but of our Nation.

Mr. President, the Democratic Party is not only the oldest political party in our country, but arguably the oldest in the world. Despite being two centuries old, the Democratic Party remains young as it and its leaders are constantly changing. As our Nation has grown, the Democratic Party has grown and, as the party of the people, has reflected the dreams and highest aspirations of our Nation. I wish it 200 more.

Thank you, Mr. President.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Tennessee is recognized to speak for up to 20 minutes.

BICENTENNIAL OF THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I thank you for the recognition. I hope it will not inconvenience my colleague from California. I had arranged for this time earlier in the week. I do appreciate his courtesy and forbearance.

Since the time of the Senator from North Carolina has run out, I had planned to make comments on two subjects. First, on his time, I had wanted to make comments about the bicentennial of the Democratic Party, but the time I had reserved was for another topic. Let me foreshorten my remarks on the first subject and then concentrate on the other.

I thank Senator SANFORD for his tireless efforts on behalf of this observance, the bicentennial of the Democratic Party in S. 2047.

May 13, of course, marks the 200th anniversary of the oldest continuously existing political instrumentality in America.

Fathered by Thomas Jefferson and nurtured by Andrew Jackson, the history of the Democratic Party is inextricably linked with the history of our country.

Thomas Jefferson's election to the Presidency in 1801, after numerous ballots in the House of Representatives, in fact as the head of a new political party, was not just the birth of a new political party organization, but was the first peaceful transfer of national power from one political organization, the Federalists, to another. This peaceful transfer of power has, of course, lasted as tradition, surviving for 200 years and is the envy of the world for all who love peace and democracy.

I have spoken a good many times on this floor about the ecological system of the Earth. What would that have to do with this observance? I note with great pride that one of the seminal events in cementing the Northern-Southern alliance that helped to form the new party was an expedition to New England undertaken by Thomas Jefferson and James Madison for the purpose of botany. Many suspected the trip was for the real purpose of organizing opposition to Treasury Secretary Hamilton, but the records show that Jefferson wrote voluminous works on the trees, flowers, lakes, soils, and other subjects of relevance to botany himself, and went on at great length about it.

It is an interesting body of work that resulted from that expedition.

Let me say that as a Tennessean I am especially proud of the role Andrew Jackson has played in the history of the Democratic Party. My colleague, Senator SASSER, earlier spoke at some length about this and I will not replicate his fine words. But just let me say that not only did Jackson give the party its current name, he gave the people a greater voice in choosing their elected leaders by taking the Government from the aristocracy and giving it to the general population.

Throughout our Nation, Jefferson-Jackson Day dinners mark the importance of these two historic figures in the development of principles and practices of the Democratic Party. It is commonly said that Jefferson gave the party its principles and creed while Jackson gave the people control of their Government.

Jackson's election in 1828 after he was, in the view of some, unfairly deprived of election in 1824, was a result of a tide of change that swept away State laws restricting the vote to those with property or who could afford certain taxes. When the people rather than the aristocracy and the State legislatures were given the power to elect the President, the first President they chose was Andrew Jackson.

So, I am indeed proud to be a lifelong Democrat attempting to carry on the tradition of Jefferson and Jackson and other leaders in my party in promoting and defending the interests of the people and trying to spread democracy and the power of the vote to every county and parish of this Nation and to every country in the world.

Mr. President, let me shift gears and speak about the subject that I have requested time for earlier.

BOSNIA-HERZEGOVINA

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, on several occasions I have spoken about the events in the Balkans. As I have noted on other occasions, my father's older brother was severely injured in World War I because the events there in the Balkans spilled out from that area of the world to consume most of the world in that terrible war. My family's oral history has always carried lessons with it about World War I and I have, for that reason and for other reasons, spoken on numerous occasions here since last year about events there.

The ongoing destruction of Bosnia-Herzegovina is a crime that must be laid squarely at the feet of the Government of Serbia, and of its leader, Slobodan Milosevic. And it is with great sadness that I must also say that in my opinion it is in part a consequence of a major failure of American policy.

Long ago, before this cycle of violence began, we had a chance to recognize what Milosevic represents and what he and his associates were up to. Unfortunately, such was our Government's concern for the preservation of Yugoslavia that we failed to grasp the fundamentals of a radically changed situation. We failed to realize that Yugoslavia was no longer of value to us as a bulwark against the Warsaw Pact. We did not see that, in fact, the unity of Yugoslavia could only be preserved by means that would make it what it has now become: A major source of instability for all of the Balkans, and the successor to Lebanon as a metaphor for internecine violence.

Even after Serbia invaded Croatia, our Government continued to base its policy on the incredible fiction that the victim was as much to blame as the perpetrator, and that a moral symmetry existed such that the appropriate response was to turn our backs on both. Nothing reflects the bankruptcy of that concept more, Mr. President, than the fact that the Bush administration actually imposed identical sanctions on both Croatia and Serbia, as if it made no difference that the latter's armed forces were helping to conquer a third of the former's territory.

Nor did it seem to matter, Mr. President, that the Government of Serbia was engaged in a process running directly contrary to the interests of the United States as a great power. Namely, the Government of Serbia was reorganizing the map of the Balkans to suit itself—to carry out the dream of a Greater Serbia by violently annexing territories which would establish it as the region's dominant power. Instead of reacting to this threat by at least coordinating our policies with those of our European allies, this administration dragged its heels to the very last. We obstructed. We disengaged. We continuously assured the Serbian authorities of our basic good will toward them long after we should have informed them of an irreparable breach of relations.

In recent weeks, there were some indications that this blindness and paralysis would yet fall away from the Bush

administration. We began to show some anger and determination. It may have taken thousands of deaths, hundreds of thousands of refugees, and the destruction of the economy of what had been a country of 25 million people, but our Government finally seemed to get the message. We came up on the net. We pushed for some action among our allies. We were blunt.

If we had continued down that path, Mr. President, I would not be standing here again as I have at intervals since last September, puzzled again, embarrassed again, and outraged by the moral and intellectual bankruptcy of our policy. But having strutted and roared a bit, the Bush administration now seems to be calling it quits. The situation, we are saying, is beyond control. There is nothing to be done except to wait until the violence exhausts itself, until the aggressor is too fatigued even to continue to assault the helpless.

That is what is going on there now. There is an aggression against the helpless. How did we feel when we watched the horrible scenes on television of people pulling the truck driver out of the cab and continuing to beat him mercilessly? How did we feel for that matter when we first saw that videotape of Rodney King?

There is a basic human emotion when someone who is helpless who is being beaten and who is being brutalized and murdered. We want to help. How do we wall ourselves off from this ongoing brutalization of a helpless people in this situation?

So, a day or two after the European Community ordered home its Ambassadors we are essentially doing that, standing by, doing nothing as this tragedy unfolds. Why? Because we want to be ever the last to risk offending Mr. Milosevic, ever hopeful for his redemption.

Well, it is of course an open question whether we can force an effective cease-fire, but there is no question at all that there are still measures that remain to be taken by our country and by our allies.

First, we can destroy the illusion that there still exists a state whose legal name is Yugoslavia and whose inheritor is the Republic of Serbia and its vassal, the Republic of Montenegro. Yugoslavia does not exist. Its seats on all international bodies, ranging from the United Nations to the various trade and banking institutions, should be voided and its representatives decertified and cast out.

Second, in the place of Yugoslavia, representatives of the successor states of Slovenia, Croatia and Bosnia-Herzegovina should be seated. Representation should be denied to Serbia and Montenegro. Diplomatic relations with Belgrade should be cut. Any assets owned by Yugoslavia that can be seized should be put into escrow. Air traffic to Belgrade should be suspended. Any and all international agreements with the former Yugoslavia should be declared null and void and replacements should be negotiated with the successor states—but not with Serbia under these circumstances.

Third, we and our allies should impose a full embargo on military parts and on oil to Serbia. Romania, which might want to profit by violating either or both of these embargoes, is in no position to bite the hands that feed it and should therefore be put on notice that its choice is to fall in line behind its friends in the West, or look elsewhere for economic help. Greece, which might want most of all to keep its relations with Serbia in good shape and which for understandable reasons has evidenced a deep fear of the consequences of international recognition of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia—especially if it uses that name—must be told in a friendly but firm way that its friends in Western Europe and in the United States need solidarity on this question.

Fourth, since the European Community's April 29 deadline for a cessation of hostilities has come and gone and it is clear that Serbia is the party bearing primary responsibility for this, it is time for the west to begin supplying antiaircraft and antiarmor weapons to those forces which still respond to the instructions of the Bosnian Government. Further, since Mr. Milosevic now claims that his army is to be withdrawn from Bosnia, it would appear that the legal status of Serbian forces that continue to fight in that country has changed. Any further support of these forces from Serbian territory is thus unambiguously a violation of an international border and an assault on the territorial integrity of an internationally recognized independent state. That state has every right to defend itself and to call upon the international community for the financial and material means to do so.

Fifth, we should make clear that we hold the Serbian Government responsible for what is occurring, and we should warn them that this extends to personal responsibility for government and military officials operating in violation of international law and United Nations resolutions. This cycle of violence did not have to occur in Bosnia. Its people had learned to live with each other—Christian, Orthodox, Muslim, all various kinds of Christians. Its people had learned to live together. It was the Government of Serbia and the army of Serbia that ignited the fires now burning in Sarajevo. The fact that, for tactical and propagandistic reasons, Milosevic now wishes to pretend that he bears no responsibility for what is happening is a gross distortion, which needs to be rejected.

In my opinion, intensified pressure on Serbia will in fact bring about a cessation of hostilities in Bosnia. But even if I am wrong, we must try, and we must also make it clear that if war does not end, it is our intention to exact a severe price from Serbia itself. That country's economy is in shambles. Its currency is made of the printing press, not in the marketplace. We are being too conservative in our estimates of our ability to make the so-called Yugoslav dinar completely worthless and to bring their industry to a halt. The political consequences of that are far more clear to Milosevic than to our leaders. That is why he continues to maneuver to forestall effective economic sanctions.

Sixth—and I say this with a degree of understanding for the feelings of Croatians—the Government of Croatia cannot participate either directly or indirectly in any deal to partition Bosnia. If the kind of deal allegedly discussed at Graz were to become Croatian policy, the consequences of that for Croatia itself would be severe. A third of Croatia's territory still lies under Serbian occupation. Any hope Croatia has of recovering that territory rests upon the international community's refusal to accept changes of recognized borders by violence. If Croatia compromises that principle in Bosnia, it destroys its efficacy in Croatia. I grant that the Government of Croatia continues to deny that it is participating in any way in an effort to partition Bosnia and disposes its Muslim inhabitants. Hopefully, that denial is true. It will be a sad day for Croatia if it is not.

There are still other measures, more controversial than any of these, that could be discussed. But in my opinion, it is already clear that major cards remain unplayed. Instead of turning its back, our Government should be working with our allies to confront Serbian authorities with a very stark message: make peace, or the rest of us will see to it that you will ultimately be rejected by your own people and handed over to justice—either at their hands or ours.

I yield the floor, Mr. President.

Mr. SEYMOUR addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SIMON). The Senator from California [Mr. SEYMOUR] is recognized.

Mr. SEYMOUR. Mr. President, parliamentary inquiry. Under a previous order, does Senator SIMPSON from Wyoming have 15 minutes allocated?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is correct.

Mr. SEYMOUR. Mr. President, I am here as his designee and would ask that I be allowed 10 minutes of that 15.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has that right if there is no objection from the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. SEYMOUR. The distinguished Senator from Wyoming has asked that we split that time, Mr. President, so if I could have 7 minutes of his 15.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I regret my tardiness. I believe there is 15

minutes under a special order. Let me relinquish 8 minutes of that time to the Senator from California.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recognized for 8 minutes.

Mr. SEYMOUR. Thank you very much, Mr. President, and I thank my distinguished colleague from Wyoming for permitting me to speak.

THE LOS ANGELES RIOTS

Mr. SEYMOUR. Mr. President, the wonders of electronic media afforded all Americans, and the international community, as well, the opportunity to watch as hoodlums and hooligans and thugs proceeded to tear apart south-central Los Angeles and the greater Los Angeles area. We saw entire communities go up in flames, businesses that took years of sweat and hard work to build were destroyed, livelihoods were destroyed, property was destroyed, and lives were taken in the most senseless and mindless looting and pillaging and killing and burning that we have seen in our country in, in fact, this century. We were live participants in the absolutely senseless beating of an innocent truck driver.

And now what do we hear from out political leaders? More finger pointing. For anyone watching C-SPAN, the Senate floor probably resembles a schoolyard given all the finger pointing and name calling that has been going on here since those tragic events of the last 2 weeks.

Let us be honest with ourselves. There is enough blame to go around for everyone, Democrat and Republican alike. And if we really want to take the time, I suppose we could spend the next several days and weeks, if not months, pointing fingers at one another as to why this tragic incident and devastation occurred.

But that is not why we are here, Mr. President. Time is precious and we must not waste our efforts on a dead-end debate. We all understand this. The Congress is not elected to play Monday morning quarterback. Unfortunately, that is how the general public views this institution. Our constituents expect us to be in the game, directing the action, not on the sidelines pointing fingers at one another.

Mr. President, I was in Los Angeles the last 2 weekends. I met with business people and merchants and church and community leaders, city and public officials, and just people in the streets. They do not care as much who is to blame as they are concerned with their futures and how we in the Congress are going to work with them to rebuild their communities, to make their streets safe, and to restore their confidence in America. If I heard one resounding message, it was that we must put aside partisan bickering and "I told you so politics" and get down to enacting real change.

President Bush heard this message when he spent all day Thursday and half of Friday in Los Angeles last week listening to these same people to whom I previously referred. And he has been quick to move forward with an emergency aid package to ensure that the Federal Emergency Management Agency and the Small Business Administration are adequately funded. He also convened yesterday with leaders from both sides of the aisle from both Houses to come together and form a bipartisan solution.

And this process is beginning to move forward.

So, Mr. President, let us nurture it. Let us not condemn it just for partisan purposes. A game of one-upmanship will only hurt the people we are all committed to help.

I do not doubt the commitment of any Senator to give his or her total energy to solving the problems that face our inner cities and urban centers of America. Let us take a lesson from the hundreds of volunteers that flooded the streets of Los Angeles, with brooms and shovels, to start to clean up the destruction. Did we see them pointing fingers? Of course not. They saw the urgency of the situation and went to work immediately to effect change.

These were people from all walks of life. Hollywood stars took up positions next to burned-out shop owners and suburbanites. Each in his or her own way was telling us to get moving and start working together. If they can do it, then can we not?

I am ready for that. The Congress needs to change if we are going to accomplish this. The problems are complex and I do not want to suggest for 1 minute that I, JOHN SEYMOUR, the Senator from California, have all the answers, because I do not.

I have my own ideas, having viewed the devastation. I believe in the fact that we must have law and order in not only the streets of Los Angeles but all the cities of California and the cities across America. Any civilized society is first based and founded and rooted in law and order.

I also have ideas that refer to the rebuilding of greater Los Angeles to ensure that that devastation never takes place again in Los Angeles; in Detroit, MI; in Chicago, IL; or New York City, or any other urban center of our country. What I am talking about is ideas that will create job opportunities, give those citizens a piece of the action, give them a reason to get out of bed in the morning and reach for all they are capable of becoming.

Yes, we have a lot of work ahead of us. The people in Los Angeles and across America are sick and tired of the political finger pointing. It insults them and it demeans us. We are better than that. Now let us prove it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming is recognized.

RESPONSE TO THE REMARKS OF SENATOR RIEGLE

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from California for his remarks. I think they are very powerful and provocative and should be heard.

Mr. President, maybe I missed something, but yesterday I was part of a group at the White House with members of the Democrat congressional leadership and members of the Republican congressional leadership who met with the President of the United States. The purpose of it all—no other purpose, nothing sinister, mind you—was to forge a bipartisan accord on how to proceed on urban initiatives and particularly emergency funding in the wake of the Los Angeles riots.

I felt really very gratified when I left there, that the bipartisan congressional leadership—our fine majority leader, the assistant majority leader, the Senate minority leadership, the Speaker, the Republican leader of the House, and the deputies on both sides of the House—met, and I felt gratified that we could see eye to eye with the President and work for results—not partisan advantage.

That gratification may have been short-lived, especially after hearing this morning's statement by the chairman of the Banking Committee, my friend Senator RIEGLE. He is, indeed, my friend. We have shared much together. I enjoy his energy and earthy humor and spirit. I only have a few minutes to respond, but let me just make a few points.

If all that my friend Senator RIEGLE said was correct, where was all of that directed emotion prior to the tragedy of the Rodney King verdict? Urban issues were not exactly a common topic on this floor. Why? Because it did not play. Well, it may play now. So here is another chance for George Bush to take a good, hard shot in the chops during this election year.

The Democrats seem to find a problem—I suppose through some focus group out in the land they discern such problems—and then they crank in the same formula they use to assess blame for everything. The shocking verdict in the Rodney King case results in riots in Los Angeles—and it was shocking. Who is to blame? Who else? Ronald Reagan, George Bush, and the decade of the eighties.

It is not just Senator RIEGLE who gives us this same verse. I note the District of Columbia Mayor was interviewed this morning regarding recent disturbances in the Mount Pleasant neighborhood. Who is to blame? You guessed it, the decade of the eighties, the distribution of wealth from the have-nots to the haves and the frustration it caused. The main culprits? You guessed it, Ronald Reagan and George Bush, of course.

I think the Democrats must have met somewhere a few months ago and

decided they would employ the same strategy. Find a problem; blame it on the eighties. Then you must remember, now, they use figures about the economy that are based upon the Reagan years, which are now cited as the years between 1980 and now; 1980 was not a Reagan year. He was not President, and it was a miserable year, economically. The misery index was off the rails.

So we want to keep that in perspective. I think the edges of the hymnal that they are singing from are getting a bit frayed. Americans are smarter than we give them credit. They really do not buy the premise that George Bush is responsible for the King verdict or the subsequent riots. Those things were brooding for decades.

Then I heard another old familiar lilting refrain, we have a war in our cities—and here it comes—the Republicans are more concerned with aid in foreign countries and maintaining big defense budgets.

Senator RIEGLE was shocked when he cited that the House Armed Services Committee, which at least at my last knowledge was controlled by the Democrats, had authorized 20 B-2 bombers. He said this constituted spending billions on a weapons system we do not need while there is a war going on in our cities.

Just a brief note. On May 5, 1992, George Bush wanted the Senate to rescind spending on two *Seawolf* submarines costing billions of dollars. The Pentagon does not need them. George Bush tried to cut them. We failed to rescind their spending. How did the Senator from Michigan vote? To maintain full spending for the *Seawolf* submarine.

So, really, why do we not level with the American people? We have lost people from this Chamber—people like WARREN RUDMAN, TIM WIRTH, KENT CONRAD—who are leaving. And the single theme as they leave our Chamber is clear. it is "We all know what we have to do." And we all do know exactly what we have to do. And we will not do it.

But the American people are not going to listen to it anymore. They are not going to keep score. They are not going to delight on whether the Republicans diddled the Democrats this day or vice versa; it make no difference at all to them.

The Democrats have been out of the White House now so long they can taste it. No matter what the problem, George Bush will be the cause. He will be blamed when Democrat committees authorize B-2 bombers or when the Democrat-dominated Senate fails to honor his request to cut spending for an unnecessary weapons system.

But I want to leave this floor in the spirit of optimism because of the meeting yesterday. The statement of my friend from Michigan does not reflect in any way, in my view, the constructive bipartisan approach which was taken yesterday, and which is so long overdue. I prefer to rely on the representations of the Democrat leadership when they indicated to us, and to the President yesterday, that they wanted to work with the President to resolve problems, not against him for partisan gain.

Mr. President, in conclusion, last month I also had to respond on the floor to a Senator's remarks that George Bush had encouraged racial divisiveness in this country. How absurd. There is no spirit of racism in that decent man. What guff.

In the conclusion of my remarks. I inserted the administration's fiscal year 1993 budget proposals for local government. The range of assistance included infrastructure, drug enforcement, crime control, enterprise zones, children's programs, education, real estate incentives, housing, pro-family tax incentives, and health care all funded at increased levels from previous years.

Finally, I ask unanimous consent to include after my remarks a factsheet issued after yesterday's constructive bipartisan meeting outlining the President's six priorities for strengthening urban areas: weed and seed, HOPE, enterprise zones, America 2000, welfare reform, and youth jobs.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. SIMPSON. I think we can get back now to the work of the day. I think we will, because we can see how feckless it is to simply send the President all the things he wanted plus all things he did not want in the same bill, knowing full well what he would do with it—veto it and then send it back here where we will sustain the veto. It is time to get over that hump. It is time to do the work. We all know what we have to do.

EXHIBIT 1

FACTSHEET—OUTLAYS FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENTS IN THE PRESIDENT'S FY 1993 BUDGET

Listed by section, are Administration programs which will directly and indirectly benefit local governments all across our nation:

JOB TRAINING 2000

The Employment Service would be reconstructed and its resources incorporated into Skill Centers in order to improve the delivery and effectiveness of job training and vocational education programs.

These "one-stop shopping" Skill Centers would replace the many uncoordinated entry points that the programs now have in each community. Skill Centers would offer testing, counseling, job market information, referral to available jobs, and vouchers for PIC-approved education and training programs.

Private Industry Councils (PICs), originally created to administer JTPA, would be expanded and modified to manage and coordinate $12 billion in Federal resources.

$4.1 billion of proposed 1993 funds would be under direct PIC control while an additional $7.6 billion of proposed 1993 funds would be coordinated through PICs.

Only participation in certified training programs would be funded by any major Federal program. Financial incentives will make training institutions accountable.

The transition of young people from school to work will become more efficient through skill standards and youth apprenticeships.

INFRASTRUCTURE

The budget requests $19.2 billion, a $2.2 billion or 13 percent increase over 1992, for highway construction and rehabilitation and will support over 1 million jobs in 1993.

The budget proposes $2.5 billion for EPA wastewater treatment grants, a $100 million or 4 percent increase over 1992. These grants will assist cities in providing adequate secondary sewage treatment to protect health and the environment as well as allow business expansion by providing sufficient treatment capacity.

Maglev/High-Speed Rail: The budget includes $28 million, an $8 million or 40 percent increase over 1992, for high-speed rail and maglev research and development. The Administration proposes to complete a full and fair evaluation of maglev technology before deciding to undertake prototype development.

CRIME

The Bush Administration's investment in fighting crime will grow from $14.6 billion in 1992 to $15.8 billion for 1993—an 8 percent increase over 1992, and a 59 percent increase over 1989.

The Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) will field over 2,000 new agents.

In it's pursuit of violent gang members, the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms (BATF) will devote $38 million to its National Violent Gang Enforcement Program to investigate gang members who are weapons violators.

To prosecute violent offenders and others, $814 million will be requested for the U.S. Attorneys, 77 percent more than was spent in 1989.

Every year nearly 6 million people are victims of violent crimes. In 1993, the Administration will provide $144 million to assist victims of crime and to fund programs that offer support to overcome the traumas caused by violent criminals.

Fighting White-Collar Crime: To fight white-collar crime, including financial, insurance, Medicaid, and bankruptcy fraud, the Administration will devote $864 million in 1993.

Jailing Criminals: To ensure that prison space is available so that convicted criminals will serve their entire sentences, the 1993 budget proposes $2.2 billion for Federal prisons, an increase of $185 million, or 9 percent over 1992. This is 44 percent more than was spent in 1989.

To fight crime at home, the 1993 budget proposes $7.7 billion for domestic law enforcement activities, an increase of $470 million over 1992.

DRUGS

The Administration's budget to fight drug abuse will grow from $12.0 billion in 1992 to $12.7 billion for 1993—an increase of more than 6 percent above 1992, and nearly double the sum appropriated in 1989.

To attack drug trafficking organizations at the source, the 1993 budget proposes $8.6 billion. This is an increase of $443 million or 5 percent over 1992, and 88 percent more than the 1989 level.

To protect U.S. borders from the influx of illegal narcotics, the 1993 budget proposes $2.2 billion for interdiction activities, including 200 new Border Patrol agents on the Southwest border.

To prevent people from becoming users and to help persuade current users to stop, the 1993 budget proposes $1.8 billion, an increase of $77 million, or 5 percent over 1992. Special attention will be focused on children and adolescents.

To treat and rehabilitate those whose lives have been disrupted by drug use, the 1993 budget proposes $2.3 billion, an increase of $256 million, or 12 percent over 1992.

The Administration's 1993 budget proposes a new $500 million initiative called "Weed and Seed", which will use a neighborhood-focused, two-part strategy to control violent crime, and to provide social and economic support to areas in which high crime rates and social ills are prevalent. This program will complement the President's proposal to create Enterprise Zones in distressed urban areas.

ENTERPRISE ZONES

The Administration proposes to provide tax incentives, entrepreneurship, and job creation in up to 50 economically distressed urban and rural communities. Beginning in 1993, the proposal provides for the elimination of the capital gains tax with respect to tangible investments located in a zone, expensing of investments in certain corporate stocks issued by zone businesses, and refundable tax credits for low-income zone employees. The establishment of Enterprise Zones will help create jobs in distressed urban and rural areas.

CHILDREN

The 1993 Budget invests over $100 billion in programs serving children, a $7 billion (or 7 percent) increase over 1992 levels and $40 billion (or 66 percent) over 1989 levels. This Administration has placed a priority on programs serving children, which will help ensure a better future for the next generation.

The budget also recommends that the Head Start programs increase by $600 million or 27 percent over 1992—the largest one-year increase in history. The 1993 Head Start budget of $2.8 billion is $1.6 billion (or 27 percent) higher than 1989—for the first time covering all participating 4-year-olds.

The budget increases support for childhood immunization grants by $52 million (18% increase).

The budget proposes $9.4 billion for all Federal activities to reduce infant mortality.

EDUCATION

Record investment in education overall, but specifically in math and science education, funding is recommended at a level that is 69 percent higher than in FY 1989.

The Education Department would receive the largest discretionary program increase for any Department, $1.6 billion over 1992, for a total of $24.3 billion; an increase over 1989 of $7.2 billion or 42 percent.

Education Department total outlays would grow $3.9 billion or 15 percent over 1992, to a total of $30.4 billion.

REAL ESTATE INCENTIVES

Provide first-time home-buyers a $5,000 tax credit: The Administration proposes to provide first-time home-buyers a tax credit on the purchase of principal residence. The credit would equal 10 percent of the purchase price of the residence, up to a maximum credit of $5,000.

Extend low-income housing tax credit: The Administration proposes to extend for 18 months, State authority to allocate the low-income housing credit to qualifying rental housing.

Waive the IRA withdrawal penalty for first-time home-buyers.

Reduce the top capital gains tax rate to 15.4 percent for long-term investments.

HOUSING

The President's 1993 Budget requests over $1 billion for the Homeownership and Opportunity for People Everywhere (HOPE) program, a 180 percent increase over 1992 enacted level of $361 million. HOPE grants will help public housing and other low-income people become homeowners.

The budget proposes a change in the law to allow Section 8 vouchers to be used to pay for either a home mortgage or rent. Currently, such vouchers can only be used by very low-income households to help pay rent. This change in the law would greatly expand the opportunity for low-income tenants to become homeowners.

Through the President's Low-Income Housing Preservation program, tenants will have the right to purchase buildings from private owners who wish to terminate low-income housing rental subsidies. The budget requests $1.2 billion for his program, almost double the 1992 amount enacted for this program.

The budget proposes over $1 billion for homeless programs, a 6 percent increase above funding enacted by Congress 1992. For HUD homeless programs, the budget recommends an increase of $87 million, or 19 percent, above 1992 levels.

The budget supports a new $50 million initiative. "Safe Havens," for the mentally ill homeless who are unwilling or unable to commit to existing treatment programs.

"Restore" is a $412 million budget initiative to improve the housing conditions, financial health, and affordability of an estimated 1,800 troubled projects insured by FHA that are in danger of defaulting.

PRO-FAMILY INCENTIVES

A new Flexible IRA—with penalty-free withdrawal for medical and educational expenses (in addition to first-time purchase of a home), and with tax-free withdrawal after 7 years.

Family tax allowance: Personal exemptions will be $2,300 for 1992. In order to assist families with children, the Administration proposes to increase the amount of such exemptions for dependent children, who are under 18 years of age, by $500 per child. The increase in exemptions for children would be effective October 1, 1992.

Permit deduction of interest on student loans: The Administration proposes to allow the deduction of interest paid on or after July 1, 1992 on student loans for higher education or post-secondary vocational education.

Creation of the Commission on Urban Families. Co-chairs are Missouri Governor John Ashcroft and former Dallas Mayor Annette Strauss.

HEALTH CARE

In addition to the President's comprehensive health care reform strategy, the Budget includes a additional $1.3 billion for primary and preventive health care.

This includes a 15 percent increase for community and migrant health care centers, which will be used to open new centers in areas characterized by high poverty rates and low rates of public and private insurance coverage.

The budget also continues a 19 percent increase for the National Health Service Corps (NHSC), which will train additional physicians to provide health services in low income and under served areas.

MISCELLANEOUS EXTRAS

Extend Medicare hospital insurance (HI) coverage to all State and local government employees: Extending Medicare coverage to those State and local employees not currently covered would assure that they have access to Medicare and would eliminate the inequity and the drain on the Medicare Trust Fund caused by those who receive Medicare without contributing fully.

Expand public transit exclusion to $60 per month: To encourage employees to use energy-efficient mass transit in going to and from work, the Administration proposes to increase the amount of employer-provided public transit pass expenses that may be excluded from an employee's income from $21 to $60 per month.

Extend mortgage revenue bonds: The Administration proposes to extend the authority for State and local governments to issue mortgage revenue bonds and mortgage credit certificates through December 31, 1993.

The Budget proposes the largest ever one-year funding increase to WIC, $240 million (or 9 percent), for a total of $2.84 billion.

To help AFDC recipients get jobs, pilot projects will experiment with incentives to for-profit companies to train and place AFDC clients in jobs; and test providing lump-sums to recipients who work their way off AFDC. The President's health plan would eliminate loss of health care coverage when AFDC recipients work; their health insurance credits would help cover employer health insurance costs.

The budget includes $437 million, a 33 percent increase over 1992, for weather satellites, and $177 million, a $21 million or 14 percent increase, for Weather Service modernization which will improve weather forecasts and storm warnings.

KEEP IN MIND

Presidential Reform Proposals Still Awaiting Congressional Action:

The following programs are stalled on Capitol Hill. The quicker they are passed, the sooner they can be effectively implemented:

America 2000;

Financial Service Sector Reform;

Legal Reform; and

The National Energy Strategy.

Last but not least, please do not forget the President's remarks concerning unfunded mandates. In his State of the Union address, President Bush strongly declared his support of an end to unfinanced Federal government mandates. He realizes that unfunded mandates unfairly increase the fiscal burden of local governments and has called upon Congress to stop the practice. The President firmly believes that Congress should either responsibly supply the monies with the mandate or not pass the mandate at all.

[Factsheet]

PRESIDENT BUSH'S INITIATIVES FOR STRENGTHENING URBAN AREAS

MAY 12, 1992.

In a bipartisan meeting with Congressional leaders this morning, President Bush reiterated his call for action on initiatives for aiding and strengthening inner cities.

The President believes we must achieve three principal objectives in strengthening our Nation's inner cities. First, we must establish law and order; second, we must create jobs; and, third, we must expand opportunity and help people achieve greater independence.

I. WEED AND SEED

In order to establish law and order on the streets of America's cities, the President has requested $500 million in his FY 1993 budget to fund the "Weed and Seed" program. This program will combine Federal, state, local

and private resources to "weed out" criminals and drug dealers from the streets, and will "seed" social programs and assistance necessary to alter the conditions that create a breeding ground for drugs and crime.

In his recent trip to Los Angeles, the President announced a $19 million award to the City and County of Los Angeles for the "weed and seed" program.

II. HOME OWNERSHIP FOR PEOPLE EVERYWHERE (H.O.P.E.)

The Administration has requested $1 billion for H.O.P.E. in FY 1993. This money will help 36,000 families become homeowners in 1993 and start another 65,000 families on the road to homeownership.

H.O.P.E. helps families in public housing, in projects that HUD owns, and in housing owned by other Federal, state, and local government agencies. Any of these properties can be eligible for H.O.P.E.

III. ENTERPRISE ZONES

In order to provide capital investment and jobs to inner city areas the Administration in pursuing enterprise zone legislation. This legislation would encourage the development of inner city areas by:

Implementing a zero capital gains tax rate on tangible investments located in enterprise zones for at least two years;

Deferral of personal income taxes for small investors who purchase stock in businesses located in enterprise zones. With this incentive, investors would be able to deduct on their personal income taxes amounts up to $50,000 in equity investment in enterprise zone businesses in the year the investment is made, with a $250,000 lifetime limitation; and

Providing a five-percent refundable tax credit on personal income taxes for the first $10,500 or wages earned in an enterprise zone by workers with total annual wages below $20,000.

IV. AMERICA 2000

AMERICA 2000 is the President's strategy to help every community achieve the six National Education Goals established by the President and the nation's Governors in the 1989 Charlottesville Summit. AMERICA 2000 will revolutionize education in America by:

Building AMERICA 2000 communities to improve education neighborhood-by-neighborhood, school-by-school.

Creating "break the mold" schools to lead the way to a new generation of American schools.

Establishing world class standards to create a consensus on what students need to know and be able to do in five core subject areas.

Giving flexibility to teachers and principles to use Federal and state dollars to meet local strategies to help children learn.

Providing all parents with the freedom to choose their children's schools whether they be public, private or parochial.

V. WELFARE REFORM

The President has asked the Congress to grant significant flexibility to the states and localities to implement new approaches to welfare reform. The Community Opportunity Act, which was sent to the Congress in May, 1991, would allow states, cities, and communities to escape the rules and limitations of narrow categorical programs to use resources to meet local needs.

In addition, the President called in his State of the Union address for innovation by the states through waivers of welfare program rules that can be accomplished under current law. The first of these since the State of the Union, from the State of Wisconsin, was approved within 30 days of being received.

In January the President also has asked the Congress to:

Give states the option to raise the AFDC assets limits to $10,000 for families already receiving AFDC;

Establish, through a demonstration "escrow" savings accounts for long-term AFDC recipients working their way off the rolls; and

Extend application of the Pan for Achieving Self-Support (PASS) to allow individuals to disregard income or resources when used in achieving self-sufficiency.

VI. YOUTH JOBS

The President called on Congress to pass the Youth Apprenticeship Act of 1992 and his comprehensive Job Training 2000 proposal to help provide better job opportunities and training for youth and to assist in developing a skilled workforce.

Mr. BYRD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia is recognized.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to proceed for 15 minutes.

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

The Senator from West Virginia is recognized.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. BYRD pertaining to the introduction of S. 2704 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. BYRD. I yield the floor. 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. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. BYRD. I thank the Chair.

CLEMENT STONE'S 90TH BIRTHDAY

CELEBRATING 90 YEARS OF A UNIQUE LIFE

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I am pleased to call attention to the 90th birthday last week—May 4—of one of America's hardest-working, most generous, most irrepressibly optimistic, and most successful business entrepreneurs and public figures, Mr. W. Clement Stone of Chicago, IL, the State represented by the able Senator who presently presides over the Senate with a degree of dignity and skill so rare as the day in June.

I take this belated opportunity to call the Senate's attention to Mr. Stone's birthday because he is currently in Washington to attend a trustees' meeting of one of his favorite organizations, the International Federation of Keystone Youth Organizations, and to be a guest at a private dinner and reception in his honor at the Hay-Adams Hotel.

W. Clement Stone is a father of the contemporary and widespread "self-motivation" movement and, as such, has been directly and indirectly responsible for the personal, business, and life success of literally millions of people. Through his books, tapes, seminars, study courses, and personal appearances, Clement Stone has shared his own experience-tested techniques for achievement and ensured fuller, more abundant lives for men and women around the world.

Many of those lessons Clement Stone learned from his own life.

Left to become the man of his house by his father's death when Clement was only 3 years old, at age 6 Clement began selling newspapers on the streets of Chicago while his mother labored as a dressmaker.

By age 13, Clement Stone was running and managing his own newsstand.

And in the meantime, he devoured all of the old Horatio Alger stories he could lay his eyes on!

At age 16, Clement Stone joined his mother's insurance agency in Detroit and learned sales and marketing by selling and marketing.

At age 20, with barely $100 in his savings account, Clement Stone launched his own insurance agency back in Chicago. That was in 1922. By 1930, Clement Stone was employing 1,000 insurance agents selling insurance throughout much of the country.

Since then, W. Clement Stone has evolved into a mythic American figure, his advice heeded by Presidents, corporate CEO's, ordinary Americans trying to make their lives work as they ought, and millions of men and women in the business world who want to live out the secret of achievement and accomplishment in their chosen careers.

W. Clement Stone's philanthropies and public interests are legion, and hardly any American has not been touched in some fashion by the gifts of time, money, and other resources that Clement Stone has lent to churches, the Boy Scouts and Girl Scouts, cultural institutions and organizations, the American Red Cross, and his numerous books on self-motivation and success.

Mr. President, I have long been an admirer and friend of this uniquely patriotic and positive American, and I am particularly honored to wish him a sincere and unrestrained Happy 90th Birthday as his life and contributions are celebrated this week here in our Nation's Capital.

Mr. DECONCINI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed as if in morning business.

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

GOOD NEWS AND BAD NEWS IN TAJIKISTAN

Mr. DECONCINI. Mr. President, news agencies reported day before yesterday that President Nabiyev of Tajikistan

has agreed to form a coalition government with eight different ministries, including the Ministry of Defense, going to the opposition. This is the good news. It is good news for what is happening in that part of the world.

It is good because the Tajikistan Government in central Asia was a bastion of hard-line Brezhnev-era politics, totally dedicated to communism. Despite some progress toward democratization, they have really spent their time consolidating the Communist line and their authority. But, nevertheless, that is good because they talked like reformers. They changed the name of their party. They even subscribe to freedom of religion, freedom of press, pluralism in the political system, and, in fact, they publicly subscribe to the Helsinki Final Act, all of the articles, including the human rights basket, which includes the right of freedom of religion, the right to emigrate and to move freely, and the right to criticize your government.

The bad news is because the opposition's entry into government came about only after 2 months of severe civil disorder, disorder which resulted in some recent violence and some deaths.

Though each member of the Commonwealth of Independent States is unique, Tajikistan, a Sunni Muslim country adjacent to Iran, with which its culture and language are very closely linked, epitomizes one of the problems common to all the former Soviet Republics. Even in Russia and Ukraine, where Boris Yeltsin and Leonid Kravchuk fairly won Presidential elections and have begun the democratic transformation of their newly independent states, the Communist hold on government structures and the bureaucratic apparatus remains strong.

The pattern is all the more prevalent and very evident in Tajikistan where the Communist-dominated Parliament elected in 1990 still rules the country and placed hard-line President Nabiyev back in power in the wake of the August 1991 coup attempt in Moscow. Nabiyev subsequently won a Presidential election in November 1991, but no international observers monitored the balloting, and there were widespread reports describing a fraudulent election.

In mid-April, I led a Helsinki Commission delegation to Dushanbe, the capital of Tajikistan. At the time, thousands of demonstrators had already been camped out in the city's central square for several weeks, demanding the resignation of the chairman of the Parliament and new elections.

Along with Senator JEFFORDS and Senator AKAKA, I spoke with many of the demonstrators and the leaders of that demonstration, with the chairman of the Islamic Renaissance Party, and other opposition spokesmen to the popular front organization, as well as the chairman of the Parliament and the Foreign Minister and President Nabiyev.

Demonstrators told us clearly that they were deeply distressed at the failure of Secretary Baker to meet with the opposition during his February 1992 visit to Dushanbe. I believe it is particularly important in predominantly Muslim central Asia for Western governments and human rights organizations to have an ongoing dialog and contact with the opposition. It is further essential in these countries for the opposition to be able to voice their concerns to Western Governments' representatives and business people and certainly human rights groups such as the Helsinki Commission.

I stressed to the Government and the opposition leaders the necessity of free and fair elections, of having international monitors, and we were invited to attend the next elections—when I say "we," the Congress of the United States—through the Helsinki Commission, which is a joint committee between the House and the Senate. A bedrock principle of the Helsinki process, which Tajikistan's Government has signed and ascribed to publicly in writing, is the basis of any legitimacy that they may seek. That means fair and free elections monitored by outside forces or outside observers, and I hope that they can achieve that because they will not achieve credibility, in the judgment of this Senator, without such an election process.

At the same time, the democratic process must be observed, and I was disturbed by the efforts of the demonstrators to force the Government's resignation. It just seems to me much better for them to force new elections rather than the resignation of the entire Government that was elected albeit under an election process which was not entirely credible.

Last week's violence signaled the failure of negotiations and the apparent outrage of the opposition forces over the appointment of the former chairman of the Parliament, who had been forced to resign and now was put back into the Government. We met with him, and we found truly a very nice, genuine man on the surface, but, in fact, as he laid out all the programs and plans that the Supreme Soviet was involved in, now known as the Parliament, it became clear they were not enacting the laws to come into compliance with the Helsinki principles. First, he was appointed to head the Tajikistan security forces and then reappointed to Parliament as well after Nabiyev had agreed he should resign and be out of the Government.

So, Mr. President, United States involvement is helping to moderate this difficult transition period in Tajikistan and in other central Asian countries. To our credit and to the credit of the Secretary—though I was critical of Secretary Baker for not meeting with the opposition—to his credit, the recognition of these countries as free, independent, sovereign nations and the establishment instantly of an embassy and the decision to send an attaché and competent people there, not political appointees, to these countries I think has served us well, and we get a great deal of credit for being there. We are the only other major nation, with the exception of Iran, that has Embassies that are open in most of these countries. Our Embassy personnel in Dushanbe are doing an outstanding job. They are professional people that have been sent there for the most part on a permanent basis.

What these countries really want and what they tell us they really need is exchange programs. They want the know-how to build and put together communications systems. In Alma-Ata, Tajikistan, we met with the AID Director, who was starting a new program at the time. On a collective, Communist-oriented farm, which was about 60,000 or more acres, several hundred families worked on this farm pretty much like serfs today. And the AID program, from my recollection, for $3 million was to decollectivize this farm to give every family member a plot of land and title to it, and explain what title was, and what you could do with title to the property.

You could hand it over to your relative, your descendents. You could sell it if you wanted to. Teaching how to have a democratic cooperative as we have in the Western World, is what AID is doing.

AID is also bringing in experts from the agri-industry, from the university ag colleges, to show them how to put together a system of crop substitutions, storage of crops, marketing those crops and exporting them; exactly what they want, and it costs, to my recollection, $3 million.

These countries are not looking for big bucks, billions of dollars, as President Bush has suggested—that we cough up $12 billion to stabilize the ruble in Russia, and in addition agricultural credits as well as $625 million of economic aid.

But the Government and the opposition leaders were unanimous in their request of us. They want our knowledge. They want our hands to show them how to build the democratic process. And they want our understanding.

They are really not looking, I felt, for checks that are blank and open, saying America you are so rich, send us your money. They like us. They respect us, and we should respect them and give them something that is really tangible and that they can use in the future. We should take the opportunity to nurture democracy in this way, and build upon the good will that we have established in these particular Repub-

lics, I think this is the best investment we can make.

No longer are we considered the great Satan, as has been said prior to Gorbachev's days and is still said in Iran. We are considered a model of economic progress and democratic process.

In today's world, in the United States—I mean in today's life, we are so critical of ourselves, and rightfully so, because we know we can do better. We know we can balance the budget and do things if we just have the willpower and leadership. My compliments to the present Presiding Officer for his leadership in the balanced budget effort.

So we all know what is wrong with ourselves here. We just have to get our act together. But, halfway around the world these people are looking to us as examples of what a democratic, free society can be, and an economic free society can be. We should invest in these types of programs to these countries, and not the multibillion efforts and suggestions that President Bush is promoting.

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. EXON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. EXON. The Senator from Nebraska makes an inquiry of the Chair as to the status of the Senate at the present time. Are we in morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SANFORD). The time for morning business has expired, but the time for morning business has not been formally closed.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Nebraska may be authorized to proceed as in morning business for a relatively short period of time for the purpose of a floor statement and the introduction of a bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from Nebraska is recognized.

Mr. EXON. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. EXON pertaining to the introduction of Senate Joint Resolution 302 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

IRRESPONSIBLE CONGRESS? HERE IS TODAY'S BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, the Federal debt run up by the U.S. Congress stood at $3,883,871,790,311.42, as of the close of business on Monday, May 11, 1992.

As anybody familiar with the U.S. Constitution knows, no President can spend a dime that has not first been authorized and appropriated by the Congress of the United States.

During the past fiscal year, it cost the American taxpayers $286,022,000,000 just to pay the interest on spending approved by Congress—over and above what the Federal Government collected in taxes and other income. Averaged out, this amounts to $5.5 billion every week, or $785 million every day.

On a per capita basis, every man, woman, and child owes $15,120.64—thanks to the big spenders in Congress for the past half century. Paying the interest on this massive debt, averaged out, amounts to $1,127.85 per year for each man, woman, and child in America—or, to look at it another way, for each family of four, the tab—to pay the interest alone—comes to $4,511.40 per year.

What would America be like today if there had been a Congress that had the courage and the integrity to operate on a balanced budget?

TRIBUTE TO CLYDE DAVENPORT

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I rise today to commend a fellow Kentuckian, Clyde Davenport. Clyde, from Monticello, KY, has a talent that recently won him the recognition of being selected to receive the 1991 National Heritage Fellowship Award.

This talent that Mr. Davenport possesses brings with it a historic musical tradition. His ability as a master fiddler and banjo player starts back to his early days when at age 11 he made his first banjo by hand.

Today, because of his technical artistry and musical memory for the songs of his forebears, Mr. Davenport is considered the greatest living exemplar of the Cumberland style music and perhaps the best ever by many local players in his region. That is a big compliment especially coming from an area where tradition and memory of great fiddlers remain in minds of old and young alike. Clyde has produced a style that is all his own, making him stand out from the rest of his peers.

It is not only musical talent that makes Clyde such a unique man. He has shared his music with others nationwide and made himself available as a teacher whenever called upon. His performances include the National Folk Festival, the Smithsonian Festival of American Folklife, and the Festival of American Fiddle Tunes in Seattle. And as a teacher in his home in Monticello, he welcomes anyone interested in the chance to listen and learn his musical heritage and allows them to take home recordings of his work.

I would like to extend my congratulations to Clyde. I applaud him in his desire and efforts to keep a tradition alive—a tradition that is not only special to the people of that area but one that is unique to the State of Kentucky.

PRESIDENT LEE TENG-HUI'S SECOND ANNIVERSARY

Mr. WALLOP. Mr. President, as President Lee Teng-Hui and Vice President Li Yuan-Zu of the Republic of China prepare to mark their second anniversary in office on May 20, 1992, I wish to extend to them and to the Chinese people my congratulations. The Republic of China has much to be proud of. Its economic growth and development have been the envy of the world. As the 13th largest trading entity in the world, the ROC is now our 6th largest trading partner. A dynamic and diversified economy, the Republic of China on Taiwan provides the economic opportunity which enables all Chinese on Taiwan to attain a high standard of living and a great level of personal freedom.

In the political arena, Taiwan has a strong multiparty system and continues the process of constitutional reform, including a revision of its Presidential election methods. Just last December, Chinese in the ROC had the opportunity to vote for representatives to the national assembly. The results of that election gave a strong mandate to President Lee to continue the process of constitutional reform.

On the international scene, Taiwan plays an important role in the community of free nations. Taiwan's accession to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade [GATT] is under consideration by the members of that trading body. I cannot overemphasize the importance of moving quickly on that application. In terms of its international responsibilities, Taiwan has shown itself as a compassionate nation, willing to shoulder the commitments of a great economic power. In recent days, Taiwan has donated 100,000 tons of rice and $5 million worth of medical aid to the Ukraine, a breakthrough in establishing direct links between the ROC and the former Soviet Republics. Additionally, Taiwan's overseas fund has assisted a number of Southeast Asian and Central American countries. For its efforts, Taiwan should be commended.

On a personal level, I have enjoyed greatly working with Taiwan's representative here in Washington, Ambassador Ding Moushih. Ambassador Ding and his excellent staff have worked diligently to keep us on Capitol Hill abreast of developments in the Republic of China. They deserve recognition for the role they have played in improving relations between our two countries. I know that relationship will continue to grow and flourish.

JOINT APPEAL ON THE ENVIRONMENT

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, yesterday Senator DOLE and I met with a group of religious and science leaders called the Joint Appeal. Their purpose

is to advocate further action to protect the environment, which they have concluded is warranted based on scientific and religious grounds.

The religious leaders represent 330,000 congregations nationwide. The scientists represent a range of disciplines. All are concerned about the environment. They urged that Congress do more to protect the environment. They asked for better protection of the ozone layer, more actions to curb greenhouse gas emissions, better protection of biological diversity and recognition of the environmental impacts of a growing population.

I applaud the efforts of this diverse group that has found such strong common ground. I ask unanimous consent to insert their Declaration of the "Mission to Washington" into the RECORD.

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

DECLARATION OF THE "MISSION TO WASHINGTON" JOINT APPEAL BY RELIGION AND SCIENCE FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, WASHINGTON, DC, MAY 12, 1992

We are people of faith and of science who, for centuries, often have traveled different roads. In a time of environmental crisis, we find these roads converging. As this meeting symbolizes, our two ancient, sometimes antagonistic, traditions now reach out to one another in a common endeavor to preserve the home we share.

We humans are endowed with self-awareness, intelligence and compassion. At our best, we cherish and seek to protect all life and the treasures of the natural world. But we are now tampering with the climate. We are thinning the ozone layer and creating holes in it. We are poisoning the air, the land and the water. We are destroying the forests, grasslands and other ecosystems. We are causing the extinction of species at a pace not seen since the end of the age of the dinosaurs. As a result, many scientific projections suggest a legacy for our children and grandchildren of compromised immune systems, increased infectious disease and cancer rates, destroyed plants and consequent disruption of the food chain, agriculture damaged from drought and ultraviolet light, accelerated destruction of forests and species, and vastly increased numbers of environmental refugees. Many perils may be still undiscovered. The burdens, as usual, will fall most cruelly upon the shoulders of the poorest among us, especially upon children. But no one will be unaffected. At the same time, the human community grows by a quarter of a million people every day, mostly in the poorest nations and communities. That this crisis was brought about in part through inadvertence does not excuse us. Many nations are responsible. The magnitude of this crisis means that it cannot be resolved unless many nations work together. We must now join forces to that end.

Our own country is the leading polluter on Earth, generating more greenhouse gases, especially CO_2, than any other country. Not by word alone but by binding action, our nation has an inescapable moral duty to lead the way to genuinely effective solutions. We signers of this declaration—leaders in religion and science—call upon our government to change national policy so that the United States will begin to ease, not continue to increase, the burdens on our biosphere and their effect upon the planet's people.

We believe that science and religion, working together, have an essential contribution to make toward any significant mitigation and resolution of the world environmental crisis. What good are the most fervent moral imperatives if we do not understand the dangers and how to avoid them? What good is all the data in the world without a steadfast moral compass? Many of the consequences of our present assault on the environment, even if halted today, will take decades and centuries to play themselves out. How will our children and grandchildren judge our stewardship of the Earth? What will they think of us? Do we not have a solemn obligation to leave them a better world and to insure the integrity of nature itself? Insofar as our peril arises from a neglect of moral values, human pride, arrogance, inattention, greed, improvidence, and a penchant for the short-term over the long, religion has an essential role to play. Insofar as our peril arises from our ignorance of the intricate interconnectedness of nature, science has an essential role to play.

Differences of perspective remains among us. We do not have to agree on how the natural world was made to be willing to work together to preserve it. On that paramount objective we affirm a deep sense of common cause.

Commitment to environmental integrity and justice, across a broad spectrum and at the highest level of leadership, continues to grow in the United States religious community as an issue of utmost priority—significantly as a result of fruitful conversations with the scientific community. We believe that the dimensions of this crisis are still not sufficiently taken to heart by our leaders, institutions and industries. We accept our responsibility to help make known to the millions we serve and teach the nature and consequences of the environmental crisis, and what is required to overcome it. We believe that our current economic behavior and policies emphasize short-term individual material goals at the expense of the common good and of future generations. When we consider the long-term as well as the short-term costs, it seems clear that addressing this problem now rather than later makes economic as well as moral sense. We impoverish our own children and grandchildren by insisting that they deal with dangers that we could have averted at far less cost in resources and human suffering.

We reaffirm here, in the strongest possible terms, the indivisibility of social justice and the preservation of the environment. We also affirm and support the indigenous peoples in the protection and integrity of their cultures and lands. We believe the wealthy nations of the North, which have historically exploited the natural and human resources of the Southern nations, have a moral obligation to make available additional financial resources and appropriate technology to strengthen their capacity for their own development. We believe the poor and vulnerable workers in our own land should not be asked to bear disproportionate burdens. And we must end the dumping of toxic waste materials disproportionately in communities of low income and of people of color. We recognize that there is a vital connection between peacemaking and protecting our environment. Collectively, the nations of the world spend one trillion dollars a year on military programs. If even a modest portion of this money were spent on environmental programs and sustainable economic development we could take a major step toward environmental security.

We commit ourselves to work together for a United States that will lead the world in the efficient use of fossil fuels, in devising and utilizing renewable sources of energy, in phasing out all significant ozone-depleting chemicals, in halting deforestation and slowing the decline in species diversity, in planting forests and restoring other habitats, and in realizing worldwide social justice. We believe there is a need for concerted efforts to stabilize world population by humane, responsible and voluntary means consistent with our differing values. For these, and other reasons, we believe that special attention must be paid to education and to enhancing the roles and the status of women.

Despite the seriousness of this crisis, we are hopeful. We humans, in spite of our faults, can be intelligent, resourceful, compassionate, prudent and imaginative. We have access to great reservoirs of moral and spiritual courage. Deep within us stirs a commitment to the health, safety and future of our children. Understanding that the world does not belong to any one nation or generation, and sharing a spirit of utmost urgency, we dedicate ourselves to undertake bold action to cherish and protect the environment of our planetary home.

SIGNATORIES

Dr. Diane Ackerman, Poet, Naturalist, Author.

Dr. John F. Ahearne, Executive Director, Sigma Xi.

Dr. Richard Cartwright Austin, S.T.D., Environmental Theologian with Appalachian Ministries Educational Resource Center.

Dr. Ian Barbour, Professor Emeritus, Religion Department, Carlton College.

Reverend James Bell, Executive Director, Interfaith IMPACT for Justice and Peace.

The Reverend Thomas Berry, Director, Riverdale Center for Religious Research.

Dr. Alan Betts, Atmospheric Research.

Sally Grover Bingham, California Diocese: Environmental Commission, Episcopal Church.

Dr. Elizabeth Bowen, Representative, National Spiritual Assembly of the Bahai's of the United States, President-Elect, Physicians for Social Responsibility, Assistant Professor of Family Medicine, Morehouse School of Medicine.

The Most Reverend Edmond L. Browning, Presiding Bishop, Episcopal Church of America.

Reverend William J. Byron, S.J., President, The Catholic University of America.

Reverend Joan Campbell, General-Secretary, National Council of Churches of Christ.

Mr. John Carr, Secretary for Department of Social Development and World Peace, United States Catholic Conference.

The Rt. Reverend Frank S. Cerveny, Bishop of the Diocese of Florida, Episcopal Environment Commission.

Dr. Charles Chambers, Executive Director, American Institute of Biological Sciences.

Dr. Audrey Chapman, Program Director for Science and Human Rights, American Association for the Advancement of Science.

Reverend Dr. Benjamin F. Chavis, Jr., Executive Director of the Commission for Racial Justice, United Church of Christ.

The Reverend Dr. Herbert W. Chilstrom, Bishop, Evangelical Lutheran Church in America.

Dr. Eric Chivian, Professor of Psychiatry, Harvard Medical School, Psychiatrist, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Co-Founder, International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War.

Father Drew Christiansen, S.J., Director, Office of International Justice and Peace, United States Catholic Conference.

Mr. Robert H. Cory, Quaker United Nations Office.

Mr. Herman Daly, Senior Economist, World Bank.

Dr. Calvin DeWitt, Director, Au Sable Institute of Environmental Studies.

Ms. Ann Druyan, Secretary, Federation of American Scientists & Senior Consultant, Joint Appeal by Religion and Science for the Environment.

Reverend Dr. Milton Efthimou, Ecumenical Officer, Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of North and South America.

Mr. Warren Eisenberg, Director, of the International Council, B'nai B'rith.

Mr. Joseph Fitzgerald, Executive Director, National Catholic Rural Life Conference.

Ms. Susan Fletcher, Senior Analyst in International Environmental Policy, Congressional Research Service.

Ms. Amy Elizabeth Fox, Associate Director, Joint Appeal by Religion and Science for the Environment.

Dr. Jerome Frank, Professor Emertius, Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences, Johns Hopkins University Hospital.

The Most Reverend William B. Friend, Chair, Committee on Science and Human Values, National Conference of Catholic Bishops, Bishop of Shreveport.

Mr. George T. Frampton, Jr., President, The Wilderness Society.

Reverend Dr. William Gardiner, Director of the Department of Social Justice, Unitarian Universalist Association.

Dr. Arthur Green, President, Reconstructional Rabbinical College.

Dr. Lester Grinspoon, Associate Professor of Psychiatry, Harvard Medical School.

Mr. Paul Gorman, Executive Director, Joint Appeal by Religion and Science for the Environment.

Dr. James Hansen, Director, Goddard Institute for Space Studies.

Mr. Jaydee R. Hanson, Assistant General-Secretary, Ministry of God's Creation, United Methodist Church.

Dr. John Haught, Chairman of the Department of Theology, Georgetown University.

Dr. Raymond Hayes, Chairman of the Department of Anatomy, Howard University.

Professor Theodore Hiebert, Associate Professor of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament, Harvard Divinity School.

Reverend Theodore M. Hesburgh CSC, President Emeritus, University of Notre Dame.

Dr. Robert Hestenes, President, Eastern College.

Reverend Gilbert Horn, Executive Director, Colorado Council of Churches.

Reverend Father Vertanes Kalayjian, Diocese of the Armenian Church.

Mrs. Annette Kane, Executive Director, National Council of Catholic Women.

Dr. Henry Kendall, Stratton Professor of Physics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Chairman of the Board, Union of Concerned Scientists.

Ms. Kaye Kiker, Member, Executive Board, National Toxics Campaign.

Dr. Gail Buchwalter King, Associate Director for Program Services, Association for Theological Schools.

Dr. Richard D. Land, Executive Director, Christian Life Commission of the Southern Baptist Convention.

Dr. Dan Lashof, Senior Project Scientist, Natural Resource Defense Council.

Dr. Harold Lohr, Retired Bishop, Northwestern Minnesota Synod, Evangelical Lutheran Church in America.

Chief Oren Lyons, Faithkeeper and Chief of the Turtle Clan, Onondaga Nation.

Professor Wangari Maathai, Founder, Kenyan Green Belt Movement.

Dr. Jerry Mahlman, Director, Geophysical Fluid Dynamic Laboratory, United States Department of Commerce.

Most Reverend James M. Malone, Chair, Domestic Policy Committee, United States Catholic Conference, Bishop of Youngstown.

Dr. Thomas F. Malone, University Distinguished Scholar, Department of Marine, Earth and Atmospheric Sciences, North Carolina State University.

Dr. Jessica Tuchman Matthews, Vice President, World Resources Institute.

Sister Catherine McNamee, President, National Catholic Educational Association.

Mr. Alden Meyer, Director, Climate Change and Energy Program, Union of Concerned Scientists.

Reverend Charles Miller, Executive Director, Division of Church and Society, Evangelical Lutheran Church in America.

Reverend Dr. Donald E. Miller, General Secretary, Church of the Brethren.

Dr. Irving Mintzer, Senior Research Fellow, Center for Global Change, University of Maryland.

Dr. Wendell Mohling, President, National Science Teacher's Association.

Ms. Kay Moran, Office of External Affairs, The Smithsonian Institution.

The Very Reverend James Parks Morton, Dean, Cathedral of St. John the Devine.

The Reverend Dr. Edwin G. Mulder, General Secretary, Reformed Church in America.

Dr. James Nash, Executive Director, Churches' Center for Theology and Public Policy.

Dr. C. William Nichols, General Minister and President, Christian Church (Disciples of Christ).

Dr. Richard S. Nicholson, Executive Officer, American Association for the Advancement of Science.

Dr. Richard B. Norgaard, Professor of Energy and Resources, University of California at Berkeley.

Dr. Kusumita P. Pedersen, Joint Secretary, Global Forum of Spiritual and Parlimentary Leaders for Human Survival.

Dr. Albert M. Pennybacker, Professor of Homiletics, Lexington Theological Seminary.

The Reverend Dr. William R. Phillippe, Executive Director, General Assembly Council, Presbyterian Church USA.

Reverend Tyrone S. Pitts, Secretary General, Progressive National Baptist Convention Inc.

The Right Reverend Nathaniel Popp, Bishop of Detroit, Orthodox Church in America.

Dr. Charles C. Price, Board Chairman, Chemical Heritage Foundation, Benjamin Franklin Professor of Chemistry Emeritus.

Dr. H. Ronald Pulliam, Director of the Institute of Ecology, University of Georgia, President, Ecological Society of America.

Ms. Paz Artaza-Regan, Program Associate, Ministry of God's Creation, Board of Church and Society, United Methodist Church.

Dr. W. Franklyn Richardson, General Secretary, National Baptist Convention.

Dr. Howard Ris, Executive Director, Union of Concerned Scientists.

Most Reverend John R. Roach, Chair, International Policy Committee, United States Catholic Conference, Archbishop of St. Paul/Minneapolis.

Mrs. Barbara Bellows Rockefeller, Professor of History, Middlebury College.

Mr. Steven C. Rockefeller, Professor of Religion, Middlebury College.

Dr. F. Sherwood Rowland, Donald Bren Professor of Chemistry, University of California at Irvine, President, American Association for the Advancement of Science.

Dr. Robert John Russell, Founder and Director, Center for Theology and Natural Sciences.

Dr. John Ruskay, Vice Chancellor for Public Affairs, Jewish Theological Seminary of America.

Dr. Carl Sagan, Professor of Astronomy and Director of the Laboratory for Planetary Studies, Cornell University & Co-Chair of the Joint Appeal by Religion and Science for the Environment.

Rabbi David Saperstein, Director and Counsel, Religious Action Center of Reform Judaism.

Rabbi Alexander Schindler, President, Union of American Hebrew Congregations.

Dr. William Schlesinger, Department of Botany, Duke University.

Dr. Stephen H. Schneider, Head of the Interdisciplinary Climate Systems Section, National Center for Atmospheric Research.

Dr. Ismar Schorsch, Chancellor, Jewish Theological Seminary of America [Tues. only].

Mr. Leonard Schwartz, Chairman, Rainforest Alliance.

Dr. Stephen E. Schwartz, Senior Physical Chemist, Brookhaven National Laboratory.

Dr. Cecil E. Sherman, Coordinator, Cooperative Baptist Fellowship.

Dr. Ronald Sider, Professor of Theology and Society, Eastern Baptist Theological Seminary, Executive Director, Evangelicals for Social Action.

Mr. Art Simon, Christian Children's Fund.

Dr. N. Jean Sindab, Program Officer for Economic and Environmental Justice, National Council of Churches of Christ.

Dr. Bennett W. Smith, First Vice President, Progressive National Baptist Convention.

Dr. Anthony Socci, Professional Staff Scientist, Science, Technology and Space Subcommittee, United States Senate.

Mr. William Somplatsky-Jarman, Associate for Environmental Justice, Presbyterian Church USA.

Ms. Frances Spivy-Weber, Director of the International Program, Audubon.

Ms. Victoria Stack, The Albert Schweitzer Institute for the Humanities.

Dr. Jeremy Stone, President, Federation of American Scientists.

Sister Betty Sundry, Associate Director, Leadership Conference of Women Religious (Catholic).

Dr. Byron Swift, Executive Director, International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources.

Professor Ronald F. Thiemann, Dean, Harvard Divinity School.

Dr. Foy Valentine, Former Executive Director, Christian Life Commission of the Southern Baptist Convention.

Dr. Anne Whyte, Director General, Division of Environment and Natural Resources, International Development Research Centre.

Dr. Timothy Weiskel, Fellow at the Center for Science and International Affairs, JFK School of Government Research, Associate in Environmental Ethics, Harvard Divinity School.

Dr. Edward O. Wilson, Baird Professor of Science, Harvard University.

The Rt. Reverend William Winterrowd, Bishop of The Diocese of Colorado, Episcopal Environment Commission.

Ms. Nancy Wisdo, Director, Office of Domestic Social Development, United States Catholic Conference.

Dr. Steven J. Zeitlin, Center for Psychology and Social Change, Harvard Medical School.

(Affiliations for identification purposes only.)

SPEECH BY MARILYN QUAYLE

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I recently attended the dedication ceremony for the Center for Cancer Research at Richland Memorial Hospital in Columbia, SC. This was a momentous occasion, and among the other guests were Mr. Dave Dravecky, the former pitcher for the San Francisco Giants; and Mrs. Marilyn Quayle, the brilliant and indefatigable wife of our Nation's Vice President.

Mr. Dravecky and Mrs. Quayle have both been outstanding advocates for cancer research as well as early detection and treatment, and it was an honor to be with them. During the course of the day, I had the good fortune to hear Mrs. Quayle deliver an outstanding speech, and I ask unanimous consent that it be included in the RECORD.

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

REMARKS OF MARILYN TUCKER QUAYLE

(Richland Memorial Hospital, Dedication Ceremony for the Center for Cancer Research, Columbia, SC, April 27, 1992)

Thank you, Senator Thurmond. I am honored to be here today. And thank you for such a warm welcome.

It is indeed a pleasure to help dedicate the Center for Cancer Treatment and Research of the Richland Memorial Hospital. My congratulations to Mr. Ivey and all the staff on this very special occasion.

I am often asked, what exactly does the wife of the Vice President do? When Dan first took office nearly four years ago, I asked myself the same question. There didn't seem to be a job description for the Second Lady.

When stepping into a new role, it is always helpful to talk with those who have past experience. So I asked Barbara Bush. She explained that, aside from attending official White House functions and being the President of the Ladies of the Senate, I could create my own job description.

As a lawyer. I had advocated the cause of individuals, but as wife of the Vice President, I now had the unique opportunity to advocate the cause of millions.

I only had to recall the agony of the final days of my mother's battle against breast cancer to know what one of the causes would be.

Cancer continues to take a tremendous toll on our country—both in human and economic terms.

When an individual develops cancer, there are numerous costs associated with treatment. In all, including direct costs of medical care and the cost of lost productivity, total cancer costs will reach more than $90 million this year. Cancer accounts for more than 10 percent of our nation's health care bill.

But far worse—and certainly more devastating for all of us—is the human cost of cancer. This year alone, more than a half a million Americans will die—victims of some form of cancer.

Cancer *is* frightening to all of us. About 76 million Americans alive today will eventually develop cancer. That's one in three—about one million this year.

Statistics and figures are quoted so frequently these days that, for many of us, it is difficult to fully understand the truly devastating impact cancer has had on this nation over the years. Let me give you yet another statistic, one that, I think, may help put this into perspective for you:

During the ten years of the Vietnam War, nearly 58,000 soldiers died. This was indeed a tragic loss for the families of these brave men and women and for our nation. During this same ten-year period, the lives of more than three million Americans were cut short because of cancer. Three million. That is too many loved ones lost, and too many families shattered.

The State of South Carolina is not exempt from the tragedy of cancer. Cancer is the second leading cause of death here—the first is heart disease. This year, over 14,000 South Carolinians will be diagnosed with cancer and almost 7,000 will die.

Most of us have been touched in some way by cancer. And although this disease can claim the lives of those we love, it is important to remember that, in many cases, cancer can be beaten. In fact, there are over 8 million Americans who have faced this disease and are alive today—the survivors are leading healthy, full and rewarding lives.

Many of you in the audience this morning are among those courageous survivors. And I want to take just a moment to salute you for your valor and determination in your personal battle against cancer. This disease is physically and emotionally draining. In facing this challenge, each of you is truly an inspiration to us all.

It is for you, and the countless others who will one day face cancer, that we must put forth every effort and utilize every resource to conquer cancer. Clearly, the fight against cancer deserves—indeed, it demands—our nation's focus and attention.

We must stop the trail of tragedy that cancer leaves behind. We cannot allow this disease to continue unchecked along its path of pain and suffering. This is an urgent mission—and one in which we must be united.

The opening of this cancer center is an important step in fulfilling this mission. This center offers new hope to cancer patients, cancer survivors, and their families. It adds one more piece of artillery to the arsenal of weapons we need to win the war against cancer.

As many of you know, this year, the Richland Memorial Hospital will celebrate its centennial anniversary. For the past one hundred years, this community has relied on Richland Memorial for its medical care. It is a fitting tribute to this longstanding commitment that, this year, you are once again expanding services to meet the unique and ever-changing needs of the residents of South Carolina.

A number of you here today are physicians, nurses and staff at the Center for Cancer Treatment and Research or at the Richland Memorial Hospital. As health care professionals, you are on the front line in the battle against disease. You are committed to the care and comfort of those who suffer.

Whether in the operating room or admissions office, laboratory or nurses station, you are there—every day—fighting the ongoing battle to preserve human life and helping to end the pain and suffering that illness brings.

The quality of our lives depends a great deal on our health, and, as supporters, volunteers and friends of the Center, you know this to be true. This facility would not have been possible without your dedication and hard work. You are vital to this health care system's ability to grow and enhance its services and programs.

This morning, Dave Dravecky and I had an opportunity to take a tour of the new Center for Cancer Treatment and Research. It's a fabulous facility. We met a few members of the staff. And had the chance to learn about some of the impressive programs that this center will offer.

It will provide comprehensive, state-of-the-art services to individuals with cancer. And a union has been forged between this regional hospital and the University of South Carolina's research program.

Science and the scientific application of new knowledge is the path to ending the pain and suffering that cancer causes. The collaborative efforts of the talented staff here at the hospital and the University will give this facility the ability to bring together the best and the brightest, enabling you to pool resources, skills, and knowledge.

I am confident that, with you continued dedication, many discoveries and valuable insights will originate from the laboratories here at this facility. Your work will have an impact not only here in South Carolina, but across the nation.

Medical and technological advances have given us new methods of diagnosis and many new treatment options—that only a few years ago would have been considered science fiction. We know more about cancer and how cancer develops than ever before. However, in our quest for a cure and prevention for this disease, we must remember that the quality of life must be a priority before, during, and after treatment.

The Center for Cancer Treatment and Research recognizes that cancer patients and their families have unique psychological and emotional needs, and offers special supportive services to their patients—A camp experience for children and adolescents that provides an escape from the seemingly endless array of tests and procedures, and gives these young people a few hours to just be children.

There's a support group for parents who have suffered the pain of losing a child, and a home hospice program for those patients whose final days are best experienced in a home environment. These services will help cancer patients and their families cope with the anger, frustration and uncertainty that often accompany a cancer diagnosis.

Looking across this audience, I see women and men with unique talents, special skills and unlimited potential, and the words of the poet Elizabeth Barrett Browning come to mind, because you are the people who can "light tomorrow with today."

Each of you—in your own way—has the power to light tomorrow for the thousands in this community who will face cancer. No matter where your talents lie or how much or how little time you have to give, every one of us can—and must—be a part of the fight against cancer. Simply by talking to your loved ones and friends about this disease, you can make a difference. And, you just might save the life of someone you care about.

Two decades ago, before President Nixon signed the National Cancer Act into law, the word "cancer' was rarely spoken aloud. This disease was a mysterious malady for which there was little hope of survival, and physicians often veiled the diagnosis of a malignancy.

Today, however, because of the candor of many people, cancer is openly discussed. I

believe that because of these honest and forthright exchanges, we have been educated and have all become more aware.

Education is a powerful tool that helps us to prepare. The more we know about cancer, the better prepared we will be should this disease strike. Early detection is one of our most effective weapons in combatting cancer. Detecting and treating this disease in its earliest stages dramatically boosts our chance of survival.

Yet, even with the numerous education and awareness campaigns that highlight the many life-saving benefits of early detection, most Americans—in fact nearly 70 percent—do not follow the guidelines for such screening procedures as mammograms, Pap tests, colon screenings, and monthly breast self examinations.

Early detection is our first defense against cancer, and it begins with you—the individual.

I try to prepare. Each year, I see my doctor for a physical exam. I have a mammogram. And every month, I practice monthly breast self examination.

I do it for myself and I do it for my family. I also do it in memory of my mother. My mother was a physician. She knew the warning signs and what she should be doing. Yet, when her cancer of the breast was discovered, it was already too late. Early detection and prompt treatment might have given my mother many more years with her family. What happened to her does not have to happen to anyone else.

Learning the facts about cancer and the importance of early detection, and implementing that knowledge, can make the difference between life and death. There a number of sources for information. And now, one of them is right here in this community. Everyone can turn to this Center for the information they need to take charge of their lives.

What you are doing here at this new facility and in this community is an integral part of our nation's overall efforts to combat cancer. I know that you work will make a difference in the lives of thousands.

When cancer enters our lives, we are changed forever, and the lives of our families and friends are never the same. We must not stand idly by as this disease takes the lives of our loved ones.

Ladies and gentlemen, we cannot be resigned to the immense tragedy that comes in a lump the size of a pea or in the invisible malignancy that invades our body. We are here today to reaffirm that, in the war against cancer, there can be no substitute for victory.

And on the day, when our mission is fulfilled and cancer no longer darkens our lives, my mother and the millions of others who have lost their battles with cancer, will have their memorial in the lives of all those who will be saved.

Thank you. God bless you, and God speed in your important work here at the Richland Memorial Hospital Cancer Research Center.

TRIBUTE TO COL. JOHN H. MILLER

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to the memory of a great South Carolina soldier and patriot, Col. John H. Miller, who passed away on April 13, 1992. Colonel Miller was a decorated veteran of World War II, Korea, and Vietnam, who served his country with great courage, dedication, and integrity. We mourn his passing.

"Buck" Miller believed there was no nobler duty than military service, and he lived by that belief. He was a brave, selfless, public-spirited soldier, and he dedicated his life to upholding the principles which made our Nation great.

Colonel Miller built a distinguished record during his 21-year military career. He fought with the 517th Parachute Regiment during World War II, as well as serving on General MacArthur's staff. He also saw action with U.N. forces in the Korean war and later fought with Special Forces in Southeast Asia. During his combat service, he earned the Combat Infantryman Badge with two stars, two Purple Hearts, and a Bronze Star.

After his retirement from the Army, Colonel Miller continued to serve his fellow man by working with the Department of State and as a commissioner with the Maryland District Court.

Mr. President, Col. John Miller will be remembered by all those who knew him as a man whose life exemplified love of country and service to others. He was a fine soldier; loving husband, devoted father and grandfather, and proud American, and he will be sorely missed.

I would like to take this opportunity to extend my deepest condolences to Colonel Miller's lovely wife, Nell Oland Miller, his son, retired army Lt. Col. John H. Miller, Jr., his daughter Vicki, and the rest of his fine family.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the eulogy written by Colonel Miller's son be included in the RECORD following my remarks.

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

EULOGY IN MEMORY OF COL. JOHN H. MILLER

(Memorial Service at Arlington National Cemetery, April 16, 1992)

The family appreciates you who have gathered to honor this officer, who delighted in serving his Country, who has now been taken by our Lord. I have been asked by John Miller, Jr., Colonel Miller's son, to relate his memories of his father to this congregation.

My father was a soldier—first, last, always. He attained the distinction of serving his country in three wars, World War II, Korea, and Southeast Asia. He welcomed his duty and took great pride in his willing sacrifices.

Men and women of my father's generation were given a gift of which many were unaware. In fact, I think my father would have denied it was a gift. But from my perspective, he and others like him were given the gift of opportunity to serve their Country and to receive the thanks of the Nation for that service. Such a gift imparts a meaning and an unwavering purpose to a life that those of us who came after can only examine with some envy and awe at its largesse.

My father loved his Country and he loved the Army. He frequently remarked, "There is no nobler duty than military service to your Country." His remark deserves reflection for it is the essence of the officer at rest before you. "There is no nobler duty than military service to your Country." Together he and my mother energetically fulfilled the requirements of a military career. In the early 1940's, my father cut quite a figure in his Clemson University ROTC uniform—enough to convince a young lady at Brenau College to marry him and become an Army wife. Their first overseas assignment together was in Occupied Japan. My mother packed and set off by ocean liner to Tokyo alone with a 1 year old boy. My mother loved the military life and my father. While only a toddler then, I can only now realize that working for General MacArthur was a great challenge. After Japan, we were stationed at Fort Benning in the first of many post quarters. My sister Vicki was born there.

Successive tours took us throughout the world. After serving in two wars, it was in Europe and later at Fort Bragg and Southeast Asia where my father's life as a soldier became real to me. Germany was a special assignment in those days, at the height of the Cold War and the Cuban missile crisis. We watched on many occasions as this officer would muster for countless field exercises for days and weeks at a time. The world situation was real.

This new world with its new kinds of wars would demand a new kind of soldier. Colonel Miller was called on to gather with others with like skills to form a small unique cadre which was to activate what has become the Army's elite units—the U.S. Special Forces. We found ourselves back at my birthplace, Fort Bragg, in a world of professional soldiers made even more distinct by their elite Green Berets. From there, my father deployed to a remote part of the world referred to as "Southeast Asia." He was one of the first U.S. soldiers to see service in that part of the world. These were the years, when everything was possible and America a moral force in the world.

During all their tours, my father and mother made close friends, many of whom have shared their grief with us at his passing. And, his friends from Clemson University stayed in touch with "the Colonel" during the many years of his illness. Clemson University mementos and his display case of his service awards—including the Combat Infantryman's Badge with two Stars, two Bronze Stars, two purple Hearts, and Master Parachutist Jump Wings—vied for the place of honor on his hospital room walls.

My father never really told "war stories." Men and women who have been in combat often do not. But I know that combat and his military career were the defining events of his life. And those defining events made him proud and capable. For all his worldliness and experience, my father remained a man who loved the simple things and simple truths of life. He could write beautifully crafted and thoughtful prose. His thoughts were always characteristically distilled, simple in deliverance but profound and lasting in meaning. He chose his words, endeavors, and friends well.

The energy and directedness of the military officer did not desert him in civilian life. I particularly remember the time he hauled load after load of brick from the demolition of the old VFW building in Frederick to the new house where he designed and built a brick patio by himself. He delighted in saving and refurbishing and improving. And the home he left behind in Frederick stands as testimony to his and my mother's hard work.

I am absolutely certain of his parting words for those of us gathered in this fine chapel and on these hallowed grounds. He would simply say, "Shoot! Where else in the

world could an unwealthy and unworldly boy from Pickens, South Carolina be given such great opportunities to serve his Country, make his way through the ranks, and then spend eternity with such honorable and brave friends?" I believe he would also counsel us to live by our distinct values which make us distinctly Americans, to not forsake these values, and to be ready to defend them if necessary.

My father was not a perfect man, nor am I, nor are any of us. We all have our faults. We all make our mistakes. But my father was a good man, with a big heart, and always the best of intentions. He loved his wife, "my Nell." He loved his children. He loved his grandchildren. He loved his Country. And, he loved the Army. We will miss him.

THE END OF AN ERA AT WALMART, INC.

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, the recent passing of Sam Walton marked the end of an era at Walmart, Inc. We in Arkansas have long known what a treasure we had in Sam.

I want to share with my colleagues a number of editorials about Sam Walton and the legacy he left behind.

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

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 7, 1992]

"SAM WALTON"

Sam Walton was as direct and unglamorous as his business, which consisted mostly of finding out what people wanted and selling it to them at the lowest possible price. Although he was, by the mid-'80s, considered the world's richest man, chances are that if you live in the urban Northeast you didn't know much about him or his principal works: the hundreds of discount department stores that have helped transform much of small-town America. In fact, he did little to draw attention to himself, unless driving an old pickup truck and continuing to lead a simple Arkansas existence could be considered an oblique bid for notoriety.

Mr. Sam—as he liked to be called by his employees, whom he liked in turn to call "associates"—had the idea some 30 years ago that there was big business to be done in small towns, much bigger than was being done in the 15 Ben Franklin five-and-dime franchises he and his brother had acquired since starting with a single store in Arkansas in 1945. He set out on his own in 1962 to build a chain. By the time of his death this week at 74, there were more than 1,700 Wal-Marts, mostly in the South and Midwest, with annual sales well over $40 billion.

The pattern with Wal-Mart has been to scout out promising towns and open a store nearby that combines under one vast roof much of the merchandise available in an old-fashioned town center, from drugs to clothes to bicycles. Understandably enough, Mr. Walton has been criticized as a despoiler of downtowns because of the many small merchants driven out of business by his relentless cost-cutting and low prices. But he was hardly the first to realize that Main Streets were being replaced by parking lots, and there is no denying that the demand was that for what Wal-Marts offered: low prices, convenience and helpful clerks.

He drove himself hard until near the end of his life, generally getting to work at 4:30 a.m. and going at high speed all day long. He was also a hard driver of others. The "associates" have never received high salaries, but they are encouraged to take advantage of company stock plans, which have been lucrative for many of them and no doubt encourage a greater attention to making the stores work. Mr. Walton seems to have conducted a lifelong war against complacency, within both his company and himself. Perhaps he disdained the trappings of wealth out of a fear that he would lose his feel for what it takes to meet the simpler needs of ordinary people. No one had better cause to know how demanding a business that can be.

[From the Washington Times, Apr. 10, 1992]

SAM WALTON'S AMERICA

(By Paul Greenberg)

It must have been about 1950 when an ambitious young fellow came to Bentonville, Ark., installed his wife and four children in a rented house, and opened a five-and-ten in an old store he'd bought for $15,000. He made his first desk out of a couple of sawhorses and a sheet of plywood, and nailed an orange crate to the wall for a bookcase. When he died Sunday at 74, nobody had to identify Sam Walton. His chain of Wal-Mart stores in 43 states and 212 Sam's Clubs now employ more than 400,000 people and ring up $43.8 billion in annual sales, making it the country's largest retail chain.

How did he do it?

He paid attention, particularly to the customer, who was always right. He offered low prices, and achieved them through efficient, centralized organization, especially when it came to purchasing and distribution. He made his employees, always called Associates, part of an intense, customer-oriented, proud team. He was completely efficient and completely down-home. And he learned from everyone. To quote one Wal-Mart executive, "I've seen entire company policy change in one day over one constructive comment submitted by a stockman."

Sam Walton proved that the American frontier hadn't ended in 1890, no matter what the history books say. Like the frontier, his empire combined individual drive and complete cooperation. Result: He showed that the American Dream was still attainable, not just for himself, but for a vast army of employees, stockholders, suppliers, and all those who prospered with Wal-Mart. At last report, his chain of 10 Arvest banks from Fayetteville to Bella Vista had more than a billion dollars in assets. Of course that represents only part of the wealth he created—wealth that continues to spark the growing economy of Northwest Arkansas, just to start with.

The American frontier had its dark side, too. Wal-Mart's reliance on part-time employees raised questions about who would pay for their health insurance and retirement, if anyone. As on the frontier, would those who couldn't keep up find themselves abandoned? Or would society—that is, all of us—step in at some point and take care of those left behind? On the frontier, the U.S. Cavalry always arrived in the nick of time, at least according to tradition. What of those who couldn't compete on this new business frontier—the stores that had once anchored small towns, and that took the towns with them when they went? Ghost towns were a feature of the frontier, too.

An unquestioned success, Sam Walton's story raises questions that, like the frontier spirit, are still with us. Sam Walton wasn't just an ingenious entrepreneur but, given the American ethos, a kind of inevitable force of nature. He left behind immense wealth and some nagging doubts as he moved across the landscape like a cyclone.

For the frontier spirit to triumph, as it did in Sam Walton's case, a frontier is needed, and he proved that one still exists. Right here in Arkansas, where the license plates used to read Land of Opportunity. Arkansas still is. So is America.

One of those parochial observers from the national press who came through the state the other day in search of the real Bill Clinton dismissed Arkansas as a "small, insular" state. Well, Arkansas is small, with only 2 million people. Arkansas is also insular, in the sense that everybody seems to know everybody else, their family, nickname and business.

Sam Walton's story reminds that Arkansas is small and insular in other ways—in the way England was small and insular when the sun never set on her empire. In the way Japan is small and insular even with a vast trading empire. In the way a vast frontier can seem small and insular to those without vision or pluck or understanding.

Arkansas is small and insular in the way Tyson Foods is, with its sales worldwide. It is small and insular the way Murphy Oil is. It is small and insular the way Stephens Inc., the biggest bond house off Wall Street, is. It is small and insular the way Sam Walton was—doing business far beyond Arkansas but caring most about his family and friends, his Associates and his state. The obituaries made Mr. Sam's simple priorities seem eccentric in a man of great wealth—on a par with his old pickup and ordinary haircuts. But to what better uses could wealth be put? Another "secret" of Sam Walton's success was that he had the right priorities. And if that is being small and insular, long may Arkansas—and America—remain so.

[From USA Today, Apr. 6, 1992]

"MR. SAM'S" SECRET

He learned to think of employees as associates as a clerk at J.C. Penney.

And taking that to heart may have been the abiding genius of Wal-Mart founder Sam Walton, who died Sunday at age 74 of bone cancer.

"You have to talk to the people. You have to listen to them, mostly. You have to make them know that this is a partnership. That's our secret," Walton told USA Today last year.

It's a secret that turned Wal-Mart into the USA's biggest retailer and made Walton's family, with $22 billion, among the richest in America.

But it's a secret that many businesses only talk about and never take to heart.

The recession has led many businesses to resort to "expense management" to beef up anemic bottom lines, with perks including stock ownership for workers and even free coffee getting the ax.

Walton knew how to cut costs. His company's name was chosen in part because it had fewer letters than other alternatives and, so, signs would cost less. And his cost consciousness kept Wal-Mart's overhead, at 15%, about half that of other major retailers.

But Walton also knew that his bottom line depended on his associates' morale.

He didn't lavish perks upon them, but he did share the growth of his enterprise through an employee stock purchase plan. And he and fellow managers talked with them about everything from where to put a store to how to cut expenses.

In short, Walton formed a real partnership with workers that helped keep Wal-Mart's customers happy.

And for any business, that's the bottom line that matters most of all.

[From the Chicago Tribune, Apr. 7, 1992]

"WAL-MART WON'T BE THE SAME"

The Wall Street experts profess that Wal-Mart Stores will continue on the same without Sam Walton, the 74-year-old founder of the world's largest retailer who died Sunday after a long fight with cancer.

They say his tireless and zealous way of doing business and treating customers is so pervasive and deep-seated that Wal-Mart will grow and thrive for years.

Maybe so, but his employees will mourn the loss of his drive and enthusiasm for change and innovation. And many Americans will miss seeing his smiling, weathered face, peering through the window of his pickup truck and from underneath his baseball cap.

For many, the 1980s was the decade of greed that produced flashy, powerful billionaires like Donald Trump and Michael Milken. But it also was the period that saw Sam Walton turn a backwater discounter into a retailing giant by applying common sense and high technology to a tradition-bound industry.

Along the way, the self-effacing Walton made himself and his family among the wealthiest people in America. Few seemed to begrudge him, however, because he did it the old-fashioned way—through hard work, ingenuity and tough competitiveness.

After World War II, Walton acquired a Ben Franklin dime store in Arkansas with a $25,000 loan from his father-in-law. By the early 1960s, he and his brother owned 15 stores, and Sam wanted to begin opening discount stores in rural communities.

The honchos at Ben Franklin said it would never work, so Walton opened his first Wal-Mart in 1962. Today, Wal-Mart has nearly 2,000 stores in 42 states. It's opening about 150 new outlets a year and eyeing expansion in foreign cities.

Most of the growth came in the 1980s. Concentrating on small Southern and Midwestern towns, he offered low prices on many name-brand goods without special sales and heavy merchandising. He stressed friendly service, and shoppers dictated what went on the shelves, not some army of corporate buyers.

A penny-pincher, he fought to lower operating costs by investing in modern warehouses and computers. With the latest sales and inventory data, his stores could be resupplied in a matter of days, instead of weeks. Sears and K Mart scrambled to catch up.

The success didn't come without controversy. Consumers loved the value and convenience of Wal-Mart, but some Main Street stores were overrun by the giant who had gobbled up acres of cornfields outside of town. Most overlooked the destructive nature of Walton's brand of capitalism, however, to get lower prices and greater selection.

In giving Walton the Presidential Medal of Freedom last month, President Bush called him "an American original who embodied the entrepreneurial spirit and epitomized the American dream."

For this pioneer, it was a fitting eulogy.

[From the Houston Chronicle, Apr. 7, 1992]

SAM WALTON: ARKANSAS ENTREPRENEUR WAS ONE OF CAPITALISM'S ICONS

In the tradition of other entrepreneurial giants before him Sam Walton had a better idea, which was also a simple one: Walton brought the buying power of enormous scale to small towns throughout the South and Midwest, and sold a wider variety of things cheaper than the Mom and Pop operation on Main Street could ever imagine. Out of that straightforward strategy, Walton, who died Sunday at age 74, created a fortune that made him the richest man in America—worth a mind-boggling $18-plus billion in 1991, according to one published estimate.

Walton was a latter-day life sign of capitalistic creativity.

In an age of doubt about the inherent vitality of American capitalism, Sam Walton was the living, breathing, ever-tinkering, never-quite-satisfied proof of it. As big as he became, Sam Walton never lost his inclination to seek ways to improve the way his more than 1,700 Wal-Mart stores did business.

Walton was not without his critics. His brand of entrepreneurialism—on the outskirts of countless small towns—sounded the death knell for many a small-town Main Street and town square across the state of Texas.

But even in that problem there was growth. Walton forced small-town boosters and merchants into new approaches. American merchandising, and American capitalism, were changed for the better by the energy of Sam Walton.

[From the Hartford Courant, Apr. 7, 1992]

"IN THE MOLD OF FORD, ROCKEFELLER"

Sam Walton was a retailing genius because he knew what shoppers wanted and he gave it to them. He stocked the shelves of his Wal-Mart stores with popular products, priced them competitively and employed clerks who wanted to serve customers. Mr. Walton did not discover this winning formula. Beatrice Fox Auerbach, for example, used customer service and quality products to make her G. Fox & Co. a premier department store in Connecticut.

There were other Connecticut similarities with Wal-Mart. Carl Bennett, founder of the Norwalk-based Caldor discount store chain, and the Gilman brothers, Milton, Irving and Herbert, who ran Rocky Hill-based Ames Department Stores, were contemporaries of the Arkansas-based Sam Walton, who died Saturday at age 74.

There was so much similarity between Ames and Wal-Mart that the Wall Street investment community in the 1980s hungered for a merger of the two discount chains. The rumors became so intense that Herbert Gilman and Sam Walton at one point had to issue a joint statement denying there would be a marriage.

Mr. Walton's death came before Connecticut consumers got a chance to know him personally. Wal-Mart is scheduled to open stores soon in Willimantic and Manchester. Another Walton discount enterprise, a Sam's Club, was opened last year in Manchester. Since it was his practice to visit as many of his company's nearly 1,800 stores in 42 states as possible, it was certain Mr. Walton would have showed up in Connecticut.

He was a legend in the mold of Henry Ford, the automaker, and John D. Rockefeller, the oil baron. All were of humble origins and through their industry accumulated enormous wealth.

Messrs. Ford and Rockefeller left family dynasties that have carried on the founders' reputations. It's now up to Sam Walton's children to maintain that reputation—that example of what hard work and imagination can accomplish.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, morning business is now closed.

DISAPPROVAL OF S. 3—THE CONGRESSIONAL CAMPAIGN SPENDING LIMIT AND ELECTION REFORM ACT OF 1992

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now resume consideration of the President's veto message on S. 3, which the clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

President's veto message accompanying S. 3, an act to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to provide for a voluntary system of spending limits and benefits for congressional election campaigns, and for other purposes.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will now be 4 hours of debate on the message with the time to be equally divided and controlled between the majority leader and Republican leader or their designees.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum and ask unanimous consent that time be charged equally against both sides.

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

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. BOREN. Mr. President, I yield so much time as the Senator from Nebraska might desire off my time.

Mr. EXON. I thank my friend and colleague from Oklahoma.

Mr. President, the Senator from Oklahoma has asked me to add him as a cosponsor to the bill that I have just introduced, and I so ask unanimous consent.

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

Mr. EXON. I reserve the remainder of the time allotted to me, and I suggest the absence of a quorum as per the previous request by the Senator from Oklahoma.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized.

Mr. BOREN. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. BOREN pertaining to the introduction of Senate Joint

Resolution 302 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. BOREN. Mr. President, I yield myself as much time as I might require.

Mr. President, I rise today to discuss a subject which relates to our political system. It relates in fact to a crisis in our political system that is not one that is looming in the future, it relates to a crisis that is here with us. It relates to a problem, a deep and serious problem, an illness, a malignancy within the heart of our political system that is already threatening the lifeblood of the system itself.

Mr. President, I refer to the way that we finance campaigns in the United States and the way that we finance campaigns is contributing to the disintegration of the political process in this country. We talk about gridlock in our politics. We talk about the fragmentation of the American people, and the fragmentation of the Congress. We talk about the inability of the Congress to get its work done.

Mr. President, one of the most important reasons why we are seeing the erosion of the strength of this institution, the ability of Congress to do its work in a meaningful way and the inability of those of us in public life to form a consensus to bring the American people together to solve our problems is the way that we finance campaigns in this country.

My colleagues all know when it comes to financing campaigns in this country, the sky is the limit. There is no limit on how much money a candidate can raise to run for public office in the United States. And we all know the result. More and more, because unlimited amounts of money can be poured into our political system, campaigns have been not about the issues, not about the qualifications of the candidates, not about which candidate has the best ideas for the future of this country, more and more often elections are being decided in this country on the basis of which candidate can raise the most money. And in the vast majority of the cases, over 95 percent of the cases, the candidate that raises the most money is able to win the election.

Mr. President, that perception that money—instead of ideas, instead of qualifications—is deciding the course of American politics is one of the reasons why so many people in this country are becoming disillusioned with our political system. It is one of the reasons why over 80 percent of the American people say they have lost confidence in this institution. It is one of the reasons why over 80 percent of the American people say that they believe that Members of Congress are more interested in serving the special interests, those who have the ability to pour money into their campaign, than they are in serving the national interests of this country.

And when you ask people do you think Members of Congress care more about people like me, average working men and women in this country at the grassroots, or do you think they care more about the special interests who can fund their campaigns, 78 percent of the American people say we think the Members of Congress care more about the special interests than they care about me.

This great institution which is here to represent the people themselves is being tarnished in the public mind, and the confidence of the public in this institution is being eroded in large measure because of the way that we finance our campaigns.

What has happened? We all know the facts and figures. In the last 14 years, the cost of a winning candidate on the average to run a successful campaign for the U.S. Senate has gone from $600,000 14 years ago to $4 million this year. And when I say $4 million, I refer to the average in the average size State. I am not talking about New York or California or other States where the figure can go as high as $20 million or $30 million or $40 million when we put in what the candidates in both parties spend.

Mr. President, can anyone say that this trend of pouring more and more money into American politics has been a good thing? I find it hard to understand anyone could argue that it has been good for our political system.

More and more time of Members of Congress is spent raising this money. On the average, you have to raise $13,000 every week for 6 years during a Senatorial term to raise just the average amount of money that it takes to run a successful race. So there is too much money coming into the American politics. It is playing too great a role. Too much of our time and attention is spent trying to raise that money, and the perception that money really determines decisions here and the outcome of elections across this country is causing the American people to lose confidence in the Government. So we have too much money coming into our politics.

Mr. President, the second thing that is wrong with the current system is too much of that money is going to incumbents. I just looked at the figures. They are now in already for this election cycle. So far during this election cycle incumbent Members of the House of Representatives have raised 19 times as much as challengers who are seeking to unseat them from the House of Representatives this year, 19 times as much. In the last election, when all the results were in, incumbents, sitting Members of Congress, were able to raise $8 in campaign funds for every $1 raised by opponents, and in the Senate it was $3 raised by sitting Members for every $1 by opponents.

So what do we have? We have, in essence, by having no spending limit, by allowing people to raise as much money as they possibly can with no limit whatsoever, and very little limit on where it comes from, we give an enormous advantage to incumbents. It is one of the reasons why people across the country have become so impatient with the unfairness and the tilting of the system that they have urged term limitations and other ways of getting at the problem because they know that the current elections system is not competitive, because so much advantage is given to incumbent Members—19 to 1 is the figure so far—without spending limits, in terms of the amount that incumbents are able to raise instead of challengers.

And we all know the reason. It is because people are concerned about the legislative decisions we have to make. It is because sitting Members of Congress serve on important committees and subcommittees that affect this business interest or that labor interest or whatever it happens to be. Those decisions are being made by people who are here now. And therefore citizens, or groups, especially those who have an interest in legislation, want access to the Members that are here now. And they believe that one of the ways they can be heard is to give a generous campaign contribution to the person that is already here, to get that advantage, to get in the door.

So, as I have said, Mr. President, it is just human nature. I would not begin to say that I think that the average Member of the U.S. Senate or the U.S. House of Representatives would consider himself or herself to be for sale. I think they would be offended by that suggestion. I think the vast majority of our colleagues are honest people who came here with a sincere desire to render public service.

But, Mr. President, when you are having to operate under a system in which you have to raise $4 million, on the average, to successfully run for reelection and you are trying to decide desperately how to raise that $4 million, if you have 5 extra minutes, as I have said before, and there are large numbers of people waiting in your waiting room to come in to see you, if one of them is a farmer in bib overalls that cannot possibly contribute more than $1, if anything, to your campaign and one is a school child that cannot afford to make a contribution but whose life you might touch by spending some time with that school student, whose life you might change and perhaps inspire somebody to seek to make a difference in terms of public service himself, or herself, or perhaps there is another citizen there who could make a modest contribution or be active in your campaign, and there sits someone else, let us say a lobbyist or a representative of a special interest group who that very day could cut you a check for $10,000—$5,000 for the general

election and $5,000 for the primary election—and perhaps host a fundraiser for you in Washington, DC, where you might raise $300,000 or $400,000 or $500,000 in one night—I read where I think the Presidential dinner raised I think $9 million in one night, one dinner in this city—where are you going to spend your 5 minutes if you are sitting there worrying about where in the world am I going to raise the money to run for reelection? Will you spend the 5 minutes with the school child or farmer or that other citizen that is out there? Or will you spend that 5 minutes with the person that might be able to help you figure out how to raise $300,000 or $400,000 of that $4 million you need.

Then we say, Mr. President, we are surprised and shocked when the public has the perception that we might be influenced by special interest money flowing into American politics. It would be shocking if indeed that influence was not being felt here. It must be stopped.

Mr. President, that is not why we came to this institution. We are the trustees of this institution. If we do not look after it, if we do not look after the peoples' interest, if we do not look after our constitutional system, if we do not preserve the election process for the future generations of this country, no one else will. No one else has the power to do it. We are charged by the Constitution with that responsibility.

We must stop this, stop the money chase in American politics, stop a system of unlimited spending which allows more and more of the money to pour in on the side of those that are already in office. And so that is the second evil. An incumbent's protection plan is inherent in any system which has unlimited campaign spending.

The third evil of the current system is that too much of the money comes not from the people back home, not from the individual citizens at the grassroots, but more and more of it does come from special interests.

More and more of it comes from special interests, the political action committees. More than half of all the money contributed to candidates in the last election cycle who were elected to Congress, more than half of them got more than half of their money, not from the people back home but from special interest groups, political action committees, many of them with no connection whatsoever with their home States or districts, many of them led by people who never even visited the districts or States of the Members of Congress where those contributions were made.

Where does the special interest money go? It goes even more strongly to incumbents than the general contributions go. So far in this election cycle the political action committees have been giving to incumbents in the House of Representatives at a ratio of 30 to 1. I know that is an unbelievable figure, but I want to say it again because it is accurate. So far the ratio of political action committee contributions to incumbents has been 30 to 1 this year in the House, and in the Senate it has been 6 to 1.

Mr. President, we passed through the Congress of the United States a bill, Senate bill 3—it passed by a substantial majority of the Members of this body and Members of the House of Representatives—to stop it, to reform the system, to try to bring the political process back into the hands of the people themselves where it belongs, to stop the perception that Congress is for sale, to reduce the influence of money and politics so we can spend more of our time solving the people's problems and less of our time raising money for campaigns and so we can help restore the confidence of people back in their own Government again. What an opportunity.

We have heard so much, and we have heard it from the President of the United States as well as from Members of this body, about doing something to reform the system and restore confidence in Government. We sent to the President of the United States a bill that, had he signed it, would have given him, I believe, an opportunity to be recorded in history as having signed one of the most important pieces of legislation in many years to restore confidence in Government again and to clean up the political system.

He had a historic opportunity to sign a bill to stop the money chase, a historic opportunity to sign a bill to reduce the influence of special interests in the political action committees, a historic opportunity to sign a bill that would level the playing field between the challengers, people with new ideas who want to come and serve in this Congress, and the incumbents who are already here.

And what did he do? Instead of taking that opportunity and seizing this chance finally given to him through the constructive action, after 9 years of work—beginning with the bill that I first introduced with Senator Goldwater as a bipartisan measure several years ago—finally Congress, struggling with this problem, finally able to set aside its own self-interest—because, after all, every sitting Member can raise more money than challengers, virtually everyone—finally we got Congress to do the right thing. Congress voted to put limits on the amount of money it could raise for its own reelection campaigns.

And what did the President of the United States do with this legislation? Tragically, he vetoed this legislation. He vetoed this legislation not on a weekday, not at a time on which there could be a lot of comment about it; he vetoed this legislation over the weekend where it would receive the least amount of attention.

Mr. President, he not only missed a historic opportunity to do something to help clean up the political process of this country, he issued a veto to prevent this bill from becoming law and from beginning to change, in a very wholesome way, the political process of this country, for reasons that absolutely defy any logical analysis.

I want to quote his two or three main reasons for vetoing this legislation contained in his veto message. First, he said, "This is an incumbents' protection plan." To put spending limits in place? When incumbents are outraising challengers 19 to 1 under the current system? To call a bill that finally puts limits on spending an incumbent's protection plan? Mr. President, there is no excuse for that kind of mischaracterization of this legislation. The President either should know better than that or he should be ashamed of himself for misrepresenting what he knows to be the facts. There is no earthly way that you can say this bill is an incumbents' protection plan when compared to the status quo, where incumbents are given such an enormous advantage in fundraising.

Mr. President, if the staff of the President of the United States—if, indeed the President really did not know better, and I can really, given the two alternatives, hope that is the case and hope he was not playing politics with this—if the President of the United States was not staffed on this issue any better than that, if I were to vote on a bill on this floor and have the members of my staff tell me that I was trying to help challengers by stopping a plan to put spending limits on campaigns, I would be looking for a new staff to advise me. I hope the President, if he had been given that kind of information, I hope he will let us know so we can give him an opportunity to send another bill back to level the playing field; and maybe, with better advice next time, he will sign it.

Mr. LEAHY. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BOREN. I will be happy to yield on my time.

Mr. LEAHY. First, I commend the Senator from Oklahoma, as I did before, for his sterling efforts in this regard. To call this bill an incumbent's protection act, of course, makes no sense whatsoever. I think when I first ran for the Senate and, in effect, was in the position of being a challenger, I would have given anything to have had legislation like this because it would have given me a tremendous advantage I did not have at that time.

As I have said on the floor, I think the Senator from Oklahoma has done such a good job on this legislation that, even if this veto is upheld, and even though this legislation does not take effect for 2 more years, I will fol-

low this in my own reelection campaign. In fact, I will set my own limits considerably lower. But I will do it because of the strong controls and strong conditions for both sides, especially for the challenger, that the Senator from Oklahoma has put into this legislation. In fact, I will do it even though it means sending back some money I have raised.

I commend him for doing it. I wish, at a time when most people are turned off by the whole electoral process, that the President had thought long and hard before vetoing this. He is, after all, one who will have received, by the end of this year, $200 million in Federal funds for his own campaign elections. He ought to say if that worked for the Presidency, it should certainly work for the other branch of Government which has to represent all the people in all parts of the country.

Mr. President, I do commend the Senator from Oklahoma. He has fought long and hard on this. I think I know where the votes may fall today. But if he is not successful in overriding this veto, I hope the Senator from Oklahoma will be back and try again. I want him to know the Senator from Vermont will be there with him.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Vermont for his generous remarks. His support has been very important all through this fight, not only his support but his example, his statement of his willingness to abide by the limits of this bill himself and the standards that are set forward in this bill. Trying to clean up the political process is, I think, a very inspiring example and one which I truly appreciate.

Sometimes we hear people say, do politicians just want to talk about something, or do they want to do something about it? The Senator from Vermont is clearly the kind of person who wants to do something about it. I appreciate very much what he said.

I want my colleague to know the answer to the question which he raised. I know he already knows the answer. If we are not successful in overriding this veto today, will the Senator from Oklahoma and others be back here until we finish the job? Absolutely. I say to my colleagues, this is a matter that is on the national agenda to stay.

The people expect us to do something about this problem. The people understand it—the people understand. Perhaps if the White House staff does not understand, the people understand. The people know what is happening when an unlimited amount of money is flowing into the political process. The people understand when incumbents are able to outspend challengers 19 to 1. The people understand exactly what is wrong when political action committees are giving more than half the money, instead of the people back home, to political campaigns. The people understand. The people are registering in polls, expressing their disapproval, their lack of confidence. Mr. President, this should be and this will be an election issue this year.

I do not believe that the public, I do not believe that the citizens of the United States would allow us, even if we wanted to, to continue to duck and dodge this issue. They are going to insist that we continue to enact bills that have meaningful campaign finance reform until the President of the United States signs a meaningful bill into law.

As long as this Senator is here, and there are 4 years and a few months remaining in this Senator's term, I can assure that this Senator will continue to bring back this proposal. People cannot run away from it. They are going to have an opportunity again and again, and let the people notice, let the people watch which Members of Congress are prepared to step up and vote for a bill to reduce and put limits on the amount of campaign spending and reduce the influence of special interest groups, and let them see which Members of Congress are not willing to make those sacrifices necessary to put those limits in place.

And then let the people be the judge. The people will ultimately be the judge. And in spite of an advantage enjoyed from special-interest money and floods of money coming into the system, there is going to be enough of a political backlash in this country one of these days that we will be forced to act, if we have not already done the right thing.

Mr. President, that is not the way the system ought to work. Those of us charged with this responsibility here and now, as trustees of the people, should do what is right now, on our own volition, of our own free will and not wait until we are forced to do it. We ought to demonstrate to the people that we are statesmanlike, to take this action now without being forced to take it, without public pressure, and we have done that.

This is one of the most positive things that has come to this Congress in a number of years. People said, how in the world are you going to get incumbents to vote against something that is in their own interest? How are you going to get the Members to put limits on themselves and to take on this disadvantage? We have been able to do it and now, I am sorry to say, we have been thwarted by the President.

The President has changed his mind on a number of other issues. He has changed his mind on unemployment compensation; he has changed his mind on civil rights legislation, and I say that not to criticize, I say that not to make a partisan point. I would worry about a President of the United States who did not retain a willingness to look at an issue over again and anew and to listen to new ideas and to listen to new arguments.

Mr. President, all I can say is that I have never been unfair to this President. I think I have cast as many votes as anyone on this side of the aisle in behalf of programs of this President when I thought they were right. I have come to his defense when I thought he was right. I have criticized those who made attacks on a partisan basis because we have too much partisanship in this country. But I sincerely believe the President of the United States is wrong in this instance, frankly wrong.

He missed a historic opportunity to reform the system, and I am going to do all I can, and I hope my colleagues will do all they can, to convince the President to change his mind and to change his mind about this veto.

Again, the President's first point is wrong calling it an incumbent's protection plan when it is just the opposite. The current system is an incumbent's protection plan. It will not have anything for challengers to have a chance until we limit spending. The limit on spending is the issue.

The second mistake he made in his veto message is, he says this bill fails to limit political action committees. He says he is vetoing it because it fails to eliminate them completely. In the drafting of his own proposals, his own lawyers at the White House indicated to him they thought there was a constitutional problem with abolishing political action committees totally. His own bill did not abolish political action committees, it only abolished connected political action committees, those of labor and business groups. It did not abolish ideological political action committees. So all in the world that would have happened under that legislation is business and labor groups would have reincarnated themselves in the form of ideological PAC's, and we would have had all the same special interest money flooding into the system under new labels.

I personally would be prepared to abolish political action committees. Senator Goldwater and I, in our first legislation, put limits on what candidates could receive from political action committees. This bill, while it does not completely abolish political action committees, goes a long way toward limiting them. For the first time this bill puts a limit on the total amount that candidates can receive from political action committees, and the facts are that had this bill been in law in the last election cycle, the amount of money contributed by political action committees to candidates running for Congress would have been reduced by 53 percent, more than cut in half. It would more than have cut in half the influence of political action committees on the election process. And yet the President said he vetoed it because it does not do enough about political action committees.

When you cut in half their influence, surely that is a positive and constructive step in the right direction, sufficient to not only keep the President from not vetoing this bill, but to have merited the President's enthusiastic support. After all, this is exactly the kind of thing that the President has talked about in the past.

Finally, he has indicated he thought it was subsidies, public financing, taxpayer financing. Mr. President, he even said there was not a sufficient description in this bill as to how the funds would be raised.

Mr. President, I know again by discussing other issues with legal counsel at the White House who are well versed, they could have told the President since this bill originated in the Senate rather than the House of Representatives, it was beyond the possibility of this bill to describe how the funds would be levied. But we did put a sense-of-the-Congress resolution in this legislation that indicated that we would not use additions to the burden on general taxpayers of this country, voter finance incentives.

We all know if we are going to have spending limits, they have to be voluntary under the Supreme Court decision in the case of Buckley versus Valeo. And, therefore, we have to have some incentives to encourage, to get candidates, just as President Bush has accepted the $200 million over a period of years for his campaign fund from the public Treasury in order that he be enticed to accept spending limits. That is exactly what he has done. He understands that. He understands that system. He has participated in it. He received $200 million of taxpayer financing from it.

And so, of course, he must be aware of the fact that there is a Supreme Court decision; that there have to be some incentives. We made it clear we do not want to pay for these incentives by taxes on the general public. We have said that in this legislation. There are all sorts of alternatives: Voluntary checkoff in which people can make a voluntary contribution through their tax returns over and above what they owe as a tax liability. There is a possibility you can have a clean Government fund of some kind setup. Some people suggest lobbyist registration fees be increased, as a matter of good Government and oversight, to bring in additional revenues in order to finance this proposal. The incentives, the lower advertising rate on television and radio that would be provided to candidates who accept spending limits.

There are many possibilities. One thing that is clear in this bill through the sense of the Congress resolution is that it would not be from any additional burdens on the general taxpayers of this country. And so, Mr. President, I can only say I hope the President will change his mind. I believe that he has been ill-advised and I truly believe that he has missed a historic opportunity to do something about a serious problem in this country.

I want to read, Mr. President, from just a few editorials that have been written since the veto by the President. One is from the Washington Post. I ask unanimous consent that the entire editorial from the Washington Post of today be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington Post, May 13, 1992]

A RETROGRESSIVE VETO

Making as little noise as he could, the president over the weekend did as expected and vetoed the campaign finance reform bill. "I cannot accept legislation . . . that contains spending limits or public subsidies," he said. It's a curious point to be made by a public figure who has now accepted precisely such limits and subsidies in four presidential elections, two as a vice presidential candidate, two for president. No candidate in American history has received as much public money as Mr. Bush will have accepted in return for ostensibly abiding by spending limits by the end of this year—a total over his career of about $200 million. Whatever his reasons for rejecting the legislation, they can't have been these.

The presidential system in which Mr. Bush himself has flourished was created in the mid-1970s in response to the excesses of Watergate. It was meant to prevent precisely the kind of buying of elections that is now characteristic at the congressional level. Mr. Bush by his veto perpetuates a system that he pretends to deplore.

The problem is that the price of office has gone too high. Congress as a whole now collects more than $2.5 million in campaign funds a week; that's the year-round average, not the election-year high. The average senator must raise $12,000 a week every week of his six-year term to accumulate the $4 million he is likely to spend for reelection; a senator facing a costly race may spend three times that. The figures for House seats are comparable when adjusted for size of district and length of term—but while the problem in the Senate is the constant begging of money, the problem in the House has become its receipt. Most House members are easily able to raise much more than they need; they carry over the excess to deter future challengers. On the House side especially, much of the money comes from PACs, the giving arms of interest groups whose legislative fortunes the receiving candidates control.

It's a terrible system; the latest figures suggest it is getting worse. The Federal Election Commission reports that receipts at this stage of the two-year cycle are up about 25 percent over the comparable figure for 1989–90. Part of that is an anomaly, the result of three unusually expensive Senate races in the two largest states of California and New York. Part is also due to a healthy increase in challengers for House seats and to the unusual number of open seats on the House side particularly, where incumbents have lost in primaries or retired. Still, House incumbents have raised $92 million, up 7.5 percent from the cycle before and about six times what their challengers have raised.

The president said the vetoed bill would have perpetuated "the corrupting influence of special interests and the imbalance between challengers and incumbents." In fact, the spending limits and partial public finance would have had the opposite effect. The system he leaves in place is the one that is rotten. He calls it "seriously flawed," and so it is—but his own veto has not protected it.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. President, to quote a little bit about the veto message from the Washington Post editorial, here is what the paper has to say:

Making as little noise as he could—

And I already mentioned that. I did not know until the very next day it had been vetoed. I understand why he would not be proud of it—

Making as little noise as he could, the President over the weekend did as expected and vetoed the campaign finance reform bill. "I cannot accept legislation * * * that contains spending limits or public subsidies," he said. It's a curious point to be made by a public figure who has now accepted precisely such limits and subsidies in four Presidential elections, two as a Vice Presidential candidate, two for President. No candidate in American history has received as much public money as Mr. Bush will have accepted in return for ostensibly abiding by spending limits by the end of this year—a total over his career of about $200 million. * * *

The problem is that the price of office has gone too high. Congress as a whole now collects more than $2.5 million in campaign funds a week;

Congress is bringing in $2.5 million in campaign contributions each week collectively—

that's the year-round average, not the election-year high. The average Senator must raise $12,000 a week every week of his 6-year term to accumulate the $4 million he is likely to spend for reelection; A Senator facing a costly race may spend 3 times that.

And then the editorial goes on to talk about the advantage that incumbents have, about the fact that House incumbents have already raised $92 million, up 7.5 percent from last cycle, and 6 times what their challengers have raised. And then it concludes:

The President said the vetoed bill would have perpetuated "the corrupting influence of special interests and the imbalance between challengers and incumbents." In fact, the spending limits and partial public finance would have had just the opposite effect. The system he leaves in place is the one that is rotten. He calls it "seriously flawed," and so it is—but his own veto has now protected it.

That is why, Mr. President, the President of the United States should change his mind. The present system as the editorial says, is rotten. We all know it and the people of the United States know it. And then as the editorial concludes, by his own veto he has now protected it.

I also would like to read into the RECORD an editorial from the New York Times of yesterday and ask unanimous consent that the full text of that editorial also appear in the RECORD.

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

[From the New York Times, May 12, 1992]

PRESIDENT BUSH AND THE SEWER

The Democratic Congress, finally heeding public anger, passed a solid campaign finance reform package and sent it to the President's desk. It wasn't perfect—merely a giant leap in the right direction.

So how did Mr. Bush, the self-proclaimed government reformer, respond? He raised his veto pen and killed the bill, for the thinnest, most cynical of reasons. And he did so on the weekend, while public attention was still fastened on Los Angeles.

The bill would have created a cleaner, more competitive system of public financing for Congressional races. It also would have stopped the flow of "sewer money"—the millions nominally aimed at "party-building" that evade present limits on contributions to individual candidates.

The $9 million the Republicans recently raked in at a black tie embarrassment called "The President's Dinner" is further evidence that the sewer remains wide open.

Mr. Bush dismissed the reform bill as a "taxpayer-financed incumbent protection plan." That ignores the letter he received from 32 current and former Republican Congressional challengers, who rightly lauded the reform as "necessary to level the playing field." It also ignores reality. In 1990, House incumbents had on hand $239 million; challengers had only $37.5 million.

Mr. Bush's call for abolishing all corporate and union political action committees is deceptive. Even in the event that his proposed ban passed constitutional muster, the special interest contributions would still flow, as corporate executives and union officials organized new "ideological" action committees.

But Mr. Bush's trashing of public financing is even more disheartening. A leader would explain to the public that for candidates to rely on favor seekers for funding ends up costing democracy far more than the $150 million or so in public subsidies the bill offered every two years. A leader would tell the truth: The only way to reduce the influence of corrupting private money and to help challengers is to supply public money.

By November, meanwhile, Mr. Bush will have received the benefit of more than $200 million in public financing for his four national campaigns. The voters now know from the weekend veto who's being contradictory and who's blocking reasonable reform.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. President, as this editorial States:

The Democratic Congress, finally heeding public anger, fashioned a solid campaign finance reform package and sent it to the President's desk. It was not perfect—merely a giant leap in the right direction.

So how did Mr. Bush, the self-proclaimed Government reformer respond? He raised his veto pen and killed the bill, for the thinnest, most cynical of reasons. And he did so on the weekend while public attention was still focused on Los Angeles.

The bill would have created a cleaner, more competitive system of public financing for congressional races. It also would have stopped the flow of "sewer money", the millions nominally aimed at "party building" that evade the present limits on contributions to individual candidates.

The $9 million recently raked in at a black tie embarrassment called "The President's dinner" is further evidence that the sewer remains wide open.

Mr. Bush diminished the reform bill as a "taxpayer-financed incumbent protection plan." That ignores the letter he received from 32 current and former Republican congressional challengers, who rightly lauded the reform as "necessary to level the playing field." It also ignores reality. In 1990, House incumbents had on hand $239 million.

It does not say House Democrats or House Republicans, House incumbents, whether they are Democrats or Republicans, $239 million, challengers had $37.5 million. Well, Mr. President, the editorial goes on to cite other reasons why the bill should not have been vetoed but it is certainly clear that it is the current system that is an incumbent's protection plan.

I hope that the President had an opportunity to read the letter from the 32 Republican candidates for the Congress who urged him to sign this bill and the former Members who wrote so eloquently.

The article which appeared recently by former Congressman John H. Buchanan, Jr., in the Washington Post, the Republican Member of Congress from Alabama from 1965 to 1981 was I thought particularly interesting, and I ask unanimous consent that this article also appear in the RECORD in full.

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

[From the New York Times, May 4, 1992]

SIGN THE CAMPAIGN FINANCE BILL

(By John H. Buchanan, Jr.)

In the midst of chaos and upheaval, Congress has passed historic campaign finance reform legislation. This legislation is long overdue. Campaign finance reform is essential to reverse the public's perception that the institution has fallen to the wolves of special interests and corruption. Unfortunately, President Bush has threatened to veto the bill—the Congressional Campaign Spending and Election Reform Act of 1992. If the president follows through on this ill-advised threat at this crucial juncture, Congress will be further damaged—leaving democracy hanging in the balance.

As a former Republican member of the House of Representatives, I've joined with Hugh Scott, Robert Stafford, Thomas Railsback and 15 other distinguished Republican alumni of Congress to urge President Bush to sign this reform package. Republican challengers from more than 20 states have also called the president to endorse this landmark initiative so that they can begin to compete on a level playing field against well-funded incumbents.

In the 11 years since I left Congress, I've watched at a distance as public respect for the institution I served faithfully has plummeted. The nation has looked on in frustration at Congress's inability to grapple with the budget deficit, the savings and loans crisis, health care and other pressing issues. Our electorate's traditional skepticism has turned to dangerous cynicism. As well, a number of members are retiring, citing their frustration at being unable to accomplish legislative goals. Further evidence of the deepening discord between the public and government, particularly elected officials, can be seen most notably in the decline in voter turnout and civic participation.

In short, the current system has muted the competition as well as discourse on issues. A growing number of incumbents run unopposed or face challengers with negligible resources to mount effective campaigns. Moreover, each successive federal election shows a marked increase in campaign spending. The average cost of running and winning in a House race has more than doubled since I won election in 1980, when the cost was almost $170,000 compared with more than $400,000 in 1990. On average, House members must now raise $4,000 per week, and senators must raise $12,000 per week to garner the resources needed to win reelection. The current system returned incumbents to office at a rate of 96 percent in 1990 even in the face of that year's alleged anti-incumbent sentiment—giving challengers little incentive to compete. And six of every seven PAC dollars go to incumbents. Our system desperately needs reforms that will level the playing field for challengers.

I firmly believe that the reforms being proposed by Congress are a significant step toward limiting the influence of money on the political process. Fundamental changes to the current campaign finance system are necessary to jumpstart our democracy by restoring credibility and respect to our democratic institutions.

Similar reforms in the presidential campaign system restored public confidence in the presidency following the Watergate scandals. With a system of voluntary spending limits, partial public financing, limits on contributions from political action committees, prohibitions on bundling practices and restrictions on the flow of soft money through the political party system, this reform package could forever transform the political landscape. In particular, the combination of voluntary spending limits and public financing will provide balance between private (interested) and public (disinterested) sources of campaign funds. This balance is requisite to lessen the negative impact of special interests on the electoral and legislative processes.

For challengers, the reforms contained in S. 3 will mean that all credible congressional candidates will be positioned to join the political debate. For incumbents, these reforms will mean an end to the degrading money chase that detracts from their ability to respond to concerns of constituents and the nation's business. Campaign finance reform will provide a welcome boost for Republicans and Democrats alike who want to challenge the status quo.

A presidential veto would be especially painful. I know that Republicans can win under the system of reforms proposed in S. 3. The Republican Party cannot continue to enjoy success in winning the presidency under a system of spending limits and voluntary public financing and losing Congress because the current rules are tilted squarely in favor of Democratic incumbents.

This legislation comes at a time of anger, frustration and disappointment in our political system. To its credit, Congress, albeit reluctantly, has responded to popular discontent by moving forward on these reforms. As the leader of our nation, President Bush can set the standard for change by approving this measure. The true beneficiaries of the reforms embodied in S. 3 will be voters who are tired of political maneuvering. Together, Congress and the president can erase the public perception that voter participation in the electoral process is meaningless because democratic institutions have been sacrificed to the highest bidder.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. President, Congressman Buchanan concludes his statement with this paragraph: "A Presidential

veto would be especially painful. I know that Republicans can win under the system of reforms promised in S. 3."—promised in this bill.

The Republican Party cannot continue to enjoy success in winning the Presidency under a system of spending limits and voluntary public financing in losing Congress because the current rules are tilted squarely in favor of Democratic incumbents.

Mr. President, I think Congressman Buchanan has it right. It has amazed me for a long time, in fact, when I first began this effort to put on campaign spending limits and to limit what political action committees could give to candidates, there were those on my own side of the aisle who said "What have you been up to? Have you entered into a plot with Senator Goldwater to try to hurt the Democratic party?"

My response to that was, no, I have entered into a plot with Senator Goldwater, Senator Stennis, who at that time was a Member of the Senate, and later with the distinguished President pro tempore, Senator ROBERT BYRD, and later with Senator MITCHELL and others who joined in the effort over a period of years, I have entered into a plot to try to make this system function as it should and to try to squeeze out of our political campaigns the excessive amount of special interest money that is there. That is the plot I have entered into.

A few years ago there were those on the other side of the aisle that absolutely were strong in their support of the political action committees; we were taking away the right of people to associate freely if we limited what political action committees could pour into the process. And then they found an interesting thing, that approximately 60 percent of the political action money was going to Democrats, and they decided all of a sudden that PAC's were an evil thing.

It was quite an unusual conversion experience. They were a good thing until they found out that 60 percent of the money from PAC's was coming to this side of the aisle instead of that side of the aisle. Then they became absolutely evil. And the President himself says they ought to be totally abolished, although he has not proposed a way to do that and meet the constitutional test.

But there was a conversion. Now, 60 percent of political action committee money did not come to Democrats because they were Democrats. It came to Democrats because they were incumbents. If there had been 60 percent Republican incumbents in Congress, if there had been a Republican Congress at that time, 60 percent of the political action committee money would have gone to Republicans. It is because it was going to incumbents.

Those who came to understand from a point of view of partisan advantage that Republicans were being disadvantaged by political action committee money coming into the system failed to understand the underlying reason for it. It is because political action committees give to incumbents.

Now, Mr. President, I am amazed that they have not understood the second basic point, and that is that spending limits, imposition of spending limits, will hurt Democrats more than Republicans because more Democrats are incumbents and more incumbents are able to exceed the spending limits than are challengers. That is a very simple and obvious point, Mr. President.

My surprise has been that those on the other side of the aisle have not seized the opportunity and tried to push spending limits into law as quickly as possible. I do not understand it.

I suppose the thing that is painful, Mr. President, is that we do understand it. I understand it. I am willing for my own political party to sacrifice some advantage that it now has. Why? Because there is something more important than being a Democrat or Republican, something more important than that. There is the national interest. There is being a good American. We do not hear that often enough around here.

All the Republicans go to one room for lunch on Tuesdays, and all the Democrats go to lunch in another room in the Capitol Building on Tuesday. All too often the talk in the Republican caucus is about what is good for the Republican Party and how we can put it to the Democrats. And the talk in the Democrat caucus is just the opposite, what is good for the Democratic Party and how can we put it to the Republicans.

Mr. President, that is how we got to the place we are. It is time we started talking about the national interest. It is time we started talking about the integrity of this political system.

I do not care whether my party is advantaged or disadvantaged by putting spending limits on candidates. I do care about what is happening to the political process of this country, and what is going to happen to this institution when we hand it on to our children and our grandchildren, and what is going to happen to this country if we do not take care of handing it on in the right condition. That is what I care about, and I think most of my colleagues care about that.

Mr. President, I wish the President of the United States had listened to those who wrote to him. I wish he had listened to the 32 past and present Republican challengers from the 32 States who called upon the President to sign the bill.

I again put into the RECORD a copy of that letter from the 32 Republican candidates. And they indicated in the beginning, they started their letter out, "As congressional challengers and loyal Republicans we urge you to sign the comprehensive campaign finance reform legislation. Such legislation is necessary to level the playing field for credible challengers and restore major fairness to the electoral process."

I wish, Mr. President, that he had heeded the letter sent to him by 17 very respected former Members, Republican Members of the House and Senate.

This letter contains some of the names of some of those people that I certainly most admired when I came to serve here, and many people on the other side of the aisle that I have admired.

That is another problem with our country right now, our process. Human friendships and cooperative working relationships between Members of both parties have come to a very reduced level. This is something that should not happen. There are many men and women of both parties who have come here to serve their country and to be admired.

I look at this letter, and I see names on it like Senator Charles McC. Mathias, one of the finest Members that ever served in this Senate. I see names like Senator Hugh Scott, who was the minority leader. I used to come here as a young man and sit in the gallery and listen to him, the Republican Senate leader, make speeches on this floor. I have known him from childhood, admired him for many years; Senator Bob Stafford, who served with many of us here, who was a real statesman and true gentleman who cared about this country; and, those 17 Republican leaders wrote to the President of the United States.

They said, "As Republican alumni of Congress, Mr. President, we urge you to sign the comprehensive campaign finance legislation making its way to your desk this week. It is necessary to level the playing field for challengers who restore a measure of fairness and decency to our electoral process." It is not only fairness, but the perception of fairness, a level playing field that would help restore the confidence of the American people and the political process itself.

So, Mr. President, I can only express my disappointment, my keen disappointment, that after years of work and effort this legislation finally was shepherded through the Congress of the United States.

Finally, the Members of Congress, both Houses, voted their better instinct to put limits on how much money they could accept from PAC's and special interests, put limits on how much money they could raise in terms of financing their political campaigns, set-aside what is an obvious partisan advantage to the majority party in both Houses of Congress, that is the ability to raise more money, because they have more incumbents—sent the bill to the President, along with the

appeals from outstanding leading members of the Republican Party both now formerly Members of Congress and candidates for Congress, and the bill was vetoed.

Mr. President, I only hope we can find a way to change the President's mind. I certainly want him to make every effort to do that. I hope we will be able to override his veto this afternoon. It would be the right thing for the country. I hope there will be enough on both sides of the aisle that will reconsider how they voted on the original piece of legislation enabling us to do that.

It is not a perfect bill. This is not the bill that the Senator from Oklahoma would have written if I had the ability to write this bill all by myself without anyone else intervening or amending it. But it is a bill that goes a long way in the right direction.

One of the newspaper editorials I quoted said it is a giant step in the right direction. It does not do away with all special interest money, all PAC's. It cuts the amount political action committees can give by more than half. It still leaves incumbents or challengers with an opportunity to raise enough money to make their case but it also puts limits on spending so challengers have a chance.

This Senator would prefer to find a system that did not require incentives to get people to accept campaign contributions. I wish we could directly legislate no amount can be spent, but the Supreme Court has ruled otherwise.

We have to have incentives, dangle some incentives out in front of candidates like those that have been put before President Bush and others in both parties, Democrat and Republican. Both accepted these incentives in the past. We have to do that if we are going to have a system of spending limits under the Supreme Court decision.

We have kept those incentives to a minimum. We have kept those costs to a minimum. We provided that the general taxpayers shall not be burdened with additional taxes in order to pay for this. We will find some other way to do it, to establish a clean government fund, an approach that will be fair, single out those who should contribute to the cleaning up of political process to pay for it.

An opportunity has been missed by the President of the United States to do what he has been talking about—help clean up the system, help reform the system, stop the fragmentation in Congress, help focus more attention on the national interest, have Congress stay here and do the people's business instead of raising campaign money. They should be thinking about the national interest instead of the interest of every special interest group that might give up a $5,000 or $10,000 PAC contribution or a large number of individual contributions to a candidate. It is an opportunity missed.

But even though the veto message was rendered over the weekend, it was not missed by the American public. The American people, over 80 percent of whom want spending limits, including just as large a majority, not one percentage point of difference between how Republicans in this country feel about spending limits and Democrats, both by overwhelming majority, want spending limits. I am not talking about the Members of Congress here, incumbents who want spending limits because they are favored. I am talking about Republicans, like Republican challengers running for Congress, who want a chance, and Democratic challengers who want a chance, and the people who want to know that they count for something again instead of the almighty dollar counting for so much in the election process.

So, Mr. President, it is an opportunity missed. We can reverse the damage that has been done by voting to override the veto. If we do not succeed, we can all do our best to try to change the President's mind about this issue, as I certainly will, especially the question of spending limits and see if there is another way we can come together.

I am willing again to extend any hand to try to work on a bipartisan solution if we fail this time. It is a way to bring the President on board with true reform that will bring about spending limits.

Mr. President, if we do not succeed in that direction, all I can say is we will be back again and we will be back again and again and again until we get it done; until we get it passed, until we get it signed into law because we have that responsibility to the American people, and I believe we will be held accountable by the American people until we finish the task.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and reserve the remainder of my time.

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. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I yield the distinguished Senator from Mississippi whatever time he may desire.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished Senator from Mississippi is recognized.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I think I would begin by saying to the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma and our colleague from Kentucky that if you do not succeed first or second or third time, try, try again. I know that these two Senators have been working on this issue for a long time. You have made a little progress, but you do not have it right by any stretch of the imagination yet.

So I would say that this campaign finance reform package is fundamentally flawed. The President absolutely did the right thing to veto it. And I hope that the Senate will in short order sustain his veto. It should be sustained. And then hopefully maybe next year, in a less partisan, less political atmosphere we can really produce campaign finance reform legislation. This is not it.

To suggest that this is something that just the Republicans are opposing is absolutely ridiculous. When you go back to States across America and tell them what is in this package, I mean they would have to laugh. I described it when it came to the Senate originally as a joke. If it was a joke when it went through the Senate, it was an absolutely hilarious act after it got through in conference.

But I would like to say to the Senator from Oklahoma again that I appreciate the work he has tried to do. Frankly, knowing that he has been involved or will be involved in the future, I still have faith that we can work something out. I believe, in fact I am sure, that if we can come up with a package that both he can support and the Senator from Kentucky, it is something I will be able to vote for.

I am sorry to say that I believe what happened, in spite of the good intentions and good faith by the Senator from Kentucky who has been leading this issue, was that perhaps he had to yield on a number of issues, both in the Senate and then in the conference. One of the things that happened in the conference, when he could not get our colleagues from the House—I know those guys, because I served there for 16 years. Since they could not agree, he basically said, OK, you take it your way, and we will do it ours. I understand that, but I do not think that is the way it should be done. We should have the same rules applicable to the House and Senate.

So I just say to the Senator—and I know he has to go—keep trying, and next time let us come up with a package that genuinely can be bipartisan. It may hurt both parties a little, but it will not disadvantage either side too much, and it should be one that the American people can have faith in.

Let me talk a little about the substance here. The President's message was a very good message. I commend it to my colleagues. Read it, because it is not just negative. He explains what he sees wrong with this bill. He reminds us what he asks for, and he tells us that, in the future, if we can come up with some better agreements, that he

certainly would want to go along with it. I want to particularly refer to what he asked for, because I want to emphasize that I am not opposed to campaign finance reform. I am for it. Heaven knows, we need it.

But this is not campaign finance reform. This will make a bad system worse. But the President made proposals in 1989. In his comprehensive campaign finance reform, he did want to try to reduce special interests and the powers of incumbency. He pointed out in his message: My proposal would abolish political action committees, not cut them back a little bit, not have one set of rules for the Senate and another for the House. Get this, it would allow higher PAC contributions for the House than in the Senate. Most of us do represent more than any one House Member. There are a few States where you have just one House Member at large. But most of us represent 2, 3, 4, 5, 10 times as many people in our States, as Senators, than House Members. Yet, we have the different set of rules. We do not abolish it, and then we have two different sets of rules. The House is allowed the higher PAC amount.

The proposals would, by limiting those PAC's, minimize some of the influences now of corporations, unions, and trade associations. It would protect, statutorily, the political rights of American workers, implementing the Supreme Court decision in Communication Workers versus Beck, something that has been long overdue. Now, people that are not in a union have to pay dues or fees, whatever you want to call them, which are then used politically by the union bosses; and this decision would just say that they will have some say in how their money is used or not used, as I understand it.

The President's proposal would have curtailed leadership PAC's. As far as I am concerned, eliminate those; that is fine. It would virtually prohibit the practice of bundling. It would require the full disclosure of all soft money expenditures by political parties, by corporations, and by unions. In this package we have, there is a lot of picking and choosing of who is restricted and who is not.

The President's proposal would also restrict the taxpayer-financed franking privileges enjoyed by incumbents. The President's package would prevent incumbents from amassing campaign war chests from excess campaign funds from previous elections.

Those are just a few of the proposals the President asked for in 1989. I have always thought it was curious, frankly, that a lot of House Members have campaign war chests that have built up to $400,000, $500,000, $600,000, $1 million, $2 million. I do not know. I guess the sky is the limit. Some are probably hoarding as much as $4 million over there. There are not many Senators running for reelection this year that have that much money in their war chest. There is a real question about how this is being accumulated and carried over. I think it is a practice we need to find a way to terminate.

Let me talk about some of the problems I see with this bill. To hear our friends on the other side of the aisle talk, the only solution that we need is spending limitations. Just spending limitations. Just put a cap on what you can spend. The problem is not spending; the problem is how the money is being raised, and money that is being spent that is not even being reported by people that are involved in the elections, influencing elections, buying elections, if you will, and not even reporting.

Mr. President, when I go to the plant gates and the shipyard gates and the facilities in my State of Mississippi on election day and hand out my literature at 6 o'clock in the morning, I usually have a couple volunteers with me trying to hand out the campaign literature I had to pay for, and lined up across in front of me are eight union stewards handing out my opponent's literature, which they printed up, on which, can say anything they want it to say. Did my opponent pay for that? No. Does he have to report it as something that benefits him? No. Do they have to report it? No. This is education.

It seems to me that something that has that big an influence on an election, campaign election should at least be reported. Disclosure. That is the key. Let us always disclose to the American people where we are getting our money, where it is being spent. That is the answer.

Those that are in office, incumbents—and that is Republicans and Democrats—sure, we like spending limits. Do you think some poor challenger out there in America has a chance against an incumbent that can be on television, radio, and is sending out weekly news columns? We all do it. I do it. Using the frank. There is no way a challenger is going to have a chance against that avalanche of stuff we can put out, unless he or she can buy the coverage they need to get their message across.

Let me raise another question. How would you like to be a challenger in Northern Virginia running for Congress, who has a conservative philosophy of government, who thinks it is too big, too fat, bloated, spends too much money, taxes too much, regulates too much, and basically does not like government? What do you have to contend with? The Washington Post. The Washington Post will blast you on their editorial page if you are a conservative candidate of either party for Congress in northern Virginia.

How are you going to get your message across? How are you going to tell the people you are not some sort of lowdown fink, when the Washington Post is saying: this guy probably will not vote for campaign finance reform that includes—guess what—spending limits.

The only way you get your message across if you are a candidate for Congress in northern Virginia with a conservative philosophy is that you have to pay for it. You have to buy it. Because the newspaper and the television stations are going to be kicking you every night. Unless you have the ability to get your story across and let the people look at you on television, hear you on radio, see your message in print, you are out of there.

But, fine, let us limit the spending on that guy. You know what that really is? It is muzzling him. It is controlling his ability to speak. I thought there was something in the Constitution about that. I do not know. Maybe we forgot about that. Limiting speech. Great, that is the answer to campaign finance reform in America. That is the most ridiculous allegation I have heard in this debate.

Mr. McCONNELL. Will the Senator yield.

Mr. LOTT. Yes.

Mr. McCONNELL. A very liberal Supreme Court in 1976 in Buckley versus Valeo in a pro curia opinion, with a number of separate opinions written, only one Justice out of nine felt that spending limits might be constitutional. Why, even Thurgood Marshall and William Brennan obviously felt that spending limits were clearly a violation of the first amendment. So the Senator is right on the mark. This is an attempt to muzzle speech, inconsistent with the first amendment to the Constitution.

Mr. LOTT. I thank the Senator for reminding us once again of that. I do not think we can dismiss that argument lightly. Constitutional arguments make a difference. But I have noticed from lawyers, my friends and colleagues in the Congress, sometimes we stand up and say, well, this is a constitutional matter, if it is on our side of the debate. But if we are trying to limit spending, all of a sudden we will let the courts decide that, and brush that aside. Speech and spending limitations are the fundamental question here. This is the wrong way to go. I do not think that as responsible legislators, we can do that.

I would be glad to yield, if the Senator wishes.

Mr. McCONNELL. If the Senator will yield, the Court went on to say in the Buckley case that if Congress concluded that it was so desirable to control speech and to dole it out in individual set amounts to candidates, if that was such a desirable thing, the Congress could provide a public inducement, public dollars, but no one could be compelled to limit his speech.

In this bill, if you are so brash as to say I choose not to limit my speech, I choose to speak as much as I want to, all hell breaks loose.

Mr. LOTT. Absolutely.

Mr. McCONNELL. All hell breaks loose, your opponent gets a public subsidy to match your speech from the taxpayers, you lose your broadcast discount. In fact, I say to my friend from Mississippi, there is nothing voluntary about the spending limits in this measure that the President vetoed.

Mr. LOTT. Absolutely. I will talk about that in a moment.

One other interesting thing. There seems to be a changing position quite often in the media for or against the candidate whether they want to limit the spending. I know of a situation where a statewide candidate in my State spent $3.2 million getting elected to office, and he was berated by the biggest newspaper in my State. Three years later a liberal candidate spent $4 million trying to get reelected to a statewide office, lost, but not a word was said about the fact that he raised the largest amount of money in the history of any campaign in the State. So it depends on whose ox is being gored.

People might say, all right, all right, OK, your freedom of speech argument is one we have to be concerned about. But what do we do about this inordinate amount of money.

I have a couple of suggestions and remind you of something. No 1, I repeat, the problem is not too much spending; the problem is how it is collected, how much collected, where it comes from. That is the solution. I am perfectly willing to limit contributions. I am for eliminating PAC's, not because they are illegal and not because they are even bad, but because there is a perception that they are doing something inordinately bad. So if there is a perception, I am willing to go with that. I am willing to limit PAC's. I am willing to limit individual contributions.

I would like to find some way to limit the ability of a multimillionaire or billionaire to buy office in an election. What about that superwealthy person that can put in, of his or her own money, $500,000, a million bucks, 100 million bucks? Is this something that makes you a little queasy about someone being able to spend millions of dollars running against a guy that maybe has no net worth, buying the office. But again there is a constitutional problem there. He has a right to speech, too. How do you limit a person's individual right to spend his or her own money? But there is something about it that I am not very comfortable with. I do think we should limit contributions and report where that money comes from.

Let me make one other suggestion. If we were really trying to work out a compromise bill here, when are we ever going to get around some day to limit campaigns. The thing I like about the British campaigns is they say, "Look, we will have an election," in a specified time period. Everybody knows when it is. Everybody listens. In America it goes on forever. Presidential elections, I am beginning to think, last 4 years. Races for the Senate last well over a year, running all the time. People are tired of hearing it. How about giving thought to trying to get some sort of limit on the time that campaigns take? Maybe we cannot do that. Maybe there is a constitutional problem there.

I will tell you one thing. Every time I make that point to audiences in my State, they say, "Great. I wish I only had to listen to this for 90 days, not listen to it for a year or 2 years."

People have been sending messages in the Presidential campaign all year. They sent a message with Pat Buchanan, sent a message with Paul Tsongas, sent a message with Jerry Brown, and sent a message with Ross Perot. I expect they are tired of sending messages. I hope party nominees will get the messages and let us have the election.

If this actually was intended to be a real campaign finance reform and bipartisan campaign finance reform, why was it there was not real negotiations in the Senate between Democrats and Republicans? It was reported out on the straight party-line vote. Was there a real effort to have the Republicans involved? Or was it a matter where they said, "Look, this is what we are going to go have, spending limits, do it our way, and you guys can take it or leave it." The same thing in the House. What about the conference? Where there real negotiations in conference? Absolutely not. The only question was could we get the House to be reasonable at all, and we could not. So we said, "OK, you can have a different set of rules."

There has to be a real, legitimate give and take across party lines and philosophical lines to get genuine campaign finance reform. It did not exist in this instance. You know what this is. This is another example, like every other example, of what is language in this body of absolute gridlock, gamesmanship, partisanship politics. That is what is going on with the motor-voter registration. That is what went on with the tax increase. That is what is happening with campaign finance reform. Everything is designed to set up a battle or gridlock where the Congress says, "Mr. President, we are not going to do it your way; we are going to do it our way. If you don't like it, you can veto it and it will be sustained and then we will forget it."

Do you think that American people want us to do business this way? I think they are fed up with it. I am ashamed of the way this institution is acting in matter after matter, in bill after bill that comes up here, and that is exactly what this is. There is fun and games. If they really thought the President would have signed this, they would not have passed it. That is the truth of it. They would be horrified if he had signed this bill.

Now, I do not understand what happened on the PAC's. We voted to eliminate them in the Senate. The House would not do it. A lot of people think PAC's benefit Republicans. Why, the Republicans are ready to eliminate PAC's, and all of a sudden Democrats are protectors of political action committees. They want a switch here, just because of a discovery on our part the PAC's try to buy an incumbent whoever he is? I do not know. Maybe that is it. I think it is something we could live without. We should eliminate them.

Then, as I mentioned earlier, how in the world could we come up with a bill that sets up two different sets of rules, one for the House and one for the Senate? That is a new one on me. It will not work. It could not last. Yet, that was the solution. When the Senate Democrats could not get the leadership from the House to go along, they just said, "OK, you do it your way, and we will do it ours." That is no solution.

Now, the Senator from Oklahoma, the Senator from Maine, and others can get up all they want to and say what the American people want is spending limitations. I do not believe that. But I tell you what the American people do not want and that is public financing of campaigns. They are really thrilled at the idea now we are going to start paying for our campaigns out of the General Treasury. That will be the final blow. "Boy, if we can just get our campaigns paid for by the Government, we will have everything made just like we wanted it." But check the polling data on that. Call it voluntary public financing if you want to; it is public financing. The argument that the Washington Post and other such papers make, "Gee whiz, the President has been getting it for years."

Frankly, I wish they did not have the Presidential public financing of campaigns. But I tell you what the American people are speaking on that, too. We got the checkoff, and I believe we are finding the American people are stopping checking off, those that did. Most of them never started. I never have. If I have $1 to give a candidate, I will give it to a candidate of my choice personally; I "am not" sending it through the Treasury and let them play with it, send it to the candidates they decide to run.

Some of the candidates running this year, I think they are laughing even louder. As a matter of fact, one in five taxpayers now check the box on their tax forms to designate a mere $1 in the taxes to the Presidential fund, and the

Presidential fund is going broke. I tell you another thing. When people find out the checkoff is going to pay for the political party conventions, they are liable to march on this city again. So I do not like the Presidential public financing.

I will be glad to yield to the Senator because I see he is anxious to get into this. It is one of his favorite points.

Mr. McCONNELL. A couple of observations about this public finance business. I say to my friend from Mississippi, there are votes on April 15 on public financing. We have a total poll where every taxpayer in America gets to vote. Eighty-one percent of them say do not give a dollar I already owe. This is down from 29 percent in 1976. And as the Senator mentioned, if the American public ever found out, the 19 percent who do continue to check off, if they ever found out what it went for—well, there was a focus group done by the Federal Election Commission in order to try to figure out how to get people to check off more than they have been doing.

And when the focus group found out that the political party conventions, balloons and booze, if you will, and people like Lenora Fulani were getting public funds they all turned against it. Even the interviewer for the focus group said, after learning himself what it went for, that he was not going to check his box off anymore. And these were people who were hired by the FEC to try to figure out how to get Americans to check off more than they are currently checking off.

If you wanted to pick an unpopular item out of all the things we could think of to spend money on, our campaigns would have to be at the top of the list.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I say to the distinguished Senator from Kentucky—I want to tell him again I appreciate his courage and leadership on this issue. It is not easy to stand up and say I am not for this campaign finance reform because it is not real campaign finance reform, and he has done it and done a great job, and he has divulged the hypocrisy that has gone into it. I believe this is true.

One of the highest recipients of public financing of the Presidential campaign this year is a person that probably not one person in this room can name. I think it was a lady up in maybe New Hampshire. She had, I do not know, $1 million; I do not remember the amount or the name. But that is the point. You get fringe candidates nobody knows or has ever heard of or cares about getting hundreds of thousands of dollars of the people's checkoff of public financing.

Mr. McCONNELL. And our friends on the other side of the aisle want to extend that system to 535 additional races. Every crackpot in America who wakes up in the morning, looks in the mirror, and says, by golly, I think I see a Congressman, is going to reach into the cookie jar and get some of this public money. We are going to be funding people like this all across America, at costs of millions of dollars to the taxpayers of this country.

Mr. LOTT. Absolutely. Well, everybody has a threshold on campaign finance reform. I will tell you what mine is. I will go along with all kinds of different campaign finance reform suggestions and packages. I hope someday to be able to vote for a good one that would really reform elections. But I will tell you what I am not going to vote for, not now and not in the future. I am not voting for public financing of campaigns. Call it voluntary, call it mandatory, call it anything you want to, but I am not going to allow my vote to be used to get House and Senate Members' hands into its Treasury to run their campaigns.

Mr. McCONNELL. My friend makes a good point. The President has been criticized because he accepted public funding in Presidential races, as if you could not accept public funding in a Presidential race, and possibly veto public funding for Congress. Now the logic of that, I would say to my friend from Mississippi, is sort of like saying because the House has a bank the Senate ought to have a bank.

Mr. LOTT. I do not like that.

Mr. McCONNELL. There is no logic to that. Just because there is a Federal entitlement program for Presidents, that frankly is so generous that even people who do not approve of public funding like President Reagan, looked at the practical alternative to giving up this enormous public subsidy and concluded they simply could not. To argue that that is a rationale for extending this failed system which, by the way, has not done anything to curb spending on Presidential races, public funding, and spending limits, to argue that rationale, that President Bush should buy into this turkey, just sums up the absurdity of the whole process which my friend has already skillfully outlined.

Mr. LOTT. Let me go to my next point. That is, well, all right, even if you accept all these things, do you not have to acknowledge that there are some costs associated with this bill? I have seen estimates up to $100 million that it would cost the Federal Government by 1994. So there gets to be a little nagging question of how is this going to be paid for.

Well, that is taken care of in this bill in this way. Section 902, subsection (a), section 902 provides:

> The provisions of this act * * * shall not be effective until the estimated costs under section 252 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 have been offset by the enactment of subsequent legislation effectuating this act.

Great. Do you know what that means? We do not pay for it. We are going to devise a system here that is going to cost up to $100 million for 1994 and we are not going to provide a way to pay for it. That is nothing new in this Congress. Sure we will just pass it. We will find a way to pay for it later.

No, the American people are not going to buy that deal either. This bill should have been vetoed on that basis, if none other. You cannot pass this sort of thing under our budget agreement and not pay for it. They could not figure out a way to pay for it, they could not find a way on how to agree to pay for it, and so they said we will worry about that another day. Another good, I think, proof that they never expected it, never wanted it to go in effect in reality anyway. But do not forget this bill is not paid for.

I want to touch once again on this so-called soft or sewer money. How can you have reform that sets up a process of limits, controls, and reporting in some areas but not in all areas? What they did in the conference, in the Senate bill I believe, but certainly the final bill we are looking into now, what they said is we will not require the same reporting of sewer money when it benefits us. That is all. If it benefits the Democrats, you do not have to report it. If it benefits the Republicans, we are going to restrike it, eliminate it, or require reporting.

Could we have at least included uniformity? That is all, just a little similarity here. I think we can probably work that. I cannot believe the Senator from Oklahoma, who is a respected Member of this body, would not agree to that. Report it all.

Now, some people say, well, in connection with this public financing and the volunteerism and the benefits you get if you do that. The truth of the matter is this bill just shifts the burden. We are going to say to the broadcasters, hey broadcasters, you have to pay for the extra cost here. We have to have spending limits. But to make up for those limits, we are going to allow that you get a special deal that the broadcasters pay for.

Ladies and gentleman, there never has been a free lunch and there is not now. How do you think the broadcaster is going to pay for that? They are going to pass it on somewhere, to the consumer. And we are going to give those that voluntarily participate free or better special postage rates again. You have the frank and now we are going to give you a special postage rate arrangement if you volunteer to take this public financing of campaigns.

It is just a real sleight of hand here. Yes, we will take it away over here, but we will give it back to you and we will let the private sector pay for it in the case of the broadcasters. That is really a great solution to the problems we face.

So my colleagues in the Senate, I think the President did absolutely the

right thing. I am sorry. I think the people would like to see real campaign finance reform but this is not it. This bill is wrong on far too many accounts. It is a shame for it to have the title that it has of campaign finance reform. I will be glad to work with any Senator of any party, any philosophy that is serious about this issue. This is not a serious bill. And so I am glad the President vetoed it. It will be sustained. And then maybe next year we can have a real, genuine campaign finance reform.

Mr. President, I yielded floor.

Mr. MCCONNELL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky is recognized.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I want to commend my friend from Mississippi for his outstanding contribution to this debate. I listened with great interest to his comments and they were all right on the mark. He really summed it up very, very well.

Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky has 88 minutes.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I have just a couple of observations. I see the Senator from South Dakota is here, but just a couple of observations before I yield him some time.

We have heard a lot of talk about the amount of spending in campaigns, as if America was literally awash in political spending.

David Broder, the premier political reporter in the country, I think we would all agree, has referenced that very issue in a couple of columns he has written, opposing this version of campaign finance reform, the first one appearing on June 2, 1991.

Broder pointed out, in pertinent part in this article, quoting our friend from Oklahoma, he said:

> Senator Boren repeatedly warned that "the amount of money to run successfully for the House and Senate has been escalating at an alarming rate. Spending per voter in Senate races last year continued to climb, going up at the rate of $1.41 per voter spent in 1988 to $1.87 per voter in 1990."

That is David Broder quoting our good friend, Senator BOREN.

Broder goes on to point out:

> Even at that higher figure, it is less than one one-hundredth of what any of the Big Three auto companies spends on persuasion for each sale.

It goes on to point out:

> The comparison is not irrelevant. One reason the cost of campaigns is rising is that candidates are competing, not just with each other, but with all the other products and services being marketed to the American public. Why should a society that tolerates an avalanche of auto, soft drink, beer, and cold remedy advertising choke on a relatively small amount of political persuasion?

In this year's Broder column appearing on May 3, 1992, a column headlined, "Campaign Finance Farce," further observations about the so-called spending issue, Broder points out:

"That notion of 'skyrocketing' campaign spending is so firmly fixed in the public mind that it is a shock to read in Sorauf"—this is Professor Sorauf from Minnesota, who I might say is kind of the principal professor in the country on the subject of American political parties and elections. As a matter of fact I teach a course on that topic and use his text, which has been the principal text in this field for some 20 or 25 years. Referring to Professor Sorauf he said:

> It is a shock to read in Sorauf that while spending did increase rapidly in the first decade under the 1974 finance reform law, it has leveled off and actually declined since the mid-eighties. Between 1986 and 1990, actual spending in congressional races dropped 1.3 percent; adjusted for inflation, it fell by 17 percent. In constant dollars, PAC contributions also declined 4 percent in the 1986–1990 period.
>
> "Americans are shocked by total expenditures of $445.2 million in the congressional campaigns of 1990," Sorauf writes, "but in that same year Sears Roebuck, the giant merchandiser, had an advertising budget of over $1.4 billion."

Mr. President, in fact we spend about on a per capita basis what every other Western democracy does on politics. We spend less on Senate campaigns than we do on bottled water. We spend less on Senate and House races combined than we do advertising dog food, soap, or toothpaste. So why all the zeal to get rid of all of this speech is beyond this Senator.

In any event, we do not have to worry about that happening because today we are driving the final stake through the heart of this ill-advised bill.

I would say to those who think this is going to pass someday, or it is going to keep coming back—I suspect like a headache it is going to keep coming back, or a toothache. But this is not ever going to become law. Even if the Democrats were to elect a President and the President were to sign this bill, the courts will take care of it. It is blatantly unconstitutional. So those on the other side who voted aye and cringed can feel some sense of relief that the courts will protect us from ourselves.

How much time does my friend from South Dakota desire? I yield Senator PRESSLER 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Kentucky for his excellent presentation, and my colleague from Mississippi.

Mr. President, I am very interested in campaign reform as are many people in my State. I come from a small State, the State of South Dakota, where candidates for Federal office sometimes get as much as 90 percent of their money from out-of-State labor unions, business PAC's or individuals. I have noted that North Dakota, South Dakota, and some of the smaller States have some of the highest percentages of out-of-State money. I support campaigns for the House and Senate financed entirely by money from the candidate's own State. I run very low budget campaigns and have tried very hard to keep my spending down.

Mr. President, I voted for the campaign reform bill that passed the Senate last year. I believe I was one of five Republicans to vote for it. I reluctantly voted for it, saying at the time I wanted the process of campaign reform to move forward. I voted for it primarily because it eliminated political action committees.

But some very strange things happened to this bill in the conference committee, as we all know. In this election year, the conference committee designed a bill guaranteed to be vetoed by the President.

What the Democrats did in the conference of the House and Senate, was establish two sets of rules, one that just fit the incumbent Democratic House Members and another that just fit the Democratic Senate Members.

For example, labor union soft money or sewer money was not reduced. But it was for political parties. Political action committees mysteriously were restored to the Senate passed legislation which banned them. It is true that the amounts PAC's now can contribute are somewhat smaller. Labor unions can create 8 or 10 PAC's in hardly a day, at the twinkling of an eye. They will continue drawing money from the National Education Association, big labor interests, and the like. So PAC's have barely been touched by this measure.

Mr. President, the two parties raise money in different ways. Political scientists and economists have analyzed political party fundraising. The parties have slightly different bases. The core of the liberal Democrats' money comes from organized labor, the National Education Association, and similar groups. The bulk of Republican money comes from middle-class businessmen, from large business PAC's, and from individual contributors.

The fact is this bill was written in such a way that it protects fundraising of incumbent Democratic Senators and incumbent Democratic House Members, even to the extreme the bill has two different sets of rules, one for the House and one for the Senate. The conference-reported bill fits Democratic incumbents like a glove. This bill is an incumbent protection bill, a Democratic incumbents' protection bill.

Who are the losers in all this? The losers are people who want true campaign finance reform, who want to eliminate PAC's. A PAC ban is one of Common Cause's goals. It also is one of the President's goals. I have a copy of the President's veto message. He says:

My proposal would abolish political action committees (PAC's) subsidized by corporations, unions, and trade associations. It would protect statutorily the political rights of American workers, implementing the Supreme Court's decision in *Communications Workers* v. *Beck*. It would curtail leadership PAC's. It would virtually prohibit the practice of bundling. It would require the full disclosure of all soft money expenditures by political parties and by corporations and unions. It would restrict the taxpayer-financed franking privileges enjoyed by incumbents.

This bill does not do that. It runs contrary to the President's plan. His message continues:

It would prevent incumbents from amassing campaign war chests from excess campaign funds from previous elections.

So many items Common Cause and the President wanted were not included by the conference committee in this bill. This is an election year bill designed to embarrass the President. His opponents want to say he has vetoed campaign reform legislation or at least a bill called campaign reform.

Let me touch on a couple of other points. The deficit of the United States is a big problem. The legislation before us would require millions of Federal taxpayers' dollars to implement its provision. It sets out no funding mechanism to raise the required millions other than, presumably, to increase the deficit.

This bill also would do something very interesting. It would require radio and TV stations—but not the newspapers, to offer discount advertising rates to candidates.

In my State there are many smalltown radio stations that are not making much money. In fact they look to campaign years as a chance to make a little money. They are not as rich as NBC, or CBS, or ABC.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time allocated to the Senator has expired.

Mr. McCONNELL. I yield to the Senator 2 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized.

Mr. PRESSLER. Can these small radio and TV stations afford to discount political campaign advertising? Has someone looked into this? I know the ones in the metropolitan areas can probably afford to subsidize political campaigns, but South Dakota has a lot of marginally profitable locally-owned family run radio and TV stations providing weather and news service in small cities and towns across the State. Can they afford this? Or are we putting a burden on them that might make the difference between them staying in business or going under.

I know we like to beat up on our radio and TV stations, and newspapers. But some of the locally-owned, independent, smalltown AM and FM stations and television stations actually are struggling, at least in my State.

Mr. President, I will conclude by saying that this is an election year piece of nonsense. It does not accomplish reform. Oddly enough, I came to this town in 1974 as a newly elected Member of Congress. At that time, the introduction of political action committees was the big reform. I remember Common Cause was happy at that time with the coming of PAC's. Everybody said now we will be able to identify where the money is coming from. I have been around here long enough to see the old reforms reformed and called the new reforms. That shows you how gray my hair is getting. So when we do have a campaign finance reform, let us try to analyze it more thoroughly. Let us particularly analyze whether we are treating radio and TV stations and newspapers the same. Let us also analyze how it will affect the deficit of our country. We don't need just another incumbent's perk. We just eliminated a number of perks around here. This place went berserk eliminating perks. The only thing that's a perk in my office now is coffee. That's the only perk left.

The point is this legislation is a giant election year perk for incumbents. We are trying to eliminate perks. So I shall vote to sustain the President's veto.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I want to thank my good friend from South Dakota for his very good statement with regard to this bill which we will finally lay to rest today.

Mr. GORTON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, what I shall like to do, with the permission of the Senator from Kentucky, is to ask him a few questions about the bill and secure his own answers to those questions. Will the Senator be willing to enter into such colloquy?

Mr. McCONNELL. I will be happy to.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, my first question is: Is this bill in the form in which it is before the Senate now, is it not absolutely unprecedented in creating a different set of election rules for Members and candidates of the House of Representatives than it creates for Members and candidates for the Senate and, if I am correct in that, is there any justification for a different set of rules for the same Congress despite reason of their membership of one House or the other?

Mr. McCONNELL. The Senator from Washington is correct, of course. This conference report is essentially stitched together, two entirely separate measures, one applying to House races, one applying to Senate races. It is sort of a cobbled-together version that makes absolutely no sense. It is illogical to have one House of the Federal Government elected under one set of rules and another under another. It also raises a very interesting question of what happens when you have an incumbent Congressman running for the Senate, largely unanswered, totally unanswered by this conference report. With all due respect for those who voted for this, this thing is a joke. It is a laugh. it is unbelievable we spent so much time this year on this.

Mr. GORTON. The second set of questions. If this Senator remembers correctly, it was the Senator from Kentucky whose bill, which had an effective ban against political action committees, was first included, and if this Senator's memory continues to be correct, with some reluctance, that ban was accepted by the majority party and incorporated in its bill in the Senate. But the bill as returned here from conference committee, lo and behold, PAC's like cats seem to have multiple lives; is that not correct?

Mr. McCONNELL. My friend from Washington is correct in his observation. It was, in fact, the Senator from Kentucky 4 years ago who originally proposed we zero out political action committees entirely. That measure at that time, as you can imagine, was rather controversial. It had only 14 cosponsors, all of them Republicans. On the day before the Rules Committee-reported version of campaign finance was to be called up in the Senate last year, there was a switch and the majority substituted therefor and brought up a core package that adopted what had then become the Republican position of no PAC contributions at all, and that is what we passed in the Senate last year.

But alas, the Senator from Washington is correct, the PAC's are back in this conference report. And so a vote for this conference report is a vote to essentially do nothing about PAC contributions.

Mr. GORTON. On another subject and one which, in the view of this Senator, may be even more important, is this Senator correct in his understanding that while this bill limits or eliminates the ability for political parties to use so-called soft money, the very political parties which have been a part of the structure of this country for almost its entire existence, it does nothing effective to limit the use of soft money by other organizations, whether they are labor unions or special interest groups, and that soft money in unlimited amounts can come into these organizations and be used by these organizations without limitation or even attribution as to its sources?

Mr. McCONNELL. The Senator from Washington is correct. There are two kinds of soft money, soft money being defined as money spent in campaigns outside of the Federal Election Campaign Act, which limits and discloses those contributions. There are two kinds of soft money. This bill attempts to cripple the parties in the name of stemming the flow of soft money. In fact, it is the provisions of this bill that so restrict the activities of parties

that are the principal motivation for David Broder's opposition to this measure because he believes that party activity is clean activity; that political parties are the only entity in America that can be counted on to support challengers and that the very last thing we ought to be doing is to restrict parties.

So this bill drives a stake through the heart of political parties under the guise of doing something about sewer money. The practical effect of that is, of course, it nails Republicans in something they do better because they have done a better job of raising money for their party than the Democrats have and does nothing whatsoever about the other kind of soft money, which is the money spent by 501(c) organizations hiding behind the Tax Code on behalf of candidates, almost all of that activity on behalf of Democratic candidates, which never shows up on a Democratic candidate's finance report, is not limited, and is not disclosed.

Mr. GORTON. And so the very contributions, as I recall, of almost a million dollars from Charles Keating to a Member of this body, which were part and parcel of one of the great historic scandals, would not be affected in any respect by this bill?

Mr. MCCONNELL. Eighty percent of what Charles Keating contributed is completely unaffected by this bill because they were contributions to a tax-exempt organization that was a favorite of both a candidate and a party. It is unaffected by this.

Mr. GORTON. And finally, the heart of this bill is to take money out of taxpayers' pockets and put it into the hands of candidates and incumbents for public office in a way in which almost every, if not every public opinion survey shows the people disapprove of; is that not the case?

Mr. MCCONNELL. The Senator is correct. On this issue, we have a massive public opinion poll every April 15. Voters get a chance in a massive referendum, called signing your tax return, to express their opinion on the public funding of a campaign that is already financed that way: the Presidential campaign.

Eighty-one percent of them say no to the following proposition: Do they want to divert a dollar of taxes they already owe? It does not add to their tax bill. Do they want to divert a dollar of taxes they already owe to the Presidential campaign? Eighty-one percent of the American people say no.

It is the most comprehensive survey ever conducted in America on an issue. On no other survey do you have 150 million or so respondents. So we know how unpopular public funding is. We have a referendum every April 15.

Mr. GORTON. In summary, while I note that the pretend title of this bill is the Campaign Reform Act of 1992, might it not be better to entitle it "the Campaign Fraud Act of 1992?"

Mr. MCCONNELL. I think that would be an excellent title.

Mr. GORTON. I thank my distinguished colleague from Kentucky.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I thank my friend from Washington.

I yield 5 minutes to my friend from Wyoming.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, that was a very excellent colloquy between my friend from Washington, Senator GORTON, and the remarkable floor manger of the bill on our side of the aisle, the Senator from Kentucky. He has truly become the Nation's watchdog on this extraordinary issue of campaign finance reform.

Mr. President, now that we are at the end of this futile and ignoble effort to impose a rawly partisan Democrat bill on this country in the guise of campaign finance reform, maybe we can now start all over again in a constructive manner. Maybe next time those who control the Congress will spend a little more time listening to the other side of this debate—just for a little while—because it is like our colleague WARREN RUDMAN said in his swan song—and I keep using his words:

> We all know what we have to do. We all really do know that in this place. We know what we have to do with the budget. We know what we have to do with defense. We know what we have to do with the entitlement programs. The issue is will we really do it? The people are not really going to spend much more time waiting for us to do it and just giving excuses.

But this is a remarkable piece of work. No one has described it better than the Senator from Kentucky. Senator MCCONNELL has warned us, told us, educated us. Here we are with what really is an absurd piece of legislation where the Republican conferees just sat there, and the Democrat conferees just rammed it in their ear and said "there it is; you are going to love it." There was no participation by Republicans to any degree. The Democrats had the strategy to just get the bill down to the President; get him to veto it; and just hope it would blow up under his chair. Then they could have more fun with him; toy with him.

Well, it will not work. The President vetoed this thing and any thoughtful American has got this figured out. How in the world can you justify a reform bill which treats one House differently than another.

Republicans know what we suggested. We said let's eliminate PAC's. That is what the Republican Party in the Senate said. We will ban the sewer money, reduce the amount of money coming in from out of State individuals that bloat a politician's campaign war chest. That is what we wanted.

What the Democrats gave us and parcelleled out to the minority in a great lump, and what the President so wisely vetoed, was a bill that breathed life into PAC's. I am talking about PAC's that give money to both sides. They allowed labor unions to continue their little soft money efforts—setting up phone banks on the edge of town to tell voters that the Republican candidate is the guy who voted to take away your Social Security, your veterans' benefits, and every other known Federal program. That is the kind of reform that we as a party are not interested in. That is what we are not going to see get through here. The final indignity of this bill is that these reforms will be paid for with American's tax dollars.

What the House Democrats said they uniquely needed for reelection, they put in this report. What the Senate Democrats said they uniquely needed for their reelection they put in this final product then they wrapped it up in one great dandy, happy package and shipped this turkey in here for us to deal with.

The result is that this legislation would not provide different reforms for each House of Congress. Americans are not dumb, just disgusted. Republicans will continue to call for the elimination of PAC's, and boy, do not think they are going to do that down at the other end of the Capitol Building. This is mother's milk. PAC's are the mother's milk of the Democrat Party in the House of Representatives. That is why we have this twisted, absurd, grotesque final product.

And the final corrupting force in American politics is soft money. Republicans would ban it all, from all special interest groups. Democrats made a truly feeble and fumbling attempt to "do something about that problem," but they cynically and deliberately made a huge exception for the union soft money which benefits mostly Democrats. We refer to that as sewer money. It goes unreported to the Federal Election Commission. That was a purposeful omission on the Democrat's part. Any future attempt to rig the system to favor one political party over another should be rejected in the same manner as this ill-fated legislation was by President Bush.

So there we are. Thank Heaven we have people like Senator MCCONNELL to point out these defects and stay consistent, fully informed, fully advised, fully up to speed. He is certainly our conscience in these matters.

And then to put the final touch of cynicism on this package—and the American people ought to just laugh if they can get through the tears—this bill is going to cost the taxpayers money, but the conference report says we will pay for it later. It has some nonbinding language in the report which says you cannot have a tax increase to pay for this. You cannot have it come from other programs. And it excludes an increase in the deficit as

any possible funding source. Well, where else do you get money around here? If you find the place, tell us, because we really would love to know. The fact is everyone knows where the money is coming from. It is coming from the taxpayer. The American people know better than to believe this truly phony proposition.

So the Democrats decided to defy all the President's criteria, and make no effort to address the concerns of the Republican conferees. Now the game is almost over, thank Heaven. Perhaps the Democrats will be a little more accommodating on future campaign finance reform bills. Maybe they will even pay some attention to the recommendations of the poor, old, ragged Republican minority. Maybe they will pay more attention to the bipartisan task force appointed by the majority leader, our fine majority leader, GEORGE MITCHELL, and our extraordinarily capable Republican leader, BOB DOLE. Republicans did pay attention to that report, and those recommendations are at the heart of our party's alternative proposal. So I urge my colleague to sustain the President's veto of this highly partisan, rawly partisan bill, and I thank Senator MCCONNELL from Kentucky for presenting it to the American public in a way they indeed can understand it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DECONCINI). The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I thank the Senator for his contribution to the debate and the kind words made of the Senator from Kentucky. I very much appreciate his support during the debate. We hope next year to be able to approach it in a more bipartisan fashion.

Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Mississippi 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Kentucky for yielding time to me.

I first want to congratulate the Senator from Kentucky for his leadership on this issue and the way in which he has gone about trying to identify the reasons why this veto of the President's ought to be sustained. He is eminently correct in the remarks he makes characterizing this bill as an incumbent protection plan, pointing out also that a taxpayer subsidy is being authorized in this legislation at a time when we are trying to get better control of the runaway deficits at the Federal level. This bill would add to those deficits.

Our Appropriations Committee just coincidentally happened to be meeting in a room on the first floor of the Capitol the day we had this bill on the floor of the Senate. The purpose of the Appropriations Committee meeting was to consider a rescission package and to report out a proposed rescission of appropriated dollars which would cancel the previous appropriations of funds for this current fiscal year.

The total amount of money involved was about $8 billion. While we were discussing that, at the same time here on the floor of the Senate we were being asked to vote approval, which the Senate did that day on a very partisan basis, of a bill that would add money to the deficit. Some estimate that would require as much as $200 to $300 million, every election cycle, in funding for the campaigns of House and Senate candidates. And this is tax money whether the taxpayer whose money is being used agrees with or supports the candidates or not. The bill also adds to the administrative costs of the Federal Election Commission which has the responsibility of administering this act.

It is complicated and complex. It is complicated the way the subsidies are described, and the spending limits, the way they are calculated. There are differences as the bill applies to House candidates and to Senate candidates. So, it is very complex and will require a lot of work and manpower and effort by the staff to implement and monitor compliance with this act. The FEC estimated, in testimony before the Rules Committee, that it would cost at least $2 million a year to administer this new program. They are spending $18 million a year in administrative costs now. So, the fact of the matter is, this is an expensive bill. It will add to the Federal deficit, and it is another good reason that the Senator from Kentucky points out that the President's veto should be sustained.

I think the President summed it up well in his veto message in the last paragraph when he said:

> Our Nation needs campaign finance laws that place the interests of individual citizens and political parties above special interests and that provide a level playing field between challengers and incumbents. What we do not need is a taxpayer-financed incumbent protection plan. For these reasons, I am vetoing S. 3.

Mr. President, I think President Bush is exactly right in characterizing the bill as he has. I hope the Senate will support the President on this issue today and vote to sustain his veto of this bad bill.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Mississippi for his participation in this debate, not just today, but at every step along the way, very useful and constructive contribution to the discussion of this issue. I really want to express my appreciation.

Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Oklahoma.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, first, I wish to compliment my friend and colleague from Kentucky for his leadership, and, also, I would like to concur with the comments just made by my friend and colleague, Senator COCHRAN, from Mississippi, and Senator SIMPSON, from Wyoming. I heard their comments. I think they hit the nail on the head.

This bill is really nothing but an entitlement for politicians, or you could say perks for politicians. This bill has taxpayer subsidies for candidates. That is not popular in my State. It is not popular, in my opinion, anywhere across the country. Do you really think that candidates for the House and the Senate should be subsidized by taxpayers at a time that we have these enormous deficits? Do you really think the taxpayers should be helping subsidize political campaigns? I think the answer is overwhelmingly no.

Frankly, it is disappointing to me that there is such a partisan bill because it has been very well known that if we had taxpayer subsidies in the bill, the President was going to veto the bill. So we have been wasting our time. Everyone in here knew that this bill would be vetoed. Frankly, I think everybody in Congress knows the veto is going to be sustained. So we have to go somewhat through a charade of some type because we have wasted our time.

I, for one, would like to see us do real campaign reform. I think we need real campaign reform. And that can be—I have heard many people say, "Well, we need to eliminate the special interest money." Let us do it. Let us take PAC's down to the same amount as individuals. Right now PAC's can give $5,000 per election, both the primary and the general. That is $10,000. And an individual can only give $1,000 in primary and general, or $2,000. Let us put PAC's on the same level as individuals. That will take out a lot of that special interest money. A lot of that does go primarily to incumbents. Let us take that out. Let us limit them to the same thing as individuals. That would be positive reform.

Actually, we passed that bill through the Senate. We said we would eliminate PAC's. Most of us believe that is unconstitutional. We had this fallback regime. But the bill that came back did not reduce PAC's down to $1,000. It left PAC's, reduced it in the Senate's to PAC's of $2,500 per election cycle, or cut it in half. In the House it did not even change that. In the House they can still receive $10,000 from a PAC. They call that campaign reform? I do not think so.

I mentioned I thought it was perks for politicians. I do not see why politicians should be able to buy broadcast time at one-half the rate of anybody else, the lowest rate of anybody, lower than a church in Mississippi, lower than a charitable organization in Kentucky that is trying to raise money, maybe to help somebody that has had a problem, maybe their house burned down or something. The station has a low rate that they want to give to a nonprofit organization.

This says, we want politicians running for the U.S. Congress to get one-half the rate that you charge anybody else. Do you know what the net result of that provision will be? A lot of stations do not make money, at least in my State. We have had a lot of radio stations that are just barely making it. They give a lot of time away. They are going to have to raise those lower rates up because they cannot afford to just give that much time. If they are going to say politicians get one-half the rate in election years, their minimum rate is going to go up pretty significantly. So we are going to end up charging charitable organizations a lot more because of this little perk for politicians so politicians can have rates at one-half the rate of anybody else.

Why should politicians be able to mail at 9.8 cents when most Americans have to pay 29 cents, or if you mail class 3, it is still 16.8 cents. Why should politicians get it at 9.8 cents? That is certainly a subsidy. That is certainly something. The rest of the postal payers or the taxpayers would be picking up that rate.

Why should politicians get broadcast vouchers that say, "Here is a couple hundred thousand dollars. Go out and buy some time. We are glad that you are running for Congress or for the Senate. Here is a couple of thousand dollars, $100,000. Here is a gift. You go out and buy this time. Incidentally, yes, you get to buy the time at one-half the rate of anybody else."

Then some people say this is voluntary. What they do not tell you is, if you do not participate—there is a little catch—if you decide to exceed the limit—let us say the limit is $1 million, and you think in your State, maybe it is Mississippi, you need to spend $2 million—they say it is voluntary, but, if you do not participate, your opponent is going to get $1 million. So the limit is $1 million for the general election, and you spend $2 million, and the taxpayer is going to match that $1 million if you exceed the limit of $1 million. Of course, your opponent can take that $1 million. Since he gets to buy broadcast time at one-half the rate that you do, that is equivalent to a $2 million gift.

They call this thing voluntary? It is not voluntary. It is a massive raid on the taxpayers. It has enormous expenses. We have done a little estimate.

We calculated the cost to the taxpayers is in excess of $1 billion over a 6-year cycle. So we are talking about real money. We are talking about heavy Government involvement in campaigns.

Some people say, eliminate soft money. This bill does eliminate soft money for political parties, but it does not touch soft money for organized labor. Organized labor puts lots and lots, millions of dollars, of soft money into campaigns. This does not touch it. It just goes to prove that this bill really is partisan. It was written by the majority party in both Houses. It was written one bill for the Senate and one bill for the House, different bills, which makes no sense whatsoever.

It is not a fair bill. It is not a bill that deserves to become law. The veto deserves to be sustained. I hope after the veto is sustained that we will have responsible leaders. I compliment my colleague and friend from Oklahoma. He has been steadfast in his desire to see this bill go forward.

I urge him to get together with Senator MITCHELL and Senator DOLE and Senator MCCONNELL and others who have shown leadership in this bill, and let us put together a bill that the President can sign. Let us put together a bill that does reduce PAC's. Let us put together a bill that does eliminate soft money for organized labor as well as the political parties, if we are going to go that far.

Let us put together a bill that says you have to raise the majority of your money from your home State or district. I think those are good reforms. Many of these reforms can and should be agreed upon.

So I hope that we will. And I also say I do not think we will have a bill, period, unless we do work in a bipartisan fashion.

Right now, with the makeup of Congress, if it is all one party, one side, and all one party the other side, with the President being in one party and opposite of the controlling party in Congress, we are not going to have a bill. So we might as well quit wasting our time.

I urge the leaders on this issue to get together and figure out what we can pass, and let us pass it this year. We may not get the full loaf. Let us take what we can get and make some real reforms and pass something that can be signed and become law this year. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Kentucky.

I yield the floor.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Oklahoma. He has been a major player in this issue all along, including membership in the group who tried to negotiate this issue, with little success. He understands the issue well and has made a fine contribution. I express my appreciation.

Mr. President, I understand that Senator GRASSLEY is on his way and would like to speak. Until he arrives, I want to make a couple more observations about the Constitution.

This bill is about the first amendment, about speech. It is a serious matter. The Supreme Court has been rather clear, crystal clear, that when you start talking about limiting speech, you are treading on thin ice. I think it is good to go back to the Buckley case. I want to briefly read a couple of quotes from the Buckley case, and I will give some time to Senator GRASSLEY.

The landmark case of Buckley versus Valeo set out essentially what is constitutionally permissible and what is not. The Court was really very articulate and right on the mark. I will read directly from the case, their observations about spending limits. Here is what they said:

> A restriction on the amount of money a person can spend on political communication during a campaign necessarily reduces the quality of expression by restricting the number of issues discussed, the depths of their exploration, and the size of the audience reached. This is because virtually every means of communicating ideas in today's mass society requires the expenditure of money.

Mr. President, let me read further from the decision.

The Court said in the Buckley case:

> It is clear that a primary effect of these expenditure limitation, those that had been passed by Congress back in the mid 1970's, is to restrict the quantity of campaign speeches by individuals, groups and candidates.

Then the Court reached the crux of the matter, Mr. President. Here it is:

> The concept that Government may restrict the speech of some elements of our society in order to enhance the relative voice of others is wholly foreign to the first amendment.

The Court went on:

> The interest in equalizing the financial resources of candidates competing for Federal office is not a convincing justification for restricting the scope of Federal election campaigns.

The Court said:

> Moveover, the equalization of permissible campaign expenditures might serve not to equalize the opportunities of all candidates, but to handicap a candidate who lacked substantial name recognition or exposure of his views before the start of a campaign.

The Court went on:

> The mere growth and the cost of Federal election campaigns in and of itself—

And the growth, of course, in congressional races, I add, is over, going down again—

> Provides no basis for Governmental restrictions on the quantity of campaign spending, and the resulting limitation on the scope of Federal campaigns.

The court said:

> The first amendment denies the Government the power to determine that spending to promote one's political views is wasteful, excessive, or unwise. In the free society ordained by our Constitution, it is not the Government, but the people who must retain control over the quantity and the range of debate in a political campaign.

Mr. President, it is absolutely clear that this bill would not survive before the current Supreme Court. As I have predicted previously, if such an issue wends its way up to the Supreme Court again, it is my prediction that the current Court would find spending limits, even with the public subsidy enticement, a violation of the first amendment.

So I might say that if anything like this ever passes, I look forward to

being involved in the litigation. The courts will ultimately save us from ourselves, and will not allow this kind of trashing of the first amendment.

I see that Senator GRASSLEY is here, and I yield him 6 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Kentucky for his leadership in this area, but most importantly, for his mastery of this subject of campaign finance reform and, I can say, his effective opposition to bad legislation that will eventually lose, thanks to a President's veto, but also thanks to the Senator's leadership.

Obviously, I am here to support President Bush's veto. I am disappointed, of course, that Congress sent the bill to him in the first place, a bill that he could not sign, when there were some very good ideas around here that could have been put together that would have brought real campaign finance reform and would have been signed by the President.

Mr. President, my colleagues have earlier, during this debate, mentioned that the American Civil Liberties Union opposes the conference report to S. 3. The ACLU says that this bill "will not solve the problems of fairness and financial equity" that proponents of this legislation claim. Even more interesting is that the ACLU points out that the limits on campaign contributions and expenditures "impinge directly on freedom of speech and association."

This is an important point to understand. Speech is what is really restricted by this legislation, our constitutionally protected right of free speech. Proponents of S. 3 argue in terms of contributions, in terms of money, and in terms of runaway spending. But, in reality, it is speech, and not spending, that is under attack by S. 3.

And if Members can pass legislation such as S. 3 that restricts the ability of challengers and their supporters to speak out against incumbents, what better incumbent protection could anyone who wants to be reelected ask for?

The Supreme Court, long ago, settled the issue in Buckley versus Valeo. The Court states that "no Government interest that has been suggested is sufficient to justify the restriction on the quantity of political expression imposed by campaign expenditure limitations." The Court also underscored that such restrictions would actually hurt challengers with little name recognition.

Four years ago, the Senate Democrats attempted to overturn the Buckley versus Valeo decision through a constitutional amendment. This legislation was understandably nicknamed the "Democratic incumbent protection bill." This legislation would have allowed Congress and the States to virtually prohibit all campaign expenditures. Now, of course, that is the ultimate in incumbent protection.

During the 101st Congress, a similar resolution was introduced but it had some modifications. This new version was not quite so draconian because it stipulated restrictions had to be reasonable, and whatever that means of course would be left up to the courts.

And, now according to the American Civil Liberties Union, S. 3, this campaign reform package presented by the Democrats in both the Senate and the House, represents yet another unconstitutional attack against freedom of speech.

Mr. President, I cannot help but be reminded of the embarrassing moment for this body last Congress when its Members wrapped themselves in the Bill of Rights to fight efforts of some of us in this body to protect the American flag from desecration.

We were told that we must not risk tampering with the speech clause to protect the American flag from flag burners. Yet these same Senators thought it was just fine to tamper with freedom of speech in order to protect the incumbency of Members of this body through assuring their own reelections.

It is as simple as this: If freedom of speech should be restricted at all, should it be to protect the American flag, or to protect political incumbents? Should it be to prohibit the physical burning of the flag, or the verbal burning of politicians?

Mr. President, I do not know how this affects most of my colleagues, but during the last Congress some Members felt shook up by the arguments for protecting the flag and my analogy with this legislation to amend the Constitution to protect incumbents.

And I would hope that people would feel as moved today to think in terms of what this bill does for free speech.

If you cut off spending, it is as simple as cutting off speech. It takes money to deliver your message through print and broadcast media. It takes money to pay for political travel to speak with voters. And if you cut that spending off, the one hurt most is the challenger who has not already established name recognition and who has not already enjoyed a forum to express and disseminate the challenger's views.

The problem with taxpayer funding of campaigns should be equally obvious to this body. Our budget deficit could reach $400 billion this year. Our national debt is at $4 trillion. Voluntary taxpayer contributions to the Presidential election fund is dropping off. That is the way the taxpayer is imploring us in this Congress to be a little more financially responsible. This drop in voluntary contributions to the Presidential election fund is their freely-expressed way of saying that they do not agree with that approach of financing elections.

And yet proponents of S. 3 expect us to believe that Americans want to be forced to spend several hundreds of millions of dollars, in tax dollars at that, to assure the reelection of incumbents.

Mr. President, campaign reform may be warranted, but it should be a product of bipartisan support. It should not be a product, such as S. 3, which provides income protection for the political party that has exercised a virtual lock on the control of Congress for the last four decades.

So, Mr. President, without any hesitancy at all and without any apology, I think that this legislation must be rejected again by our support of the President's veto.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, before the Senator from Iowa leaves the floor I wanted to compliment him for bringing up the constitutional amendment issue. I think it is very important. About 1½ years ago in response to suggestions that we amend the first amendment of the Constitution to prevent burning of the flag, a number of Senators, mostly on that side of the aisle but some on this side of the aisle as well, made a rather persuasive argument, it seems to me, which was the first amendment has served us well for over 200 years and had never been tampered with and that it was very dangerous to be modifying the first amendment with another constitutional amendment.

And as the Senator knows, because he is on the Judiciary Committee, and I believe the Judiciary Committee has reported out a constitutional amendment which would provide the Congress the authority in effect overruling the Buckley case, making it possible to quash speech, to quantify speech, to dole it out in equal amounts. I share the Senator's view that that would be most unfortunate, a trivialization, if you will, of the first amendment. Of all things, to modify the first amendment so people can speak less after 200 years of extraordinary success with the first amendment is a terrible idea.

Mr. President, it is such a terrible idea that even Common Cause is against a constitutional amendment. Common Cause, the principal interest group in America trying to promote spending limits on public finance, vigorously opposes tampering with the first amendment in order to achieve a goal that they desire.

So I commend my friend from Iowa for bringing up the constitutional amendment issue. It would be a most unfortunate way to go to tamper with the first amendment after all these years. I just wanted to thank him for his contribution.

Mr. GRASSLEY. If the Senator will yield, I thank the Senator very much for his kind remarks.

But in addition, if there is anything that is clear from the debate of the Bill of Rights and at the State legislature referendum after the first Congress, and most of the Court decisions, it is the importance of protecting political speech. That is the one outstanding motivation behind the first amendment. And if there would be one unacceptable compromise, extraordinary compromise of that principle, it would be to put some limit on political speech that is directly related to the political process, to what the average citizen out there might be wanting to say. Political debate would be limited. The essence of how we make decisions in this democracy is compromised by such an approach and must be rejected.

Mr. McCONNELL. Absolutely. No matter what the views of Senators about the advisability of voluntary spending limits and public finance, I hope the Senate will never trash the first amendment by constitutional amendment to provide spending limits. I thank my friend from Iowa.

Mr. President, I was about to say that the major leader had indicated to me earlier he was hoping we might be able to vote prior to 5:30. I sent the word to him as far as this Senator knows we are out of speakers on this side of the aisle. For the moment I reserve the time. Until I have a chance to confer with Senator MITCHELL further, I yield the floor.

Mr. WIRTH. Who controls the time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma controls time.

Mr. WIRTH. Is it possible to ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Oklahoma be considered having yielded 8 minutes to the Senator from Colorado?

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

The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. WIRTH. Thank you very much, Mr. President.

Here we are again in invisible city, almost no interest or reaction to this most important campaign finance reform bill, this extraordinarily important piece of legislation but there is almost no interest in it at all.

The President vetoed this bill, I think, with some embarrassment, Mr. President, so that that news appeared in the Saturday news—maybe he did it late Friday after the news had gone to bed. Now we are going to act on the veto override late in the afternoon, so it does not have any possibility of being part and parcel of any kind of evening news program.

Yet what is this issue, Mr. President? This issue is about a cancer that is eating up the Congress of the United States. This issue is about the fact that money across the country is out there, poised and very effectively purchasing political outcomes.

There is arrayed an increasing number of special interests that are out there standing between the people's elected representatives and the people themselves. We all know that that is happening.

You cannot tell me, Mr. President, that people who will piously say every one of my constituents gets the same reading as being level. That is not true. People who have donated from a large group a large amount of money are getting a very significant voice. As a consequence, what is happening is that our decisionmaking capability is declining. There is a lower and lower common denominator. And the people of the country are saying about their Congress, oh what is going on up there? And what do we do?

If this veto is not overridden, we just increase the amount of money we spent this year on campaigns and it will probably be increased in 1994 and again in 1996. More and more Members of Congress are out there hat in hand, cup in hand, tapping down the street asking whoever they pat on the shoulder if they would please make a contribution. Who are they asking? They are predominantly asking people who have a very, very significant interest in front of the Congress of the United States. They are asking people who already can go out there for the most part and hire a bank of consultants and a whole lot of accountants to make their case in front of the Finance Committee to come in and get lines in the appropriation bill and do all the things related to legislative process and buy even more influence.

The average individual in our society is saying to himself or herself, what is going on here? Why is this common denominator getting even lower? And it gets lower with each passing month. Here we are debating this important bill that got vetoed on a Saturday, debated late in the afternoon, the evening news having gone by, and little or no attention is paid to it. Yet we are trying to cure this virulent cancer.

Mr. President, let me ask you, was this the fact for the first operation in open heart surgey? Did that get no attention? No, the press was all over it. The country was all over it. They were interested in this issue. They knew about it. When the first artificial heart was implanted, was the press not interested, was the country not interested, were people watching it? They were watching with enormous concern because it was their vital bodily organs that they were talking about.

Well, this is the people's organ, this is the people's institution. This institution is in very, very significant trouble, in part, Mr. President, because of the cancer of money. The cancer of money is all around the institution, and we know it. People here know it and yet in a disingenuous way, they are saying, well, because of this or because of that, we cannot pass legislation.

Mr. President, I have heard that argument since I was first elected to the House in 1974. That argument has been made in 1975, 1976, 1977, on and on and on, the same weak arguments being made about not being able to do anything about this system.

But while Congress tries to do something about this system, the President, who in fact has been the largest single recipient of public funding of a shared public-private partnership passed in 1974, piously says no, and vetoed that bill.

Mr. President, if the President were going to be consistent, why did he not do the following, say "I'm not going to take any public funds. I'm going to go out and do it by myself, do it the way John Connally did it." Why did he not do that? I think people ought to catch on and they probably will not.

Let us just think for a minute what has happened since the Senate passed this bill for the first time? We had one evening of an event here in Washington, DC, in which more than $7 million—$7 million—was raised in one evening for the President's reelection campaign. Such an enormous amount of money was raised in that evening from so many interests that were piling in to get a piece of the action that the President of the United States disavowed that and had his banners taken down in the hall.

What else has happened? Four hundred thousand dollars was given in a donation from a single individual and nobody knew who it was. Nobody knew who that person was.

Now I can guarantee you, Mr. President, that that person, $400,000 later, did not intend to remain a shrinking violet and remain absolutely anonymous. Why did that individual organize and give $400,000? Do you think there was any correlation between his largess and his desire to be able to guide a political outcome?

Oh, no. We all say there is no correlation between the two. Let us be honest about the fact that, yes, there was.

In today's New York Times—another example of what has happened just since we passed the bill—a number of individuals who have major, significant problems in front of the Federal Government yet are raising money for candidates. This is a rank conflict of interest all by itself. Some of us were brought up to think about conflicts of interest.

Do you suppose there is any connection between those, Mr. President? Do you suppose there is any relationship between these individuals' willingness and eagerness to go out and raise a ton of money and then worry about the problems that they have in front of the Federal Government? I never met any of these individuals, I do not know anything about them. But it is a pretty embarrassing and tawdry state of affairs when this exists and the Amer-

ican public should ask and could ask what is going on here?

Mr. President, I think people do know what is going on. I think most Members of this institution are sick and tired of this demeaning money chase. They know what it does to them. They know what it does to the votes that they have to cast. The people on the outside who are giving this money are sick and tired of this. They know how wrong it is. You can talk to anyone, and they know how wrong it is.

Mr. President, we are certainly not going to be able to override this veto. The phalanx has been set up out there and there will be enough votes to sustain the President's veto and the President will then continue on and will probably have another, maybe not $7 million dinner, may only a million dollars.

We will have another anonymous donor who is just purely generous, giving hundreds of thousands of dollars. We will have other scandals that hit the newspapers sure as can be and the beat will go on and on and on and the price of elective office will go up and up and up. And our ability to have rational debate on the issues of the country will be lessened.

It is a terrible situation, Mr. President. It is a terrible situation. We all know it. And yet somehow the paralysis has hit, and we cannot do anything about it. It is an appalling situation, Mr. President.

We should all be embarrassed for the institution in this fashion. We should be embarrassed for the people of this country looking at this institution and the amounts of money cycling through here.

This is a modest attempt to make some changes; a modest attempt to make some changes. It is not perfect by any means—no piece of legislation is. There are compromises that have to be worked out. But it is a step in the right direction. It is a step to get rid of this virulent cancer, and we should do it.

Mr. President, I certainly, obviously, intend to vote to override President Bush's veto. I certainly hope that people who will vote to override the veto also can do so, hold their heads high and explain to the American public who overwhelmingly says that we know something is deeply amiss and campaign finance is a major part of that problem.

Let people go back and explain it to their constituents and let us hope that there is some attention to this. Let us hope that the press which was standing outside the door over there on the House Ethics Committee—you will remember when the report of all the people who allegedly bounced checks over there, there was a massive number of people from the press that could not wait to get that list, could not wait to get in the door, could not wait to grab hold of that, and go out and talk about that issue.

That issue, Mr. President, is irrelevant compared to what we are talking about here. It is irrelevant compared to what the relationship of this has to do with anything about the budget. It is irrelevant compared to what the relationship of this has to do with anything about the budget. It is irrelevant compared to our inability here to do anything about guns in the United States and the slaughter that is going on everywhere. It is irrelevant to our inability to break down the budget wall and to treat children in this country the way that we should who do not have a voice, who cannot raise $7 million in an evening.

That is what this is all about, and that is where this should be looked at, Mr. President, and looked at and understood in a serious way. Not the lemming instinct of looking at the House bank, even if it is a metahpor for a lot of other problems.

But the attention given to this issue is so small and the reflection of that is what is going on right here, this afternoon: disappeared, vetoed on a Saturday, disappeared, the silent Stealth issue; a Stealth-like cancer, which creeps up and wipes out that living organism. That is what is happening to us here, Mr. President. That is why we should override the President's veto.

Mr. President, noticing the fact that there is nobody here to speak on this issue at this point, I make a point of order for our grateful viewers that a quorum is not present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. BOREN. Mr. President, I yield to myself as much time as I might require.

Mr. President, I have been listening to comments made on both sides about this matter. Of course, I have already made extensive comments about the veto message myself. I will not repeat what I have said earlier, but, simply, again to sum up by asking the question: How long are we going to wait until we do something to solve the serious problems that we have in this country with the way we finance campaigns?

When I first became a Member of the U.S. Senate I was alarmed by the fact that the average candidate for the U.S. Senate, the average successful candidate was spending $580,000 to get elected to the U.S. Senate; 14 years ago, $580,000. It seemed to me at the time to be too much money, too much time spent raising money, too much attention to raising money, too much perception on the part of those watching the fundraising process that the integrity of the candidates and the process were somehow being compromised by the amount of money that had to be raised. That was 14 years ago. And now the average successful candidate for the United States Senate does not have to raise $580,000. In the last cycle, in 1990, the average successful candidate raised $4 million in order to run for the U.S. Senate; $4 million, almost $15,000 for every single week for 6 years of a 6-year term to raise the amount of money that is necessary.

My question, Mr. President, is this: How long are we going to wait before we act? How much longer are the American people going to have to wait? The American people, according to survey after survey, in excess of 80 percent, sometimes as high as 90 percent, want to see us put limits on the amount of moneys that can be raised and spent on campaigns.

They know. The people know. We do not understand it here in the Nation's Capital. The people across this country know there is too much money in this process. They want the money chase to stop. They want us to have a competition in campaigns based upon ideas and the qualifications of candidates and solutions to the problems facing this country, not a competition based upon who can raise the most money.

So, Mr. President, I ask how long will we wait? How long will we wait before we repair a system which one leading newspaper in this country correctly called "rotten"; a system which gives such an unfair advantage to incumbents over challengers?

Until we put spending limits in place we will never have a level playing field between incumbents and challengers, not when incumbents have been able to raise, as they have so far in this election cycle, $19 for every $1 that challengers can raise. In 1990, for the House, House Members raised eight times as much, $230 million versus $30 million, compared to challengers, to run for reelection. Senate challengers do not have a chance in that it was 3 to 1. How long are we going to wait until we level the playing field between incumbents and challengers by placing spending limits in place?

Finally, how long are we going to wait before we reduce the influence of special interest groups in American politics? Over half of those running from Congress successfully in the last election received over half of that money not from the people back home but from the special interest groups, the political action committees, mainly located here in Washington, often controlled by lobbyists who are seeking special legislative favors and enactment by Members of the Congress. How long are we going to wait?

This bill, S. 3, which was just vetoed by the President very quietly over the

weekend, would have, had it been in effect, cut by more than 53 percent the amount of political action committee contributions, PAC contributions, special interest money that could have been accepted by candidates in the last election.

It is a major step in the right direction. It is not a perfect bill. But it does limit spending. It does limit overall spending. It does reduce the advantage, therefore, that incumbents have over challengers and it helps level the playing field. It would have squeezed out over half the special interest money now flowing into the system, creating a perception that causes the majority of the American people, 78 percent in a poll, to say that they thought the Members of Congress cared more about the special interest groups than they cared about people like themselves.

Until we change it, we are going to continue to have problems in this country with the perception people have of this institution. How long are we going to wait? Are we going to wait, using the argument that somehow the spending of money is free speech and therefore the more money we spend the better our political process will be? The more time we spend raising money, the more money that flows in from the special interest groups, creating the perception that Members of Congress are actually almost for sale to the highest bidder in order to raise the campaign funds that are necessary? How long are we going to wait? We have waited until 82 percent of the American public said, when they are polled, they do not have confidence in this institution. Shall we wait until it is 88 percent? Shall we wait until it is 92 percent? Shall we wait until it is 99 percent?

We have waited while the cost of campaigns went from $580,000 to winning a race to $4 million to winning a race. How long are we going to wait Mr. President? Until it goes to $20, $30, $40 million; it is $60 million that will make the political process better? How long are we going to wait? How long are we going to wait before we act, Mr. President?

We had a chance to do something. The President of the United States had a chance to do something important in terms of reforming this process, in terms of cleaning up the current rotten system, and in restoring, as a former Republican Congressman, Congressman Buchanan said, restoring decency to the system.

He had a chance to heed not just appeals from this side of the aisle but appeals from the other side of the aisle as well. Thirty-two challengers, Republicans running for Congress this year, not already here, not interested in protecting the advantages of the incumbency, but 32 Republicans running for Congress this year said please sign this bill to put spending limits in place; level the playing field and give challengers a chance.

This is not for one party or the other. This is for the integrity of the political process and the ability of both sides to compete fairly on an equal basis.

All of us know the truth. I do not care what anybody can say on the floor of the U.S. Senate. The argument can be made: yes, you need to spend money in order to express yourself in political campaigns; oh, yes, we need to spend more money so we can buy more advertising time and put more of our message on the air.

Mr. President, that argument can be made. But if we were to go out and ask the American people what they think about what has happened to the political process in this country over the past 15 years we will find that the people have more common sense than to fall for that argument. We will find the people do not think the quality of political debate has gone up in this country as we moved from $600,000 to $4 million being poured into the average campaign, by more and more 30-second spots with actors on them assassinating the character of the opposition, whichever party it happens to be—more negative mudslinging, more slogans, more sound bite politics, more and more and more, and all of it paid for more and more and more by the special interest groups, with the impression more and more and more that if we are going to be spending our time and energies, we are going to be spending them on the people who can give us that campaign money that we have to have if we are going to be elected, because 99 percent of the time the candidate who raises the most money is the candidate who is going to be elected.

How long are we going to wait, Mr. President?

This institution does not belong to us. It belongs to the people. We are the trustees of this institution. We are expected to pass it on to the next generation, strong and vital and representative of the American people, a system of government of which the next generation can be proud, a system of government those young people who serve here, for example, as pages for the House and Senate will want to participate themselves in some day. We are expected to pass it on. If we do not fulfill our obligation to be trustees and set aside our party differences and our own individual self-interest—and I am sure there is not a single Member of the U.S. Senate who probably cannot raise more money than any challenger because we are here, we have the power to pass bills and grant favors now, and those challengers do not.

But how long are we going to wait, Mr. President, to meet our responsibility as trustees of this institution? How long? I hope before Members vote this afternoon, they will consider again their responsibility, not to themselves, not to the next election, not to any political party, but their responsibility to our system of government. And at the heart of it is the integrity of the election process itself. If the election process does not have integrity and fairness and an equal chance for challengers as well as incumbents and a chance for people with good ideas and good character and good qualifications who cannot raise millions of dollars to compete in this system, that is not basic to our system of government. That is not basic to what we believe in as Americans. That is not basic to what we call the American dream. It is not that any child who grows up in this country who has good ideas and works hard and has a desire to serve has a chance to be a U.S. Senator some day, if they want to be. But it is any child with good ideas who works hard, who has a lot of ability, who has the desire to serve might be a U.S. Senator some day if they can figure out which special interest group will give them the $4 million they have to have to get elected to this body.

That is not the American dream. That is not the America of which we were sent to be trustees. We have a higher responsibility. It is time for us to meet it. The President missed his opportunity to sign this bill. Let us not miss our opportunity to sign this bill. Let us not miss our opportunity to enact this bill into law over his unwise veto and let us again revitalize this institution and make it what it should be.

Mr. DECONCINI addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. BOREN. I will be happy to yield as much time as he desires to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. DECONCINI. I thank the Chair and the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma. Mr. President, I am glad to see him get exercised. It is worth getting exercised. He asked a question this afternoon I feel somebody ought to try to answer. The question is: How long are we going to wait? He laid out a case that is overwhelming; that it is way over time; that we waited too long.

But I will tell him how long we are going to wait. We are going to wait until we have some leadership in the White House, until we have someone who wants to be honest with the American public and tell the truth, the President takes public financing for his Presidential campaign and he takes special interest money. I believe it was $9 million and not $7 million the other night in the convention center downtown that President Bush raised.

There is nothing illegal about that. I do not want to leave any misimpressions. But the public does not like it, and I doubt whether the President likes it. And yet he turns around and also makes application to the Federal Election Commission for

public funds and he will receive the largest amount of money of anybody in the history who has run for President. During his tenure as Vice President and President, as has been pointed out before today, he will receive over $200 million of public taxpayers' money.

There is nothing wrong with it. We saw the problems in Watergate of special interests influencing Presidential elections, and the Congress of the United States did something about it because the people wanted something done about it. Now we have the opposition on the other side of the aisle standing up here and throwing all the bogus arguments out once again, all those arguments that say, if we just sit down together and compromise, we can put something here; that we want to wipe out PAC's, and this bill only reduces them 50 percent, and we want to put some limits on spending, but they have to be our limits.

But the truth of it is those who are opposing this bill do not want to change the system because they like it. They like it because they can raise all the money they want to, and that way they can beat anybody they want to.

I am one of the incumbents who think I can raise all the money I want to, but that is not the point. The point is that we have to put the brakes on and we have to answer the question of the Senator from Oklahoma: How long are we going to wait? We have waited far too long. The American public is sick and tired of us. They are tired of the whole process, and yet we see the opposition today give us all the arguments from first amendment rights to taking away the privilege to speak your piece, to having to pay only half the cost of television and media costs and that charities will have to pay more. That is hogwash and we know it so well and the American public, if anybody is listening, knows it. It is a shame somebody in the press does not care enough to make this an issue.

Talk about an issue. We see the issues in the House and the Senate from the Ethics Committees and we see how these are made into gigantic issues as if this republic is going to fall on those kinds of issues. And here is an issue, the Senator from Colorado pointed out, which is as bad as a cancer eating away at our very democracy. The opponents to this bill say, no, no, no, we just have to get together and sit down with the majority leader, the minority leader, and the cosponsor of the bill, the opponents of the bill, and we can put something together. So let us not pass something foolish now that commits public dollars to help finance campaigns. The justification for that is as clear as the nose on my face. It is so the special interests can run this country. I am tired of it. I think that is why so many Members are not running for reelection in the House and Senate, not because of some checks, but because they are tired of it, and the American public is tired of it.

The Senator from Oklahoma has stood here for day after day fighting for this bill. President Bush has demagoged it to the hilt while he is taking all the money in wheelbarrow loads that he can from the Federal Treasury to support his campaign for President. He says, ah-ha, we are not going to bend on this principal of having public funds supporting campaigns of congressional Members' candidacies.

It is a fraud, and those who are opposing this bill are not being totally honest as to why, because the reason, I submit, why is because they can raise the money, they want the money, and they like the system the way it is. Let us call it what it is. It is time that we answer the question of the Senator from Oklahoma, and that is: How long do we wait? I have yet to hear an answer here for several days, including today, of one good reason why we are waiting and not going to override this veto. I thank the Senator from Oklahoma.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time? The Senator from Kentucky is recognized.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, as we move toward, once again, the conclusion of this seemingly endless debate that has been going on for 4 or 5 years, there has been a lot of talk about challengers and how they are affected by not only the current system but what is proposed here that, of course, is not going to pass.

I think it is interesting to note that there are twice as many challengers running this year than there was in 1990. The filing deadlines are not complete yet in all States. Obviously, there are a whole lot of challengers out there. I say this as a member of the minority party who would like to have a lot of effective challengers, aggressive challengers. There are a heck of a lot of people out there this year who think they can win and they have not been deterred by the current climate. They have been encouraged by it.

So I think the argument that has been made that this bill somehow benefits challengers is truly absurd. Not only do all the scholars in this country who look at the issue conclude the bill does not help challengers, the Supreme Court even referred to that in its Buckley decision.

Clearly there is not anybody disinterested, anybody who sits on the sideline as an observer of this issue believes this bill would help challengers.

Mr. President, we have finally arrived at the end of a very long road in the quest to enact campaign finance reform legislation.

The other side was well aware of what would happen if they continued to pursue their partisan agenda, just as they are aware of what the outcome of this vote will be.

The other side has known for a long time that we are not going to let them get away with crafting the rules of the campaign finance game in a way that cleverly benefits them and hurts the Republican Party.

They have known for long time that they cannot simply bludgeon the political parties while leaving PAC's and sewer money alone.

And they have known that they cannot put up walls to challengers while protecting the considerable advantages of incumbency.

Yet the other side has continued to push its partisan agenda; it has resolutely ignored serious reform issues like special interest sewer money; and it has brushed aside all objections and proposals raised by this side of the aisle.

Thus, one can only conclude that the other side is not serious about enacting campaign finance reform. They do not want to sit down with the President and all of us from this side of the aisle and hammer out a bill that actually could become law.

In fact, they apparently were so afraid of any bill becoming law that they loaded up this conference report with as much veto-bait as they could find—even provisions that were outside the scope of conference—just to make absolutely sure the President would veto it.

So this is not an exercise in serious legislating. It is an effort to raise a political issue, make a lot of noise, beat up on the President, but end up doing nothing.

I am not the only one who has reached this sad conclusion. David Broder, senior political commentator for the Washington Post, dubbed this whole exercise the "campaign finance farce."

He wrote recently that:

> The 1992 version of the campaign finance reform drama has been playing out according to script, with winks and leers signaling the hypocrisy.

Broder goes on to quote Prof. Frank Sorauf of the University of Minnesota, to provide what Broder calls the "proper commentary on this sickening spectacle":

> When legislators know they are not writing legislation [referring to the President's well-advertised threat to veto this bill], they write for self-protection and self-advertisement. It is an old, if not very honorable, form of symbolic politics.

At this point, I would like to insert into the RECORD this column by Mr. Broder, as well as a column he wrote last year entitled "Bogus Campaign Finance Reform."

Mr. President, the bill before us today, and the utter lack of seriousness in getting a real campaign reform bill passed, demonstrate better than anything else what upsets people about politics today.

What is one of the major objections that voters have? Government waste. So what has the other side done?

It has wasted countless legislative hours on a bill that no one expected would become law. No one.

What is another big concern of voters? The deficit—caused by rampant spending without ever figuring out how to pay for it all.

That's exactly what this bill does: It proposes a new multimillion-dollar entitlement program—for politicians—without ever figuring out how to pay for it.

As David Broder writes, "That kind of chicanery perpetuates the something-for-nothing fantasy life."

This is brilliant, Mr. President: The House has a check-bouncing scandal that could end up claiming half its Members, and the other side's response is a bill that writes the biggest rubber check in history to pay for campaigns.

It is a bit like Marie Antoinette saying to the angry mob, "Let them eat cake. And by the way, send them the bill for our next palace, too."

What else are voters sick of?

They are sick of the mentality that says the solution to every problem is yet another Government program—preferably an entitlement program.

So we have a bill before us that creates an expensive entitlement program—and this time, the welfare cases are ourselves. The voters are going to love that.

But the one thing that voters are most upset about is that they feel their representatives in Washington don't listen to them anymore.

If you want proof of that feeling, you don't have to look any further than the bill before us today.

People outside the beltway—real people—simply hate public financing of political campaigns.

The Federal Election Commission recently held some focus groups to find out why taxpayers are not checking off on their returns to support the Presidential election campaign fund.

This fund, which provides taxpayer financing for Presidential races, is sinking into bankruptcy because the number of taxpayers who check "yes" has fallen drastically since it was established.

The FEC thought that maybe taxpayers didn't really understand the concept; and that was why they weren't supporting it. So they held focus groups to explain what taxpayer financing was and how it worked.

Well, the FEC was partly right: Taxpayers did not understand how public financing worked in presidential races. They never dreamed that their tax dollars were paying for negative political ads, balloons at political party conventions, or fringe candidates like Lenora Fulani.

But once it was explained to them, the participants in these focus groups responded the way most Americans would: They went ballistic.

Nearly all of them said that they would emphatically check the box against designating a dollar of taxes they already owe to the taxpayer financing fund. And they were glad someone had finally explained this boondoggle to them.

In fact, even the researcher who conducted the focus groups—who was of necessity neutral in the discussion—came away saying that he never knew his tax dollars were being used in this way, and he would most certainly check "no" on taxpayer financing in the future.

Survey data from across the country confirms this sentiment among voters regarding taxpayer financing: In State after State, upwards of 85 percent of those surveyed say that they oppose taxpayer financing.

In many of these surveys, taxpayer financing has more negative resonance than congressional pay raises, voting against the gulf war, and voting against making Congress obey the same rules it imposes on everyone else.

A newspaper poll in Kentucky found 65 percent opposition to public financing of campaigns, even after the issue of spending limits was discussed and tested.

The annual nationwide poll on public financing—conducted on our tax returns with the dollar checkoff—shows only 19 percent of Americans support taxpayer financing. And that support is falling every year.

America despises taxpayer financing. And America wants to know: Is Congress listening?

To judge from the bill before us today, the other side apparently is not listening to what America is saying about taxpayer financing of campaigns.

What we need, Mr. President, is legislation to make challengers more competitive, to stimulate grassroots democracy, to force out special interest money, and to reduce campaign costs through a meaningful broadcast discount.

That is what the Republican alternative bill does: It provides seed money for challengers, enhances the role of political parties at the grassroots, eliminates political action committees, requires complete disclosure of special interest soft money, and reins in the single greatest cost component of campaigns—broadcast rates.

What does the Democratic bill do, on the other hand?

It insulates incumbents, protects their advantages, walls out challengers, chokes off grassroots democracy through the parties, tiptoes around the PAC's, and makes believe that special interest soft money simply doesn't exist.

And on top of that, the Democrats' bill sends an open-ended bill to the taxpayers and says, "You handle it."

This is not reform. As David Broder says, it is a farce.

If the other side really wanted reform, they would sit down with us, list the areas we agree on—like bundling, independent expenditures, the broadcast discount, special interest money—and write a bill that could pass both Houses almost unanimously.

On the other hand, if the other side prefers the status quo, they will keep wasting time with worn-out proposals that most respected scholars on the issue—Democrat and Republican—have rejected as terrible public policy.

Unfortunately, the other side appears to have decided that posturing is better than progress—that rhetoric gets you farther than reform.

We hear over and over again the same recycled nonsequitters and discredited arguments.

For example, the other side is particularly exercised that the President is opposed to taxpayer financing for congressional races, but has received hundreds of millions of dollars in taxpayer financing through the Presidential system.

As I have said before, that is like saying that the Senate should get a free bank just because the House had one.

But the reason for the President's position—and the other side knows this—is that we play under the rules as they exist—not as we might wish them to be.

That is equally true of those on the other side who are aggressively pushing for new campaign finance laws.

Even though their bill—as passed by the Senate—eliminated PAC contributions, I haven't noticed many of the cosponsors swearing off PAC's. In fact, some of them are absolutely raking it in from PAC's.

That's true on this side as well: We have legislation to prohibit PAC contributions, but most of us play under the current rules. There's nothing inherently wrong about that.

Just like there's nothing especially hypocritical about the fact that the other side claims to be for voluntary spending limits—of course, the spending limits in their bill are anything but voluntary.

Yet I haven't seen anyone on the other side volunteer to unilaterally limit their spending in their next really competitive race.

We all play by the rules as they exist today.

In the Presidential system, the spending limits are truly voluntary; because the public subsidy that you get for complying with them is so generous that only someone like Ross Perot could afford to turn it down.

John Connally also turned down public financing; he didn't get many votes; but again, he could afford to forgo the tremendous public subsidy offered in the Presidential system.

So the argument that President Bush should support taxpayer financing for congressional races just because he has accepted it in Presidential races is to-

tally bogus. And it raises serious questions about those who support any form of campaign finance legislation but are unwilling to live under its provisions right now.

The other argument we hear about ad nauseum is the so-called money chase.

The C-SPAN cameras don't pick this up, but we are all actually wearing Nike track shoes so that we can sprint from one fundraiser to another.

And all those 2,000-plus bills that get introduced in this Chamber every Congress—many of which are covered in depth by committees, debated on this floor, amended, and voted upon—we don't introduce those bills or pass them through here.

It's all the work of gremlins. We're all hanging out at fundraisers all day.

That is the money chase myth. And it's absolutely false. Over 80 percent of the money raised for Senate campaigns is raised in the last 2 years of the election cycle. Over 80 percent.

People are not spending all their time raising money, to the neglect of their official Senate duties.

So the money chase myth is another stale piece of rhetoric that the other side continues to substitute for reform.

One other argument that we hear with increasing stridency is that Members' votes are being bought with private contributions.

First of all, no individual can give more than $1,000 per election. Most people give considerably less than that.

Even PAC's, which our bill would eliminate, can give only $5,000 per election. The average PAC contribution is about half of that.

So when we talk about the average Senate campaign costing millions of dollars, it takes an extreme leap of faith to believe that these small, disclosed contributions are buying vast amounts of influence.

But even if that were true, if Members were being bought by these contributions, the answer to that is very clear: The United States Code states that bribery and quid-pro-quos for political contributions are criminal acts with severe criminal sanctions.

Members who violate these laws are prosecuted and sent to prison where they belong. That is the correct response to corruption.

The worst possible response to corruption is to create a taxpayer-financed system with loophole-ridden spending limits that encourages wealthy special interests to influence elections outside of the campaign finance laws.

Listen to what Michael Malbin, of the Rockefeller Institute of Government, says about this:

> [Spending limits] encourage the powerful to engage in subterfuge and legal gamesmanship. It is giving them an incentive to increase their influence in ways that are poorly disclosed. As a cure for cynicism or corruption, this seems bizarre.

What Mr. Malbin is saying here is that the system the other side is proposing will actually encourage subterfuge and corruption—not combat it.

If this bill ever became law, all of the problems of the Presidential system would be replicated by a factor of 535.

Fat cats and special interests spending millions of dollars outside the system—with no disclosure at all.

Built-in loopholes, like unlimited compliance costs for House races.

Unrestrained soft money activity by labor unions and tax-exempt corporations.

Not to mention hordes of fringe, extremist, third-party candidates like Lenora Fulani and David Duke. The Ku Klux Klan has fallen on hard times with their fundraising; but under this bill, their candidates could get tax dollars to run for office.

Mr. President, when I look at the bill before us, I can see why Americans are just plain fed up with politics and Washington.

They are fed up with rubber-check spending. They are fed up with self-insulating incumbents. They are fed up with rhetoric that masquerades as reform. And they are fed up with a Congress that seems not to care what people at home want and don't want.

Finally, I would like to say a word or two about a subject that is critical to the whole issue of campaign finance reform: The Constitution.

In 1975, the Supreme Court struck down mandatory spending limits in the case of Buckley versus Valeo.

Now, there are some from the other side of the aisle who have characterized this decision as a heinous travesty of justice. So I think it bears examining just what this radical opinion said:

> A restriction on the amount of money a person can spend on political communication during a campaign necessarily reduces the quantity of expression by restricting the number of issues discussed, the depth of their exploration, and the size of the audience reached. This is because virtually every means of communicating ideas in today's mass society requires the expenditure of money.

Nothing very radical about that, is there?

Let's read on for just a few more paragraphs:

> It is clear that a primary effect of these expenditure limitations is to restrict the quantity of campaign speech by individuals, groups, and candidates.

Now the court reaches the crux of the matter:

> The concept that Government may restrict the speech of some elements of our society in order to enhance the relative voice of others is wholly foreign to the First Amendment.
>
> The interest in equalizing the financial resources of candidates competing for federal office is [not a] convincing justification for restricting the scope of federal election campaigns. * * * Moreover, the equalizing of permissible campaign expenditures might serve not to equalize the opportunities of all candidates but to handicap a candidate who lacked substantial name recognition or exposure of his views before the start of the campaign.

Finally, the court addresses the issue of rising campaign expenditures:

> The mere growth in the cost of federal election campaigns in and of itself provides no basis for governmental restriction on the quantity of campaign spending and the resulting limitation on the scope of federal campaigns. The First Amendment denies government the power to determine that spending to promote one's political views is wasteful, excessive, or unwise. In the free society ordained by our Constitution it is not the government but the people—who must retain control over the quantity and range of debate in a political campaign.

That hardly sounds offensive or radical to me. It sounds like mom, apple pie, and the first amendment.

Unfortunately, the bill before us does violence to the free speech principles enunciated in Buckley.

Although the other side has attempted to sell the spending limits in its bill as voluntary, they are about as voluntary as a loaded gun to the temple.

If a candidate decides not to limit his constitutionally protected speech, the bill unceremoniously strips away the broadcast discount rate to which he would otherwise be entitled. This nails two rights at once: free speech and equal protection.

Not only that, but if a candidate exceeds the spending limit—or even raises contributions exceeding the limit—his opponent receives a massive infusion of tax dollars. In other words, this bill uses the U.S. Treasury as a sword of Damocles against anyone with the gall to freely exercise his or her constitutional rights.

Then, if a private group decides to make independent expenditures for or against a candidate, the sword falls again: The opposed candidate gets tax money on a dollar-for-dollar matching basis.

So, if David Duke were running for the Senate in Louisiana, the B'nai B'rith decided to run ads critical of Duke's racist record, then Duke could get Federal tax dollars to counteract the B'nai B'rith expenditures.

Mr. President, not only is this bill not going anywhere in Congress, it will never be able to crawl across the street to the Supreme Court. There is no question that the court would pronounce it dead on arrival.

So this whole exercise by the other side of the aisle has been a phenomenal waste of time.

The President has done the right thing by vetoing this beltway production of a bill. It is time for us to sustain this veto—and stop wasting America's time with partisan agendas that are not going anywhere.

As I said earlier, Mr. President, there are no more speakers on this side of the aisle. I might ask my friend from Oklahoma whether he has any other speakers. If not, we might——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. President, I understand the distinguished majority leader does wish to make a concluding comment. I am verifying that. If so, he would be the last speaker on this side. We should have the answer to that question in just a moment.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I will vote against override of the veto message on the Campaign Finance Reform Act. This conference report contains both public financing of elections and voluntary spending limits. Public Financing of senatorial and congressional races would create an onslaught on the public treasury to pick up the tabs for campaigning and politicking and is nothing more than a Government subsidy for all would-be politicians and I oppose it. Voluntary spending limits are a carrot-and-stick approach where candidates enticed by the Federal financing would accept spending limits. What we need, Mr. President, are real spending limits.

Senate Joint Resolution 35, my constitutional amendment to empower Congress to place limits on campaign spending, does just that. It has been voted out of Judiciary with a favorable 9–5 vote and I hope it can be brought to the Senate for debate later this year. When the Senate considered a virtually identical amendment in 1988, 52 other Senators joined me in voting for cloture to permit an up-or-down vote. Mr. President, the need for spending limits is more urgent than ever, with the average cost of election to the Senate having risen to some $4 million and a constitutional amendment is the only way to get it done. As I have said before, Mr. President, in 1974, Congress and the President on a bipartisan basis agreed that spending limits are the only rational alternative to the current system of awarding public office to the highest bidder. Regrettably, the Supreme Court overturned that 1974 solution in Buckley versus Valeo, ruling that spending limits infringe a candidate's freedom of speech. In the same breath, however, the Court said that limits on campaign contributions were justified because the absence of such limits creates the appearance of corruption. The Court's double standard in Buckley is bizarre and it is wrong. Obviously, the absence of limits on spending by candidates creates no less an appearance of corruption.

Mr. President, my amendment, Senate Joint Resolution 35, is a narrowly drafted amendment which would allow us to impose order on the way we finance Federal campaigns. I remain committed toward working toward realistic campaign finance reform and my constitutional amendment would do so directly, decisively, and with finality.

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, despite widespread call for reform by the citizens of this country that we put an end to the money chase; and, despite the pleas by 33 Republican congressional challengers; President Bush listened to his advisers and to incumbent Republicans and vetoed the campaign finance reform bill.

President Bush's statement included the usual litany of excuses for vetoing the bill. But, perhaps the most troubling excuse was that he vetoed this bill because it is an incumbent protection plan.

Mr. President, if there is any plan which is an incumbent protection plan, it is the current system. Under the current system, incumbents outspent challengers 3 to 1. Under the current system, PAC's gave over three-fourths of their contributions to incumbents. In the Senate alone, incumbents maintain a 4 to 1 advantage over challengers in the receipt of PAC contributions.

It is the present system which kept all but one challenger from winning a Senate seat in the 1990 elections.

It is the present system in which 26 of 28 incumbents outspent their challengers. In 21 of those races, the incumbents outspent their challengers by more than $1 million each.

Under the present system, in the 1990 elections, incumbents raised $4.9 million each, while their challengers raised $1.8 million each. Incumbents raised $1 million each from PAC's, while their challengers raised less than $300,000 each from PAC's; and incumbents spent $4.5 million each, while their challengers spent $1.7 million each.

Mr. President, it is as plain as the nose on your face that the present system is the incumbent protection system. It is the present system which continues to put challengers at a disadvantage.

The President vetoed this bill because he says the bill didn't eliminate the special interest influence of PAC's. While the bill did not eliminate PAC's, it certainly imposes a greater restriction on the amount of contributions that PAC's can make. If the PAC limitations of S. 3 had been in place in the 1990 elections, there would have been a 53-percent reduction in the amount of money incumbents could have raised from PAC's.

Mr. President, I cited a statistic before that the average cost for a winning Senate incumbent in the 1990 elections was $4.5 million. That amounts to raising over $14,000 a week during a 6-year term. But some of my colleagues argue that the money chase is really a myth because most incumbents raise at least 83 percent of their contributions in the last 2 years of their term. Well, if that's true, Mr. President, then that amounts to raising almost $36,000 a week in the last 2 years of office.

Think about that, Mr. President, you need to raise almost $36,000 a week in the last 2 years of your term. More than $5,000 a day. And they say that the money chase doesn't exist. I'm sorry, Mr. President, but that dog just won't hunt.

How can we serve our constituents; how can we fulfill our constitutional duty here, if we have to raise that kind of money? It's no wonder that the American people are growing increasingly cynical about this institution.

Perhaps it was coincidence. But on the same day that the President vetoed this legislation, the FEC reported that candidates for the 1992 congressional races have raised nearly $248 million. This is $55 million more than candidates raised at this time 2 years ago.

Mr. President, while the President and his supporters in the Congress claimed that this is an incumbent protection bill, 33 Republican challengers from across the country wrote to the President and asked him to sign this bill. These challengers wrote that this legislation is necessary to level the playing field for credible challengers and to restore a measure of fairness to our electoral process.

I ask you, who knows better what is in the best interest of challengers. Thirty-three Republican challengers from across the country who have challenged incumbents under the present system—and lost under the present system? Or, incumbents who won under the present system—a system that got them here and keeps them here as incumbents.

It all comes down simply to this: Who knows best whether the bill will create a level playing field for challengers, the challengers or the incumbents?

By refusing to sign this legislation, President Bush has stated that he prefers the current system. He prefers the current incumbent protection plan. And why shouldn't he? It's the very system that helps to sustain his vetoes.

Mr. President, while this veto may be sustained, let the record reflect that it was a majority of the Congress; a majority of this Senate, demanding a change to the system. A majority of the Congress; a majority of this Senate, support putting an end to the money chase.

For the first time in over 10 years, a majority of the Congress supported fundamental reform of the campaign finance system. I hope that we do not have to wait another 10 years to get a reform bill signed into law.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BREAUX] might be allowed to proceed as if in morning business for not to exceed 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Could the Chair clarify, is the Senator yielding 10 minutes from the time allotted?

Mr. BOREN. How much time remains to the Senator from Oklahoma?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Twenty-five minutes, fifty-four seconds.

Mr. BOREN. I ask unanimous consent that the time not be counted against the time available to either side on this matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BREAUX. I thank the President. I thank the Senator from Oklahoma. If the majority leader gets to the floor, I will be more than happy to curtail my remarks because I am speaking on a different subject.

HEALTH CARE IN THE 1990'S

Mr. BREAUX. Mr. President and my colleagues, as we wrestle with the very difficult job of coming up with a health care plan, there are probably as many thoughts and ideas on what we should do as we have Members of the Senate. I know the general public wants us to do something. They are not certain what we should do. They know we have a medical crisis on our hands and they want Congress to try to address it.

We have been wrestling in the Finance Committee with a number of different plans and options. We have had some outstanding hearings. We have had people representing the administration and hospitals and labor and doctors and, of course, the Congressional Budget Office, all making their presentations on what the problem is. Some have made suggestions as to what we should do to address the most serious problem facing our Nation in the 1990's, and that is the real problem of the cost of health care in this country.

We all know the facts and they are frightening. We are spending more on health care in this country, almost $800 billion, than we spend on the entire defense budget, plus buying all the cars and all the trucks in the United States, plus refueling them, plus repairing them, plus buying all of the parts for them. Add up all of those numbers and it is still not as much as we spend on health care in this country.

If you ask the average person, would daresay that most of them think they are paying most of their own bill, even if they have insurance through their employer. We have had some studies done that were a part of our hearing record, contained in faulty diagnosis, public misconceptions about health care reform in the United States. One of the interesting things that I noted in this national study was that people often overestimate how much they themselves, personally, pay for health care, believing that their out-of-pocket costs for insurance premiums and doctor bills account for 70 or 80 percent of what they spend on health care.

Just the opposite is true, as a matter of fact. The truth is that employers and Government pick up about 70 to 80 percent of the cost and individuals pick up only between 20 and 30 percent of the cost, if they have employer-provided health insurance.

It is interesting to note that, depending on which plan we choose, those of us in the Senate, those of us who are Members and employees of the Senate, pay about 25 percent of the premium for our health insurance. The Federal Government picks up 75 percent of it.

The reason I give these statistics is to raise what I think is a problem, and that is when people do not understand how much health care costs, there is little reason to exercise discipline in how they utilize health care services. There are people who do not mind going to the doctor for problems that may not require a doctor's visit or a hospital visit because some third party is paying for it. As long as somebody else is paying for it, well, we have no real discipline on how we are to spend our health-care dollars in this country.

I will be introducing legislation shortly which is not intended to solve the health care problem in America, because I think none of us are wise enough to write the definitive plan on how we do it, but to maybe solve one portion of it. There are a number of problems it is not intended to solve. It is not intended to solve the problem of 37 million Americans who have no health insurance. That is a serious problem, no question about it. I am a cosponser of the bill by the chairman of the Finance Committee to address health care problems, the Bentsen bill and I would like my proposal to be considered with it not instead of it. I also support the need to enact broader reform. But here is an idea that I think we ought to consider now, and I would like to ask my colleagues to take a look at it and consider it.

This chart represents two things. I will only cite the first example. The first example covers insurance costs in what I would consider to be middle America—Denver, CO; Peoria, IL; Cincinnati, OH; and Scranton, PA. These figures are ballpark figures, but they are accurate. The typical cost in these areas of an employer provided health insurance policy is $4,500.

I will point out that only 6 percent of the people in that area actually have claims in 1 year of over $3,000. If you think about it, that is about right. If you are a healthy person, you do not spend $3,000 a year for your health care. I have been fortunate. I do not remember a year in my life that I have ever had to spend more than $3,000 for health care, and 94 percent of the people in this particular area fall into that same category.

A point I will make, if we allow that employer, instead of paying $4,500 to buy a health insurance policy, to take $3,000 of it, as an example, and give it to an employee to put into a medical care savings account for that employee.

Under my proposal, they would have control over it. That person would be able to take that $3,000, and use it to pay for their medical care. The amount of money contributed to the account would constitute the deductible. He or she would not have to go through all of the problems of having each child meet the deductible before the insurance paid anything. He or she would have that $3,000 in his or her account, in their own name, and when he or she got sick, or the children got sick, or the spouse got sick, he or she would be able to use the money in that account to immediately pay the bill. They would not have to file any insurance form. They would immediately pay the doctor's bill or the hospital bill.

That employer who normally had given $4,500 to pay for the insurance would then have about $1,500 left that he or she would be able to use to buy a catastrophic policy for that employee. In this area we are talking about he or she could buy a catastrophic policy for about $1,395. That person, that employee would have all of his medical costs covered after the $3,000, and he or she would have his own account to pay for the first $3,000.

My legislation which we will propose, Mr. President, says that account belongs to that employee. If they lose their job, they would keep their account. It has been a big problem for employees in this country who have lost their jobs. They lose their health insurance. This would help to correct that problem because that employee would have that medical care savings account that they could take with them anywhere that they would go, and when they find a job, or even if they do not do not find a job, they would still have the money to pay for the health care costs.

The most important point I want to make in offering this is that it would instill more discipline in how the individual person buys their health care in America. They would be more selective. They would be more careful. They would be better buyers. They would be wiser shoppers. Because if they did not spend the whole $3,000 in 1 year for health care, they would keep it. And the employer the next year would give them another $3,000. They would build up their account. In the next year, they would give them another $3,000. The money would continue to build up in that individual's account.

My proposal would also allow that individual, if he or she wants to take that money out before retirement, pay a penalty on it, and also pay income tax on it, and use it for whatever purpose he or she would want to use it for. But the main purpose would be to use it to pay for their health care.

Under this proposal, I would suggest that a couple of things happen which bring about savings. No. 1, the person is more careful on how he or she buys

health care services. They would shop around. They would get the best deal possible. Therefore, they would bring down the cost of health care in this country.

Second, we eliminate an incredible amount of paperwork. Right now it costs as much to process a $50 claim through insurance company, bureaucracies, as it does to process a $500 claim. Under this proposal, that paperwork would be eliminated. A person goes to the doctor for a checkup, or for a minor injury, that person does not have to fill out insurance forms. The hospital or doctor does not have to deal with bureaucratic redtape and insurance forms. No, the only thing that person does is go to the doctor, get the bill from the doctor, write him a check out of their account and there are no forms to file and no forms to fill out. Therefore we eliminate the incredible amount of bureaucratic redtape which costs a great deal to handle.

Who loses under this? Well, the employer, the business person who provides insurance does not. The employer is still giving no more than he or she gave before for health care with the possibility, very real, that it costs a little less. Second, with the idea that these plans ultimately would help to bring down health care costs in this country.

I think this is something that is very, very important. This amount that the employer gives now is already deductible to the employer. He can deduct the cost of the premium that he pays for each one of his employees. It is already deductible. Under my plan it still remains deductible and there are no losses at that point to the Federal Government whatsoever.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is advised the 10 minutes allocated has expired.

Mr. BREAUX. I ask unanimous consent if I could have 5 minutes more with the understanding that if the leader comes, I will be more than happy to relinquish.

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

Mr. BREAUX. Here is the other chart that more graphically tries to spell out what the medical care account is about. I will be doing more of these trying to help educate my colleagues and better educate myself about this concept.

It is important to note that in this fairly typical example of the area we are talking about; 94 percent of people who have insurance claims have claims that are less than $3,000 in a year. So if you give them $3,000, in a medical care savings account, you have taken care of 94 percent of the people in most parts of the United States.

Here is the explanation of the typical employer-provided health insurance plan. It costs that employer $4,500. So if we look at that $4,500, take $3,000 of it, and give it to a medical savings account for that individual to use as they see fit, you still have $1,395 remaining, which would be enough to buy an umbrella insurance policy which would cover 100 percent of that employee's health care costs of over $3,000. In this example, there is an immediate savings to that employer of $105 in the cost of his health care plan for his employee.

But I think the big concept that we are talking about here is for the first time to give more discipline to the individual on how he or she uses health care in this country.

I know that there is a tendency for many individuals as long as some third person is paying for it, Medicare, or a private insurance plan, that there is not the great discipline that I think is needed in order to be more selective, in order to be more careful, wherever you go, how often we go, and who we choose to take care of our medical needs for ourselves, and for our families.

If you add this to the reduction in paperwork, which I think is going to be obvious, because you eliminate the paperwork for 94 percent of the people in this country, you spend less than $3,000 a year for their health care, and you add additional savings to the cost of health care in this country.

Mr. President, there have been a number of people who have analyzed this concept. It is not original with me. But I have become convinced after reading the proposals that it is a worthwhile thing for us to be considering.

I ask unanimous consent that an article by William Raspberry in the Washington Post dated January 15, 1992 talking about the merits of this proposal be printed in the RECORD, as well as an article in the Wall Street Journal dated January 28, 1992, talking about this proposal and commending it to Congress for consideration and for adoption be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Wall Street Journal, Jan. 28, 1992]

GIVE EMPLOYEES MEDICAL IRA'S AND WATCH COSTS FALL

(By J. Patrick Rooney)

In most of the discussions of how to control the cost of health care, the most important managers of all are left out of the equation—consumers.

Giving consumers an incentive to keep down costs is the one sure-fire way to see that it happens. And the best way to accomplish that is to see that they are spending their own money. We'd see medical costs fall if consumers had incentives to treat their medical spending the way they treat spending for any other good.

Here's how it would work: Employers would give each employee an annual allowance of, say, $3,000 or so for routine health care for him and his family—checkups, sore throats, sprained ankles, etc. That allowance would go into a fund—call it a medical IRA. If the employee spent less his allowance in a given year, he could keep it. (More on that later.) To protect the employee against the cost of medical bills above his annual allowance, the employer would continue to buy insurance.

Let's look at how this would work in an average-cost-of-living city, such as Peoria, Ill.; Scranton, Pa.; Cincinnati; or Denver.

Currently, an employer in such cities pays an average $4,500 insurance premium to cover an employee and his family; the deductible typically is $100 to $250. The premium for a policy with a $3,000 deductible, by contrast, would be about $1,500. The employer could then deposit the approximately $3,000 difference in premiums into his employee's medical care savings account. The employee would use the money in the account to pay for the first $3,000 in annual health care costs for any family member, with the rest covered by insurance. Putting real money in the employee's medical-care savings account effectively deals with his natural fear of big deductibles, because he will have employer-provided money sitting right there in the account to cover the deductible.

The following year, the employee would get an additional $3,000 or so to put into the medical care savings account, and $3,000 or so the year after that—$9,000 in three years; $15,000 in five years.

The medical care savings account would be especially helpful to the financially stressed employee. Today, even relatively small deductibles can create a hardship for, say, a divorced woman who is trying to raise two or three children. Insurance doesn't pay until she has paid the deductible first out of after-tax income. With the medical care savings account, she'll have money right there with which to pay for the first dollar of care. The objective is to have her spend wisely throughout the year, not to cause her hardships when she has to take her children to the doctor in the early part of the year.

For the single employee whose annual account deposit is half as much, or for the new employee who in the first few months on the job would not have enough savings in the account to cover the deductible, a variety of don't-be-afraid safeguards could be included. It would be a small matter to offer employees interest-free loans until the savings had accumulated.

One of the arguments for national health insurance is, "What will I do if I lose my job and then don't have insurance?" If medical care savings accounts were in general use, there would be tax-free money in the accounts to pay insurance premiums between jobs. Half of the uninsured remain uninsured four months or less and only 15% are uninsured for as long as two years. If I lose my job, or if I am out on strike, there would be money in the medical care savings account to continue my insurance.

Employers could implement such a program today without waiting for the government to make it possible. But they're not doing so—because current law makes the money tax deductible only if spent by the employer. (Some employers now offer plans that are something like this, but funds not spent by year's end revert to the employer. The result is that the incentive is for the employee to make sure that the money is spent before the end of the year, adding pressure for ever-higher health spending.)

It will take only a fairly simple modification to the tax law to let any money the employee has not consumed on medical care accumulate tax-free in a medical IRA. No new federal bureaucracy would be needed. Since employers are already spending this money

tax-free on insurance premiums, the money retained in employee medical IRAs would be tax-neutral.

Such a change in the tax law would be a godsend for small employers and their workers. Small employer groups—even associations of small employers—often must pay prohibitive premiums because of high claim costs. Examples of family premiums in this category are $7,920 in Des Moines, Iowa; $9,643 in Chicago; and $8,238 in Washington.

As premiums have escalated, the healthier groups have gradually dropped out of the insurance pool. The ones who have stayed are the high users. Moderate utilizers have either decided to go bare or, in the case of one firm I know of, the owner-partners have left the group and bought individual high-deductible policies on their own. For these firms, group insurance is no longer a rational purchase.

To bring health care costs under control, insurance has to become a good-sense product again. The combination of the medical care savings account and high-deductible insurance would bring these costs back into line, and would even bring many employers back into the insurance system.

As with any IRA, an employee would be allowed to make an early withdrawal for a nonmedical purpose (a house downpayment, for instance). The employee would have to pay a 10% withdrawal penalty, and the money would become taxable income. Those taxes are revenue-positive. And, from the employee's standpoint, the money wouldn't have been there at all without the medical IRA. At age 59½, the employee could begin to draw income from the medical IRA, at which time the resulting income would become taxable and could be used for any purpose.

Wouldn't that be great?

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 15, 1992]

HEALTH CARE GIVEAWAY

(By William Raspberry)

The reason for America's health care crisis, Pat Rooney insists, is not that medical care *costs* too much but that we *spend* too much on it.

The focus on the cost of the medical care, he says, leads to proposals for imposing limits on what doctors and hospitals can charge, which medical procedures can be authorized (and by whom) and other attempts to put a lid on medical bills.

Rooney, who is head of the Golden Rule Insurance Co., says it's possible to bring down employer-subsidized health care *spending*—perhaps even bring it down dramatically—without tinkering with the cost of individual medical procedures.

He'd do it by giving the individual worker an incentive to forgo unnecessary medical treatment and to shop for the best value in cases where treatment is necessary. Here's the proposal:

"Give each worker an allowance for medical care that represents, say, two-thirds of the [per capita] money the employer is now spending for health care. Tell them that any of that money they don't spend on health care is theirs to keep—permanently. Then buy them an umbrella insurance plan for the really big medical bills that might come up: costs like injury from a bad auto accident or heart bypass surgery or the premature birth of a child.

"Then watch the cost of medical care drop."

Rooney, who was in Washington (from Indianapolis) last week to pitch his idea to staff of the Office of Management and Budget, offered an example of how it could work.

An employer making annual premium payments of $4,500 per employee family (the national average for medium-size cities) would, under Rooney's scheme, put $3,000 into each employee's medical care bank account and let the employee pay the first $3,000 of his own medical bills.

The remaining $1,500 of the employer's contribution would be used to purchase an umbrella group policy that would pay 100 percent of medical costs after the first $3,000. (Two-thirds of all medical spending at present is under $3,000 per family.)

It's a little like a deductible auto insurance policy, except the employer provides the money for the deductible amount.

But here's where the scheme gets interesting. Any of the $3,000 that doesn't get spent on medical bills belongs to the employee. If, for example, he has no medical costs for three years running, he winds up with $9,000 *to do with as he pleases*—whether to buy a car, make the down-payment on a house or finance a European vacation—with no tax liability until the money is withdrawn for some non-medical use.

The relevant point is that it would have the effect of containing medical care spending, now rising at the rate of some 17 percent a year—in part because there is little incentive for individual policyholders to keep the costs down.

To see why this is so, Rooney suggests, imagine that employers issued grocery credit cards that paid 80 percent of an employee's food bill after a $100 deductible and 100 percent after the first $5,000. His prediction: "Grocery stores would stock only the highest-priced food because that is all the employees would want to buy. Why? Because they'd be spending someone else's money. And that is why we spend so much on medical care in the United States.

There are other details, less exciting but no less vital to the economic and political viability of Rooney's proposal. Since it would involve changing the tax code (to permit employees to pay their doctor bills with untaxed cash and also to accumulate tax-free savings), provisions would have to be made for employees whose companies did not offer the plan, or for people temporarily out of work.

As clever as the Rooney proposal looks (Rooney says he borrowed major chunks of it from others) it looks even better when compared to the "play or pay" idea being advocated in Congress. Under that idea, employers (including small and marginally profitable companies) would either "play" by buying health insurance for their employees or else "pay" with an 8 percent payroll tax to cover the cost of Medicaid. The consequences, says Rooney, would include unemployment (as some employers simply couldn't afford the extra costs) and a mushrooming Medicaid, as more and more employers found it cheaper to "pay" than "play." But Medicaid pays only about half a physician's normal charges—a tolerable arrangement as long as only a tenth of the patients are on Medicaid. But what happens when the Medicaid proportion grows? Will more and more doctors refuse to take Medicaid patients—as many already do?

Rooney acknowledges that his proposal could have one unfortunate side-effect: Some people would be so seduced by the prospect of an employer-provided bank account that they'd forgo needed medical attention in order, say, to buy a car.

Says Rooney: "So? I have a car. Don't you? Why should we deny anyone else the right to make that choice?"

Mr. BREAUX. As I have said, I will conclude with this, Mr. President, that we are drafting the legislation. I have spoken to a number of my colleagues who have expressed an interest in this concept. It is not intended to be the overall solution to our health care problems but I think it is a significant and balanced start, and a move in the right direction as we wrestle with the very serious problem of health care solutions for the 1990's.

I yield the remainder of my time.

Mr. McCONNELL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky is recognized.

Mr. McCONNELL. I understand the Republican leader would like to speak briefly prior to the majority leader. I think he is near at hand.

Mr. President, I yield such time as the Republican leader may need.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican leader is recognized.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, parliamentary inquiry. Is the vote still set for 5:30?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair advises that there is no time certain for a vote. There are 27 minutes remaining on the Republican leader's side.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I just want a couple of minutes. That is about all this bill deserves. When we debated this earlier on the floor, I said three things were about to happen:

First, the Democrats had the votes to pass this very flawed bill—a bill that protects the status quo by protecting incumbents, and by refusing to make the true reforms recommended by the President, by Senate Republicans and by nonpartisan campaign finance reform experts.

Second, I said that President Bush should and would veto the bill.

And third, I said the Senate would sustain that veto.

Two-thirds of what I predicted would happen has happened. And the third will happen in just a few minutes.

I am no psychic, Mr. President. I do not claim that I was the only one who could foresee what would happen. Every Member of the Senate knew precisely what would happen.

And I suspect that is why the Democrats in the House and Senate put this bill together without any sense of bipartisanship, and without any consultation with Republicans or the President.

They did not want our help because they knew that we are for true reform. They did not want our help because they knew that we are for true reform, and Republicans agree with mainstream America—we want to change the status quo—we want a campaign finance system that will promote competition in politics, not protect incumbents.

They did not want the President's help, because they knew he had pro-

posed the total elimination of political action committees.

And as I have said before, when it comes to big PAC dollars from big special interests and big labor, it is the democrat party that has the big, big, big, advantage.

How big is the advantage? Let me share just a few numbers with you.

In the ongoing 1991-92 election cycle, labor union political action committees have given $13,887,561 to House and Senate candidates. Just short of 94 percent of that money—nearly $13 million—has been given to Democrat candidates. That leaves 4, 5, or 6 percent that must have been a mistake that went to Republicans.

These numbers are comparable to the 1989-90 election when labor unions contributed nearly $35 million to congressional candidates—with over 93 percent of that money finding its way into Democrat campaigns.

Everybody knows organized labor is part and parcel of the Democratic party, but there are always a few dollars given to Republicans, but not many.

It is obvious that the Democrats do not want true reform. It is obvious why they slapped together a political cover bill they knew would not become law—a bill so bad that even one of their usual allies, the ACLU could not even support it.

Once again, Democrats have demonstrated that their answer to every problem is getting their hands on the taxpayer's wallet. Can you imagine asking the taxpayers for more of their hard-earned dollars so politicans can pay for TV ads, bumper stickers, and highly paid consultants so they can stay in office? No. Public financing is a loser.

And so are this bill's spending limits. The proposed limits are designed to limit a lot of things, namely political change and the ability of challengers to compete. But the Democrats do nothing to limit the sources of campaign money, as Republicans have proposed, sources such as the total of big out-of-State contributions, and cash from the special interests. In other words, raise all the money you want as long as you hit the limit, whether all the money is coming from PAC's, fat cats, labor unions, and special interests in some other State—just hit the limit, claim reform, and then claim victory at the polls.

Let us face it, this bill fails the truth in advertising test. Just slapping the word "reform" on the label does not make it so.

Mr. President, yesterday, the distinguished majority leader and the Speaker of the House said some nice words outside the White House. They spoke of bipartisanship and cooperation and of doing what the American people sent us here to do.

Those words can also apply to this issue. President Bush and the Republicans stand ready to adopt true campaign finance reform.

And the American people are now watching to see if the ruling class—the Democrat incumbents who control Congress—will stand with us, or whether they just want to stand for more of the same old status quo.

Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to sustain the President's veto.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. McCONNELL. 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. BOREN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. BOREN. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Colorado.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado is recognized.

Mr. WIRTH. Thank you, Mr. President.

Since I spoke a few minutes ago, I was cornered by other Members of the body who said, "Why do you make a speech like that, trying to connect donations with political outcomes?" They said to me, "How about Charlie Keating? Look what happened. You know how Keating was involved with the Democrats."

I said, "How about Charlie Keating?" Maybe we ought to look at the Keating situation. If you will remember, during all of the hearings that were held on Keating and Keating's relationship with the so-called Keating Five, Jim Grogan, who was the right hand to Mr. Keating, testified that in fact what happened was that Keating gave up on the Senate, because it served no productive purpose. The Senate could not deliver what Keating wanted.

The regulators were still being recalcitrant and Keating gave up on the Senate and went to the White House.

What did he do at the White House? He became a member of Team 100. He gave $100,000 to the Bush election campaign in 1988.

What did he get for it? Anything?

Well, first of all, all of the papers that have been sent up from the thrift regulators to the Justice Department in 1987 got put aside—papers on Keating's conduct, which people in the Congress were told by the regulators ought to be looked at by the Justice Department.

And, second, the then head of the FSLIC took the Keating case away from the regulators in the regional office in California, brought it back to Washington, and decided that Keating should be allowed to continue operations.

So I just wanted to take the floor to say that it seems to me that in discussing Keating it is all right there. Keating's own guy said that Keating had been attempting to purchase political outcomes. He was getting nowhere with the Senate. He was getting nowhere with the regulators and Senate pressure.

So Keating turned his attention to the White House, and joined Team 100. Keating got the case brought back from the regulators in California and in a lenient ruling from Washington was allowed to continue to work, continue the operations of Lincoln Savings and Loan.

I just wanted to take the floor to answer very clearly there is a very clear connection. It is certainly not an anecdotal connection and it is one I suspect most people will want to draw that line—that these outcomes are perhaps connected to a significant contribution.

Mr. President, that is what this legislation is all about and that is what we ought to be tending to. We ought to be cleaning out this and this is one step in that direction.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and 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. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, there has been lengthy debate on the subject of campaign finance reform today and over many months and years prior to today. I recognize that many Senators have other obligations and, therefore, I will limit my remarks and I anticipate that a vote will occur on the pending matter at approximately 6 p.m., to give Senators time to prepare their schedules accordingly, and that will be the only rollcall vote this evening. There will be no further rollcall votes thereafter.

I will during the vote and following discuss with the distinguished Republican leader the proposed schedule for proceeding thereafter, and I will announce that to the Senate before the Senate concludes its business today.

Much disagreement has been expressed during the debate today and in the preceding months. But on one important aspect of the matter, there has been no disagreement, and that important aspect is that the system under which campaigns are now financed and conducted needs change.

I did not listen to every word spoken in the debate, but I listened to a great deal of it. I did not hear anyone, during the time I listened, defend the current system as what we ought to have and what we ought to continue. There is, if not unanimity, a broad consensus in the Senate, in the Congress, in the

country that we ought to change the system by which Federal election campaigns are financed and conducted.

The change must begin with the heart of the problem, and that is the dominant, increasing, overwhelming role which money plays in the election process. The cost of campaigns is spiraling and the result is, as virtually every American citizen knows and agree, that American political campaigns are too long and expensive. If we can reduce the cost, the length will necessarily be reduced and we can, hopefully, produce campaigns devoted more specifically to issues, less dependent upon the kinds of tactics, the now famous 30-second attack spots, which have so come to dominate political campaigns in recent years.

The bill, which both the House and Senate passed by substantial majorities, reflecting the clear will of a majority of Members of the Senate, the clear will of a majority of Members of the House and, in my opinion, the clear will of a majority of Americans, will have begun the process of reform by putting a limit on the amount that is spent in political campaigns. That is the heart of the problem. It must, therefore, be the heart of the solution. There must be limits on the amount of money spent in political campaigns. That is the central element of the bill now before us.

The Senators who believe in genuine reform based upon the limitation of spending should vote for this bill and to override the President's unfortunate and, in my judgment, most unwise veto.

The bill also eliminates some of the most egregious practices in fundraising which have also been denounced by almost all concerned—the so-called soft money, sewer money—that permits very large contributions that would not be permitted under the law if they were made to candidates and which are now made in a way that is intended to benefit candidates and avoid the requirements of the law. It is a travesty and a tragedy when American political candidates—of both parties, I might add—in the Congress and running for President pursue actions which everyone knows contradicts the spirit of the law and are plainly intended to evade the requirements of the law. And yet that is what is going on in American politics today.

And let it be said clearly and with no equivocation, this is not a problem that involves just one party. It involves both political parties. It infects and infests the entire system and is one reason why so many Americans today are turned off by the political process and are turned off by both parties.

The American people want change. The American people want reform. This legislation would provide change. This legislation would ensure reform. And that is what makes the President's veto of this bill so deeply regretful.

I will describe just briefly and respond to the reasons stated by the President for the veto.

First, that it includes some public funding. The best answer to that is that the President has voluntarily participated in a public funding spending limit process four times and, by the end of this year, will himself be the recipient of more than $200 million in public funding. It is difficult to square those actions—and I emphasize those are voluntary actions; there is nothing in the law which has compelled the President to participate in the system—it is difficult to square those actions with the President's veto message. Indeed, they are inconsistent, and the fact is that the practices pursued by the President are the opposite of the statement also made by the President.

The second reason is that the bill does not eliminate completely political action committees. But it should be made clear, there should be no misunderstanding that the President himself has never proposed the complete elimination of political action committees. The President has proposed the abolition of some political action committees while he would permit others to continue in existence, recognizing that an outright ban would be unconstitutional. But, of course, permitting some means that those that would be disallowed under the law would quickly reform and there would be a new proliferation of political action committees. Nothing would have been solved. The problem would, in fact, have been made worse.

The bill takes the reasonable and constitutional step of limiting the amount that political action committees can give, actually reducing the amount that such a PAC could give to a candidate for the Senate. This is responsible legislation. It is important legislation. It is one way in which we in the Senate can begin to raise the status of the institution of Congress in the eyes of the American people by eliminating the abusive, demeaning practices that are now employed in the financing conduct of American political campaigns.

In short, Mr. President, we can do better than the current system. Everybody knows that. Every Member of this Senate is demeaned by this process. We should do better.

This bill will enable us to do better. I urge the Senate to vote to override the veto.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of time on the part of the proponents of override.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WELLSTONE). Do the opponents yield back their time?

Mr. MCCONNELL. I yield the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the bill pass, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding?

The yeas and nays are required. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. METZENBAUM] is absent because of illness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber who desire to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 57, nays 42, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 88 Leg.]

YEAS—57

Adams	Durenberger	Lieberman
Akaka	Exon	McCain
Baucus	Ford	Mikulski
Bentsen	Fowler	Mitchell
Biden	Glenn	Moynihan
Bingaman	Gore	Nunn
Boren	Graham	Pell
Bradley	Harkin	Pryor
Breaux	Heflin	Reid
Bryan	Inouye	Riegle
Bumpers	Jeffords	Robb
Burdick	Johnston	Rockefeller
Byrd	Kennedy	Sanford
Conrad	Kerrey	Sarbanes
Cranston	Kerry	Sasser
Daschle	Kohl	Simon
DeConcini	Lautenberg	Wellstone
Dixon	Leahy	Wirth
Dodd	Levin	Wofford

NAYS—42

Bond	Gramm	Packwood
Brown	Grassley	Pressler
Burns	Hatch	Roth
Chafee	Hatfield	Rudman
Coats	Helms	Seymour
Cochran	Hollings	Shelby
Cohen	Kassebaum	Simpson
Craig	Kasten	Smith
D'Amato	Lott	Specter
Danforth	Lugar	Stevens
Dole	Mack	Symms
Domenici	McConnell	Thurmond
Garn	Murkowski	Wallop
Gorton	Nickles	Warner

NOT VOTING—1

Metzenbaum

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote the yeas are 57, the nays are 42. Two-thirds of the Senators voting, a quorum being present, not having voted in the affirmative, the bill on reconsideration fails to pass over the President's veto.

The majority leader is recognized.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I am going to be meeting shortly with the distinguished Republican leader regarding the schedule for the remainder of the week and for the next week prior to the recess. I expect to have an announcement on that shortly. In the interim, I ask unanimous consent that there be a period for morning business with Senators permitted to speak therein.

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

U.N. SECRETARY GENERAL BOUTROS-GHALI DISCUSSES "INTERNATIONAL PEACEKEEPING IN A MULTIPOLAR, MULTIETHNIC WORLD"

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, this morning, I had the honor of introducing Dr. Boutros Boutros-Ghali, the recently elected Secretary General of the United Nations, when he gave the ninth annual David M. Abshire lecture sponsored by the Center for Strategic and International Studies [CSIS] here in Washington, DC.

For me this was a double honor, not only to present the Secretary General to a distinguished invited audience in the auditorium of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, but also to help pay tribute to David Abshire, our very able and distinguished former Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations and U.S. Ambassador to NATO. David Abshire has been the long-time president of CSIS, and this year's lecture in the series that bears his name marks the 30th anniversary of the founding of the center.

It is particularly appropriate that Dr. Boutros-Ghali would give this lecture under the auspices of CSIS, because he himself has been a participant in CSIS programs as far back as 1976. He is now in the fifth month of a 5-year appointment as Secretary General.

Dr. Boutros-Ghali takes over his position in the United Nations at an extraordinary time in history. With the end of the cold war, the United Nations is at last in a position to attain some of the high hopes that we who were present had for it at its founding 47 years ago in San Francisco.

In the last few years, the United Nations has had an extraordinary role in serving its collective security purposes and in resolving regional conflicts. When Iraq invaded Kuwait, the United Nations moved to protect this small member state. The United Nations imposed economic sanctions and eventually authorized the use of force. While the military operation was not U.N.-flag operation, the legal framework for collective action provided by the U.N. Charter and Security Council decisions was essential to the global support for the undertaking. For the first time, the world community and not individual states became the arbiter of the use of force. This is a key step to moving to a more peaceful world. Of course, the U.N. role in the Iraq-Kuwait conflict will also serve to deter other potential lawbreakers.

The end of the cold war has enabled the world community to get on with resolving such regional conflicts as existed in Namibia, Afghanistan, Cambodia, El Salvador, Nicaragua, Angola, and Western Sahara. U.N. efforts have not been equally energetic or successful in all these conflicts, but the common denominator has been an active U.N. role in helping the parties reach a result. The changing world has presented new crisis, notably in Croatia, Bosnia-Hercegovina and Nagorno-Karabagh that demand U.N. attention.

The end of the cold war has imposed major new burdens, including financial burdens, on the limited resources of the United Nations. Before we complain too much about these costs, two points must be kept in mind. First, these costs are costs associated with peace. While they may increase the U.N. budget, they involve enormous net savings to the world community, including to the United States, by ending far more costly armed conflict. Second, the high costs of peacekeeping and peacemaking are a temporary phenomenon. When the cold war regional conflicts are resolved, thanks to U.N. peacekeeping, there is every reason to hope the peace will hold. And, while the end of the Communist empire has spawned its own conflicts, this is a matter of the transition period. Here, too, there is every reason to hope that the extraordinary demand that now exists for U.N. peacekeeping is only the temporary price of the extraordinary revolution that has transformed our world.

A more peaceful world will enable the United Nations to act creatively in addressing other threats to mankind's well-being and even existence. This includes the problems of weapons proliferation, the need to establish a global regime based on democracy and respect for human rights, the threat posed by environmental degradation and the social disorder arising out of global poverty.

It is an exciting time for the United Nations, and I envy Dr. Boutros Boutros-Ghali in his new assignment. He is exceptionally well qualified to take advantage of the opportunities of the United Nations and the challenges of the new world order. Dr. Boutros-Ghali is an Egyptian patriot who has served his country in the United Nations, to the Organization of African Unity, and as a key negotiator in the Camp David process that brought peace between Egypt and Israel. He is a former parliamentarian, Minister of State for Foreign Affairs, and Deputy Prime Minister. He holds a doctorate in international law from the Sorbonne and has had a long-time scholarly and political association with many in this room.

The Secretary General's lecture this morning was entitled "International Peacekeeping in a Multipolar, Multiethnic World," and it is an excellent review—and preview—of the United Nations activities now underway. To bring his text to a wider audience I ask that it be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point.

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

ADDRESS BY DR. BOUTROS BOUTROS-GHALI THE SECRETARY-GENERAL OF THE UNITED NATIONS, NINTH ANNUAL DAVID M. ABSHIRE LECTURE, MAY 13, 1992

FROM PEACE-KEEPING TO PEACE-BUILDING

Introduction

It is a special pleasure for me to give an address in honour of my friend and colleague, David Abshire. This distinguished gathering is a tribute to the mutual understanding that lies at the heart of the relationship between the United Nations and its host country. It is David Abshire's extraordinary contribution to the development of informed understanding in international relations which is rightly celebrated through this series of lectures in his name.

I have chosen to speak about peace-keeping for two reasons. One, because it is one of the most visible activities of the United Nations today; and two, because in this new era of international relations, the nature of United Nations peace-keeping is evolving.

During much of the history of the United Nations, of all its activities, peace-keeping has attracted the most attention. This is understandable. Conflicts are newsworthy and dramatic. The deployment of military personnel by an international organization to preserve a fragile peace makes a good story, and captures public interest. For the United Nations the publicity generated by its peace-keeping activities has, for the most part, been beneficial, especially in times when the Organization did not otherwise enjoy high public confidence or credibility.

In fact, the demand for United Nations peace-keeping has increased dramatically over the last four years. Before 1988, the United Nations had set up 13 peace-keeping operations. The total *since* 1988 is also 13, the most recent being the newly approved operation in Somalia. We have thus done as much in the last four years as we did in the previous 40 years. And, as conflicts between ethnic groups pose an increasing threat to international peace and security, it is clear we will have to do even more.

1992 will be the most testing year ever. We are simultaneously deploying, in Cambodia and Yugoslavia, the second and third largest operations the United Nations has undertaken. The number of United Nations soldiers and police deployed in the field will almost quadruple from 11,500 at the end of January to a planned 44,000 at the end of May.

All this activity of course costs money. In 1987 the Member States of the United Nations were asked to pay $233 million for peace-keeping and, in 1991, $421 million. The bill for the next 12 months will be around $2.7 billion.

In other words, peace-keeping is a growth area. Much that is good is being done. But this rapid expansion presents many questions. Should the United Nations alone carry this burden? How can its ability to do so be improved? Are the Member States ready to finance peace-keeping on this scale? How can priorities be established to ensure that the limited resources available for peace-keeping are spent where they can achieve the most? The beginning of answers to these questions lies in the history of peace-keeping.

The Development of Peace-keeping

United Nations peace-keeping and peace enforcement are distinct. The central difference is that peace-keeping requires the consent of the parties and peace enforcement does not. Chapter VII of the Charter describes in detail how the Security Council may apply measures to deal with threats to the peace, and acts of aggression. The most

recent example of peace enforcement is, of course, the action taken by the Security Council in regard to Iraq's invasion of Kuwait. There is no specific provision for peace keeping in the Charter of the United Nations. There is even disagreement as to when the "first" peace-keeping operation was established. Most think that it was the group of military observers, known as the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization, who were sent out during the first Arab-Israel war in 1948 to supervise a ceasefire and then to implement the 1949 Armistice Agreements between Israel and Egypt and Israel and its Arab neighbours.

Thereafter, peace-keeping evolved steadily. In 1956 the first armed force was set up in after the Suez crisis. In 1960 the United Nations launched its operation in the Congo.

In 1962 United Nations peace-keepers assumed responsibility for the administration and internal security of West Iran during a period of transition from Dutch colonial rule to independence. In 1964 the United Nations again became involved in an internal conflict when it established a force to control intercommunal fighting in the Republic of Cyprus.

Peace-keeping's ability to evolve in this way was greatly helped by the fact that the Charter did not define it. This enabled the statesmen and Secretary-General to develop a flexible instrument. This approach partly compensated for the Security Council's limited ability to operate during the Cold War.

But there was another side to this coin. The absence of any reference to peace-keeping in the Charter caused the Soviet Union to question its legitimacy and to refuse to pay for it. This led to a major financial crisis in the mid-1960's. It also obliged my predecessors and their staffs to do peace-keeping quietly, treating with great care to avoid a Permanent Member's veto.

Peace-keeping After the Cold War

I have described all this history in order to demonstrate that by the time the Cold War ended a whole set of peace-keeping concepts and principles and practices had been developed. The United Nations could thus move into higher gear when suddenly the United States and the Soviet Union began to find it possible to work together in the Security Council to resolve and control conflicts. It is this most welcome development which has dramatically increased demand for United Nations peace-keeping services.

It has also led to an important change in the character of peace-keeping operations. Of the 13 operations which were set up before 1988, all except the one in West Iran were what are now described as traditional peace-keeping operations. That is, they were largely military in composition and their tasks were to monitor cease-fires, control buffer zones, investigate alleged arms flows, prevent a resumption of hostilities and so on. In other words, they were to maintain calm on the front lines and give time to the peace-makers to negotiate a settlement of the dispute which had led to conflict in the first place. Sometimes the peace-*makers* succeeded. More often they did not, which is why so many of the pre-1988 operations are still in the field.

By contrast, only five of the 13 post-Cold War operations have been of this traditional kind. The other eight have, like West Iran, been set up to help implement a settlement already negotiated by the peace-makers. As such, they have involved not only the traditional military activities but also a whole range of civilian ones. It is these new activities which call for a much wider range of United Nations skills and expertise including those derived from our work on global issues.

An example of this new peace-keeping can be found in El Salvador, where the United Nations is verifying what has been called a negotiated revolution. I had the opportunity to visit ONUSAL, the Observer Mission in El Salvador, following the signature in Mexico of the final peace agreements last January. They involve not only a cease-fire and related measures but also reform and reduction of the armed forces, creation of a new police force, reform of the judicial and electoral systems, human rights, land tenure and other economic and social issues.

Another example is Cambodia, where the peace agreement requires the United Nations to supervise various parts of the existing administration, organize elections, monitor the police, promote human rights, repatriate over 350,000 refugees and begin rehabilitation of the country, as well as carrying out a familiar range of traditional military functions.

I recently spent three days in Phnom Penh, where I had the opportunity to review the work of the United Nations Transitional Authority in Cambodia (UNTAC) which, together with the Cambodian factions that make up the Supreme National Council, will for the next year perform virtually all important functions and decisions of Government.

Recalling the grim experience that nation had endured during the previous two decades, it was quite remarkable for me to attend a meeting of the Supreme National Council, presided over by Prince Sihanouk (who himself only recently returned) at which the members signed two international covenants on human rights. During my stay, I had the opportunity to meet separately with each of the factions, and to underline the need for them to demonstrate sufficient political will to ensure that the Paris peace agreements are carried out. Only through a solid commitment to national reconciliation could the Cambodians expect the donor countries to respond to their country's urgent rehabilitation and reconstruction needs. Despite the daunting tasks facing UNTAC, I departed Cambodia with an optimistic outlook. The United Nations agencies and non-governmental organizations represented there are cooperating with a sense of common purpose; it is to be hoped that this same positive spirit will continue to guide the relationship between UNTAC and the Supreme National Council.

The above-mentioned cases are examples of the comprehensive responsibilities assigned to the United Nations in the implementation of a peace agreement. The Organization is also increasingly called upon to offer technical assistance in the building of democratic institutions.

Sometimes this assumes a highly structured role such as organizing and supervising, monitoring and observing an entire election process—as was the case in Namibia, and will be so in Cambodia. In other instances, the United Nations has cooperated closely with a regional organization in the monitoring of elections, as was the case in Nicaragua and will be the case in Angola. In Western Sahara, the United Nations has been asked to conduct a referendum. In these cases, United Nations involvement was based on a request by either the Security Council or the General Assembly. However, the United Nations receives directly from Member States many requests for technical assistance. For example, twelve African countries (Cameroon, Congo, Ethiopia/Eritrea, Ghana, Guinea, Lesotho, Liberia, Mali, Madagascar, Mozambique and Rwanda) have called on the United Nations to facilitate or provide expertise regarding their respective elections. In Eastern Europe, Albania and Romania have sought technical assistance; in Latin America, Guyana has done the same.

In recent months, the United Nations has also been called upon to help deal witn another, less happy, consequence of the end of the Cold War. The demise of communist regimes in Eastern Europe and what was the Soviet Union has led to a growing number of inter-ethnic conflicts which had been dormant for the last half century. A very large United Nations peace-keeping force has been sent to Yugoslavia to try to control one of these conflicts.

At the same time ethnic conflict is causing suffering in a number of African and Asian countries. In fact, the human tragedies created by all such conflicts has led to an increasing sentiment that the United Nations must use its peace-keeping and peace-making skills to resolve them. Despite the provision in the Charter that the Organization should not intervene in domestic matters, Member States find it more and more difficult to regard any conflict as domestic or internal. It is these considerations that have just led the Security Council to set up the new operation in Somalia, which includes military personnel to protect the delivery of humanitarian relief supplies. This is an important innovation.

Peace-keeping has thus been, overall, a significant success for the United Nations. This success has not been uniform, especially when peace-making has not keep pace with peace-keeping. Moreover, it has had a human cost. Over the years, 812 men and women from 43 countries have died while in the service of United Nations pace-keeping forces. We must never forget their sacrifice.

Let me now turn to the future of peace-keeping—a future of larger, more complicated undertakings and greater demands for resources.

The Future of Peace-keeping

The United Nations has never claimed that it alone can carry out peace-keeping operations. Regional organizations have undertaken a few such operations themselves, of which the most successful was an Arab League force deployed between Iraq and Kuwait from 1961 to 1963. From 1965 to 1966, an Inter-American Peace Force was sent to the Dominican Republic on the basis of a resolution adopted by the OAS. In 1979, Egypt, in cooperation with the United States, organized a Multilateral Force and Observers in the Sinai to help implement the peace treaty with Israel. It is ironic that this latter force was established only after a request for a United Nations peace-keeping operation was rejected (by the Soviet Union, on behalf of Arab Member States).

That said, the United Nations is by far the most experienced peace-keeper. It is more likely perhaps to be seen as having the impartiality which is an essential condition for successful peace-keeping, and it has worked out structures for establishing, financing and managing such operations. It was thus inevitable that the international community should turn to the United Nations when the end of the Cold War increased the demand for peace-keeping.

But the demand has now become such that I believe that the United Nations must share the work with others. A multi-polar world should be led by a multiplicity of institutions. For if international organizations are to do justice to the aspirations of the peoples

of the world, they must be informed and inspired by the experiences, perspectives and hopes of people in all parts of the globe. The policies and strategies of international organizations must thus be responsible to the needs of people everywhere.

It is therefore logical that an effort should be made to "decentralize" the responsibilities for peace-keeping and peace-making that today are continuously being entrusted to the United Nations. The regional organizations are the obvious candidates for larger roles.

Chapter VIII of the Charter specifically provides for regional organizations to "make every effort to achieve pacific settlement of local disputes * * * before referring them to the Security Council". The problem at present is that the regional organizations have almost no experience and lack the necessary structures and procedures; and most of them are in an even worse financial condition than the United Nations.

I am, however, convinced that the regional organizations must be helped to carry a larger share of the burden, in peace-making as well as in peace-keeping. It is for this reason that in Yugoslavia I have insisted on a clear division of labor between the European Community, which has for some time been engaged both in peace-making and peace-keeping there, and the United Nations, which is responsible for peace-keeping only in certain areas of Croatia. I have also offered to help the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe to obtain technical advice with regard to its own peace-keeping efforts in the dispute between Azerbaijan and Armenia over Nagorno-Karabakh. And I have taken care to associate the Organization of African Unity, the Arab League and the Islamic Conference Organization with my own efforts in Somalia. I hope that Member States will also do their part in strengthening the regional organizations so that they can play their own essential part in the maintenance of international peace and security. Their involvement will in turn serve to promote the democratization of international relations.

We need also to expand the role of non-governmental organizations in the new and broader peace-keeping operations. They have, of course, long been involved in the humanitarian aspects of peace-keeping. This has recently been formally recognized in the latest Security Council resolution on Somalia, where much of the relief work to be protected by United Nations military personnel will be carried out by non-governmental organizations.

As for United Nations peace-keeping, we face a major resource problem. Whenever a new peace-keeping operation is established, all personnel must be transported to the area of operations. This means more than 19,500 personnel in Cambodia, nearly 14,000 in Yugoslavia, 490 in Iraq/Kuwait, 400 in Western Sahara, 500 in Angola, 500 in El Salvador, and at least 50 military observers in Somalia—to name only those operations that have been deployed in the past year. Once in the field, these people must be provided with accommodation, food, medical care, transport, communications and all the other equipment to carry out their functions. When formed military units are deployed, they bring much of their equipment with them. But this still leaves an immense amount of goods and services which have to be provided by the United Nations.

Under present arrangements, we have to start from scratch every time a new operation is set up. The United Nations is almost always in a cash flow crisis. The Working Capital Fund was long ago exhausted. Even if we had the cash, the Organization's financial procedures would severely limit the Secretary-General's ability to enter into financial commitments until the cost of the whole operation has been estimated in detail and the resulting budget approved by Member States. Only then are we permitted to place orders for the equipment needed; and the suppliers often do not have it on the shelves.

As a result there is often so long a gap between the Security Council's decision to set up a new operation and its deployment in the field that the success of the whole exercise is jeopardized. Disaster nearly occurred at the start of the otherwise successful operation in Namibia because so few United Nations personnel were on the ground at the critical moments when the transition began. In Cambodia, the delay of over seven months since the signature of the Cambodia Peace Agreement in Paris last October has added to the fragility of an already difficult operation.

Given the political will, these probems could be easily resolved. Let me suggest four steps:

First, a revolving capital fund would be established to finance the start-up costs of peace-keeping operations;

Second, as soon as the Security Council decided to set up a new operation, the Member States would be asked to pay immediately one-third of the estimated cost of its first year and the Secretary-General would be automatically given authority to commit up to this sum;

Third, a reserve stock of basic peace-keeping equipment would be established so that some of the most needed items were always available;

Fourth, Member States would pay their assessments, both for the initial one-third and for the full budget, fully and on time.

A fifth step, which is my responsibility, is to rationalize the Secretariat structures for the planning and management of peace-keeping and to speed up our own internal procedures. This is already in hand.

As regards the costs of peace-keeping to Member States, I believe that even the $2.7 billion for this exceptional year is not high in relation to the costs of the alternative, namely continued conflict. We need only recall the astounding sums of money that were spent to "win" the Cold War—in the 1980s global expenditures on arms approached one trillion dollars per year, or $2 million per minute—to acknowledge that peace-keeping is an inexpensive way to help maintain stability in the post-Cold war era.

But I am also conscious that the current volume of peace-keeping expenses, are creating real problems for Member States. It is for this reason that I have decided to ensure that they get value for money.

I am therefore taking a close look at the costs of existing peace-keeping operations, especially the older ones. I have already identified savings of up to ten percent in UNIFIL, the force deployed in South Lebanon since 1978. The focus of such budgetary cuts will be on Headquarters and support elements, and will not affect the operational effectiveness of the Force. Similar reductions will also result from efforts now under way to streamline UNDOF which, since 1974, has separated the Israeli and Syrian forces along the Golan Heights and UNTSO, whose military observers have been in the Middle East for more than 40 years.

However, this is more than a question of good house-keeping. It goes deeper and engages the responsibilities of Member States as well as the Secretary-General. It requires them both to improve their joint performance in ensuring that money is spend on peace-keeping in those conflicts where conditions exist for it to produce better results more quickly.

This requires the Secretary-General and the Security Council to study critically, every proposal for the establishment of a new peace-keeping operation. Peace-keeping is not a universal prescription. It has to be recognized, that there are some international ills which are not yet ready for the peace-keeping therapy. Peace-keeping relies heavily on the consent of the parties to the conflict and their readiness to cooperate with the peace-keepers. Unless all the parties recognize that their dispute cannot be resolved by continuing to fight, peace-keeping cannot succeed. Resources are better spent elsewhere.

It is also necessary for the Secretary-General and the Security Council to take a critical look at peace-keeping operations which have been deployed for a long time, without progress having been made on settling the dispute in question. A case in point is Cyprus, where a United Nations force has been continuously deployed since 1964 and yet a settlement continues to elude the parties, despite sustained efforts by my Special Representative and his predecessors over the years. Peace-keeping, after all, is not an end in itself. It is a technique whose function is either to create conditions for the peace-makers to do their work or to help implement settlements which the peace-makers have negotiated. If the peace-makers' task has proved impossible, or if their settlement proves that it cannot be implemented then the continued requirement for a peace-keeping presence needs to be studied very critically.

Of course, this principle has to be applied with caution. In some cases withdrawal of the peace-keepers could cause the conflict to re-ignite and thus make things worse. In such cases it may be that the international community has to accept that maintenance of a long-standing peace-keeping operation is the "least bad option" available.

It is a cause of satisfaction, however, that of the 13 operations set up since 1988, six have already discharged their mandates and been disbanded. These include two in Africa—in Namibia (UNTAG), where free and fair elections were successfully carried out in November 1989 under UN supervision; and in Angola (UNAVEM I) where, from 1989 to 1991, UN military observers monitored and verified the withdrawal of Cuban troops. In the Middle East, the Military Observer Group (UNIIMOG) that monitored the implementation of the cease-fire between Iran and Iraq following their eight-year war, withdrew with the agreement of both parties in early 1991. In Central America (ONUCA) observers monitored the cease-fire in Nicaragua; helped to verify the cessation of aid to irregular forces in the region; and assisted in the voluntary demobilization of the Nicaraguan resistance. They were withdrawn in January of this year. And in Cambodia, following the signing of the Paris peace accords in October 1991, an advance mission of military observers (UNAMIC) pave the way for the arrival of UNTAC, which began its operation last March.

Peace-keeping will continue to grow and adapt along with the changing needs and nature of peace itself. Since the end of the Cold War, these needs have become more, not less, urgent and widespread. However, I should like to reiterate that peace-keeping can never be a substitute for peace building. If I

had to leave one thought with you this morning, it would be the following: in today's multi-polar world, economic and social development, and the promotion and reinforcement of democratic institutions are an intrinsic part of maintaining peace.

A commitment to this end was effectively undertaken by the Security Council at the level of Heads of State and Government in its meeting on 31 January 1992. In the Presidential Statement that followed, the Members recognized that "peace and prosperity are indivisible and that lasting peace and stability require effective international cooperation for the eradication of poverty and the promotion of a better life for all in larger freedom."

In this new era, nations now recognize and accept this shared responsibility for peace. Those who lead nations must now take up that responsibility to build institutions, create understanding and provide resources so that those who safeguard peace may serve in confidence and with success.

Thank you, David Abshire.

Thank you, ladies and gentlemen.

TRIBUTE TO WILBUR D. MILLS

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, I rise today in tribute to Wilbur D. Mills, a legendary Arkansan who died on Saturday, May 2. Mr. Mills served the State of Arkansas in the U.S. House of Representatives for over 38 years. During his tenure in Washington, Wilbur Mills became one of the most powerful men in Congress, yet he steadfastly maintained a clear desire to utilize that power only for the betterment of his people.

Wilbur Mills was born on May 24, 1909, in Kensett, AR. He received a degree from Hendrix College in 1930, and completed 3 years at Harvard Law School before returning to Arkansas. Wilbur Mills began serving the first of 19 terms as Arkansas Second District Congressman in 1939. He served as the chairman of the powerful House Ways and Means Committee from 1958 to 1976.

During his career, he served under the administrations of seven Presidents, and spearheaded such battles as the enactment of the modern Medicare system. He also served this country during some of the most historic times of the 20th century, such as the declaration of war against Japan on December 8, 1941, and the fall of the Nixon administration.

He retired from Congress on December 31, 1976, yet continued to work tirelessly on behalf of individuals.

He was a caring, sensitive, and friendly man. I never saw him angry, nor did I ever see him demonstrate an indifferent attitude toward those who sought his counsel and help. He was unfailingly courteous and polite.

Mr. President, when I ran for Governor of Arkansas in 1970, Wilbur, once I became the Democratic nominee, was instrumental in my success, doing letters, television, and anything else I requested. So I owe a considerable measure of my success to him.

He was a rare leader. People from the poorest to people at the pinnacle of power, including the President, sought his approval.

He will be remembered for his many good deeds.

THE OCCASION OF ISRAEL INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, on May 7, 1948, by virtue of natural and historic right, based on the decision of the United Nations General Assembly, the nation of Israel was reestablished as an independent and sovereign Jewish State. On the occasion of the 44th anniversary of this proclamation, I extend my congratulations and best wishes to the people of Israel on their Independence Day.

Israel is truly a miracle in the desert. In the late 1800's, after 2,000 years in exile, the Jewish people returned to what was essentially a barren land without people. The great American author, Mark Twain, described his perceptions of the land in his book, "Innocents Abroad"—1867. In the book he says:

> Palestine is a hopeless, dreary, heartbroken land, a limitless desolation * * * Palestine sits in sackcloth and ashes. Over it broods the spell of a curse that has withered its fields and fettered its energies. * * * Nazareth is forlorn, Jericho the accursed lies in a moldering ruin. Renowned Jerusalem has become a pauper village. * * * The noted Sea of Galilee is deserted and its borders are a silent wilderness. * * * Capernaum is a shapeless ruin. * * * Palestine is desolate; it is no more of this workaday world.

Now, a century later, Jewish survivors of the Holocaust, Jewish refugees from Arab countries, and Jews who kept their ties to the land over the millennium, have come together to make the desert bloom. It hasn't been easy; to this very day Israel is still seeking recognition of its unequivocal right to exist from its neighbors. In the past 44 years, Israel has had to endure the blood and toil of six defensive wars against Arab aggression and terrorism and this Independence Day is also a reminder of the price Israel must still pay to keep its citizens secure.

Despite a constant fight for survival, Israel is a nation that has prophetically become a beacon to the world. Israel's global contributions in the fields of health, science, and the humanities are enormous, especially in comparison to its tiny population. Israelis routinely export their knowledge in agriculture and medicine to Africa and much of the Third World and have been at the forefront in innovative commercial technologies.

In terms of American national interest, the affinity Americans have for Israel is based on a common cultural, political, and economic heritage. The United States-Israel relationship is special and enduring. As the only democracy in the entire Middle East, Israel serves as a bastion for freedom and a champion for Western values.

For America, Israel is a reliable strategic partner and is, without any doubt, our best ally in the region. The uniqueness of that strategic relationship was reaffirmed during the recent gulf war. At an incalculable sacrifice, Israel absorbed 39 unanswered Iraqi Scud attacks at the request of the United States to keep the coalition against Iraq intact. Perhaps Israel's greatest contribution to our gulf war effort was its action back in June 1981 that destroyed Iraq's nuclear reactor. U.S. Defense Secretary, Richard Cheney, stated it best:

> There were many times during the course of the build-up in the Gulf and the subsequent conflict that I gave thanks for the bold and dramatic action that had been taken by Israel some 10 years before.

The heroic deeds and actions of Israel over the years are many and I can continue indefinitely with deserving accolades. But the time is short, and I just want to convey to Israel a happy Independence Day with a wish: Congratulations and may peace and prosperity prevail for the children of Israel in the years to come with Jerusalem as the undivided and eternal capital.

DEMOCRATIC ELECTIONS IN IRAQI KURDISTAN

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I want to bring to the attention of the Senate an event which will be taking place later this month in Iraq. On May 17 there will be a first ever democratic election in Iraq. Despite the fact that Saddam Hussein remains in power in Baghdad, the Kurdish people of northern Iraq are going to hold an election for Kurdish Legislative Assembly.

With so many other international events unfolding, it would be easy to miss an event which will take place so far away, but this election deserves the attention and support of the United States.

Mr. President, an estimated 200,000 Kurds—men, women, and children—have been murdered by Saddam Hussein and his ruthless military. Even after the military defeat of Iraq in Desert Storm, Iraqi troops have continued to attack Kurdish villages and it is only the threat of British, French, and United States military retaliation that protects the Kurdish people.

Despite this horrendous situation and a virtual economic blockade of Kurdish areas, the Kurds have established a liberated zone and would hold democratic elections.

Mr. President, this election, if it is held, will hopefully mark a true turning point for the Kurdish people. Hopefully, a democratic election can be the start of a brighter future for a people that have endured a denial of their most basic human rights for more than 70 years.

It is my hope that the United States Government will give encouragement to a process which will give to the Kurdish people in Iraq the right of self-determination—a fundamental human right. The government of Saddam Hussein has clearly forfeited any right to control or govern the Kurdish people and even now it pursues an economic blockade of northern Iraq which is intended to starve the Kurdish people out of existence.

Mr. President, I realize that a proper United States policy toward Iraq is a complicated matter. I realize that there are regional concerns, border disputes, and the genuine threat of Islamic fundamentalism. However, the United States has always stood for the right of self-determination and against the violation of human rights. In Iraq, the issues seem clear. The Kurdish people of northern Iraq deserve the continued protection from the genocidal attacks of Saddam Hussein and they deserve encouragement for seeking to hold the first ever democratic election in the territory now known as Iraq.

HONORING HAWAII'S SMALL BUSINESS PERSONS OF THE YEAR

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to Leonard S. Tanaka and Suellen M. Tanaka, Hawaii's recipients of the Small Business Administration's Small Business Person of the Year award.

Leonard and Suellen Tanaka, residents of Hilo, HI, are the president and vice president, respectively, of T&T Electric, Inc., an electrical company. Leonard began the company with only two full-time employees in 1983 after leaving his job as lead electrician at Volcano Electric for 8 years. Suellen worked evenings as the bookkeeper while retaining her full-time day job.

By 1988, T&T Electric grew to 25 full-time workers. Within 3 years, the company doubled its size, and employed 57 full-time and temporary employees in 1990. T&T has demonstrated its commitment to the training and development of its employees, as evidenced by the positions within the company that require various levels of training and a commitment to the electrical profession. The company is licensed in seven different areas of construction.

Among T&T customers are the State and County of Hawaii, Hawaiian Tel, and several observatories atop Mauna Kea.

Revenues have increased from about $274,000 in 1984 to $6.5 million in 1990, with T&T averaging a 75-percent growth rate between 1987 and 1990.

Leonard and Suellen Tanaka are an asset to their community and role models for entrepreneurs throughout Hawaii to follow. In addition to their contributions to the business community, they regularly donate equipment, supplies, and services generously to a variety of community functions and charities. They also support many community service activities and work with students at local schools.

Mr. President, it is indeed a pleasure to salute this husband and wife team, two highly respected members of Hawaii's business community. It is only fitting that during Small Business Week 1992, we remember the invaluable contributions made by our Nation's small businesses.

HONORING HAWAII'S SMALL BUSINESS PRIME CONTRACTOR OF THE YEAR

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, in honor of Small Business Week 1992, I rise today to recognize Spencer Kurihara, president of Society Painters, Inc., who was awarded the Small Business Administration's Region IX Small Business Prime Contractor of the Year award.

Spencer Kurihara founded Society Painters, Inc. as a one-man operation in 1971. By 1991, he employed 56 full-time workers from two Oahu locations, Pearl City and Kaneohe. Although primarily a painting company, Society Painters has expanded its business to include flooring and maintenance services.

Society Painters has completed a number of military projects including the painting of family quarters at Schofield Barracks and Wheeler Air Force Base, painting at Aliamanu Military Reservation, Fort Shafter and Kaneohe Marine Corps Air Station, as well as maintenance service and installation of fire walls and ceilings at Kaneohe Marine Corps Air Station. The company has also had flooring projects at various State of Hawaii jobs, vinyl flooring at Schofield Barracks and carpeting at Aliamanu Military Reservation.

Mr. Kurihara and his business are members of the Painting and Decorating Contractors Association, Hawaii Flooring Association, General Contractors' Association, Building Industry Association of Hawaii, and the Better Business Bureau.

Mr. President, as we commemorate National Small Business Week 1992, we should not forget the importance of our small businesses. In the State of Hawaii, small businesses make up a significant portion of our business community and play a pivotal role in maintaining our economic stability. I applaud Spencer Kurihara on the receipt of this award.

TREATIES PENDING BEFORE THE SENATE

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, pending before the Senate are consular conventions with the Democratic and Popular Republic of Algeria, signed at Washington on January 12, 1989, and transmitted by President Bush on February 27, 1990 (Treaty Doc. 101–13), the Mongolian People's Republic, signed at Ulaanbaatar on August 2, 1990 and transmitted by President Bush on September 13, 1991 (Treaty Doc. 102–14) and the Republic of Tunisia, signed at Tunis on May 12, 1988, and transmitted by President Bush on February 26, 1990 (Treaty Doc. 101–12). These were favorably reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations on May 7, 1992.

Bilateral consular agreements between the United States and these three countries do not presently exist. Each of these conventions set forth similar obligations with respect to such matters as notification to consular officers of the arrest and detention of nationals of each country and protection of their rights and interests.

With regard to the Consular Convention with Algeria and Tunisia, the committee's report reflects our concerns over the recent suspension of democratic elections in Algeria and the dramatic increases in human rights violations in Tunisia. The approval of these treaties does not constitute an endorsement of any of the policies of the countries of Algeria and Tunisia. We agree with the administration's position however, that consular treaties will provide greater protection for U.S. nationals in these two countries.

The specific consular functions and services which will be permitted on a reciprocal basis include the issuance of passports and visas, performance of notarial services, and the representation of the interests of nationals in estate matters. More significantly, the conventions state that consuls of the country whose nationals are arrested, detained, or whose personal freedom is limited in any way will be notified without delay.

The United States is a party to the Vienna Convention on consular relations which has been ratified by 130 nations, including Algeria, Mongolia, and Tunisia. Nevertheless, the United States has continued to negotiate bilateral consular agreements which serve to amplify or supplement the Vienna Convention.

Also pending before the Senate are: First, a Protocol amending the Treaty on Extradition with Australia, signed at Seoul on September 4, 1990, and transmitted by President Bush on February 19, 1992 (Treaty Doc. 102–23); second, an Extradition Treaty with the Commonwealth of the Bahamas, signed at Nassau on March 9, 1990 and transmitted by President Bush on October 28, 1991 (Treaty Doc. 102–17); third, a Supplementary Extradition Treaty with the Federal Republic of Germany, signed at Washington on October 21, 1980, and transmitted by President Reagan on June 25, 1987; and fourth, the Second Supplementary Treaty on Extradition with the Kingdom of Spain, signed at Madrid on February 9,

1988, and transmitted by President Bush on March 3, 1992 (Treaty Doc. 102-24). These were favorably reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations on May 7, 1992.

These treaties are part of the administration's continued effort to modernize the legal tools available for the extradition of serious offenders such as narcotics traffickers and terrorists.

Each treaty adopts a dual criminality approach in determining whether a particular offense is extraditable and eliminates the outdated list of extraditable offenses contained in the existing treaty with each country. A dual criminality clause permits extradition for any criminal conduct that is punishable in both states by imprisonment or other detention for at least 1 year. Inclusion of a dual criminality clause obviates the need to renegotiate or supplement the treaty as offenses, such as computer-related crimes or money laundering, become punishable under the laws of both States. This approach was most recently incorporated in the Amendment to the Extradition Treaty with Canada (Treaty Doc. 101-17) approved by the Senate in 1991.

In addition to updating and standardizing the conditions and procedures for extradition between the United States and these four countries, the treaties also provide a legal basis for temporarily surrendering prisoners to stand trial for crimes against the laws of the requesting state.

I urge that the Senate give its advice and consent to the ratification of these treaties.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

FRAMEWORK CONVENTION ON CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, as one of the Senate observers to the climate change negotiations I am pleased that last Saturday, shortly after 6 p.m., our negotiators finished a Framework Convention on Climate Change. Yesterday, I asked that this summary of the convention, which I received yesterday morning from our chief climate negotiator, Robert Reinstein, be inserted in the RECORD as if read. Yesterday, you heard a lot of people talking about what this agreement didn't do, but I don't think you can argue that the United States doesn't take the threat of global climate change seriously.

In fact, last week at a Senate Energy Committee hearing on the science of global climate change, we heard four eminent climate scientists:

Dr. Robert Watson, the Director of the Process Studies Program Office at the National Aeronautics and Space Administration;

Dr. Richard Lindzen, professor of meteorology at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology;

Dr. Michael MacCracken, Division Director for Atmospheric and Geophysical Science at Lawrence Livermore Laboratory; and

Dr. Stephen Schneider, senior scientist at the National Center for Atmospheric Research.

I asked each of them if they agreed that the U.S. position which favors flexible goals for all the greenhouse gases, not just CO_2, made more sense scientifically than the European approach of rigid targets and timetables for CO_2 only. All of the scientists on the panel, from Dr. Lindzen who is considered to be a global warming skeptic, to Dr. Schneider who is considered to be on the other side, agreed that the U.S. position in the climate change negotiations made sense scientifically. This scientifically sensible approach is what was agreed to at the United Nations last week.

The Bush administration, faced with a complicated political and scientific issue, did what I wish we could do more around here—it took the scientists' advice. Now I'm not saying that scientists should run the Government in general, but I do think that we should listen to them more—and try to listen to all of what they have to say, including all the caveats and uncertainties, not just the convenient sound bites. I don't mean to dwell too much on the politics of this issue, but I can't help observing that it's too bad that the politics of this issue has evolved so that even mentioning scientific uncertainty puts you on one side of the issue and mentioning energy efficiency puts you on the other.

So let me review what this group of scientists we heard last week said: The scientists told us that greenhouse effect is a well-established theory; that if carbon dioxide and the other greenhouse gases didn't trap heat, the Earth would be almost 60 degrees colder; that carbon dioxide in the atmosphere is now about 25 percent higher than before the Industrial Revolution and increasing exponentially. Chances are, the Earth will get warmer—maybe a lot warmer, by the middle of the next century. The implication of this warming could be quite serious. Although it might just be a few more hot days each year, there is a reasonable chance it could change precipitation and ocean current patterns. Finally, even the most conservative predictions for warming would be many times faster than anything in the Earth's history and the impact of this change on the natural world could be severe. These scientists agreed that climate change could be a serious problem and we should try to address it immediately.

The problem is that carbon dioxide emissions are also a good measure of the economic growth, of the prosperity of most of the world. With the collapse of the Soviet Union, its carbon dioxide emissions dropped dramatically—by 25 percent since 1989. I submit that this is not the approach we would want to use.

So what did the scientists recommend? They all agreed that there is great uncertainty, and that we should start by promoting policies such as improving energy efficiency which are free or even produce a net benefit. They agreed that if we include the other greenhouse gases such as methane and nitrous oxide, industrialized countries could reduce greenhouse gases by perhaps 20 percent without dramatic change. And I might add, this could happen under the current climate agreement. Finally they agreed that in the long run, the most important thing to do is help the developing countries industrialize in an environmentally sustainable way, with nonpolluting technologies.

So, now we have a climate treaty and a choice to make. We in the Senate can continue to clash and bash, or we can try to work together to integrate the language in the climate treaty into a coordinated U.S. plan for dealing with energy, the environment, and economic growth. Signing the energy bill into law would be a good start.

Now, I am not saying working together on this will be easy. The motivations for the positions on both sides of the global warming debate are very genuine, although there is also plenty of politics in this, and I respect these genuine motivations: I care deeply about risks to future generations, be they economic or environmental. But, just as it is immoral to pass on the deficit to future generations, I would argue that without taking actions of our own, without trying to help other countries to solve their energy and environmental problems in a cost-effective manner, we are gambling with the well-being of future generations on the entire planet.

We in the United States have been fighting the economics versus environment battle longer than anyone else and maybe we should be the first to stop. We have learned from this experience how to promote policies that consider environmental and business interests together; that are efficient and above all, are based on sound science. The world, and especially developing countries cannot afford to ignore the lessons we have learned from this experience. We in the U.S. Senate now can help lead in promoting policies to prevent pollution in the first place, that save energy, generate less waste, and also become more competitive internationally.

It makes sense, all things considered, to proceed as recommended by the President and adopted in the Frame-

work Convention on Climate Change. I urge my colleagues to follow that course and work together for the objectives we all desire.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

(The remarks of Mr. DOMENICI pertaining to the introduction of S. 2709 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—S. 250

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I am about to propound a unanimous consent request. I am advised by the distinguished Republican leader's staff that this has been cleared with him and is acceptable to our Republican colleagues.

I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume consideration of S. 250, the motor-voter bill, tomorrow at 10:30 a.m.; that at that time, the Senate begin 1 hour of debate on the measure, with 30 minutes controlled by Senator KASTEN; 15 minutes controlled by Senator HOLLINGS; 10 minutes controlled by Senator ROCKEFELLER; 5 minutes controlled by Senator EXON; and that at 11:30 a.m., Senator ROCKEFELLER be recognized to make a motion to table the Kasten amendment, No. 1799; that no other amendments or motions be in order in relation to the bill prior to the disposition of the tabling motion, and that if the tabling motion fails, the Kasten amendment continue to be debatable and amendable.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The text of the agreement is as follows:

Ordered, That at 10:30 a.m. on Thursday, May 14, 1992, the Senate resume consideration of S. 250, the Motor Voter Bill, with one hour of debate to start at that time, to be divided as follows: 30 minutes under the control of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. Kasten), 15 minutes under the control of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. Hollings), 10 minutes under the control of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. Rockefeller), and 5 minutes under the control of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. Exon).

Ordered further, That at 11:30 a.m. the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. Rockefeller) be recognized to make a motion to table the Kasten amendment, No. 1799.

Ordered further, That no other amendments or motions be in order in relation to the bill prior to the disposition of the tabling motion.

Ordered further, That if the tabling motion fails, the Kasten amendment continue to be debatable and amendable.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I thank my colleagues for their cooperation. Senators, therefore, should be aware that a vote will occur at 11:30 a.m. on a motion by Senator ROCKEFELLER to table the ending Kasten amendment to the motor-voter bill.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following treaties, en bloc:

Executive Calendar 18, Consular Convention with the Republic of Tunisia;

Executive Calendar 19, Consular Convention with the Democratic and Popular Republic of Algeria;

Executive Calendar 20, Consular Convention with the Mongolian People's Republic;

Executive Calendar 21, Supplementary Extradition Treaty with the Federal Republic of Germany;

Executive Calendar 22, Extradition Treaty with the Bahamas;

Executive Calendar 23, Protocol Amending the 1974 Extradition Treaty with Australia; and

Executive Calendar 24, Second Supplementary Extradition Treaty with Spain.

I further ask unanimous consent that these seven treaties be considered as having passed through the various parliamentary stages up to and including the presentation of the resolutions of ratification; that no amendments, reservations, understandings, declarations or provisos be in order; that any statements be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as if read; that upon disposition of the resolutions of ratification, the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table; that the President be notified of the Senate's action and that following disposition of the treaties, the Senate return to legislative session.

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

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I ask for a division vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All those in favor will stand and be counted. [After a pause.] Those opposed will stand and be counted.

In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of the Senators present have voted in the affirmative.

The ratifications are agreed to.

The resolutions of ratification are as follows:

TREATY DOCUMENT NO. 101–12, CONSULAR CONVENTION WITH THE REPUBLIC OF TUNISIA

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of the Consular Convention between the United States of America and the Republic of Tunisia, signed at Tunis on May 12, 1988.

TREATY DOCUMENT NO. 101–13, CONSULAR CONVENTION WITH THE DEMOCRATIC AND POPULAR REPUBLIC OF ALGERIA

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of the Consular Convention between the United States of America and the Democratic and Popular Republic of Algeria, signed at Washington on January 12, 1989.

TREATY DOCUMENT NO. 102–14, CONSULAR CONVENTION WITH THE MONGOLIAN PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of the Consular Convention between the United States of America and the Mongolian People's Republic, signed at Ulaanbaatar on August 2, 1990.

TREATY DOCUMENT NO. 100–6, SUPPLEMENTARY EXTRADITION TREATY WITH THE FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of the Supplementary Treaty to the Treaty between the United States of America and the Federal Republic of Germany Concerning Extradition, signed at Washington on October 21, 1986.

TREATY DOCUMENT NO. 102–17, EXTRADITION TREATY WITH THE BAHAMAS

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of the Extradition Treaty between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Commonwealth of the Bahamas, signed at Nassau on March 9, 1990.

TREATY DOCUMENT NO. 102–23, PROTOCOL AMENDING THE 1974 EXTRADITION TREATY WITH AUSTRALIA

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of the Protocol Amending the Treaty on Extradition between the United States of America and Australia, signed at Seoul on September 4, 1990.

TREATY DOCUMENT NO. 102–24, SECOND SUPPLEMENTARY EXTRADITION TREATY WITH SPAIN

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of the Second Supplementary Extradition Treaty between the United States of America and the King-

dom of Spain, signed at Madrid on February 9, 1988.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will return to the consideration of legislative business.

NATIONAL FOSTER CARE MONTH

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Judiciary Committee be discharged from further consideration of House Joint Resolution 388, a joint resolution designating the month of May as "National Foster Care Month"; that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; that the joint resolution be deemed read a third time, passed; that the preamble be agreed to and that the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

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

So, the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 388) was deemed read a third time and passed.

PRINTING OF REPORT OF TEMPORARY SPECIAL INDEPENDENT COUNSEL

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the report of the temporary special independent counsel Peter Fleming submitted to the two leaders be printed as a Senate document.

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

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. McCathran, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations and withdrawals which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations and withdrawals received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

NATIONAL YOUTH APPRENTICESHIP ACT OF 1992—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—PM 237

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to transmit herewith for your immediate consideration the "National Youth Apprenticeship Act of 1992." Also transmitted is a section-by-section analysis.

This legislation would establish a national framework for implementing comprehensive youth apprenticeship programs. These programs would be a high-quality learning alternative for preparing young people to be valuable and productive members of the 21st century work force. Although this framework has been designed to be comprehensive and national in scope, it is also flexible enough to allow States to customize the model to economic, demographic, and other local conditions.

I am proposing this legislation in order to promote a comprehensive approach for helping our youth make the transition from school to the workplace and strive to reach high levels of academic achievement. The lack of such an approach is one very important reason that a significant proportion of American youth do not possess the necessary skills to meet employer requirements for entry level positions.

There is widespread agreement that the time has come to strengthen the connection between the academic subjects taught in our schools and the demands of the modern, high-technology workplace. Work-based learning models have proven to be effective approaches for preparing youth at the secondary school level.

Under my proposal, a student could enter a youth apprenticeship program in the 11th or 12th grade. Before reaching these grades, students would receive career and academic guidance to prepare them for entry into youth apprenticeship programs. Particular programs may end with graduation from high school or continue for up to an additional 2 years of postsecondary education. In addition to the high school diploma, all youth apprentices would earn a certificate of competency and qualify for a postsecondary program, a registered apprenticeship program, or employment.

A youth apprentice would receive academic instruction, job training, and work experience. The program is intended to attract and develop high-quality, motivated students. Standards of academic achievement, consistent with voluntary, national standards, will apply to all academic instruction, including the required instruction in the core subjects of English, mathematics, science, history, and geography. Students also would be expected to demonstrate mastery of job skills.

My proposal provides for vigorous involvement at the Federal, State, and local levels to ensure the success of the program. It also requires that employers, schools, students, and parents promise to work together to achieve the program goals. Enactment of my proposal will result in national standards applicable to all youth apprenticeship programs. Thus, upon completion of the program, the youth apprentice will have a portable credential that will be recognized wherever the individual may go to seek employment or pursue further education and training.

I believe that the time has come for a national, comprehensive approach to work-based learning. The bill I am proposing would establish a formal process in which business, labor, and education would form partnerships to motivate the Nation's young people to stay in school and become productive citizens. It will provide American youth the opportunity to gain marketable and portable skills while establishing a relationship with a prospective employer.

I urge the Congress to give swift and favorable consideration to the National Youth Apprenticeship Act of 1992.

GEORGE BUSH.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 13, 1992.*

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 2:19 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 bills, each without amendment:

S. 452. An act to authorize a transfer of administrative jurisdiction over certain land to the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes;

S. 749. An act to rename and expand the boundaries of the Mound City Group National Monument in Ohio; and

S. 1182. An act to transfer jurisdiction of certain public lands in the State of Utah to the Forest Service, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House has passed the bill (S. 2344) to improve the provision of health care and other services to veterans by the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes, with an amendment; it insists upon its amendment to the bill, asks a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. ROWLAND, Mr. STUMP, and Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT as managers of the conference on the part of the House.

The message further announced that the House disagrees to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 4990) rescinding certain budget authority, and for other purposes; it agrees to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. WHITTEN, Mr. NATCHER, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Mr. YATES, Mr. OBEY, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. MYERS of Indiana, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. GREEN of New York, Mr. ROGERS, and Mr. SKEEN as managers of the conference on the part of the House.

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

H.R. 1514. An act to resolve the status of certain lands relinquished to the United States under the act of June 4, 1987 (30 Stat. 11, 36), and for other purposes.

At 5:54 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by one of its reading clerks, Ms. Goetz, announced that the House has agreed to the following concurrent resolution, without amendment:

S. Con. Res. 116. A concurrent resolution to authorize corrections in the enrollment of S. 838.

The message further announced that the Speaker has appointed the following Members as additional managers on the part of the House in the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 4990) rescinding certain budget authority, and for other purposes: Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. DIXON, and Mr. REGULA.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bill was read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 1514. An act to resolve the status of certain lands relinquished to the United States under the act of June 4, 1987, (30 Stat. 11, 36), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

The following bill, introduced on yesterday and ordered held at the desk until the close of business today, May 13, 1992, was referred to the Committee on Finance:

S. 2699. A bill to extend the period for which unemployment benefits are payable under title I of the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Act of 1991, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore (Mr. GORE) reported that on today, May 13, 1992, he had signed the following enrolled bill and joint resolutions which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House:

H.R. 4774. An act to provide flexibility to the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out food assistance programs in certain countries;

S.J. Res. 251. Joint resolution to designate the month of May 1992 as "National Huntington's Disease Awareness Month";

H.J. Res. 371. Joint resolution designating May 31, 1992, through June 6, 1992, as a "Week for the National Observance of the Fiftieth Anniversary of World War II"; and

H.J. Res. 425. Joint resolution designating May 10, 1992, as "Infant Mortality Awareness Day."

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, May 13, 1992, he had presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bill and joint resolution:

S. 2378. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend certain authorities relating to the administration of veterans laws, and for other purposes; and

S.J. Res. 251. Joint resolution to designate the month of May 1992 as "National Huntington's Disease Awareness Month."

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, which were referred as indicated:

EC-3193. A communication from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, a draft of proposed legislation to improve the administration and integrity of the Food Stamp Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-3194. A communication from the General Counsel of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting, a draft of proposed legislation to amend title XXXIV of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 1992 and 1993, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-3195. A communication from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on waste tank safety issues at the Hanford Site; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-3196. A communication from the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on direct spending or receipts legislation; to the Committee on the Budget.

EC-3197. A communication from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report on all the recommendation of the National Transportation Safety Board to the Secretary regarding transportation safety; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3198. A communication from the Chairperson of the Northeast Interstate Low-level Radioactive Waste Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Commission for fiscal year 1991; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-3199. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Interior (Land and Minerals Management), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the oil and gas potential and wilderness characteristics of Alaska North Slope lands, other than those included in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge and the National Petroleum Reserve-Alaska; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-3200. A communication from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Department of Energy for fiscal year 1991; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-3201. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Energy (Environmental Restoration and Waste Management), transmitting, pursuant to law, notice in the delay of the submission of a report on the Department of Energy's research activities; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3202. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Buy American Study Report"; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3203. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Resources, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Department regarding the committees which provide advice and consultation to the Secretary of Health and Human Services; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-3204. A communication from the Acting United States Trade Representative, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report concerning recent developments regarding section 301 of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended by the Omnibus Trade and Competitiveness Act of 1988; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-3205. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make the deduction for health insurance costs of self-employed individuals permanent, and to provide for a phased-in increase in the deductible amount of health insurance costs from 25 to 100 percent; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-3206. A communication from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the United States-Israel Legal Exchange; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-3207. A communication from the Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the President of the United States' determination that the Board of the International Fund established by the Anglo-Irish Agreement is, as a whole, broadly representative of the interests of the communities in Ireland and Northern Ireland, and that disbursements from the International Fund are distributed in accordance with the principle of equality of opportunity and nondiscrimination in employment, without regard to religious affiliation, and will address the needs of both communities in Northern Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-3208. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of State (Legislative Affairs), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the International Labour Conference; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-3209. A communication from the Director of the Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, a draft of proposed legislation to authorize financial institutions to disclose to the Office of Personnel Management the names and current addresses of their customers who are receiving, by direct deposit or electronic funds transfer, payments of Civil Service Retirement benefits under chapter 83 or Federal Employees' Retirement benefits under chapter 84 of title 5, United States Code; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-3210. A communication from the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Government National Mortgage Association management for the fiscal year ended September 30, 1991; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-3211. A communication from the Director of the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences (Civilian Human Resources Management), transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the University for the year ending December 31, 1989; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-3212. A communication from the Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Office for Victims of Crime's Report to Congress"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-3213. A communication from the Secretary of Education, transmitting, a draft of

proposed legislation to make certain amendments to the Act of September 30, 1950 (Public Law 874, Eighty-first Congress), and the Act of September 23, 1950 (Public Law 815, Eighty-first Congress), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

EC-3214. A communication from the Administrator of the Small Business Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report on the state of Small Business; to the Committee on Small Business.

EC-3215. A communication from the Secretary of Veterans' Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report summarizing the disposition of cases where a VA beneficiary has suffered a loss because of reliance upon an erroneous VA determination of eligibility, without knowing that it was erroneous; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC-3216. A communication from the Secretary of Veterans' Affairs, transmitting, a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 38, United States Code, to make certain improvements in the vocational rehabilitation and educational assistance programs for veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSTON, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources:

Linda Gillespie Stuntz, of Virginia, to be Deputy Secretary of Energy.

(The above nomination was approved subject to the nominee's commitment to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.)

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. BREAUX (for himself and Mr. LOTT):

S. 2700. A bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1993 for the Federal Maritime Commission; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

S. 2701. A bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1993 for the Maritime Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. HOLLINGS (for himself, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. BREAUX, Mr. LOTT, Mr. PRYOR, Mr. KASTEN, and Mr. KERRY):

S. 2702. A bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1993 for the Coast Guard, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. FORD:

S. 2703. A bill to authorize the President to appoint General Thomas C. Richards to the Office of Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. BYRD (for himself, Mr. SIMON, Mr. BUMPERS, Mr. DIXON, Mr. BENTSEN, and Mr. SASSER):

S. 2704. A bill to prevent any foreign person from purchasing or otherwise acquiring the LTV Aerospace and Defense Company; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. SEYMOUR:

S. 2705. A bill to establish the National Technology Agency; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

S. 2706. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax incentives to encourage the conversion of the defense industry to commercial endeavors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. RIEGLE (for himself, Mr. GARN, Mr. DODD, Mr. KERRY, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. SMITH, Mr. STEVENS, and Mr. MOYNIHAN):

S. 2707. A bill to authorize the minting and issuance of coins in commemoration of the Year of the Vietnam Veteran and the 10th Anniversary of the dedication of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. HATCH (by request):

S. 2708. A bill to improve enforcement of the Employee Retirement Security Act of 1974, by adding certain provisions with respect to the auditing of employee benefit plans; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

By Mr. DOMENICI:

S. 2709. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on rifabutin (dosage form); to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. McCAIN (for himself and Mr. THURMOND):

S. 2710. A bill to provide for improvement of the health care system under chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code, for members and former members of the uniformed services and their dependents and survivors; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. EXON (for himself and Mr. BOREN):

S.J. Res. 302. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution relating to the election of the President and Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PELL (for himself, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. BIDEN, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. BRYAN, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. CHAFEE, Mr. COATS, Mr. CRANSTON, Mr. D'AMATO, Mr. DIXON, Mr. DODD, Mr. DURENBERGER, Mr. GLENN, Mr. GORE, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mrs. KASSEBAUM, Mr. KASTEN, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. LUGAR, Mr. MACK, Mr. METZENBAUM, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. NUNN, Mr. PRESSLER, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. WARNER, and Mr. WELLSTONE):

S.J. Res. 303. A joint resolution to designate October 1992 as "National Breast Cancer Awareness Month"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. BREAUX (for himself and Mr. LOTT):

S. 2700. A bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1993 for the Federal Maritime Commission; to the Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation.

FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1992

• Mr. BREAUX. Mr. President, I, along with my colleague Senator LOTT, am introducing a bill today that authorizes the appropriations for the Federal Maritime Commission [FMC] for fiscal year 1993. The bill authorizes $19,100,000 to be used for the operations of the FMC. This is the same amount requested by the President in his budget request and the same amount in the FMC authorization bill passed by the House.

The FMC is an independent agency whose primary function is to regulate the practices of both international and domestic maritime trade. Its regulatory authority is contained in the Shipping Act of 1984, the Shipping Act of 1916, and other related statutes. The FMC reviews tariff filings and service contracts, but does not regulate international ocean transportation rates. It does, however, approve freight rates for transportation between domestic ports and domestic offshore ports such as Hawaii and Puerto Rico. In addition to those duties, the FMC investigates and takes enforcement action in instances where unjust discriminatory rates have been found, or other improper activities exist among shippers, carriers and terminal operations.

This legislation is necessary for the FMC to carry out all of its functions that are so important to regulation of the waterborne commerce of the United States. I, therefore, urge its quick passage.

Mr. President, I request that the text of the bill be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

S. 2700

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 "Federal Maritime Commission Authorization Act of 1992".

SEC. 2. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated to the Federal Maritime Commission $19,100,000 for fiscal year 1993.•

By Mr. BREAUX (for himself and Mr. LOTT):

S. 2701. A bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1993 for the Maritime Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

MARITIME ADMINISTRATION AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1992

• Mr. BREAUX. Mr. President, I, along with my colleague, Senator LOTT, am introducing a bill today that authorizes the appropriations for the Maritime Administration [MarAd] for fiscal year 1993. The bill authorizes $537,419,000 to be used for the operations of MarAd. This is a decrease of $41,952,000 from the MarAd fiscal year 1992 appropriation of $579,371,000, and is the same as requested by the administration.

MarAd's main responsibility is the promotion of those activities that are designed to enhance the maritime industry in the United States. The major activities and programs conducted by MarAd include: operating differential subsidies; manpower, education, and training; operating programs; national security support capabilities, including the National Defense Reserve Fleet and the Ready Reserve Force [RRF]; and the ocean freight differential.

This bill also contains an amendment that reinstates a section of a law repealed by the Coast Guard Authorization Act of 1989. An oversight in a previous bill had technically stripped MarAd of its authority to manage the RRF. This section reinstates that power.

Mr. President, I request that the text of the bill be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

S. 2701

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

SECTION 1. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

For fiscal year 1993, the following amounts are authorized to be appropriated for the Maritime Administration:

(1) $225,000,000 for payment of obligations incurred for operating-differential subsidies of United States-flag vessels.

(2) $38,718,000 for expenses related to manpower, education, and training, including—

(A) $27,845,000 for maritime training at the United States Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point, New York;

(B) $10,072,000 for assistance to the State maritime academies; and

(C) $1,801,000 for manpower and additional training.

(3) $30,341,000 for operating programs.

(4) $8,360,000 for expenses related to national security support capabilities, including—

(A) $6,937,000 for the National Defense Reserve Fleet; and

(B) $1,423,000, for emergency planning operations.

(5) $234,000,000 for the Ready Reserve Force, including—

(A) $104,000,000 for fleet additions, replacements, acquisitions, and upgrading of vessels for the Ready Reserve Force;

(B) $126,000,000 for maintenance and operations programs in support of the Ready Reserve Force; and

(C) $4,000,000 for Ready Reserve Force shore facilities and fleet support craft.

SEC. 2. TECHNICAL CORRECTION.

Section 11 of the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946 (50 App. U.S.C. 1744), as amended by section 6 of the Act of October 13, 1989 (Public Law 101-115; 103 Stat. 693), is amended to read as if subsection (b) of such section 11 had not been repealed by section 307(12) of the Coast Guard Authorization Act of 1989 (Public Law 101-225; 103 Stat. 1925).

SEC. 3. EFFECTIVE DATES.

The effective date of section 2 is December 12, 1989. The other provisions of this Act are effective on the date of enactment of this Act.●

By Mr. HOLLINGS (for himself, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. BREAUX, Mr. LOTT, Mr. PRYOR, Mr. KASTEN, and Mr. KERRY):

S. 2702. A bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1993 for the Coast Guard, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

COAST GUARD AUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, today I am introducing the Coast Guard Authorization Act of 1992.

This bill provides the core authorization for the Coast Guard for fiscal year 1993.

The authorization totals $3.817 billion for 1993, which reflects a modest increase of 6 percent from the fiscal year 1992 appropriated level.

As chairman of the Commerce Committee, I recognize that this small increase, similar to the small increases that we have seen over the years, does not reflect adequately the expanding duties of this branch of the Nation's armed services.

When this service was first established in 1790, its mission was fairly straightforward—to prevent smuggling and collect tax revenues.

Since that time, many new responsibilities have been added, including search and rescue, fisheries law enforcement, drug interdiction, aids to navigation, marine safety, and marine environmental protection.

In addition to its routine activities, during the past few years the Coast Guard has been on the front line of high publicized events such as the cleanup of the *Exxon Valdez*, the blockade of Iraq, and the Haitian interdiction.

This bill provides the bare-bones authorization needed for the Coast Guard to perform these many important functions.

This bill provides a 5-percent increase in the authorization for Coast Guard operating expenses for fiscal year 1993.

Funding from this account provides for the operation and maintenance of the multipurpose vessels, aircraft, and shore vessels which allow the Coast Guard to perform its duties along the coasts and inland waterways of the United States. The small increase in the authorization for this year is, for the most part, an adjustment for inflation.

The authorization for capital funding in this bill totals $414 million for fiscal year 1993. Capital funding includes the acquisition, construction, rebuilding, and improvement of aids to navigation, shore and offshore facilities, vessels, and aircraft. Some major initiatives being continued during the next year include replacement of seagoing buoy tenders, coastal buoy tenders, and 44-foot motor lifeboats.

The bill contains increased funding to provide affordable housing, medical care, training, family services, and recreational facilities for the men and women of the Coast Guard. In addition, it authorizes $519 million for retired pay in fiscal year 1993, which provides money to retired military personnel of the Coast Guard, the Coast Guard Reserve, and the former Lighthouse Service.

Other funding authorizations in the bill cover research and development and bridge alteration. The bill provides for a 42-percent increase in funding for environmental compliance and restoration which will assist the Coast Guard in fulfilling its responsibilities in this area. Authorizations are provided for end-of-year strengths of 39,732 military personnel for fiscal year 1993. The bill also authorizes average military training loads for recruits and special training, flight training, professional training, and officer training.

This legislation also contains a number of provisions which amend existing law applicable to the Coast Guard. These provisions:

Authorize the Secretary of Transportation to deny the issuance or renewal of a trade or recreational endorsement on a certificate of documentation, and to revoke such endorsement for vessel owners who refuse to pay civil penalties;

Change the positions eligible for special pay in the Coast Guard;

Improve the inspection and enforcement authority of the Coast Guard with respect to foreign passenger vessels;

Authorize the Coast Guard to obtain reimbursement for overseas inspections and examinations of foreign vessels.

This year's Coast Guard authorization bill also contains an important provision to phase out the Coast Guard recreational user fee which was enacted as part of the Omnibus Reconciliation Act of 1990. Mr. President, boaters already pay their share to the Government in the form of gas taxes, excise taxes, sales taxes, and registration fees. In South Carolina, boaters on Lake Marion and Lake Moultrie are now paying this additional fee, although the Coast Guard provides no services on the lakes. I am all for common sense budget reform, but clearly this is an unfair tax which we need to repeal.

To provide an offset for the repeal of the Coast Guard user fee, I have included a proposal in this legislation to establish a fee for users of the Federal Maritime Commission's [FMC] new computerized automated tariff filing and information [ATFI] system. Under the provision, individuals who use the FMC's new computer data base to access tariff information will pay 46 cents per minute of use.

I congratulate the men and women of the Coast Guard for always stepping forward when the Nation calls. I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting this Coast Guard authorization legislation.

Mr. President, in introducing this Coast Guard authorization bill, it is very relative to the demise and disdain and cynicism that we find in government. We in the Congress constantly ask why. The distinguished Senator from North Carolina is covering it in a responsible fashion.

There is no question in my mind, not being an historian on the Democratic Party, but having experienced the party and its feel for some 40 years, it can be summed up in a line that the people who say they do not trust politicians anymore are waiting to find politicians who act as though they trust the people. And in that sense the people's trust is lost when you go to the so-called user fees or licenses that they put on boats for a service that never could be.

Out in Los Angeles they are going to have now a super-duper commission to find out why they did not get law enforcement to operate in a timely fashion. Here there is no chance of the Coast Guard operating in a timely or untimely fashion. We have acted in a panic, if you please, trying to spend all the trust funds. We have raided the highway, the airport, the Medicare, the unemployment trust fund, whereby the Senator from Texas said, when we debated it, we are trying to spend money that is already spent. We have raided the Social Security trust fund where by the year 1999, in 7 short years, we will owe it $1 trillion. We are spending a billion a week out of Social Security.

And in that panic they just said oh, we have got to get more money and they exacted a fee on small boat users in your State and mine. And in my State, if I have a boat on Lake Marion, you will not see the Coast Guard. If you have a boat on Lake Moultrie, you are not going to see the Coast Guard. If you have a boat on the Upper Congaree and the boat starts sinking or whatever it is, the one group that you will never find coming to your rescue is the Coast Guard.

Now, they ask why do we not have confidence in that crowd in Congress and in the National Government, in the Presidency and otherwise. Because here they come around and they are paying moneys for a service that is impossible to get.

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. 2702

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

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Coast Guard Authorization Act of 1992".

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 2. Funds are authorized to be appropriated for necessary expenses of the Coast Guard for fiscal year 1993, as follows:

(1) For the operation and maintenance of the Coast Guard, $2,603,000,000, of which—

(A) $142,100,000 shall be transferred from the Department of Defense;

(B) $31,876,000 shall be derived from the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund; and

(C) $35,000,000 shall be expended from the Boat Safety Account.

(2) For the acquisition, construction, rebuilding, and improvement of aids to navigation, shore and offshore facilities, vessels, and aircraft, including equipment related thereto, $414,000,000, to remain available until expended, of which—

(A) $18,000,000 shall be transferred from the Department of Defense; and

(B) $33,822,000 shall be derived from the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund.

(3) For research, development, test, and evaluation, $29,900,000, to remain available until expended, of which $4,000,000 shall be derived from the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund.

(4) For retired pay (including the payment of obligations otherwise chargeable to lapsed appropriations for this purpose), payments under the Retired Serviceman's Family Protection and Survivor Benefit Plans, and payments for medical care of retired personnel and their dependents under chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code, $519,700,000, to remain available until expended.

(5) For alteration or removal of bridges over navigable waters of the United States constituting obstructions to navigation, and for personnel and administrative costs associated with the Bridge Alternative Program, $11,100,000, to remain available until expended.

(6) For environmental compliance and restoration at Coast Guard facilities, $30,500,000, to remain available until expended.

AUTHORIZED LEVELS OF MILITARY STRENGTH AND MILITARY TRAINING

SEC. 3. (a) AUTHORIZED MILITARY STRENGTH LEVEL.—As of September 30, 1993, the Coast Guard is authorized an end-of-year strength for active duty personnel of 39,732. The authorized strength does not include members of the Ready Reserve called to active duty under section 712 of title 14, United States Code.

(b) AUTHORIZED LEVEL OF MILITARY TRAINING.—For fiscal year 1993, the Coast Guard is authorized average military training student loads as follows:

(1) For recruit and special training, 2,653 student years.

(2) For flight training, 110 student years.

(3) For professional training in military and civilian institutions, 362 student years.

(4) For officer acquisition, 878 student years.

DENIAL AND REVOCATION OF ENDORSEMENTS

SEC. 4. (a) DENIAL AND REVOCATION.—Chapter 121 of title 46, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"§ 12123. Denial and revocation of endorsements

"The Secretary of Transportation is authorized to deny the issuance or renewal of a trade or recreational endorsement on a certificate of documentation issued under this chapter and to revoke such endorsement if the Secretary finds that the vessel's owner has not paid an assessment of a civil penalty after final agency action for a violation of law for which an assessment has been made by the Secretary.".

(b) LIMITATIONS ON VESSEL OPERATIONS.—Section 12110(c) of title 46, U.S. Code, is amended by striking all of the first sentence through the first comma and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "When a vessel is operated after the Secretary has denied issuance or renewal of an endorsement or revoked the endorsement under section 12123 of this title and before the endorsement is reinstituted, or is employed in a trade for which an endorsement is required, without a certificate of documentation with an appropriate endorsement for that trade,".

(c) TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.—(1) Section 12103(a) of title 46, United States Code, is amended by striking "On" and inserting in lieu thereof "Except as provided in section 12123 of this title, on".

(2) The analysis for chapter 121 of title 46, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

"12123. Denial and revocation of endorsements.".

SPECIAL PAY

SEC. 5. (a) DESIGNATION OF ELIGIBLE POSITIONS.—Section 306(a) of title 37, United States Code, is amended by striking "of pay grade 0-3, 0-4, 0-5, or 0-6" and inserting in lieu thereof "of pay grade 0-6 or below", and by striking the chart and inserting in lieu thereof the following new chart:

"Pay Grade	Monthly rate
0-6	$150
0-5	100
0-4 and below	50".

(b) PERCENTAGE LIMITATION ON NUMBER OF PAYEES.—Section 306(c) of title 37, United States Code, is amended by striking "in pay grade 0-3," and inserting in lieu thereof "in each of the pay grades 0-3 and below,".

INSPECTION AND ENFORCEMENT AUTHORITY FOR FOREIGN VESSELS

SEC. 6.(a) RECIPROCITY.—Section 3303(a) of title 46, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking "only" immediately after "is subject"; and

(2) by striking "the condition of the vessel's propulsion equipment and lifesaving equipment are" and inserting in lieu thereof "its condition is".

(b) PREVENTION OF DEPARTURE.—Section 3505 of title 46, United States Code, is amended by striking "or domestic vessel of more than 100 gross tons having berth or stateroom accommodations for at least 50 passengers" and inserting in lieu thereof "vessel".

REIMBURSEMENT FOR OVERSEAS INSPECTIONS AND EXAMINATIONS

SEC. 7. Section 3317(b) of title 46, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking "chapter" and inserting in lieu thereof "part"; and

(2) by inserting "or a foreign vessel" immediately after "documented vessel.".

RECREATIONAL BOAT TAX REPEAL

SEC. 8.(a) IN GENERAL.—(1) Section 2110(b)(1) of title 46, United States code, is amended—

(1) by striking "1991, 1992, 1993, 1994, and 1995", and inserting in lieu thereof "1993 and 1994"; and

(2) by striking "that is greater than 16 feet in length" and inserting in lieu thereof "to which paragraph (2) of this subsection applies".

(2) Section 2110(b)(2) of title 46, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(2) The fee or charge established under paragraph (1) of this subsection is as follows:

"(A) in fiscal year 1993—

"(i) for vessels of more than 21 feet in length but less than 27 feet, not more than $35;

"(ii) for vessels of at least 27 feet in length but less than 40 feet, not more than $50; and

"(iii) for vessels of at least 40 feet in length, not more than $100.

"(B) in fiscal year 1994—

"(i) for vessels of at least 37 feet in length but less than 40 feet, not more than $50; and

"(ii) for vessels of at least 40 feet in length, not more than $100.".

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section are effective October 1, 1992.

AUTOMATED TARIFF FILING AND INFORMATION SYSTEM

SEC. 9.(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the following definitions apply:

(1) The term "Commission" means the Federal Maritime Commission.

(2) The term "common carrier" means a common carrier under section 3 of the Shipping Act of 1984 (46 App. U.S.C. 1702), a common carrier by water in interstate commerce under the Shipping Act, 1916 (46 App. U.S.C. 801 et seq.), or a common carrier by water in intercoastal commerce under the Intercoastal Shipping Act, 1933 (46 App. U.S.C. 843 et seq.).

(3) The term "conference" has the meaning given that term under section 3 of the Shipping Act of 1984 (46 App. U.S.C. 1702).

(4) The term "essential terms of service contracts" means the essential terms that are required to be filed with the Commission and made available under section 8(c) of the Shipping Act of 1984 (46 App. U.S.C. 1707(c)).

(5) The term "tariff" means a tariff of rates, charges, classifications, rules, and practices required to be filed by a common carrier or conference under section 8 of the Shipping Act of 1984 (46 App. U.S.C. 1707), or a rate, fare, charge, classification, rule, or regulation required to be filed by a common carrier or conference under the Shipping Act, 1916 (46 U.S.C. 801 et seq.), or the Intercoastal Shipping Act, 1933 (46 App. U.S.C. 843 et seq.).

(b) TARIFF FORM AND AVAILABILITY.—(1) Notwithstanding any other law, each common carrier and conference shall, in accordance with subsection (c), file electronically with the Commission all tariffs, and all essential terms of service contracts, required to be filed by that common carrier or conference under the Shipping Act of 1984 (46 App. U.S.C. 1701 et seq.), the Shipping Act, 1916 (46 App. U.S.C. 801 et seq.), and the Intercoastal Shipping Act, 1933 (46 App. U.S.C. 843 et seq.).

(2) The Commission shall make available electronically to any person, without time, quantity, or other limitation, both at the Commission headquarters and from remote terminals—

(A) all tariff information, and all essential terms of service contracts, filed in the Commission's Automated Tariff Filing and Information System database; and

(B) all tariff information in the System enhanced electronically by the Commission at any time.

(c) FILING SCHEDULE.—New tariffs and new essential terms of service contracts shall be filed electronically not later than June 1, 1992. All other tariffs and essential terms of service contracts shall be filed not later than September 1, 1992.

(d) FEES.—(1) The Commission shall charge, in fiscal years 1993, 1994, and 1995—

(A) a fee of 46 cents for each minute of remote computer access by any individual of the information available electronically under this section; and

(B)(i) for electronic copies of the Automated Tariff Filing and Information System database (in bulk), or any portion of the database, a fee reflecting the cost of providing those copies, including the cost of duplication, distribution, and user-dedicated equipment; and

(ii) for a person operating or maintaining information in a database that has multiple tariff or service contract information obtained directly or indirectly from the Commission, a fee of 46 cents for each minute that database is subsequently accessed by computer by any individual.

(2) A Federal agency is exempt from paying a fee under this subsection.

(e) ENFORCEMENT.—The Commission shall use systems controls or other appropriate methods to enforce subsection (d).

(f) PENALTIES.—(1) A person failing to pay fee established under subsection (d) is liable to the United States Government for a civil penalty of not more than $5,000 for each violation.

(2) A person that willfully fails to pay a fee established under subsection (d) commits a class A misdemeanor.

(g) AUTOMATIC FILING IMPLEMENTATION.—(1) Software that provides for the electronic filing of data in the Automated Tariff Filing and Information System shall be submitted to the Commission for certification. Not later than 14 days after a person submits software to the Commission for certification, the Commission shall—

(A) certify the software if it provides for the electronic filing of data; and

(B) publish in the Federal Register notice of that certification.

(2)(A) The Secretary of the Treasury shall make available to the Commission, as a repayable advance in fiscal year 1992, not more than $4,000,000, to remain available until expended. The Commission shall spend these funds to complete and upgrade the capacity of the Automated Tariff Filing and Information System to provide access to information under this section.

(B)(i) Any advance made to the Commission under subparagraph (A) shall be repaid, with interest, to the general fund of the Treasury not later than September 30, 1995.

(ii) Interest on any advance made to the Commission under subparagraph (A)—

(I) shall be at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, as of the close of the calendar month preceding the month in which the advance is made, to be equal to the current average market yield on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States with remaining periods to maturity comparable to the anticipated period during which the advance will be outstanding; and

(II) shall be compounded annually.

(3) A portion of amounts collected by the Commission under this section shall be retained and expended by the Commission for fiscal year 1992 and each subsequent fiscal year, without fiscal year limitation, to carry out this section and pay back the Secretary of the Treasury for the advance made available under paragraph (2).

(4) Except for the amounts retained by the Commission under paragraphs (3), fees collected under this section shall be deposited in the general fund of the Treasury as offsetting receipts.

(h) RESTRICTION.—No fee may be collected under this section after fiscal year 1995.

(i) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 2 of the Act of August 16, 1989 (46 App. U.S.C. 1111c), is repealed.

By Mr. FORD:

S. 2703. A bill to authorize the President to appoint Gen. Thomas C. Richards to the Office of Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

AUTHORIZING THE APPOINTMENT OF THE OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR OF THE FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, the administration has nominated Thomas C. Richards to be the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration [FAA]. The Federal Aviation Act requires that the FAA Administrator be a civilian. Since Mr. Richards is a retired general in the U.S. Air Force, he is not a civilian.

This legislation would permit an exception for Mr. Richards and would allow him to serve as Administrator while not affecting his status or rank as an officer on the retired list of the U.S. Air Force. The Dual Compensation Act will apply to Mr. Richards, which means that his military retirement pay will be reduced according to formula while he serves as Administrator.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy 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. 2703

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That notwithstanding the provisions of section 106 of title 49, United States Code, or any other provision of law, the President, acting by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, is authorized to appoint General Thomas C. Richards, United States Air Force, Retired, to the Office of Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration. General Richards appointment to, acceptance of, and service in that Office shall in no way affect the status, rank, and grade which he shall hold as an officer on the retired list of the United States Air Force, or any emolument, perquisite, right, privilege, or benefit incident to or arising out of any such status, office, rank, or grade, except to the extent that subchapter IV of chapter 55 of title 5, United States Code, affects the amount of retired pay to which he is entitled by law during his service as Administrator. So long as he serves as Administrator, General Richards shall receive the compensation of that Office at the rate which would be applicable if he were not an officer on the retired list of the United States Air Force, shall retain the status, rank, and grade which he now holds as an officer on the retired list of the United States Air Force, shall retain all emoluments, perquisites, rights, privileges, and benefits incident to or arising out of such status, office, rank, or grade, and shall in addition continue to receive the retired pay to which he is entitled by law, subject to the provisions of subchapter IV of chapter 55 of title 5, United States Code.

SEC. 2. In the performance of his duties as Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration, General Richards shall be subject to no supervision, control, restriction, or prohibition (military or otherwise) other than would be operative with respect to him if he were not an officer on the retired list of the United States Air Force.

SEC. 3. Nothing in this Act shall be construed as approval by the Congress of any fu-

ture appointments of military persons to the Office of Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration.

By Mr. BYRD (for himself, Mr. SIMON, Mr. BUMPERS, Mr. DIXON, Mr. BENTSEN, and Mr. SASSER):

S. 2704. A bill to prevent any foreign person from purchasing or otherwise acquiring the LTV Aerospace and Defense Co.; to the Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs.

PREVENTION OF ACQUISITION OF THE LTV AEROSPACE AND DEFENSE CO.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I am introducing legislation today to help retard the hemorrhaging of America's critical industrial base and to stop a most unwise transfer of our advanced missile and associated technologies to Europe and most probably to a variety of Third Countries. There are no precedents for a sale of the magnitude that has been proposed in the case of the LTV Corp., and this is one time that we ought to firmly say no go.

On April 10, Federal Bankruptcy Court Judge Burton R. Lifland approved the sale of LTV Corp.'s missile division to Thomson-CSF, the American subsidiary of Thomson-S.A., a French firm that is 58 percent owned by the French Government. The deal also included the sale of LTV's aircraft division to the Carlyle Group, a Washington investment banking firm. Lockheed and Martin Marietta had joined to bid on the missile and aircraft divisions, but could not match Thomson/Carlyle's $450 million offer. I am sure that the judge acted in what he saw as the best interest of LTV's creditors and shareholders by accepting the higher bid. However, the administration and the Congress now must examine this sale in the larger context of U.S. national security and we must act in the best interest of the Nation.

Before the sale to Thomson can be finalized, the deal will first be reviewed by the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States, CFIUS. The CFIUS is an interagency committee chaired by the Treasury Department, and its review process implements the Exon-Florio amendment to the Defense Production Act. The Exon-Florio amendment provides the President with the authority to prohibit the acquisition of a U.S. business by a foreign investor if the President believes such an acquisition will impair national security. Although Exon-Florio gives the President broad latitude to determine what constitutes a threat to national security, to date the administration has chosen to make little use of that authority. In nearly 4 years, CFIUS has extensively reviewed just 13 of 700 foreign acquisitions, and only one was blocked by the President.

I hope that the CFIUS review of this sale gives serious consideration to the effect that such a transaction will have on the U.S. industrial base during this period of diminished defense expenditures. But given the history of the CFIUS process, I am not encouraged and I am not prepared to wait idly while the deal is consummated and the French Government nationalizes our defense industry.

This deal, if approved, would set a dangerous precedent by allowing foreign governments, not just foreign firms but foreign governments, to compete with U.S. investors trying to buy ailing U.S. defense firms as that industry shrinks and consolidates. How can we expect any company or group of companies to marshal the resources necessary to outbid the French Government? Of equal concern is the ability of Thomson to tap into the French treasury to subsidize LTV in order to gain United States market share at the expense of United States producers. U.S. companies already face a difficult road in competing against subsidized European agricultural products and commercial aircraft. I cannot imagine why we would willingly subject our defense sector to this same unfair competition.

The proponents of this deal have pointed out that Thomson fully intends to maintain LTV's production facilities here in the United States, so no jobs will be lost, they say.

What they fail to mention is the strong possibility that Thomson could eventually and subtly shift LTV subcontract work from United States suppliers to French suppliers, resulting in jobs lost in the United States and the further erosion of our second and third tier subcontractor base.

So far, I have only mentioned the possible economic consequences of this sale. The more obvious problems concern the security of sensitive military technology. The CFIUS and we here in the Congress must consider the possibility that the French could gain access to sensitive technology and export it worldwide, possibly to countries hostile to the United States. According to an April 30, 1992, article in the Washington Post, Thomson has a recent history of selling military equipment to such countries as Libya and Iraq. Apparently, these transactions were perfectly legal under French law, but they highlight the kind of problem we would face if this deal goes through.

Of course, we also face the possibility that the United States and France might someday find themselves on opposite sides of an international crisis and we would then not have full control over one of our major domestic defense contractors. I am in no way suggesting that the French are not loyal allies, but it was only 6 years ago, in 1986, when the United States conducted a bombing raid on Libya and United States aircraft were forced to fly hundreds of miles out of their way because France refused to grant them overflight of its territory. We do have disputes with our friends, and I do not think it would be wise to give any country veto power over an important sector of our defense industry.

A final point to consider is that most of our allies, including the French, would never allow the reverse situation to occur. They would not allow the sale of a French defense firm to an American company, much less one that was owned by the American Government. This is yet another case where our economic competitors are more than willing to take advantage of our open markets while they remain committed to protecting their own critical industries.

As we consider this deal, we should ask ourselves two questions. First, will this sale adversely impact the U.S. industrial base? Second, is there a significant risk of loss of U.S. Government control over sensitive weapons technologies? I would answer both questions in the affirmative. Consequently, today I am introducing a bill that would stop this deal before it goes any further. There is no need to sell off our defense industry to foreign governments when willing and legitimate buyers exist here at home. I hope that the CFIUS process and the President come to the same conclusion, but if they do not, then I will work for the adoption of this legislation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators may have until the close of business today to add their names as cosponsors of this legislation. I send the bill to the desk for its appropriate referral.

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

By Mr. SEYMOUR:

S. 2705. A bill to establish the National Technology Agency; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

S. 2706. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax incentives to encourage the conversion of the defense industry to commercial endeavors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN FOR EMERGING TECHNOLOGY EMPOWERMENT

Mr. SEYMOUR. Mr. President, I rise this morning to introduce two bills critical to a strategy that I announced during the Easter recess in California. This strategy—called the comprehensive plan for emerging technology empowerment, or COMPETE—is designed to foster a series of market incentives to aid the transition of our economy from a Cold War to a post-cold war posture.

The first bill is the National Technology Agency Act of 1992 that combines three different technology research divisions of the Federal Government into one new agency with a director who reports to the President. Under this bill, these divisions—the National Institute of Science and Technology from the Department of Commerce,

portions of the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency, and the Office of Science and Technology Policy in the White House Office—would combine their existing budgets and staff into one unit. Their principle mission would center on the development of a coordinated research, development, and grant strategy to help defense companies devastated by budget cuts to enter new environmental and commercial product markets.

Our Federal research and development policy lacks focus and clear policy direction. The fragmentation of responsibility among three different agencies also leads to squabbling about authority instead of planning about economic development.

The National Technology Agency [NTA] Act would at least start to solve some of these problems by creating a consolidated Government organization with specific responsibilities and carefully defined powers. My bill permits the NTA to establish partnerships with different levels of Government, corporations, research laboratories, universities, and nonprofit firms that present feasible action plans to help America's highly specialized defense industries to become competitive in the economic markets of the future.

Toward this end, the legislation specifically authorizes the agency to expand the integration of military and commercial research efforts as well as actively participate in the fostering of improved manufacturing and environmental cleanup technologies.

Finally, the NTA could extend loan guarantees and cash grants to fulfill any of these mandates.

Why, Mr. President, do we need this legislation? The prospect of a long and deep economic transformation throughout America now confronts us in our new world. Indeed, the hard but overlooked fact is that the cold war with the Soviet Union—one that we neither wanted nor caused—sustained a critical part of our domestic economy.

During the years following World War II, national defense spending accounted for more than half of the Federal budget at its height and almost 25 percent of it by President Reagan's second term.

Over the same period of time, military outlays also consumed between 6 and 12 percent of our entire gross national product.

These big numbers translated into real prosperity for communities all over America. Until recently, the Defense Department kept 2 million men and women under arms and awarded billions of dollars in contract to industry each year. The total number of military-related American jobs in the second half of this century never went below 5 million and approached 10 million during the peak year of 1953.

But today, the numbers tell a different story. The fiscal year 1993 Defense budget that the President submitted to Congress represents the smallest percentage of Federal expenditures since the United States entered World War II.

Even without the help of Congress, the Bush administration has ended more than 100 separate weapons systems and has made plans to cut an additional 600,000 personnel from the Armed Forces and at least $50 billion from Defense Department accounts by 1995.

For my State of California, this trend has started to produce grim results. California has lost more than 60,000 aerospace and Defense industry jobs since 1986. A study recently finished by the Los Angeles County Economic Development Corp. warns that 210,000 more jobs could be lost in the southern part of the State alone over the next few years. Defense product expenditures in the Los Angeles area also fell from $6 billion in 1987 to $3.3 billion now.

We can understand that for every $8 lost in defense revenue, the State's revenue base will lose at least three times more than this amount.

The twin contractions of the Defense Department budget and the industrial network supporting it means that before the year 2000, well over 1 million jobs will disappear from the U.S. economy because no one foresees the national security need to rebuild our forces to the levels at which they existed before the demise of the Soviet Union.

These dislocations, with their profound effect on the ability of America to prosper in the post-Soviet world, require a constructive and coherent response from the Federal Government.

While we cannot engineer a new industrial policy controlled exclusively by Washington, Congress should devote some government resources to assist both the citizens in uniform and those from the defense industry who face the loss of their jobs because of the budget decisions imposed from Washington.

Furthermore, I agree with those who say that private sector-driven changes in management, production, and marketing techniques will ultimately determine the economic future of most defense companies. But a prudent investment in effective job retraining, promising high technologies, and sound environmental management efforts will permit our labor force to sustain the vitality of the American economic system.

Why does the Federal Government have a responsibility to make this investment? The answer revolves around the central role that defense-related high technologies can play in forging the future of our economy and our environment.

Last year, the President's Council on Competitiveness revealed that 75 percent of the technologies originally developed by the Nation's defense and aerospace sector remained vital to the trade competitiveness of the United States.

And during even these difficult times of market erosion, the aerospace industry accounts for 10 percent of all American sales to overseas customers—making it the country's No. 1 exporter.

We are not talking about short-term subsidies to cashiered colonels or displaced riveters.

Rather, we need a fresh and consistent policy to support these most promising forces of prosperity—the managers, researchers, workers, and exporters who during this time of victory over communism, made the greatest contribution to the restoration of America's national defense since Stalin's army drove into Berlin.

In addition, we cannot forget that limited Federal contributions to competitive high technology and environmental management initiatives will prevent the need for the noncompetitive expansion of welfare and toxic cleanup programs. Let us be aware that the total collapse of an industry so large and complex as defense will severely constrain our income tax base as well as the retail, housing, and construction trades.

And let us also be aware that the defense and aerospace sector has lifted some of America's most vulnerable and impoverished communities out of their despair. California's aerospace industry, for example, makes almost 30 percent of its supplier purchases from small and disadvantaged businesses and has a minority employment level of one-third.

For the sake of our export sectors, as well as the productivity of millions of Americans, a new Federal policy to aid the high technology transition of our economy today will avert the need for subsidies, clean-ups, and bailouts tomorrow. We face a choice: investments to improve our Nation's economy now or payments to manage our misery later.

We have both the knowledge and the ability to re-direct a number of flexible military technologies. Several universities and private companies in California, for example, have already begun work on using the expertise concentrated in the aerospace sector to improve our environment. California is the Nation's leading State in pioneering fuel cells, low-emission energy sources, and electric vehicles. We can also apply our understanding of how to safely destroy chemical and nuclear weapons to new methods for the equally safe disposal of commercial waste.

Furthermore, a private sector coalition from the Silicon Valley has launched a campaign to improve the marketing potential of the U.S. global positioning system. First developed by the Defense Department, GPS is a satellite navigation system that can track

and transmit information to farmers, fishermen, weathermen, and traffic planners. All of these programs, Mr. President, show that Americans have the know-how; we just need to enlarge and produce it.

A new National Technology Agency would devote itself fulltime to these critical goals. I therefore urge all of my colleagues to support this needed bill as the American economy struggles its way into the post-cold war era.

Finally, complimenting the COMPETE initiative is a package of tax breaks which will reward defense companies that convert their production lines to high-technology purposes. The incentives include an investment tax credit for the purchase of equipment or property which will allow conversion of defense technology to commercial application, incentives for the hiring of displaced workers and capital gains reductions for the creation of new small businesses.

By Mr. RIEGLE (for himself, Mr. GARN, Mr. DODD, Mr. KERRY, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. SMITH, Mr. STEVENS, and Mr. MOYNIHAN):

S. 2707. A bill to authorize the minting and issuance of coins in commemoration of the Year of the Vietnam Veteran and the 10th anniversary of the dedication of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

VIETNAM VETERANS COMMEMORATIVE COIN ACT

• Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. President, 1992, marks an important anniversary. America dedicated the Vietnam Veterans Memorial in Washington, DC, 10 years ago. The austere memorial wall honors the more than 58,000 Vietnam veterans who made the ultimate sacrifice for their country. Today, along with Senator GARN, the ranking member on the Senate Banking Committee, and Senators DODD, KERRY, SHELBY, SMITH, STEVENS, and MOYNIHAN, I am introducing legislation to authorize the minting and issuance of coins to commemorate the 10th anniversary of the dedication of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial.

More than 8 million Americans served in the United States Armed Forces during the conflict in Vietnam. Recovery from this divisive, distant war has been very difficult. Indeed, the Vietnam Veterans Memorial has been the focal point for the healing process for many Americans. It is, therefore, appropriate that we take this opportunity, one decade after the dedication of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial, to commemorate the service and commitment of Vietnam veterans.

By introducing the Vietnam Veterans Commemorative Coin Act, it is my intention to offer the Nation an opportunity to pay special tribute to veterans of the war in Indochina. The bill, however, will not only honor those whose names are enshrined on the Vietnam Veterans Memorial but will help to heal the wounds of those who survived the war.

In particular, this legislation creates a process to help veterans who are in need of assistance, at no cost to the U.S. Government. Profits from sale of the coins will be paid by the Secretary of the Treasury into the Vietnam veterans assistance fund. Proceeds from the sale of coins will be used to improve the health and well-being of Vietnam veterans. These programs will include assistance to veterans suffering from posttraumatic stress disorder and aid to homeless veterans. The Vietnam veterans assistance fund will also provide grants to continue research into the affects of agent orange and will be used to finance employment counseling and assistance to all veterans who served during a period of war. Finally, the Vietnam veterans assistance fund will be used to continue the process of honoring and recognizing the accomplishments and sacrifice of veterans of the Vietnam war and their families.

Mr. President, the 10th anniversary of the dedication of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial is an appropriate time to pay tribute to those veterans who did not return from Southeast Asia. At the same time, 1992 is a fitting time for America to recommit itself to acknowledging Vietnam veterans and assisting those in need. The Vietnam Veterans Commemorative Coin Act will accomplish both of these important goals. I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the bill be printed in the RECORD, at this point.

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

S. 2707

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 "Vietnam Veterans Commemorative Coin Act".

SEC. 2. CONGRESSIONAL FINDINGS.

The Congress finds that—

(1) in 1992, the people of the United States will observe the "Year of the Vietnam Veteran" and the 10th anniversary of the dedication of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial; and

(2) the minting and issuance of $1 silver coins commemorating the accomplishments of veterans who served during the Vietnam War is an appropriate method by which to observe those events.

SEC. 3. AUTHORIZATION.

(a) ISSUANCE.—The Secretary of the Treasury (hereafter referred to as the "Secretary") shall issue not more than 1,000,000 one dollar coins each of which shall—

(1) weigh 26.73 grams;

(2) have a diameter of 1.500 inches; and

(3) contain 90 percent silver and 10 percent copper.

(b) DESIGN.—The design of the coins issued under subsection (a) shall be emblematic of the heroic service of veterans who served during the Vietnam War. On each coin there shall be a designation of the value of the coin, an inscription of the year "1992", and inscriptions of the words "Liberty", "In God We Trust", "United States of America", and "E Pluribus Unum".

(c) NUMISMATIC ITEMS.—For purposes of section 5132(a)(1) of title 31, United States Code, the coins issued under subsection (a) shall be considered to be numismatic items.

(d) LEGAL TENDER.—The coins issued under subsection (a) shall be legal tender as provided in section 5103 of title 31, United States Code.

SEC. 4. SOURCES OF BULLION.

The Secretary shall obtain silver for the coins authorized under section 3 from stockpiles established under the Strategic and Critical Minerals Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98 et seq.).

SEC. 5. SELECTION OF DESIGN.

The design for each coin authorized under section 3 shall be selected by the Secretary after consultation with the Chairperson of the Vietnam Veterans of America Advisory Board and the Commission of Fine Arts.

SEC. 6. SALE OF COINS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the coins authorized under section 3 shall be sold by the Secretary at a price equal to the face value, plus the cost of designing and issuing such coins (including labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, and overhead expenses), and the surcharge provided for in subsection (d).

(b) BULK SALES.—The Secretary shall make bulk sales of the coins authorized under section 3 at a reasonable discount.

(c) PREPAID ORDERS.—The Secretary shall accept prepaid orders for the coins authorized under section 3 prior to the issuance of such coins. Sales under this subsection shall be at a reasonable discount to reflect the benefit of prepayment.

(d) SURCHARGES.—All sales of the coins authorized under section 3 shall include a surcharge of $7 per coin.

SEC. 7. ISSUANCE OF COINS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The coins authorized under section 3 may be issued in uncirculated and proof qualities, except that not more than 1 facility of the United States Mint may be used to strike any particular quality.

(b) COMMENCEMENT OF ISSUANCE.—The Secretary may issue the coins authorized under section 3 beginning on January 1, 1992.

(c) PERIOD OF AUTHORITY.—Coins authorized under section 3 may be minted beginning 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act and for a period of not more than 1 year thereafter.

SEC. 8. GENERAL WAIVER OF PROCUREMENT REGULATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (b), no provision of law governing procurement or public contracts shall be applicable to the procurement of goods or services required to carry out this Act.

(b) EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY.—Subsection (a) shall not relieve any person entering into a contract under the authority of this Act from complying with any law relating to equal employment opportunity.

SEC. 9. DISTRIBUTION OF SURCHARGES.

Subject to section 10, all surcharges received by the Secretary pursuant to section 6(d) shall be promptly paid by the Secretary to the Vietnam Veterans Assistance Fund for the purposes of—

(1) honoring and recognizing the accomplishments of veterans of the Vietnam War;

(2) educating the people of the United States regarding the accomplishments and

sacrifices of such veterans and their families;

(3) establishing programs for the purpose of improving the health and well-being of such veterans and their families, including programs to provide assistance to veterans suffering from post traumatic stress disorder and to veterans who are homeless;

(4) providing assistance to such veterans in qualifying for benefits under title 38, United States Code, and other benefits available under Federal law;

(5) providing grants to scientific and medical organizations to study the effects of and treatment for exposure to the chemical tetrachlorodibenzoparadioxin (commonly known as Agent Orange); and

(6) providing employment counseling and assistance to all veterans who served during a period of war.

SEC. 10. AUDITS.

(a) VIETNAM VETERANS ASSISTANCE FUND.—As a condition for receiving the proceeds of the surcharges pursuant to section 9, the Vietnam Veterans Assistance Fund shall allow the Comptroller General to examine such books, records, documents, and other data as may be related to the expenditure of such proceeds.

(b) GRANTS.—Any entity that receives a grant pursuant to section 9(5) shall allow the Comptroller General to examine such books, records, documents, and other data as may be related to the expenditure of any portion of such grant.

SEC. 11. COINAGE PROFIT FUND.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law—

(1) all amounts received from the sale of coins authorized under section 3 shall be deposited in the coinage profit fund;

(2) the Secretary shall pay the amounts authorized by section 9 from the coinage profit fund to the Vietnam Veterans Assistance Fund; and

(3) the Secretary shall charge the coinage profit fund with all expenditures under this Act.

SEC. 12. FINANCIAL ASSURANCES.

(a) NO NET COST TO THE GOVERNMENT.—The Secretary shall take all actions necessary to ensure that the issuance of the coins authorized under section 3 shall result in no net cost to the Federal Government.

(b) PAYMENT FOR COINS.—No coins authorized under section 3 shall be issued unless the Secretary has received—

(1) full payment therefore;

(2) security satisfactory to the Secretary to indemnify the United States for full payment; or

(3) a guarantee of full payment satisfactory to the Secretary from a depository institution the deposits of which are insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the National Credit Union Administration Board, or the Resolution Trust Corporation.•

By Mr. HATCH (by request):

S. 2708. A bill to improve enforcement of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, by adding certain provisions with respect to the auditing of employee benefit plans; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

IMPROVED ENFORCEMENT OF EMPLOYEE RETIREMENT INCOME SECURITY ACT

• Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, today I am introducing a bill on behalf of the administration to improve the auditing standards for employee benefit plans. The Secretary of Labor has written a letter outlining the effects of this bill and I ask unanimous consent that it be included in the RECORD. The text of the bill is accompanied by a section-by-section analysis and I ask that it also appear in the RECORD.

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

S. 2708

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

SECTION 1. REPEAL OF LIMITED SCOPE AUDIT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 103(a)(3)(C) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following sentence: "This subparagraph shall not apply to opinions required by subparagraph (A) for plan years beginning on or after January 1, 1992."

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall be effective upon enactment.

SEC. 2. PEER REVIEW REQUIREMENT FOR INDEPENDENT QUALIFIED PUBLIC ACCOUNTANTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 103(a)(3)(D) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"Notwithstanding clauses (i), (ii) and (iii), after December 31, 1994, a person shall not be considered a 'qualified public accountant' unless such person has undergone a peer review of the person's accounting and auditing practice with respect to employee benefit plans to believe that a violation of certain criminal laws may have occurred with respect to the plan shall report to the plan administrator and the Secretary.

(3) The Secretary shall issue regulations setting forth the criminal laws to which this subsection applies and the content, manner and time periods for such reporting.

(b)(1) The administrator of an employee benefit plan subject to this part shall—

(A) notify the Secretary in writing of the termination of an engagement for auditing services under section 103(a)(3)(A) within 7 days of such termination, giving the reasons for such termination, and

(B) furnish the accountant whose engagement was terminated with a copy of the report to the Secretary within fourteen days of the termination.

(2) If the accountant referred to in paragraph (1)(B) has not received a copy of the administrator's report to the Secretary as required under paragraph (1)(B), or if the accountant disagrees with the reasons given in the report for termination of the engagement, the accountant shall notify the Secretary in writing of the termination, giving the reasons for the termination, within 3 days after the expiration of the period described in paragraph (1)(B)."

(b) Section 502 of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, as amended, is amended:

(1) by inserting at the end of subsection (c) the following new paragraph:

"(4) The Secretary may assess a civil penalty of up to $100,000 against any administrator or accountant who fails to provide the Secretary with any notification required under section 111."; and

(2) by deleting in subsection (a)(6) "subsection (c)(2) or (i) or (1)" and inserting in lieu thereof "paragraph (2), (3) or (4) of subsection (c), or subsection (i) or (1) of this section".

(c) Section 514(d) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, as amended, is amended by deleting "111" and inserting in lieu thereof "112".

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall be effective upon enactment.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
Washington, DC, May 12, 1992.

Hon. DAN QUAYLE,
President, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Enclosed for the consideration of the Congress is a draft bill relating to the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (ERISA), as amended, and a section-by-section analysis. The bill would add certain provisions to ERISA with respect to the auditing of employee benefit plans. These changes would have the following effects:

Repeal the limited scope exemption for certain plan audits, encouraging employee benefit plans and financial institutions to utilize a "single audit" approach instead.

Require that Independent Public Accountants conducting required ERISA audits obtain a peer review every three years to remain qualified to perform such audits.

Require plan auditors and administrators, who have reason to believe that violations of certain criminal laws may have occurred with respect to the plan, to report certain information as designated by the Secretary of Labor in regulations, subject to a civil penalty of up to $100,000 and criminal penalties.

Require more timely notification to the Secretary of any termination of an accountant from an auditing engagement, subject to civil and criminal penalties outlined above.

I believe these changes would significantly enhance the ability of the Federal Government to protect the assets of employee benefit plans, as well as enhance the security of participants and beneficiaries. I urge the Congress to give the draft bill prompt and favorable consideration.

The Office of Management and Budget advises that there is no objection to the submission of this proposal from the standpoint of the President's program.

Sincerely,

LYNN MARTIN,
Secretary of Labor.

SECTION-BY-SECTION SUMMARY: PROPOSED LEGISLATION TO ADD CERTAIN PROVISIONS WITH RESPECT TO THE AUDITING OF EMPLOYEE BENEFIT PLANS

SECTION 1: REPEAL OF LIMITED SCOPE AUDIT

Current law

Section 103(a)(3)(A) of ERISA requires the administrator of each ERISA-covered plan to engage an independent public accountant to conduct an audit of the financial statements and of certain required schedules contained in the annual report to determine whether the financial statements are prepared and presented in accordance with Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP). Section 103(a)(3)(C) contains the so-called "limited scope exemption" which allows the exclusion of assets which are held by regulated financial institutions (e.g., banks, insurance companies or similar entities) from the scope of the required financial audit.

Description of provision

Section 1 amends ERISA section 103(a)(3)(C) by adding a sunset provision to effectively repeal the limited scope exemption for plan years beginning on or after January 1, 1992.

The provision, by eliminating the statutory scope limitation, would require inclu-

sion of plan assets which are held by regulated financial institutions within the accountant's audit of the plan. This requirement does not necessarily require that the plan's accountant duplicate the work of the independent accountant who audits the financial institution's books and records. The committee expects that, generally, the plan's accountant will encourage the use of the preferable "single audit approach". Under this approach, affected banks and other institutions would instruct their independent auditors to prepare a special report that, in essence, would speak to the reliability of information generated by the bank and other institutions with respect to their actions with respect to plan assets. This would fulfill the purposes of the audit requirement without imposing the additional cost of independently reviewing the financial institution's records.

SECTION 2: PEER REVIEW REQUIREMENT FOR INDEPENDENT QUALIFIED PUBLIC ACCOUNTANTS

Current law

There is no peer review requirement for independent qualified public accountants under current law.

ERISA requires that certain plans obtain audits of the financial statements included in their annual reports. This audit is required to be conducted by a "qualified public accountant" as defined by section 103(a)(3)(D). The definition incorporates public accountants certified or licensed by a regulatory authority of a State or certified by the Secretary of Labor. The definition contained in the statute qualifies accountants solely on the basis of licensing or certification. Accountants in many states need not participate in continuing education programs to assure the quality of their work remains sufficient to be licensed or that they are qualified to conduct employee benefit plan audits.

Description of provision

Section 2 amends ERISA section 103(a)(3)(D) to include in the definition of an independent qualified public accountant a requirement to have participated in a peer review of the accountant's accounting and auditing practice with respect to employee benefit plans within the three-year period prior to engagement to conduct an audit. The requirement is effective January 1, 1995, creating a three-year transition period which provides an opportunity for the completion of initial peer reviews, to be conducted by recognized auditing standard-setting bodies.

SECTION 3: REQUIREMENTS WITH RESPECT TO THE REPORTING OF CERTAIN EVENTS

Current law

Under current law, there is no specific duty for an administrator of an employee benefit plan, or an accountant who conducts a plan audit, to report certain information, such as information indicating that a crime involving a plan may have occurred. If a crime also constitutes a prohibited transaction which is not exempt under ERISA, it must be disclosed on the plan's annual report to the Secretary. Termination of an accountant from an auditing engagement is reportable when the plan's annual report is filed with the Secretary.

Description of provision

Reporting of certain information.—Section 3 amends ERISA by adding a new section 111, which would require the administrator of an employee benefit plan to report to the Secretary of Labor whenever the administrator has reason to believe that a violation of certain criminal laws may have occurred with respect to the plan. The administrator would also be required to furnish a copy of such report to the accountant engaged to audit the plan's financial statements. Similarly, the accountant would be required to report to the Secretary and to the plan administrator when, in connection with an auditing engagement, the accountant has reason to believe that a violation of certain criminal laws may have occurred with respect to the plan. The section would direct the Secretary to issue regulations determining the criminal laws to which these reporting requirements apply, as well as the content, manner and time periods for such reporting.

Section 3 also amends ERISA section 502 to provide a civil penalty of up to $100,000 against any plan administrator or accountant who violates any requirement to report information related to criminal violations. Noncompliance with the new reporting requirements could also subject plan administrators and accountants to criminal penalties under section 501 of ERISA. Because a willful violation of the provisions may result in criminal prosecution, it is expected that the Secretary of Labor will consult with the Department of Justice in drafting the regulations.

Reporting of Auditor Termination.—Section 3 amends ERISA to require an administrator of an employee benefit plan to notify the Secretary of any termination of an accountant from an auditing engagement within seven days, stating the reason for such termination. The administrator would be required to furnish the accountant with a copy of the report to the Secretary within fourteen days. An accountant who does not receive a timely copy of the administrator's report to the Secretary or who disagrees with the stated reason for the termination, would be required to file a report with the Secretary within three days, subject to the civil and criminal penalties outlined above.•

By Mr. DOMENICI:

S. 2709. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on rifabutin (dosage form); to the Committee on Finance.

TEMPORARY SUSPENSION OF DUTY ON RIFABUTIN

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I am pleased to introduce legislation that will provide a temporary duty suspension for Rifabutin in dosage form.

Rifabutin is a product used in the treatment of AIDS patients to prevent or delay the onset of the life-threatening infection mycobacterium avium complex [MAC]. MAC is believed to be a major cause of the wasting syndrome suffered by AIDS patients. Individuals with the MAC infection experience chronic, debilitating symptoms affecting many parts of the body. Fever, weight loss, fatigue and gastrointestinal problems are common and, frequently, fatal.

While Rifabutin awaits FDA approval of a pending new drug application, AIDS patients will have access to it through a recently approved FDA designation as an investigational new drug [IND] during this pre-approval period.

Rifabutin is produced by a single Italian company worldwide. Once imported into the United States, the product will be bottled, packaged and distributed by Adria Laboratories, a major US manufacturer of oncological and immunological products. Actual work will be accomplished in Adria's New Mexico facility, Adria S.P. Inc. located in Albuquerque.

Under current law, Rifabutin would be subject to a 3.7 percent duty rate. My bill will facilitate the distribution of this potentially important AIDS treatment in the United States and help to hold down its costs by granting a temporary duty suspension.

I hope that the Senate will consider this measure on an expeditious basis.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of this bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 2709

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

SECTION 1. RIFABUTIN (DOSAGE FORM).

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter II of chapter 99 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States is amended by inserting in numerical sequence the following new heading:

"9902.31.12 (Rifabutin-dosage form) (CAS No. 72559-06-9) (provided for in subheading 3004.20.00)	Free	No change	No change	On or before 12/31/94".

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption, on or after the 15th day after the date of the enactment of this Act.

By Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. THURMOND):

S. 2710. A bill to provide for improvement of the health care system under chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code, for members and former members of the uniformed services and their dependents and survivors; to the Committee on Armed Services.

MILITARY HEALTH CARE REFORM ACT

• Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce legislation critical to meeting the health needs of active duty personnel, dependents, retirees and survivors during a time when we are changing the base and force structure of our Nation's military.

With the modifications being planned and already underway for our Nation's military force and base structure, there has been a great deal of focus on the economic and strategic implications. One area, however, that has not received much attention is the impact these changes are going to have on the ability of active duty personnel, dependents and retirees, to gain access to the health care services they need. The legislation I am introducing today, the Military Health Reform Act of 1992, is designed to address these issues.

Certainly, it is critical that Congress focus on the medical readiness issues, but we cannot ignore the health care coverage needs for active duty person-

nel, dependents, retirees and survivors. And, it is these issues that become perhaps most critical with the changes that are taking place in the force and base structure of our Nation's military.

I believe the future is going to test the very fabric of our Nation's military medical system, particularly with the changing makeup of our Nation's military base structure.

Over the past few months, I have been meeting with many military family members, veterans and military retirees in Arizona and I am constantly impressed with the concern they have for maintaining a strong national defense in the post-cold-war era. At the same time, in every meeting, I have encountered men and women who have problems with every aspect of the military medical care system—with long waiting periods, with paperwork, with access to the right kind of care, with access to needed pharmaceutical drugs, and with the uncertainties surrounding the system in an era of force reductions and base closings, I have heard these concerns expressed in Phoenix, in Tucson, in Yuma, in Sierra Vista, and in every meeting I have had.

People like Tony Valenzuela, the Arizona State Commander of the American Legion, come to mind. He recently expressed his grave concern to me regarding those retirees and dependents who live around Williams Air Force Base and will not be able to use the military treatment facility at the Williams Air Force Base because it will close, with the base, as early as June 1, 1993.

Another fine American, Colonel Charlie Fisher of the Sun City Chapter of the Retired Officers Association, has brought to my attention that well over half of the retirees at Sun City, AZ, are already over 65 years of age. His concerns and mine are that retirees already fall at the end of a long priority list for medical care at military treatment facilities, which is already overtaxed and in most cases understaffed. This problem, especially in Arizona, is exacerbated when, during the beautiful fall and winter months, a large influx of retirees who come to Arizona further stress a system that is already overtaxed. Currently, no other option exists to handle this type of situation. I know that my distinguished colleagues have heard the same concerns in their States as well.

There is a great deal of concern among military retirees in the East Valley of Arizona about the closure of Williams Air Force Base and the loss of the hospital currently located on the base. I know I do not have to tell my distinguished colleagues in this body of the impact this will have on both the quantity and quality of health care available to that population, especially those who retired some time ago and those of lower rank. Medical costs, even with CHAMPUS or other programs, would be prohibitive to many. Additionally, for those over 65 years of age, their only alternative is Medicare.

Another issue that constantly surfaces as I talk with military families, veterans, and retirees is timely and nearby access to care. This is particularly highlighted around a closing base like Williams Air Force Base, and from groups like the East Valley Military Retiree Association. Even though there is an excellent working example of managed care in the area, called Medexcel, this is little solace to the family that will not have immediate access to a military treatment facility, or the 65 year old retiree who must now enroll in Medicare with no option for medical treatment in a military treatment facility. This legislative proposal, which I am introducing today, addresses these issues.

In addition, an issue I have heard expressed at every meeting in my State is a concern about continued access to pharmaceuticals. Most career service members have become accustomed to receiving as an earned benefit the use of the pharmacy at military treatment facilities. When that privilege goes away because of either a base closure such as Williams or when a retiree turns 65 years of age and then is required to enroll in Medicare, then he or she has no other alternative. This legislation bridges this problem with an alternative proposal of a mail order pharmacy targeted especially at this group.

Mr. President, grappling with these issues presents great challenges and I believe demands our immediate attention. It is imperative that as our force and base structure changes we stay fixated on not only the rising cost of health care, but take steps to retain the health care coverage so critical to our Nation's active duty personnel, their dependents, retirees and survivors. While the world situation necessitates a modified force and base structure strategy, it should not carry with it an abandonment of the responsibility we have to assist those who have served our country to obtain access to the health care services they need.

I would like to take a minute to describe the major features of this legislation, the Military Health Reform Act of 1992.

First, it would require the Department of Defense to solicit input from the active dependents, retirees and their survivors who will be affected by the closure of a base that houses the military treatment facility at which they receive their health care. In addition, it would require the current joint services working group that is looking at the issue of health care in noncatchment areas to include a representative of the military dependent and retiree organizations.

Second, it would require that a mail-order pharmacy service be established for members of the military community—active duty members and their dependents, retirees, and survivors. There would be a 20 percent beneficiary copayment, and the beneficiary would be responsible for the cost of the mailing and cutomary processing fee. Those over the age of 65 who are losing access to their local military treatment facility would be eligible for participation.

Third, it would require the Department of Defense to conduct an annual formal satisfaction survey of those utilizing the military medical system.

Fourth, it would lower the existing catastrophic cap for retirees and their dependents from $10,000 to $7500.

Fifth, it would eliminate the benefits-less-benefits approach to providing the disabled with continued CHAMPUS protection, thus restoring the provision to the original intent of the Senate. In addition, it will prohibit the Department from arbitrarily redefining an individual's eligibility for benefits, after they have received benefits and then forcing the beneficiary and his or her dependents to reimburse the Department for the value of the benefits that had been provided. I find it unconscionable that the Department is driving families to bankruptcy around this country as a result of its own mistake.

Sixth, it would create a demonstration project to have Medicare pay the Department of Defense for some procedures within a military treatment facility, and at 85 percent of what would be paid to a private sector provider for the same procedure.

Seventh, it would create a demonstration project to track the current Medicare managed care risk contract.

Eighth, it would add to last year's comprehensive health reform study, defined in the DOD authorization bill, a provision requiring that the Federal Employee Health Benefits Program be studied to determine whether designing a similar program for military dependents and retirees would be cost effective and provide for the health coverage needs of dependents and retirees, including those over age 65.

In addition, it would add a provision regarding the concept of a centralized, national claims processing operation for the Department of Defense.

Ninth, it would require the Department of Defense to make a number of modifications to the Coordinated Care Program. Principal among these changes is an elimination of the rule that would deny those who elect not to enroll in the Coordinated Care Program from using military treatment facilities, except for emergencies and pharmacy services. And, it would limit the areas where the Department could test this new program.

Tenth, it would extend the life of the current CHAMPUS reform initiative demonstration in California and Hawaii, and require that the contract be submitted to a competitive process.

And, last, it would require the Department to continue to test a broad array of military health reform options for the next 4 years. This should include, but not be limited to, the Department of Defense's CHAMPUS reform initiative, CHAMPUS, catchment area management and the Coordinated Care Program.

Mr. President, I believe we need to take care not to abandon the health care coverage needs of our nation's active duty, dependents, retirees and survivors, as we work to redefine the force and base structure for our Nation's military. The legislation I am introducing today, which has the endorsement of the military coalition, takes a serious step forward in addressing these needs. And, I am pleased to be joined in the introduction of this legislation by my distinguished colleague from South Carolina, Senator STROM THURMOND. I look forward to working with him and all of my colleagues on and off the committee to see to it that this legislation gets enacted this year.

I hope that all of our colleagues will study this legislation and join Senator THURMOND and I in cosponsoring this legislation.

I ask unanimous consent that letters from members of the military coalition regarding this legislation be printed in the RECORD.

I also ask unanimous consent that the full text of this legislation be printed in the RECORD following this statement.

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

S. 2710

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 "Military Health Care Reform Act of 1992".

SEC. 2. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING HEALTH CARE POLICY FOR THE UNIFORMED SERVICES.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) members and former members of the uniformed services, and their dependents and survivors, should have access to health care under the health care delivery system of the uniformed services regardless of the age or health care status of the person seeking the health care;

(2) such health care delivery system should include a comprehensive managed care plan;

(3) the comprehensive managed care plan should involve medical personnel of the uniformed services (including reserve component personnel), civilian health care professionals of the executive agency of such uniformed services, medical treatment facilities of the uniformed services, contract health care personnel, and the medicare system;

(4) the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, and the Secretary of Transportation should continue to provide active duty personnel of the uniformed services with free care in medical treatment facilities of the uniformed services and to provide the other personnel referred to in paragraph (1) with health care at minimal cost to the recipients of the care; and

(5) the Secretaries referred to in paragraph (4) should offer additional health care options to the personnel referred to in paragraph (1) including, in the case of persons eligible for medicare under title XVIII of the Social Security Act, options providing for—

(A) the reimbursement of the Department of Defense by the Secretary of Health and Human Services for health care services provided such personnel at medical treatment facilities of the Department of Defense; and

(B) the sharing of the payment of the costs of contract health care by the Department of Defense and the Department of Health and Human Services, with one such department being the primary payer of such costs and the other such department being the secondary payer of such costs.

SEC. 3. MILITARY HEALTH CARE FOR PERSONS RELIANT ON HEALTH CARE FACILITIES AT BASES BEING CLOSED AND REALIGNED.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary of Defense shall establish a joint services working group on the provision of military health care to persons who rely for health care on health care facilities at military installations being closed or realigned.

(b) MEMBERSHIP.—The members of the working group shall include the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Health Affairs, the Surgeon General of the Army, the Surgeon General of the Navy, the Surgeon General of the Air Force, and one independent member appointed by the President from among private citizens whose interest in matters within the responsibility of the working group qualify that person to represent all personnel entitled to health care under chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code.

(c) DUTIES.—(1) In the case of each closure or realignment of a military installation that will adversely affect the accessibility of health care in a facility of the uniformed services for persons entitled to such health care under chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code, the working group shall solicit the views of such persons regarding suitable substitutes for the furnishing of health care to those persons under that chapter.

(2) In carrying out paragraph (1), the working group—

(A) shall conduct meetings with persons referred to in that paragraph, or representatives of such persons;

(B) may use reliable sampling techniques;

(C) shall visit the areas where closures and realignments of military installations will adversely affect the accessibility of health care in a facility of the uniformed services for persons referred to in paragraph (1) and shall conduct public meetings; and

(D) shall ensure that members of the uniformed services on active duty, members and former members of the uniformed services entitled to retired or retainer pay, and dependents and survivors of such members and retired personnel are afforded the opportunity to express views.

(d) RECOMMENDATIONS.—With respect to each closure and realignment of a military installation referred to in subsection (c), the working group shall submit to the Congress and the Secretary of Defense the working group's recommendations regarding the alternative means for continuing to provide accessible health care under chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code, to persons referred to in that subsection.

SEC. 4. MAIL ORDER PHARMACEUTICALS.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF MAIL-ORDER SYSTEM.—The administering Secretaries shall—

(1) provide in regulations a system for persons entitled to health care under chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code, to obtain prescription pharmaceuticals from mail-order suppliers in connection with care furnished under that chapter; and

(2) enter into one or more contracts for the supply of prescription pharmaceuticals under the mail-order system.

(b) PURCHASE ON A COPAYMENT BASIS.—(1) The administering Secretary concerned shall pay 80 percent of an eligible person's cost of pharmaceuticals referred to in paragraph (2) that are obtained by that person under the mail-order system, other than mailing costs and processing fees.

(2) The pharmaceuticals for which payment may be made under paragraph (1) are generic pharmaceuticals, except that payment may be made for—

(A) a name-brand pharmaceutical for which a generic substitute does not exist; and

(B) a pharmaceutical for which there is no medically acceptable generic substitute.

(c) ELIGIBLE PERSONS.—A person is eligible for the copayment purchase of pharmaceuticals pursuant to subsection (b) if the person is a person referred to in subsection (a) and—

(1) is under 65 years of age; or

(2) is 65 years of age or older and within 18 months before the closure of a health care facility of a uniformed service in connection with the closure or realignment of an installation of a uniformed service obtained prescription pharmaceuticals at that facility.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the terms "uniformed services" and "administering Secretaries" have the meanings given those terms in section 1072 of title 10, United States Code.

SEC. 5. ANNUAL BENEFICIARY SURVEY.

The administering Secretaries referred to in section 1072 of title 10, United States Code, shall conduct annually a formal survey of persons receiving health care under chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code, in order to determine the level of satisfaction of such persons with the health care system provided for under that chapter.

SEC. 6. MAXIMUM ANNUAL AMOUNT FOR DEDUCTIBLES AND COPAYMENTS.

(a) REDUCED MAXIMUM ANNUAL AMOUNT.—Section 1086(b)(4) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking out "$10,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$7,500".

(b) APPLICABILITY AFTER FISCAL YEAR 1992.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to fiscal years beginning after September 30, 1992.

SEC. 7. CHAMPUS COVERAGE FOR DISABLED MEDICARE PARTICIPANTS.

(a) RESTORATION OF PRIOR LAW.—(1) Section 1086 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking out subsection (d) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(d) The provisions of section 1097(j) of this title shall apply to a plan covered by this section.".

(2) Such section is further amended—

(A) in subsection (c)—

(i) by striking out "Except as provided in subsection (d), the following" and inserting in lieu thereof "The following"; and

(ii) by inserting below paragraph (3), flush to the left margin, the following:

"However, a person who is entitled to hospital insurance benefits under part A of title XVIII of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395c et seq.) is not eligible for health benefits under this section."; and

(B) in subsection (g), by striking out "Section 1097(j) of this title shall apply to a plan

contracted for under this section, except that" and inserting in lieu thereof "Notwithstanding subsection (d) or any other provision of this chapter,".

(3) Section 1713(d) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out "section 1086(d)(1)" and inserting in lieu thereof "the second sentence of section 1086(c)".

(b) APPLICATION OF AMENDMENTS.—Subsection (d) of section 1086 of title 10, United States Code, as amended by this section, shall apply with respect to health care benefits or services received by a person described in such subsection on or after October 1, 1992.

SEC. 8. COVERAGE FOR END-STAGE RENAL DISEASE.

(a) Section 1086 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(i) In addition to the types of benefits authorized by section 1079 of this title to be provided under this section, health benefits shall be provided under this section for end-stage renal disease.".

SEC. 9. RECOUPMENT OF COSTS FOR CHAMPUS CARE FURNISHED PERSONS NOT ELIGIBLE FOR SUCH CARE.

Section 1086 of title 10, United States Code, as amended by section 7, is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(j) The administering Secretaries may not recoup any cost of the health care furnished under this section to a person who was erroneously determined to be eligible to receive that care. The prohibition in the preceding sentence does not apply in the case of an error that was based on a misrepresentation of a material fact.".

SEC. 10. MEDICARE REIMBURSEMENT TO DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.

(a) DEMONSTRATION PROJECT REQUIRED.—The Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall jointly conduct a demonstration project that provides for the Secretary of Health and Human Services to reimburse the Department of Defense for health care services furnished to medicare-eligible persons at a health care facility of the Department of Defense under chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code.

(b) REIMBURSEMENT AMOUNT.—The amount of the reimbursement paid under the demonstration project for any item or service provided at a health care facility of the Department of Defense may not exceed 85 percent of the amount of the reimbursement that would be paid to a provider of services for the applicable diagnosis-related group under title XVIII of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395c et seq.).

(c) SOURCE OF REIMBURSEMENT PAYMENTS.—Payments under the demonstration project shall be made out of the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund.

(d) PROJECT REQUIREMENTS.—(1) The demonstration project shall be conducted for a period of 4 years.

(2) At least 3, and not more than 7, health care facilities referred to in subsection (a) shall participate in the demonstration project.

(e) USE OF REIMBURSEMENTS.—The amounts paid to the Department of Defense under the demonstration project for health care services furnished at a health care facility of the department shall be available to the commander of that facility for the fiscal year in which the reimbursement is received and the following fiscal year. Such amounts shall be available for—

(1) furnishing health care services at that facility;

(2) expanding the amount and types of health care services furnished at that facility; and

(3) improving the efficiency of the use of space at that facility.

(f) REPORT.—(1) The Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall provide by contract for a person outside the Federal Government to evaluate the results of the demonstration project.

(2) Not later than 1 year before the termination of the demonstration project, the person performing the evaluation required by paragraph (1) shall submit to Congress a report on the results of the project. The report shall contain—

(A) a discussion of the results of the projects;

(B) the person's conclusions regarding the advisability of providing for permanent implementation of a reimbursement procedure for health care services furnished at a health care facility of the Department of Defense similar to the procedure tested under the demonstration project; and

(C) any recommendations for legislation that the person considers appropriate.

(g) DEFINITION.—In this section:

(1) The term "medicare-eligible person" means a person who is eligible for benefits under part A of title XVIII of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395c et seq.).

(2) The term "provider of services" has the meaning given that term in section 1079(j)(2) of title 10, United States Code.

SEC. 11. RISK-SHARING CONTRACT DEMONSTRATION PROJECT.

(a) DEMONSTRATION PROJECT REQUIRED.—The Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall jointly conduct a demonstration project under which the Secretary of Defense enters into risk-sharing contracts with eligible organizations described in section 1876 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395mm) to furnish health care services to eligible persons.

(b) RISK-SHARING CONTRACTS.—To the maximum extent practicable (as determined by the Secretary of Defense), the provisions of section 1876 of the Social Security Act shall apply with respect to risk-sharing contracts under the demonstration project.

(c) CONTRACT PAYMENTS.—(1) Under contracts entered into under the demonstration project, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall pay eligible organizations for health care services furnished to eligible persons under contracts entered into under the demonstration project. The amount paid for such services in the case of an eligible person may not exceed the per capita rate of payment that the Secretary pays for a relevant class of persons receiving health care services under a risk-sharing contract entered into under section 1876 of the Social Security Act.

(2) Payments under the demonstration project shall be made out of the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund.

(d) OTHER PROJECT REQUIREMENTS.—(1) The demonstration project shall be conducted for a period of 5 years.

(2) The demonstration project shall be conducted in at least 2 areas where health care facilities of the uniformed services are being closed in connection with closures or realignments of military installations.

(e) REPORT.—(1) The Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall provide by contract for a person outside the Federal Government to evaluate the results of the demonstration project.

(2) Not later than 1 year before the termination of the demonstration project, the person performing the evaluation required by paragraph (1) shall submit to Congress a report on the results of the project. The report shall contain—

(A) the person's conclusions regarding the effectiveness of using the medicare model of risk-sharing contracts for providing health care services to eligible persons; and

(B) any recommendations for legislation that the person considers appropriate.

(f) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term "eligible person" means a person who is entitled to health care in a facility of a uniformed service under section 1074(b) or 1076(b) of title 10, United States Code.

SEC. 12. COMPREHENSIVE STUDY OF THE MILITARY MEDICAL CARE SYSTEM.

Section 733 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 1992 and 1993 (10 U.S.C. 1071 note) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b), by inserting after paragraph (2) the following new paragraphs:

"(3) A comprehensive review of the Federal employees health benefits program under chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code, in order to determine whether furnishing health care under a similar program to persons entitled to health care under chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code, would result in the effective provision of health care to such persons and would be cost effective.

"(4) A review of the system of the Department of Defense for processing claims relating to the furnishing of health care under chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code.";

(2) in subsection (d)—

(A) by redesignating paragraph (12) as paragraph (13); and

(B) by inserting after paragraph (11) the following new paragraph (12):

"(12) A discussion of the results of the review under subsection (b)(3) and the Secretary's recommendations of the basis of those results."; and

(3) in subsection (e)—

(A) by redesignating paragraph (5) as paragraph (6); and

(B) by inserting after paragraph (4) the following new paragraph (5):

"(5) A discussion of the results of the review under subsection (b)(4), a proposal for establishing a national system for the processing of claims referred to in such subsection, and a discussion of the administrative problems, if any, of establishing such a system, the estimated cost savings to be derived from the implementation of such a system, and the benefits expected to be derived under such a system by persons receiving such health care.".

SEC. 13. ALTERNATIVE HEALTH CARE DELIVERY METHODOLOGIES.

(a) CONTINUATION OF HEALTH CARE REFORM INITIATIVES.—(1) During fiscal years 1993 through 1996, the Secretary of Defense shall continue to test a broad array of reform options for furnishing health care to persons who are eligible to receive health care under chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code.

(2) The health care reform options tested in accordance with paragraph (1) shall include CHAMPUS alternatives, the CHAMPUS Reform Initiative, catchment area management, coordinated care, and such other options as the Secretary of Defense considers appropriate.

(3) During fiscal year 1994, the Secretary shall conduct a study of the health care reform options tested as described in paragraph (1). The study shall compare the cost effectiveness of such options and the extent to which the persons who received health

care under those options are satisfied with that health care. The Secretary shall report the results of the study to Congress.

(b) COORDINATED CARE MANAGEMENT INITIATIVE.—(1) The Secretary of Defense may not limit the eligibility of any member or former member of the Armed Forces, or any dependent or survivor of such personnel, to receive health care under chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code, on the basis of an election by such member or former member not to participate in the Coordinated Care Management Initiative of the Department of Defense.

(2) The Secretary may carry out the Coordinated Care Management Initiative at not more than 5 locations. All locations shall be in the United States. No State may be within the area of program coverage for more than 3 such locations. The area covered at a location may not include more than one State. No military installation may be within the area of program coverage for more than 3 such locations.

(3) The Secretary shall allocate to the Coordinated Care Management Initiative a sufficient amount of the appropriations made available to the Department of Defense for the furnishing of health care under chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code, to ensure meaningful results from the initiative.

(4) The goals established for the Coordinated Care Management Initiative shall include the following:

(A) A reduction in the administrative paperwork associated with the furnishing of health care.

(B) A reduction in the average period that dependents must wait for health care.

(5) Any study of the effectiveness of the Coordinated Care Management Initiative shall include an evaluation of the extent to which the initiative achieved the goals set forth in paragraph (4).

(c) CONTINUATION OF CHAMPUS REFORM INITIATIVE IN HAWAII AND CALIFORNIA.—(1) The Secretary of Defense shall ensure that a replacement or successor contract for the CHAMPUS Reform Initiative contract applicable to California and Hawaii is awarded in sufficient time for the contractor to begin to provide health care in California and Hawaii under the replacement or successor contract not later than August 1, 1993.

(2) The Secretary shall use competitive procedures for awarding a replacement or successor contract under paragraph (1).

(3)(A) Not later than June 1, 1994, the Secretary of Defense shall provide by contract for a person outside the Federal Government to perform a evaluation of the conduct of the CHAMPUS Reform Initiative in Hawaii and California. The evaluation shall cover each of the fiscal years during which the initiative is carried out in such States under the replacement or successor contract referred to in paragraph (1) and under the predecessor contracts. The evaluation shall include a comparison of the cost savings and claims experience resulting in each such fiscal year from carrying out the initiative in such States.

(B) Not later than 1 year after the date on which the contract for evaluation is entered into under subparagraph (A), the person making the evaluation shall submit to the Secretary of Defense and to Congress a report on the results of the evaluation.

(d) LIMITATION RELATING TO A CERTAIN CHAMPUS REFORM INITIATIVE CONTRACT.—(1) No health care services may be provided under CHAMPUS Reform Initiative contract number MDA903-R-0047 (including any extension of such contract) unless—

(A) the prime contractor under such contract is the contractor that was the prime contractor under such contract on January 1, 1992; and

(B) the subcontractors under such contract include each of the subcontractors who were subcontractors under that contract on that date.

(2) The limitation in paragraph (1) does not apply with respect to a contractor or subcontractor that is determined by the Secretary of Defense to have engaged in fraud or malfeasance in connection with the contract referred to in paragraph (1).

(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term "CHAMPUS" shall have the meaning given that term in section 1072(4) of title 10, United States Code.

(2) The term "CHAMPUS Reform Initiative" shall have the meaning given that term in section 702(d)(1) of the Department of Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1987 (10 U.S.C. 1073 note).

(3) The term "catchment area management" means the methodology provided for demonstration in accordance with section 731 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 1988 and 1989 (10 U.S.C. 1092 note).

SEC. 14. MEDICAL AND DENTAL CARE FOR CERTAIN INCAPACITATED DEPENDENTS.

(a) EXCLUSION OF CERTAIN INCAPACITATED DEPENDENTS FROM CHAMPUS COVERAGE.—Section 1086(c) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by inserting "and 1072(2)(I)" after "section 1072(2)(E)"; and

(2) in paragraph (2), by inserting "or 1072(2)(I)" after "section 1072(E)".

(b) APPLICABILITY OF EXCLUSION.—Section 1072(2) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking out subparagraph (D) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(D) an unmarried legitimate child, including an adopted child or stepchild, who—

"(i) has not passed his twenty-first birthday;

"(ii) has not passed his twenty-third birthday, is enrolled in a full-time course of study at an institution of higher learning approved by the administering Secretary and is, or was at the time of the member's or former member's death, in fact dependent on him for over one-half of his support; or

"(iii) is incapable of self-support because of a mental or physical incapacity that occurs while a dependent of a member or former member under the criteria of clause (i) or (ii) and is, or was at the time of the member's or former member's death, in fact dependent on him for over one-half of his support;";

(2) by striking out "and" at the end of subparagraph (G);

(3) by striking out the period at the end of subparagraph (H) and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and "and"; and

(4) by inserting after subparagraph (H) the following new subparagraph:

"(I) an unmarried legitimate child, including an adopted child or stepchild, who is incapable of self-support because of a mental or physical incapacity that did not exist while the child was a dependent of a member or former member under criteria of subparagraphs (D)(i) and (D)(ii) and is, or was at the time of the member's or former member's death, dependent on him for over one-half of his support.".

SEC. 15. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated for each of fiscal years 1993 through 1998 such sums as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of this Act and the amendments made by this Act.

NATIONAL MILITARY FAMILY ASSOCIATION,
Alexandria, VA, May 13, 1992.

Hon. JOHN S. MCCAIN,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR MCCAIN: Thank you for proposing the Military Health Reform Act of 1992. This legislation can be the basis for a defined, equitable, comprehensive Health Benefits Program for all military beneficiaries.

Your concern for all military beneficiaries, particularly those over 65 and those facing the loss of their benefits through base closure, is evident in the proposed legislation.

NMFA fully supports your efforts and we look forward to continuing our cooperative relationship.

Sincerely,

MARGARET V. HALLGREN,
President.

NON COMMISSIONED OFFICERS ASSOCIATION OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Alexandria, VA, May 12, 1992.

Hon. JOHN MCCAIN,
U.S. Senator, Russell Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR MCCAIN: The Non Commissioned Officers Association of the USA (NCOA) is supportive of your proposal to reform the military health care system. The Association is pleased to lend its name as an advocate for the passage of such legislation. It's been needed for some years.

Anything the Association may do to assist is available at your call.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL F. OUELLETTE,
Deputy Director of Legislative Affairs.

ASSOCIATION OF THE U.S. ARMY,
Arlington, VA, May 12, 1992.

Hon. JOHN MCCAIN,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR MCCAIN: The Association of the United States Army wishes to express its appreciation for your draft legislative proposal concerning reform of the Military Health Care System.

We support your initiative and believe that the proposed language will ultimately provide military dependents, retirees and their dependents and survivors with the health care they deserve. Your resolute effort on behalf of military medical beneficiaries demonstrates a desire to overcome high costs and inefficient use of services and facilities.

You can depend upon our continuing support throughout the legislative process to gain passage of the Military Health Reform Act of 1992.

Sincerely,

ERIK G. JOHNSON, Jr.,
Colonel, USA Retired,
Director of Legislative Affairs.

FLEET RESERVE ASSOCIATION,
Alexandria, VA, May 12, 1992.

Hon. JOHN MCCAIN,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR MCCAIN: On behalf of the entire membership of the Fleet Reserve Association, I would like to thank you for drafting and submitting the legislation to reform the military medical system.

This is an item of great concern to both the active and retired members of the military community.

If I or the staff of the Administrative Headquarters can ever be of any assistance, please do not hesitate to contact us.

With sincere best wishes, I remain in Loyalty, Protection and Service,

WALLACE E. BAKER,
National President.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR UNIFORMED SERVICES, SOCIETY OF MILITARY WIDOWS,
Springfield, VA, May 12, 1992.

Hon. JOHN MCCAIN,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR MCCAIN: In my position as Chairman and Co-Chairman of The Military Coalition's Medical Committee, it was a pleasure to work with you in the development of your proposal to reform the military medical system. Members of the Coalition's Medical Committee and this association appreciate very much your legislative proposal, which when enacted, would improve access to lifetime medical care for military retirees, including those over age 65, their dependents and survivors.

I would be pleased to assist you in the future as you continue your outstanding efforts to ensure military personnel and retirees receive earned benefits and entitlements that are considered part of their military compensation package.

Sincerely,

CHARLES C. PARTRIDGE,
Colonel, USA (Retired),
Legislative Counsel.

THE RETIRED OFFICERS ASSOCIATION,
Alexandria, VA, May 12, 1992.

Hon. JOHN MCCAIN,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR MCCAIN: On behalf of the 380,000 members of The Retired Officers Association, including about 58,000 survivors, I want to express my since appreciation for your leadership in sponsoring health care reform. The initiatives you are proposing are critical first steps for improving access, continuity, and quality of care for military beneficiaries, regardless of age. Therefore, we strongly support your legislative proposal.

As we have discussed, the closure of military bases and the resultant loss of major military medical facilities has a traumatic effect on the military beneficiary population. For many retirees, who have retired in the proximity of military bases to take advantage of earned institutional programs like health care, commissaries and exchanges, loss of access to military treatment facilities imposes a financial hardship. For this reason, we consider it a leadership imperative to explore as many innovative ideas as possible to facilitate health care alternatives for military retirees, dependents and survivors.

We appreciate your consistent concern for the welfare of the military community and look forward to continue working with you on this vital program.

Sincerely,

PAUL W. ARCARI,
Colonel, USAF (Ret.),
Director, Government Relations.

IT'S OUTRAGEOUS!

On Mar. 12 Terry Cox offered gut-wrenching testimony during hearings before the House Appropriations Committee's Subcommittee on Defense. Cox, whose husband is a quadriplegic, had to declare bankruptcy and sell everything the couple owned to support her husband's medical care. Because much of the care Sgt. Cox received is now considered "custodial," which is not covered under CHAMPUS. CHAMPUS officials are taking the Coxes to court to recoup the $200,000 they reimbursed the Coxes in the past.

Subcommittee chairman Rep. John Murtha (D-Pa.) strongly protested DoD's action to Enrique Mendez, M.D., Assistant Secretary of Defense for Health Affairs, contending that it seemed patently unfair to seek repayment from the Coxes because the fault rested with CHAMPUS' poor management of the case and not with the Coxes.

Murtha went on to say, "We've excused the Defense Department of $79 million in Operation Desert Storm debt, but now the government is taking the Coxes to court to get $200,000. The court costs alone will be more than $200,000." Mendez told the subcommittee he would personally look into the matter to see if the Coxes' debt can be waived. It would be a travesty not to do otherwise!•

By Mr. EXON (for himself and Mr. BOREN):

S.J. Res. 302. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution relating to the election of the President and Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT RELATING TO THE ELECTION OF THE PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I rise to offer an amendment to the Constitution to eliminate the electoral college and permit the direct election of the Presidential ticket and assure that the American President has the support of the majority of those who vote.

The electoral college is a relic which has outlived its usefulness. It is time to do away with the electoral college and make every vote across the country count. The United States is now mature enough as a nation to elect it's own President.

The American people also agree. Over the years, public opinion has consistently favored the direct election of the President. With an exciting, potential three-way race for the White House in the offing, there can be no better time to take a very close look at the electoral process. Electoral arithmetic forces Presidential candidates to adopt special interest strategies to capture the electors in larger States and ignore the real problems of the Nation, especially the problems of smaller States. A system which makes all votes equal will encourage candidates to run their campaigns based on the national interest.

The electoral college is an antidemocratic institution. With its winner-take-all tradition, votes for opposing candidates in each State are essentially eliminated from consideration. A Presidential ticket in theory only needs to win the 11 largest States, even by the very narrowest margins and lose all other States even by significant margins to be elected; regardless of the total popular vote.

Mr. President, I say winner-take-all tradition because, there is nothing to legally bind electors to vote any particular way. The electoral college could, in theory, disregard the popular vote of the electorate and vote as the electoral college pleases.

Several times in American history, including in the 1988 election, one or two so-called faithless electors voted for candidates of their own choosing. In a close three-way race a coalition of faithless electors could create a great deal of mischief. While an occasional faithless elector will not threaten the outcome of an election, three times in our Nation's history, Presidents were elected without a popular mandate.

In 1824, Andrew Jackson received 43.1 percent of the popular vote and 37.9 percent of the electoral vote while his opponent, John Quincy Adams, received 30.5 percent of the popular vote and 32.1 percent of the electoral vote.

Since no candidate received a majority of the electoral vote, the election was thrown to the House of Representatives as directed by the Constitution, where John Quincy Adams secured the support of 13 State delegations winning over Andrew Jackson who had won the support of only 7 State delegations.

In 1876, Samuel Tilden received 50.1 percent of the popular vote and lost to Rutherford B. Hayes who won a one-vote majority in the electoral college.

The third case occurred in 1888. Grover Cleveland won 48.7 percent of the popular vote and 42 percent of the electoral vote, while his opponent, Benjamin Harrison, became President with only 47.9 percent of the popular vote and 58 percent of the electoral vote.

If the electoral college system is not changed, I suspect that within my lifetime, history will repeat itself. Indeed, in 20 Presidential elections, a 1-percent shift in the national vote could have changed the outcome of the election.

In 1976 the shift of a mere 10,000 votes in two States would have elected President Ford despite the 2 million popular vote margin won by Governor Carter. In the 1988 election the people gave then-Vice President Bush 54 percent of the popular vote and the electoral college gave the new President 79 percent of the electoral vote. It is only a matter of time before the Nation is again faced with misfire of the electoral college.

The proposed constitutional amendment I introduce today eliminates the electoral college and allows the people to choose their President. Under this proposal, if no Presidential ticket should receive at least 50 percent of the popular vote and the majority of the vote in at least one-third of the States, a run off election between the two highest vote-getters would be held.

This system will guarantee that the will of the people will prevail but at the same time will not expose the Nation to the regional factionalism feared by our Founding Fathers.

I have introduced this legislation in several previous Congresses. I do not

represent this proposed legislation to be the one and only way to bring more democracy to a Presidential election. I want to start a national examination of our electoral process as was done when similar legislation which I cosponsored was introduced in 1979 by Senator Birch Bayh of Indiana. I am especially delighted that the Nebraska State Legislature led by Lincoln Senator Dianna Shimek has recently reexamined the Presidential electoral process. The State of Nebraska has enacted a reform which allocated electors on a proportionate basis. The Nebraska system like Maine, will award an elector for each congressional district carried by a Presidential ticket and the winner of the State will then receive two bonus electors.

The Nebraska-Maine approach is a significant improvement in the current system. In my view the most democratic approach would be the change I recommended today. If, however, this legislation stimulates a serious review of the electoral college at the State level, this effort will be an important success.

Our Nation's constitutional history is one of granting increasing democratic power to the people. In 1776 our Founding Fathers declared their independence from the King of England. In 1787 the Constitution was adopted; in 1791 the Bill of Rights was ratified; in 1865 slavery was prohibited; in 1868 the vote was extended to former slaves; in 1919 the selection of the Senate was taken from the State legislatures and given directly to the people; in 1920 the vote was given to women; and in 1971 the right to vote was extended to 18, 19-, and 20-year-olds. Over our history, the Nation has never been satisfied with the democratic status quo. The direct election of the President simply continues our Nation's long march to improve and strengthen our democracy.

I look forward to the continued national discussion and the debate that the introduction of this proposed constitutional amendment will spark. In the last several days, Senators PRYOR and BOREN have introduced legislation for the direct election of the President and Vice President based on a 40-percent threshold as opposed to a 50-percent threshold that this bill champions. Senator PRYOR was a cosponsor of the legislation that I am introducing today in the last Congress. I welcome his addition to the debate on this important issue. I ask my colleagues to give this proposed constitutional amendment serious consideration. I welcome any comments and suggestions to change and improve this legislation.

Mr. President, I ask that the bill titled "Joint Resolution Proposing an Amendment to the Constitution Relating to the Election of the President and Vice President of the United States" be printed in the RECORD.

I also ask unanimous consent that several articles about the electoral college be inserted in the RECORD.

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

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

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 19, 1992]

THE FRAMERS AND ROSS PEROT

(By George F. Will)

Ross Perot's embryonic presidential candidacy is rekindling interest in the election of 1824—or, strictly speaking, of 1825.

Representative Dan Glickman (D-Kan.) worries about a "constitutional catastrophe," his odd description of the constitutional procedure for coping with the remote possibility that no candidate will win an electoral vote majority. Glickman, his lucidity crippled by his apprehension, says, "The election could be thrown into the Electoral College and could be thrown into the House of Representatives thereafter."

Steady, congressman. All elections are "thrown into the Electoral College." Thank God—or the Founders; much the same thing to me—for the Electoral College.

If November's popular vote does not produce an electoral vote majority for anyone, the House will select a president from among the top three electoral vote winners, each state's delegation casting one vote.

If that happens early in 1993, litigious liberals will ask the Supreme Court to declare the Constitution unconstitutional. They will say the court's "one man, one vote" ideology—all votes must be of equal weight—forbids Wyoming's delegation of one having weight equal to California's 52. (Real liberals consider the Senate—Vermont as weighty as Texas—unconstitutional.) But the House can select a president constitutionally, as it did on Feb. 9, 1825.

In 1824 there were four candidates—Gen. Andrew Jackson, Speaker Henry Clay, Secretary of State John Quincy Adams and Treasury Secretary William Crawford. But only five of the 24 states had all four on their ballots. Six states, including the most populous, New York, had no elections: Their legislatures selected the presidential electors. Of the 4 million white males eligible to vote, 365,863 (8 percent) did. Jackson got 38,149 more popular votes than runner-up Adams.

Clay finished fourth and so was out of contention in the House process. Then his presidential prospects were forever blighted by accusations of a "corrupt bargain" when he organized the House's selection of Adams and became Adams' secretary of state. (Adams did not officially receive a single popular vote in Clay's Kentucky, where the legislature favored Jackson.) The House process was not pretty. For example, the man who cast Missouri's vote sought Adams' reassurance that particular printers would get government business in Missouri.

Since 1825, there have been developments. Now there is a two-party system. And there is the winner-take-all allocation of states' electoral votes, a custom that bolsters the two-party system. (Deviationist Maine and Nebraska each select two presidential electors at large and the rest by congressional districts. Because both states have small, homogeneous populations, this will almost always have the same result as statewide winner-take-all.) Proportional allocation would incite multiple parties to splinter the electorate. Winner-take-all tends to shut out candidates like Perot whose support is not regionally concentrated. And regional concentration shuts a candidate out of the presidency.

Another Glickman anxiety concerns something that could happen even in any two-candidate contest. It is that one candidate might win an electoral vote majority while another is winning a majority or plurality of popular votes. That may have happened in three of the 42 elections for which we have popular vote totals, since 1824. One was in 1824. Perhaps two others were 1876 (Hayes with 47.95 percent beat Tilden with 50.97) and 1888 (Harrison with 47.82 percent beat Cleveland with 48.62). There is uncertainty because fraud on both sides probably involved more votes than the margins of victory.

But even when the electoral and popular vote winners are different, it is excessive to say the "national will" has been frustrated. On such occasions the nation's will is unemphatic.

If the Electoral College were abolished in favor of direct popular election, it would be theoretically possible for a candidate to win all of Alaska's 306,264 registered voters, lose all the other states by an average of 6,250 votes, and still win the popular vote by 14. But let's think about probabilities, not mere possibilities. The Electoral College system probably will remain the world's most successful method of picking a chief executive.

The 42 elections since 1824 have produced 15 presidents with mere pluralities, not majorities, of popular votes. But only four times has the winner been under 45 percent. They were 1824, before the party system evolved; 1860, when the nation was crumbling and Lincoln won with 39 percent; 1912, when a protean force, Teddy Roosevelt, split the Republicans and Wilson won with 41.8; 1968, when George Wallace helped hold Nixon to 43.4.

Even when the popular vote margin is waferthin, the winner-take-all electoral vote allocation tends to produce a winning margin that looks like national decisiveness. The Electoral College system does make possible the improbability that Glickman calls a "catastrophe." But the system bolsters the two-part system by discouraging independent candidacies that splinter the electorate. It generates moderate mandates for parties that seek a broad consensus through coalitions and accommodations.

The Founders wanted not just majority rule, they wanted rule by majorities of a particular character: moderation. Not being primitive men, the Founders did not aim for primitive majoritarianism.

UNUSUAL OPPORTUNITY FOR PEROT

The instinctive and passionate human curiosity to know the future drives us in many arenas. Even political ones.

One calculation is that Ross Perot's wildcard presidential candidacy this year could attract as much as 20 percent of the popular vote across the country in November. Even so, the Texan might not make a single mark in the only place where it really counts, the Electoral College.

But Nebraska is one of the few states where a strong, if concentrated, Perot showing could be reflected on the ancient college board. (All we're saying is that circumstances could make it happen.)

Our presidential elections are indirect, not direct. As every American is aware, it is the Electoral College—created by the Founding Fathers—whose members officially name the new president and vice-president.

The number of Electoral College electors from each state equals the total of that

state's national legislative representation. In Nebraska, we're talking about five people. They stand in for two senators and three House members.

When Perot supporters in Nebraska next month begin circulating their petitions to give Perot general election ballot position, those petitions also will carry the names and addresses of five people already designated as Electoral College electors pledged to Perot. It's just a formality, but a critical one.

Thanks to the 1991 Legislature, led by Lincoln Sen. DiAnna Schimek, Nebraska no longer follows the conventional "winner-take-all" feature of the Electoral College.

By way of illustration, let's imagine that Republican George Bush once again wins the total Nebraska popular vote, even if that's only a plurality; however, in the 2nd Congressional District, Perot individually attracts more votes than does either Bush or the Democratic nomines.

Nebraska's Electoral College vote then would not be 5-0 for Bush, but divided this way: Four for Bush, one for Perot.

If Perot topped the field in both the 1st and 2nd Districts yet still trailed in the Nebraska popular vote, the Nebraska Electoral College tally then would divide three for Bush and two for Perot.

Hey, we're not predicting this will come to pass. No ma'am. The example sketched above is strictly for widened educational purposes. Which is, of course, among the variety of primary justifications for newspaper editorials.

[From Roll Call, Mar. 12, 1992]

THE NIXON SCENARIO: HOW A DEMOCRAT CAN WIN PRESIDENCY

(By Charles E. Cook)

Veteran political analyst and former LBJ White House aide Horace Busby popularized a theory during the 1980s that a "Republican lock" on the Electoral College had developed.

A combination of Southern and Western states, he said, had grown so disillusioned with the Democratic party that obtaining the necessary 270 votes for an Electoral College victory was impossible.

Now, a revisionist view has developed. Busby, say the doubters, was exactly right—except during a recession. No less a political veteran than former President (and former Rep.) Richard Nixon (R-Calif) has weighed in on the debate.

In a previously unpublished Feb. 26 memorandum to longtime friend and confidant Roger Stone, Nixon writes, "My prediction at this time is that [President] Bush, without question, will win the popular vote because of his huge margins in the South. On the other hand, he could lose the electoral vote unless he holds Illinois and Ohio among the big states, other than those in the South."

In his analysis, Nixon points out that in 1988, while Bush won 79.2 percent of the Electoral College votes to 20.8 percent for former Massachusetts Gov. Michael Dukakis, the popular vote was a much closer 54 to 46 percent.

Nixon then argues that a shift of only 566,000 total votes in California, Illinois, Maryland, Missouri, Pennsylvania, Colorado, Connecticut, Michigan, Vermont, and New Mexico would have given Dukakis 161 additional electoral votes for a total of 273, three more votes than he would have needed to win the presidency.

Given the state of the economy, the desire for change, and the President's low job performance ratings, this is not at all an unrealistic scenario for this year's election.

Looking back at 1988, Nixon argues that Bush might have lost the race despite having a surplus of 5,574,000 votes nationwide, and asks, "Can you imagine what a field say the political scientists would have had if that had been the case!"

Nixon's singling-out of Illinois and Ohio as the keys to a Bush victory is a variation on his advice to President Ronald Reagan in 1984 to build a "firewall" of five states—Illinois, Michigan, Missouri, Ohio, and New Jersey—by spending a disproportionate amount of time and campaign resources in these states.

After a disappointing first debate performance, President Reagan may well have needed that firewall, but his second debate showing against former Vice President Walter Mondale was considerably stronger and he subsequently ended up winning the election easily.

S.J. RES. 302

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission by the Congress:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. The people of the several States and the District constituting the seat of government of the United States shall elect the President and Vice President. Each elector shall cast a single vote for two persons who shall have consented to the joining of their names as candidates for the offices of President and Vice President.

"SECTION 2. The electors of President and Vice President in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature, except that for the electors of President and Vice President, any State may prescribe by law less restrictive residence qualifications and for electors of President and Vice President the Congress may by law establish uniform residence qualification.

"SECTION 3. The persons joined as candidates for President and Vice President having the greatest number of votes shall be elected President and Vice President, if such number be at least 50 per centum of the whole number of votes cast and such number be derived from a majority of the number of votes cast in each State comprising at least one-third of the several States. If, after any such election, none of the persons joined as candidate for President and Vice President is elected pursuant to the preceding paragraph, a runoff election shall be held within sixty days in which the choice of President and Vice President shall be made from the two pairs of persons joined as candidates for President and Vice President receiving the greatest number of votes in such runoff election shall be elected President and Vice President.

"SECTION 4. The times, places, and manner of holding such elections and entitlement to inclusion on the ballot shall be prescribed by law in each State; but the Congress may by law make or alter such regulations. The days for elections shall be determined by Congress and shall be uniform throughout the United States. The Congress shall prescribe by law the times, places, and manner in which the results of such elections shall be ascertained and declared. No such election, other than a runoff election, shall be held later than the first Tuesday after the first Monday in November, and the results thereof shall be declared no later than thirty days after the date on which the election occurs.

"SECTION 5. The Congress may by law provide for the case of the death, inability, or withdrawal of any candidate for President or Vice President before a President and Vice President have been elected, and for the case of the death of either the President-elect or the Vice President-elect.

"SECTION 6. Sections 1 through 4 of this article shall take two years after the ratification of this article.

"SECTION 7. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

Mr. BOREN. Mr. President, first, I thank my colleague from Nebraska for adding me as a cosponsor of the joint resolution which he just introduced which would have the effect of abolishing the electoral college.

As we approach this election year, we are reminded once again that there are circumstances which might create the possibility. We could have an election take place without a majority being won by one candidate in the electoral college. This creates great problems as we know. The election would, of course, then be thrown into the House of Representatives.

There is a question of whether or not the delegations of those States would be bound to vote for the candidate which received a majority or at least the leading candidate if no candidate received a majority in a particular State or whether the Members of the House of Representatives would vote their own personal preferences or party preferences. This is a real question and that is I think because of the circumstances again highlighted by the conditions in the country this year where we may have a third party candidate or Independent candidacy that might receive a significant number of votes, that we could then have a malfunction and, in essence, of the system with the electoral college unable to find a majority.

We could then have the Congress of the United States, the House of Representatives acting in a way in which the candidate that did not receive the most popular votes might become President of the United States.

Mr. President, I think in this particular period of history it would be intolerable to have someone sitting in the White House who did not lead in terms of the popular vote of this country. With all the tough problems that we have to face—budget deficits looming, the problem of economic opportunity for the next generation which we have discussed so many times in this Chamber, the fact that our share of the world market is shrinking, the fact that in the last decade we have replaced jobs in this country that averaged $440 a week with jobs that averaged $280 a week, with growing concern and alarm about the economic opportunities for the next generation, more divisions within our own society.

It is always far more difficult to bring about change, to bring about harmony and good relationships between people in times of stress. It is easier to talk about expanding the pie then it is to talk about dividing up a shrinking pie where there are winners and losers and we have seen the stresses that brought about change and challenge facing our country.

We have seen tragic expression of those stresses in our domestic lives, the life of our communities, particularly in the urban areas. We are reminded of the crisis we faced with just the events in the last few days, the tragic events, in Los Angeles and elsewhere across our country. We are dealing with these problems and if we are to rebuild the strength of this country, we must do it as a unified people, and it is extremely important, extremely important that the President of the United States have the moral authority and have the mandate from the people necessary to lead this country in a time of transition and change.

And, therefore, I do not believe that we should even leave open the possibility that someone might serve as President of the United States who did not receive the most votes in the popular election, that a person might serve as President who was not the leading candidate in terms of the support he received from the individual citizens of the United States when they went to cast their ballots in the election. Such a President would be crippled from the beginning. He or she would lack the authority, the sense of legitimacy that would come from receiving the most votes from the people themselves.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. BOREN. I am happy to yield my colleague on my time.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I appreciate very much the very kind remarks that places exactly on point the need for this. If we do not take action on this in this election year or the next election year or the election year after that, somewhere on down the road there is going to be a calamity in this country based on what this Senator said when I made my remarks emphasized and driven home by the remarks made by my friend from Oklahoma.

We just had a situation with this 2 years ago right now in my State of Nebraska. We had a heavily contested race for the governorship in the primary. There were three candidates that were relatively close. The election came and went. All the precincts were reported. There were discrepancies as to what ballots should be counted. Because the laws of Nebraska were not clear, the courts so held that certain ballots were thrown out in certain counties because they were not initiated on the backside of the ballot by two of the election judges, in some cases some counties had one elected judge on the front of the ballot. There were all kinds of technicalities.

The eventual winner of the primary election on the Democratic Party won I believe by 30 votes, went on to be the elected Governor of the State of Nebraska in the fall.

But there are a lot of contentious attitudes about whether or not the people in charge of the election did their job in not clearly identifying what would happen.

The average person in the United States today does not begin to understand what the electoral college is all about. They really believe that if somebody is elected President of the United States and gets 1 more vote, 1 more legitimate vote than the other party, that individual should be elected President of the United States. That is not the way it is under the law today.

And I thank my friend from Oklahoma for emphasizing once again that this is the time we should begin to correct this and then not have people say when it happens the next time they should have done something about it.

I thank my friend from Oklahoma.

Mr. BOREN. I thank my colleague from Nebraska and commend him for looking ahead and taking this lead.

I agree with what he said. It would be a calamity. The average citizen believes he or she directly elects the President of the United States. They believe that. It is unthinkable to the vast majority of American people they should turn out and vote in the election and that the candidate who received the most votes might not become the President of the United States. That is exactly what could happen.

There have already been many analysts looking at the possible results of the election this year. We have had national polls showing a three-way split in the electorate, polls indicating that Mr. Perot, for example, now according to the latest public opinion polls have close to one third of the vote in the United States, that the candidates of the Democratic and Republican Parties, the likely nominees of the two parties each have about a third of the vote.

We could very easily have a situation where the majority would not be reached in the electoral college. It is too early to tell but that certainly is a possibility, and I think that is a possibility that is not acceptable and we should look ahead for once and we should take a course of action that we should have taken a long time ago in abolishing the electoral college.

So I commend my colleague from Nebraska, and I am pleased to join with him and add my name as a cosponsor of his resolution.●

By Mr. PELL (for himself, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. BIDEN, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. BRYAN, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. CHAFEE, Mr. COATS, Mr. CRANSTON, Mr. D'AMATO, Mr. DIXON, Mr. DODD, Mr. DURENBERGER, Mr. GLENN, Mr. GORE, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mrs. KASSEBAUM, Mr. KASTEN, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. LUGAR, Mr. MACK, Mr. METZENBAUM, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. NUNN, Mr. PRESSLER, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. WARNER, and Mr. WELLSTONE):

S.J. Res. 303. Joint resolution to designate October 1992 as "National Breast Cancer Awareness Month"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

NATIONAL BREAST CANCER AWARENESS MONTH

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce a joint resolution to designate October 1992 as National Breast Cancer Awareness Month. I am especially pleased to be introducing this resolution with the support of 32 original cosponsors.

For the past few years, Mr. President, as I have introduced this resolution, I have had the grim task of reciting the latest statistics on breast cancer mortality. While the numbers are no longer a surprise, they are as alarming as ever.

In 1992, breast cancer will strike an estimated 180,000 women and kill about 46,000 women, 1,500 more than in 1991. Already the second leading cause of cancer death among women, breast cancer is likely to increase further as the population ages, since a woman's risk of developing breast cancer increases as she ages. In fact, the American Cancer Society estimates that a woman's lifetime risk of developing breast cancer, assuming an average life expectancy of 85 years, is one in nine.

Mr. President, many people do not realize that breast cancer also strikes men. About 1,000 men will develop breast cancer in 1992; about 300 men will die from the disease. While breast cancer among men is largely a hidden disease, for those men and their families, it is very real and very tragic.

The statistics are no better in my own State of Rhode Island. The American Cancer Society estimates that breast cancer will strike about 1,000 Rhode Island women in 1992, and that about 250 Rhode Island women will die of the disease. While these numbers remain flat from 1991, they were much too high then, and they are much too high now.

Unfortunately, Mr. President, we are no closer today to a cure for breast cancer than we were a year ago. And we still do not know its cause or causes, or how to prevent it.

That is the bad news.

But there is good news too, which we hope National Breast Cancer Awareness Month activities will highlight: We know that we can significantly reduce breast cancer mortality through early detection: Self-examination, clin-

ical examination by a qualified health care provider, and screening mammography. In fact, 50 years ago, the 5-year-survival rate for localized breast cancer was only 78 percent; now it is over 90 percent. The American Cancer Society estimates that the use of of a combination of early detection procedures can boost the 5-year-survival rate for localized breast cancer to nearly 100 percent.

Mr. President, we also know that despite the proven success of early detection and intervention, many women do not know how to self-examine, and some are afraid to do so. Some women do not seek a screening mammogram because they are afraid, either of the procedure itself, or of the diagnosis it might reveal. Still others do not seek a screening mammogram because of lack of access or cost, or because they simply do not know its vital importance.

Educating about early detection, addressing concerns about self-examination and mammography, teaching about how to live with and after breast cancer—these issues are what National Breast Cancer Awareness Month is all about. But perhaps most importantly, we should be sure to communicate the simple but crucial message that, while breast cancer can kill, it can also be conquered.

For the last 2 years, I have had the privilege of introducing similar resolutions, both of which became law. This year's resolution, if enacted into law, will mark the third time the Congress has authorized October as National Breast Cancer Awareness Month. I hope that this year all of my colleagues will recognize and support the efforts of health advocates across the Nation to reduce breast cancer mortality by joining with us to designate October 1992 as National Breast Cancer Awareness Month.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in full at the end of my remarks.

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

S.J. RES. 303

Whereas breast cancer will strike an estimated 180,000 women and 1,000 men in the United States in 1992;

Whereas, assuming an average life expectancy of 85 years, a woman's lifetime risk of developing breast cancer is 1 in 9;

Whereas the risk of developing breast cancer increases as a woman grows older;

Whereas breast cancer is the second leading cause of cancer death in women, and will kill an estimated 46,000 women and 300 men in 1992;

Whereas the 5-year survival rate for localized breast cancer has risen from 78 percent in the 1940s to over 90 percent today;

Whereas most breast cancers are detected by the woman herself;

Whereas educating both the public and health care providers about the importance of early detection will result in reducing breast cancer mortality;

Whereas appropriate use of screening mammography, in conjunction with clinical examination and breast self-examination, can result in the detection of many breast cancers early in their development and increase the survival rate to nearly 100 percent;

Whereas data from controlled trials clearly demonstrate that deaths from breast cancer are significantly reduced in women over the age of 40 by using mammography as a screening tool;

Whereas many women are reluctant to have screening mammograms for a variety of reasons, such as the cost of testing, lack of information, or fear;

Whereas access to screening mammography is directly related to socioeconomic status;

Whereas increased awareness about the importance of screening mammography will result in the procedure being regularly requested by the patient and recommended by the health care provider; and

Whereas it is projected that more women will use this lifesaving test as it becomes increasingly available and affordable: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That October 1992 is designated as "National Breast Cancer Awareness Month", and the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe the month with appropriate programs and activities.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I rise today as an original cosponsor of a joint resolution of Congress designating October 1992 as "National Breast Cancer Awareness Month."

I am painfully aware of the need to increase public awareness about breast cancer as a result of my wife, Barbara's personal victory over breast cancer several years ago. We believe early detection through a routine mammogram saved Barbara's life and is the key to saving the lives of other women who develop this disease.

Over the last 20 years, the risk of developing breast cancer has grown. In 1990, 1 woman in 10 could expect to develop breast cancer in the lifetime. This year, a woman's risk of developing breast cancer has increased to one in nine. This means that there will be 180,000 newly diagnosed cases of breast cancer this year alone.

In my State of Iowa, the American Cancer Society estimates that there will be 2,300 new cases of breast cancer in 1992, and that 600 of these cases will result in death. For women in Iowa, breast cancer comprises one-third of all cancer cases.

Despite advances in medical technology, we do not know the causes or cures for this disease, and even less is known about how to prevent it from developing. However, despite this fact and the dramatic statistics, it is important to point out that early detection and intervention can reduce mortality rates significantly. Research has shown that early detection of breast cancer by getting routine mammograms, can reduce breast cancer mortality by 30 percent. That is why it is so important for women to be aware of their risk and the opportunities for early detection. But to achieve this goal we need to enhance public awareness. The joint resolution that is being introduced today by Senator PELL is an important step in that direction. Women need to learn how to conduct self-examinations and they need to speak with their doctors to determine how often they should have a mammogram.

I am proud to be an original cosponsor of this joint resolution. It is my hope that our daughters and granddaughters will face a brighter future against this disease.

Mr. MACK. Mr. President, I am pleased to join my colleague, Senator PELL, as an original cosponsor of "National Breast Cancer Awareness Month." While I have cosponsored this resolution in the past, it is especially meaningful to me to take part in this legislative initiative this year.

Last September, my wife, Priscilla, came to me and said she found a lump in her breast during a routine self-examination. Immediately, my thoughts turned to what my life might be like without her by my side. I thought of my younger brother, Michael, who died of cancer at age 35. I thought of my mother and our daughter, who are both survivors of cancer. it was a very emotional moment.

After consultation with oncologists, it was determined that Priscilla could not simply undergo a lumpectomy. Rather, her cancer required a mastectomy. Just days before her surgery, she joined me in testifying before the House Committee on Energy and Commerce at a hearing commemorating the 20th anniversary of the National Cancer Act. I cannot express how very proud I was of her that morning.

On October 3, Priscilla underwent a mastectomy here in Washington. Fortunately, the surgery went well. However, her oncologist then told us she would need to undergo 6 months of chemotherapy. The side effects of chemotherapy were difficult—hair loss, intense nausea, and loss of energy and appetite just to name a few. However, through it all, she maintained a sense of humor, and a willingness to talk to other women about the importance of self-examination and regular early detection testing. Her prognosis today is excellent. She is living proof that early detection saves lives.

The American Cancer Society estimates that one in every nine women will develop breast cancer during her lifetime. Florida ranks third in the number of women with breast cancer. It is estimated that more than 11,000 women in my home State will develop breast cancer this year. It is also a grim fact that nearly 3,000 women in Florida will die from breast cancer in 1992.

However, there is room for hope. Leading oncologists have told me the

survival rate of all forms of cancer, including breast cancer, can be increased by as much as 50 percent simply through early detection and prompt treatment.

As my colleagues will recall, I have introduced the Cancer Screening Incentive Act, legislation to provide a means by which all Americans can take advantage of the early detection procedures available today. Low-income Americans have a higher rate of cancer incidence and a higher death rate from cancer, and my legislation addresses this.

I have personally met with many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle about this important legislation. We currently have the bipartisan support of 32 Senate cosponsors. It has received the endorsement of such organizations as the American Cancer Society and the American Medical Association, as well as business and labor organizations. I would again urge my colleagues to carefully review this bill and add their names to the growing list of cosponsors.

I hope none of my colleagues and their families ever have to endure the experience my family has been through with cancer. It has been extremely difficult for our children, for our parents, and for our friends. However, Priscilla's bravery and commitment to help others while undergoing a personal struggle did not go unnoticed. Priscilla was selected to be the recipient of the 1992 American Cancer Society Courage Award. I was honored to be the other recipient of this award.

I am proud to join Senator PELL in introducing "Breast Cancer Awareness Month" and urge my colleagues to join us in this important lifesaving effort.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 405

At the request of Mr. MITCHELL, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. SMITH] was added as a cosponsor of S. 405, a bill to amend the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States to exclude certain footwear assembled in beneficiary countries from duty-free treatment.

S. 709

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. LIEBERMAN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 709, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to allow a deduction for qualified adoption expenses, and for other purposes.

S. 866

At the request of Mr. BREAUX, the name of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. LOTT] was added as a cosponsor of S. 866, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify that certain activities of a charitable organization in operating an amateur athletic event do not constitute unrelated trade or business activities.

S. 1002

At the request of Mr. SHELBY, the name of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBB] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1002, a bill to impose a criminal penalty for flight to avoid payment of arrearages in child support.

S. 1129

At the request of Mr. MACK, the name of the Senator from Montana [Mr. BURNS] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1129, a bill to reduce unnecessarily burdensome financial institution paperwork and reporting requirements, and for other purposes.

S. 1537

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Kansas [Mrs. KASSEBAUM] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1537, a bill to amend the National Trails System Act to designate the American Discovery Trail for study to determine the feasibility and desirability of its designation as a national trail.

S. 1627

At the request of Mr. FORD, the names of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. BURNS] were added as cosponsors of S. 1627, a bill to amend section 615 of title 38, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to permit persons who receive care at medical facilities of the Department of Veterans Affairs to have access to and to consume tobacco products.

S. 1885

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. BUMPERS] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1885, a bill to reauthorize the Uranium Mill Tailings Radiation Control Act of 1978.

S. 2239

At the request of Mr. PRYOR, the name of the Senator from Maine [Mr. COHEN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 2239, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide additional safeguards to protect taxpayer rights.

S. 2262

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. GLENN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 2262, a bill to make emergency supplemental appropriations to provide a short-term stimulus to promote job creation in rural areas of the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 2624

At the request of Mr. GLENN, the names of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. DOMENICI], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. METZENBAUM], and the Senator from Maine [Mr. COHEN] were added as cosponsors of S. 2624, a bill to authorize appropriations for the Interagency Council on the Homeless, the Federal Emergency Management Food and Shelter Program, and for other purposes.

S. 2627

At the request of Mr. GRAMM, the name of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. LOTT] was added as a cosponsor of S. 2627, a bill to ensure the preservation of the Gulf of Mexico by establishing within the Environmental Protection Agency a Gulf of Mexico Program Office.

S. 2639

At the request of Mr. NICKLES, the name of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HELMS] was added as a cosponsor of S. 2639, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a partial exclusion of dividends and interest received by individuals.

S. 2671

At the request of Mr. GRAHAM, the names of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. BOND] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN] were added as cosponsors of S. 2671, a bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to make technical corrections.

S. 2699

At the request of Mr. DOLE, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. RUDMAN], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GRASSLEY] were added as cosponsors of S. 2699, a bill to extend the period for which unemployment benefits are payable under title I of the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Act of 1991, and for other purposes.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 231

At the request of Mr. THURMOND, the names of the Senator from New York [Mr. D'AMATO], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. COATS], and the Senator from Maryland [Ms. MIKULSKI] were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 231, a joint resolution to designate the month of May 1992, as "National Foster Care Month."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 247

At the request of Mr. DOLE, the name of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SHELBY] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 247, a joint resolution designating June 11, 1992, as "National Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Counselors Day."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 262

At the request of Mr. KASTEN, the name of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. GLENN] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 262, a joint resolution designating July 4, 1992, as "Buy American Day."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 270

At the request of Mr. THURMOND, the names of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. CONRAD], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. DECONCINI], the Senator from Montana [Mr. BURNS], and the Senator from New York [Mr. D'AMATO] were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 270, a joint resolution to designate August 15, 1992, as "82d Airborne Division 50th Anniversary Recognition Day."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 282

At the request of Mr. BOREN, the name of the Senator from North Da-

kota [Mr. CONRAD] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 282, a joint resolution to provide for the expeditious disclosure of records relevant to the assassination of President John F. Kennedy.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 295

At the request of Mr. DECONCINI, the names of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. LAUTENBERG], the Senator from New York [Mr. MOYNIHAN], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SARBANES] were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 295, a joint resolution designating September 10, 1992, as "National D.A.R.E. Day."

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 118

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the names of the Senator from Kansas [Mrs. KASSEBAUM], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. PRESSLER], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. GLENN], and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. BROWN] were added as cosponsors of Senate Concurrent Resolution 118, a concurrent resolution declaring the ratification of the 27th Article of Amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 285

At the request of Mr. LIEBERMAN, the name of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. BROWN] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Resolution 285, a resolution calling for compliance with United Nations sanctions against Libya for harboring the suspects in the bombing of Pan Am flight 103, and for other purposes.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I would like to announce that the Senate Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry Subcommittee on Agricultural Research and General Legislation will hold a hearing on the utility of expanded lamb reporting services by USDA. The hearing will be held on Tuesday, June 9, 1992, at 10 a.m. in SR-332. Senator TOM DASCHLE will preside.

For further information please contact Wade Fauth at 224-2321

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 13, 1992, at 2 p.m., to hold a closed hearing on intelligence matters.

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

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate Wednesday, May 13, 1992, at 2 p.m., to conduct a hearing on urban affairs, the recent violence in Los Angeles and the plight of inner cities.

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON COMPETITIVENESS AND ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Small Business Subcommittee on Competitiveness and Economic Opportunity be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 13, 1992, at 9:30 a.m. The subcommittee will hold a hearing on the effects of the real estate crisis on small business and local governments.

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Manpower and Personnel of the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet on Wednesday, May 13, 1992, at 9 a.m., in open session, to receive testimony on the medical programs of the Department of Defense in review of S. 2629, the Department of Defense authorization request for fiscal year 1993.

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

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Indian Affairs be authorized to meet on May 13, 1992, beginning at 9:30 a.m., in 485 Russell Senate Office Building, on budgeting for the Indian School Equalization Program, 1991-93, to be followed by a markup on the Native Hawaiian Health Care Improvement Act beginning at 2 p.m.

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Environmental Protection, Committee on Environment and Public Works, be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 13, beginning at 1:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing to examine the conservation of the northern spotted owl and the ecosystem upon which it depends under the Endangered Species Act and other Federal Laws.

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

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs would like to request unanimous consent to hold a hearing to consider employment and education legislation on May 13, 1992, at 10 a.m. in room 418 of the Russell Building.

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON MEDICARE AND LONG-TERM CARE

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Medicare and Long-Term Care of the Committee on Finance be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 13, 1992, at 2 p.m. to hold a hearing on the challenge of providing long-term health care.

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

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate, 2 p.m., May 13, 1992, to receive testimony on S. 2656, the Petroleum Marketing Practices Act Amendments of 1992.

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Merchant Marine, of the Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation, be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 13, 1992, at 10 a.m. on the reauthorization of Marad/Federal Maritime Commission.

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

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATIONAL RESOURCES

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate, 9:30 a.m., May 13, 1992, to consider pending agenda business, and any other items ready for consideration.

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

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 13, at 10 a.m. to hold a business meeting to markup S. 2532, legislation authorizing assistance to the former Soviet Union.

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

COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Labor and Human Resources be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 13, 1992, at 10 a.m., for a hearing on the Freedom of Choice Act.

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON FEDERAL SERVICES, POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Federal Services, Post Office, and

Civil Service, Committee on Governmental Affairs, be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 13, 1992, on S. 1981, reauthorization of the Office of Special Counsel.

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

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

ISRAELI INDEPENDENCE DAY

• Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, today I would like to congratulate Israel in the celebration of its 44th anniversary of independence last week. Since 1948, Israel has overcome enormous obstacles to be free and independent. Her continued vitality is directly related to the courage and resilience of the Jewish state and its citizens.

The American people can be proud of the support which the United States has provided to our democratic ally in the Middle East. This last year has witnessed some trying times in relations between the Israeli Government and the United States administration. Our relationship with Israel, however, is strong enough to weather this temporary setback. I believe that most people in both countries strongly support continued cooperation across the bilateral relationship.

During the cold war, Israel was vital strategic ally in the Middle East. Today, in a multipolar global environment, Israel remains a good friend and ally. Our challenge in this new era is to foster an even closer friendship with Israel on a broad range of issues. Israel ranks among the world's finest in the fields of medical research, irrigation techniques, and high technology industries. The potential for growth and prosperity in both of our countries from cooperation in these fields has only been partially realized.

Israel, however, still faces many challenges in the near future. By the end of 1991, some 380,000 Jews, primarily from the Soviet Union and Ethiopia, had immigrated to Israel. Hundreds of thousands of Jews remaining in the former Soviet Union may also choose to live in Israel. Israel will benefit for the skills and talents that these immigrants bring, but the country faces serious absorption problems. As the United States encouraged the resettlement of these Jews in Israel, we have a moral commitment to assist Israel with absorption through provision of loan guarantees.

Israel needs peace in order to prosper. Any resolution of the Middle East problem must guarantee Israel and her neighbors secure and recognized boundaries free from threats or acts of force. I hope that the peace process now underway may yield such a solution. I commend Secretary Baker and the participants in the process for the efforts they are making toward an understanding acceptable to all parties.

Israel has come a long way since the early months of 1948. The Israeli people have demonstrated the ability to overcome tremendous obstacles—they have survived hostile neighbors, built cities on swamps, and turned the desert green. An oasis of democracy in the region, Israel has set an example for other states in the area. I hope that democratic principles, observance of individual rights, and growth of free markets will come to characterize all countries in the region. I look to Israel to lead the way here, and extend my best personal wishes to the people and Government of Israel on their Independence Day.•

REV. KEVIN WAYNE COSBY

• Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize an outstanding Kentucky minister for his commitment to the black community in Louisville, his dedication to improving race relations, and his insight into social problems which plague our minority communities.

Rev. Kevin Wayne Cosby is the dynamic leader of Kentucky's fastest-growing black congregation at St. Stephen Baptist Church in western Louisville. Under Reverend Cosby's guidance, St. Stephen has grown sevenfold, from 300 to about 2,000 active members. He has earned the respect of many black leaders for the work the church has done to help the neighborhood where it is located—primarily by building a widely used family-life center.

When he accepted the pastorate of St. Stephen in 1979, Reverend Cosby found poverty and hopelessness in the surrounding community. He and his congregation decided to build institutions to help people in the neighborhood; the resulting activities and community involvement have been phenomenal. The church and the family-life center are now a focal point of the community for church members and nonmembers alike.

Reverend Cosby also possesses a vision for the future which addresses not only the social needs of Louisville's black community, but of the entire Nation. His vision includes cities containing strong, self-sustaining black communities where thriving businesses, active churches and vital schools flourish. Reverend Cosby also teaches a course on African-American religion at the University of Louisville. At St. Stephen, he initiated a program for 11 to 13-year-olds to improve their understanding of African culture.

While many Americans remain puzzled and distraught by the recent violence in Los Angeles, Reverend Cosby maintains an accurate reading of the situation, as well as a clearly defined view of what all of us can do to improve our inner cities and race relations nationwide.

Reverend Cosby outlined his views regarding the Rodney King verdict and subsequent riots in a recent column in the Louisville Courier-Journal. Please enter this column, as well as my comments into the RECORD.

The article follows:

INESCAPABLE SOLIDARITY

(By Kevin W. Cosby)

The recent events in Los Angeles have awakened the nation from its world of delusion and brought home the rage that has been festering in inner-city, African-American neighborhoods for decades. Since the Watts riots of 1965, the nation has been content to use Band-Aid remedies to correct the social and structural injustices that afflict the masses of African Americans.

The nation has never addressed the fundamental problems—the preservation of culture and economic empowerment. These are the issues that sparked the riots in Los Angeles and across the country. The Rodney King verdict was indeed the fuse, but the dynamite was the disdain for and the inability to recognize and respect African-American culture.

Since the Brown school-desegregation decision of 1954, integration has been the social goal of the major civil rights organizations and white liberals. However, the problem has been that integration has never been clearly defined. Integration has most often meant Anglo-conformity. This is the process by which African Americans take on the dress, language, food, values, sentiments, ideas and life-styles of Anglo-Americans. Anglo-conformity is based on the assumption that there is something defective in traditional African-American culture while Anglo-American culture is sacrosanct.

The lack of cultural diversity has handicapped African Americans in two ways. First, African Americans are judged in society based on how well they approximate the Anglo-American cultural norm. For example, educator Janice Hale states that the reason why African-American children are disproportionately labeled as educable mentally retarded and placed in special education classes is because they are forced to function and learn in a system that was designed for Anglo-Saxon, middle-class children. Second, Anglo-conformity has also resulted in African Americans in the middle and professional class having to sacrifice cultural identity and group solidarity with the masses of African Americans in order to integrate into mainstream America.

Integration has not translated into economic and social justice for the masses of African Americans. Integration has meant the selective assimilation of middle- and professional-class African Americans into Anglo-American society while the urban poor are simply left behind as the permanent inhabitants of desolate and abandoned inner cities. What the civil rights community does not want to come to grips with is how token integration has helped to facilitate the growth of the African-American poor. The incorporation of an African-American middle class into America's mainstream left the poor elements of the African-American community without leaders and institutions.

Visit any inner-city neighborhood across America, and you will find an absence of basic black-owned and controlled institutions like shopping centers, athletic centers, movie theaters, drug stores, restaurants, banks, schools, social service centers and other institutions that white and more affluent neighborhoods take for granted. These

institutions are important because they transmit values and place permanent, positive role models in the community.

One might ask, why would rioters destroy those few institutions they did have? The institutions that were targeted were not owned by the people who live in the communities. The economy of the inner city is controlled most often by people who drain the neighborhoods of their resources.

Prof. Harold Cruse of the University of Michigan, responding to the riots of the '60s, said that many mistakenly thought that Black Power meant "get the cops," "burn baby burn," "down with whitey," or "let's get the loot." Ironically, Richard Nixon understood the true message of the riots, and he conveyed them in an address in 1968, when he said:

"Much of the black militant talk these days is actually in terms far closer to the doctrines of free enterprise than to those of the welfarish '30s—terms of 'pride,' 'ownership,' 'private enterprise,' 'capital,' 'self-assurance,' 'self-respect' . . . what most of the militants are asking is not separation, but to be included—not as supplicants, but as owners, as entrepreneurs—to have a share of the wealth and a piece of the action. This is precisely what . . . the new approach ought to be. It ought to be oriented toward more black ownership, for from this can flow the rest—black pride, black jobs, black opportunity and yes, black power."

Every business that only takes from the African-American community without investing in the community is at risk because people will continue to rebel against injustice, inhumanity and feelings of disenfranchisement. Not only must businesses invest in the communities, but the people must be empowered to control the economy in their own communities.

Therefore, I call for the business community and the government to form partnerships with African-American institutions for the purpose of preventing the carnage displayed in the Los Angeles community.

For example, the St. Stephen Baptist Family Life Center is operating a rites of passage program; a child development center, tutorial service, computer literacy program, and other programs designed to empower the residents of the inner-city California community.

As a result of the services provided through the Family Life Center, 60 permanent jobs have been created. The employment and services provided through the Family Life Center have been created through grassroots initiatives independent of federal, state or local government. I am confident that if government and private industry would get involved, this model could be replicated in other neighborhoods on a much larger scale.

Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., often spoke of the "inescapable network of mutuality" that exists between the haves and the have-nots. That is to say that if the strength of the strong is not at the disposal of the weak, then the weakness of the weak will eventually cross the fence and undermine the strength of the strong.

This is the true lesson to be learned from Los Angeles. Let us learn it also in Louisville.•

MARKING THE 84TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE U.S. NAVY NURSES

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I rise today to salute the U.S. Navy nurses as they celebrate their 84th anniversary. The Nurse Corps has served this country dutifully and fearlessly since 1908. They are a unique group of individuals defined by their ability to provide care in a variety of settings, ranging from a field hospital in Korea to a ship on the Atlantic Ocean. In addition, these fine men and women act as ambassadors of goodwill all over the world.

Created by an act of Congress, the first members of the Nurse Corps were an elite group of young women called the Sacred Twenty. Under the leadership of Esther Voorhess Hasson, they laid the foundation for over eight decades of care and service. Today, there are over 3,000 active duty members and 2,500 Reserves.

Over the years the nurses have established a long record of achievement and excellence. The nurse corps has been involved in every major conflict since their inception. Time and time again, they selflessly put their lives in jeopardy to complete their line of duty. In World War I, of the four Navy crosses awarded to Navy nurses, three were awarded posthumously. In World War II, five nurses were captured by the Japanese in Guam and were interned for 6 months before repatriation. Eleven other nurses were captured in the Philippines and spent 37 months in internment camp.

Through these conflicts, the nurses have improved their skills and increased their importance to the Marine and Navy corps. In the Korean war, Vietnam war, and most recently, in Operation Desert Storm, the nurses served with distinction as consultants, analysts, resource managers and commanding officers.

Mr. President, I am proud that in my home State of Connecticut there are 42 active duty members of the Navy Nurse Corps assigned to the Naval Hospital in Groton. These men and women are to be congratulated for their sacrifice, dedication, and patriotism. I hope my colleagues will join me today to congratulate the Navy Nurse Corps for 84 years of service and wish them many more successful years in the future.•

CALHOUN COUNTY EMS: BEST IN THE NATION

• Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, each year, hundreds of emergency medical service teams from across the country compete to be recognized as the best EMS unit in the country. This year, South Carolina's Calhoun County EMS won the top honor—a truly remarkable achievement in several respects.

Calhoun County's unit is the first small, rural EMS team to win the national competition, which is usually dominated by large, established, urban EMS services. The fact is, Calhoun County does not even have a 911 emergency number, and many of its rural roads are unnamed. Even more remarkable, Calhoun County EMS has only been in operation since 1990.

So this first-place award is an extraordinary tribute to the skill and professionalism of the 25 EMS technicians and paramedics of the Calhoun County unit, brilliantly led and organized by Bill Minikiewicz. It is also a tribute to the Calhoun County community, which has generously supported its EMS service, and enthusiastically embraced the programs and innovations created by Mr. Minikiewicz and his colleagues.

South Carolina takes special pride in the excellence of its EMS services. Indeed, it is amazing that three of the last four national EMS award winners have been from the State of South Carolina.

Mr. President, I just cannot speak too highly about these EMS professionals. They serve with great coolness and courage amidst some of the most horrific, high-pressure circumstances imaginable. I am sure I speak for all Senators when I say that they have earned our utmost respect and our deep appreciation.•

TRIBUTE TO DR. W.L. McDIVITT, PRESIDENT OF OTERO JUNIOR COLLEGE IN LA JUNTA, CO

• Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to Dr. W.L. McDivitt, who is retiring as president of Otero Junior College in la Junta, CO, on July 1, 1992. In fact, "Dr. Mac" is the only president Otero Junior College has ever had.

Dr. McDivitt has been a leader of higher education at Otero Junior College for 40 years and has had a major influence on so many aspects of education in the Arkansas Valley and southeastern Colorado.

Beginning his career in higher education at the former La Junta Junior College as dean in August 1952, Dr. McDivitt became president of the renamed Otero Junior College on January 1, 1956.

When Dr. McDivitt began in 1952, there were only 89 students enrolled. Today, Otero Junior College has grown to almost 1,000 students. The growth in enrollment has been a remarkable feat considering the fact that population actually declined in southeastern Colorado over the past decades.

The campus has grown, too. Early in his presidency, a new center administration building was built as part of the old Works Project Administration [WPA] Program. A humanities building was erected later and further facilities were built especially for vocational education. Today, eight area high schools bus students to the Otero Junior College campus to take advantage of its vocational education facilities. High school students can now take part in the Central Arkansas Valley Occupational Center at Otero for instruc-

tion in computer science, welding, child care, automobile repair, building and trade skills, electronics, and nursing assistance.

One of Dr. McDivitt's most noteworthy accomplishments, though, may be the establishment of child care development services on campus. The program has received Federal funds for a Head Start Program and currently serves about 400 children and their families from Otero, Bent, Crowley, and Prowers Counties.

The staff, faculty, and students of Otero Junior College will deeply miss Dr. McDivitt, but the progress that has been made under his leadership will be remembered forever. The newly renovated W.L. and Mabel McDivitt Gymnasium will not only honor him for his many decades of service to the college, but will serve as a reminder of his countless contributions to the Otero Junior College campus.●

BUDGET SCOREKEEPING REPORT

● Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, I hereby submit to the Senate the budget scorekeeping report prepared by the Congressional Budget Office under section 308(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended. This report serves as the scorekeeping report for the purposes of section 605(b) and section 311 of the Budget Act.

This report shows that current level spending exceeds the budget resolution by $6.5 billion in budget authority and by $6.1 billion in outlays. Current level is $2.9 billion above the revenue floor in 1992 and $0.7 billion below the revenue floor over the 5 years, 1992–96. Since my last report, dated May 5, 1992, the Congress has cleared for the President's signature S. 2378, a bill extending certain expiring veterans' programs.

The current estimate of the deficit for purposes of calculating the maximum deficit amount is $354.4 billion, $3.2 billion above the maximum deficit amount for 1992 of $351.2 billion.

The report follows:

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, May 12, 1992.

Hon. JIM SASSER,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The attached report shows the effects of Congressional action on the budget for fiscal year 1992 and is current through May 8, 1992. The estimates of budget authority, outlays, and revenues are consistent with the technical and economic assumptions of the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget (H. Con. Res. 121). This report is submitted under Section 308(b) and in aid of Section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended, and meets the requirements for Senate scorekeeping of Section 5 of S. Con. Res. 32, the 1986 First Concurrent Resolution on the Budget.

Since my last report, dated May 5, 1992, the Congress has cleared for the President's signature S. 2378, a bill extending certain expiring veterans' programs. This action changes the current level for budget authority and outlays.

Sincerely,

ROBERT D. REISCHAUER,
Director.

THE ON-BUDGET CURRENT LEVEL REPORT FOR THE U.S. SENATE, 102D CONG. 2D SESS. SENATE SUPPORTING DETAIL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1992 AS OF CLOSE OF BUSINESS MAY 8, 1992

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget authority	Outlays	Revenues
ENACTED IN PREVIOUS SESSIONS			
Revenues	.....	.....	853,364
Permanents and other spending legislation	807,567	727,184	.....
Appropriation legislation	686,331	703,643	.....
Mandatory adjustments [1]	(1,041)	1,105	.....
Offsetting receipts	(232,542)	(232,542)	.....
Total previously enacted [2]	1,260,314	1,199,389	853,364
ENACTED THIS SESSION			
Emergency unemployment compensation extension (Public Law 102–244)	2,706	2,706	.....
American Technology Preeminence Act (Public Law 102–245)	.....	.....	(3)
Technical Correction to the Food Stamp Act (Public Law 102–265)	(3)	(3)	.....
Further continuing appropriations, 1992 (Public Law 102–266) [4]	14,178	5,724	.....
Total enacted this session	16,884	8,430	(3)
PENDING SIGNATURE			
Extend certain expiring veterans' programs (S. 2378)	(4)	(4)	.....
Total current level	1,277,196	1,207,817	853,364
Total budget resolution [5]	1,270,713	1,201,701	850,501
Amount remaining:			
Over budget resolution	6,483	6,116	2,863
Under budget resolution	.....	.....	.....

[1] Adjustments required to conform with current law estimates for entitlements and other mandatory programs in the concurrent resolution on the budget (H. Con. Res. 121).

[2] Excludes the continuing resolution enacted last session (Public Law 102–145) that expired Mar. 31, 1992.

[3] Less than $500,000.

[4] In accordance with section 251(a)(2)(D)(i) of the Budget Enforcement Act, the amount shown for Public Law 102–266 does not include $107,000,000 in budget authority and $28,000,000 in outlays in emergency funding for SBA disaster loans.

[5] Includes revision under section 9 of the concurrent resolution on the budget (see p. S4055 of "Congressional Record" dated Mar. 20, 1992).

Note.—Detail may not add due to rounding.

THE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT FOR THE U.S. SENATE, 102D CONG. 2D SESS. AS OF MAY 8, 1992

[In billions of dollars]

	Budget resolution (H. Con. Res. 121)	Current level [1]	Current level +/− resolution
On-budget:			
Budget authority	1,270.7	1,277.2	+6.5
Outlays	1,201.7	1,207.8	+6.1
Revenues:			
1992	850.5	853.4	+2.9
1992–96	4,836.2	4,835.5	−.7
Maximum deficit amount	351.2	354.4	+3.2
Debt subject to limit	3,982.2	3,783.1	−199.1
Off-budget:			
Social Security outlays:			
1992	246.8	246.8	.....
1992–96	1,331.5	1,331.5	.....
Social Security revenues:			
1992	318.8	318.8	.....
1992–96	1,830.3	1,830.3	.....

[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.

Note.—Detail may not add due to rounding.●

IN HONOR OF DOROTHY GOODWIN

● Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize Dorothy Goodwin for her lifetime of service to the State of Connecticut. As a professional, a teacher, and a legislator, she has been committed to improving the quality of life for all people.

Dorothy was born in Hartford and educated at Smith College. As a young woman, she interned with the Bureau of Agriculture Economics in Washington, DC. Following this experience, she worked as an economic intelligence officer in India and as an agricultural economist in Japan. Upon her return to the United States, she returned to school and became the first woman to receive her Ph.D. in agricultural economics from the University of Connecticut. She taught economics at UCONN until 1974.

At the age of 60 she retired from her teaching job and ran for a seat on the Connecticut State Legislature, where she served for 10 years. As a legislator Dorothy was a strong supporter of education. One of her most notable accomplishments was the school equalization bill which distributed State aid to schools based on the relative wealth of each community, improving the educational opportunities available to the underprivileged. Dorothy was also the chairman of the Joint Committee on Education and was appointed to the Connecticut Commission of Higher Education for several years.

Throughout her tenure with the legislature, Dorothy was known as a statesman—someone dedicated to serve the best interests of the public. As an advocate for the underprivileged and someone concerned with improving access to education, she was nicknamed "the conscience of the assembly" by her colleagues.

Although Dorothy is retired from politics, she continues to be an active participant in the community. Recently, the Mansfield community recognized her years of outstanding service by renaming the Northwest School in her honor. Other awards she has received include the 1992 UCONN Award commemorating 100 Years of Women and the Wilbur Cross Award for contributions to the public humanities.

Dorothy Goodwin is a role model to all. The integrity, values, and diligence she exudes are unique. The town of Mansfield and the State of Connecticut are lucky to have such a talented resident.●

CONGRATULATING RABBI NACHUM MUSCHEL

● Mr. D'AMATO. Mr President, I rise today to honor an esteemed member of New York State's Jewish community, Rabbi Nachum Muschel. The city of Monsey, NY, is very fortunate to be home to the Adolph H. Schreiber Hebrew Academy of Rockland, known as

ASHAR. On Sunday, May 31, 1992, the academy will honor Rabbi Nachum Muschel at its 38th annual dinner. Rabbi Muschel will be retiring as dean of the school after serving 36 years.

During his tenure, Rabbi Muschel's teachings reached almost 2,000 students as well as their families. The rabbi is a man of character, courage, and compassion as evidenced by his survival in a Siberian internment camp. He also served as a supervisor of education at Yeshiva Univesity's Teachers Institute for Women. During the early 1950's, Rabbi Muschel envisioned an Orthodox community in the suburbs of New York City. He has invested his time and talent into building the community around ASHAR, and the institution has gained recognition on a national scale.

Since the 1950's, the Jewish people in Israel and elsewhere incurred many struggles in maintaining their identity. Rabbi Muschel has been a valuable man for the Jewish community in this regard and has done much to preserve the identity of his people.

I wish Rabbi Muschel and his family the best in the years to come. The Adolph H. Schreiber Hebrew Academy of Rockland and the Jewish community of New York will sorely miss his services.●

NEED A LIFT?

● Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, in an effort to help the young people of this country, the American Legion has published its 41st edition of "Need a Lift?" It is one of the best informational handbooks I have seen on educational opportunities for scholarships, careers, and loans.

It is important for students to have as much information as is available about financial aid and scholarship opportunities. For that reason, I ask that section IV of this handbook covering Federal programs for loans and scholarships be printed in the RECORD.

The section follows:

SECTION IV—SOURCES OF SCHOLARSHIPS AND OTHER FORMS OF FINANCIAL AID AVAILABLE TO ALL STUDENTS

A. FEDERAL PROGRAMS (LISTED ALPHABETICALLY)

1. U.S. Department of Education provides the largest source of funding for financial aid programs. These programs are listed in the following paragraphs. Applications are available at postsecondary schools and high schools. The "Federal Student Aid Fact Sheet from the U.S. Department of Education, 1991-92" may be obtained by writing to Federal Student Aid Programs, P.O. Box 84, Washington, DC 20044. Federal student aid questions may be directed to the *toll-free* Federal Student Aid Information number: 1-800-4 FED AID.

a. College Work-Study Program (CWSP). This program provides on-campus and off-campus employment to undergraduate and graduate students enrolled in colleges and eligible postsecondary institutions who need financial aid to meet college expenses. The wage paid is at least the current Federal minimum wage, but it may also be related to the type of work and its difficulty. In arranging a job and assigning a work schedule, the aid administrator takes into account the student's health, class schedule and academic progress.

b. Pell Grant Program. Formerly called the Basic Grant Program, this program makes funds available to eligible students attending participating colleges, community/junior colleges, vocational schools, technical institutions, hospital schools of nursing, and other participating postsecondary institutions. To apply for the grant, an applicant must demonstrate need and be an undergraduate student enrolled on at least a halt-time basis. For the 1991-92 award period, individual awards will depend on program funding. The maximum award for the 1991-92 academic year was $2,400. To apply for a Pell Grant, a student must complete either the Federal form called "Application for Federal Student Aid" or one of several private or State need analysis applications which are used to determine eligibility for other sources of student aid: the Financial Aid Form (FAF) processed by CSS, the Family Financial Statement (FSS) processed by ACT, the Pennsylvania Higher Education Assistance Agency (PHEAA) form processed by PHEAA, the Student Aid Application for California (SAAC) processed by CSS, the Illinois State Scholarship Commission's form (AFSSA), processed by CSX or the Single file Form processed by USAF. Further information may be obtained from the Office of Student Financial Aid at the institution or a high school guidance counselor.

c. Perkins Loan (formerly National Direct Student Loan Program—NDSL). These loans are available to students enrolled at least half time (and in some cases less than half-time) in a regular program of study at a participating school and who demonstrate need for financial assistance. Aggregate loans may not exceed $18,000 for a graduate student including undergraduate loans; $9,000 for students who have not completed their bachelor's but have completed 2 years leading to a bachelor's degree; $4,500 for any other student. Repayment of the loan begins 9 months after a borrower ceases to carry at least one half the normal academic work load, and is to be repaid within 10 years. Your "grace period" may be different than nine months if you are less than a half-time student. Interest of 5% will begin at the time the repayment period begins. You may defer repayment or have portions of your loan canceled under certain conditions.

d. Plus Loans and Supplemental Loans for Students (SLS). PLUS loans are for parent borrowers. SLS loans are for undergraduate/graduate students. Interest rates are variable (maximum 12%). Like Stafford loans, they are made by a lender such as a bank, credit union, or savings and loan association. It is not necessary to demonstrate need. Parents, graduate students and independent undergraduates may borrow $4,000 per year. In exceptional circumstances, the financial aid administrator may authorize dependent undergraduates to apply for an SLS. All borrowers must begin repaying these loans within 60 days, unless the borrower is entitled to a deferment and the lender agrees to let the interest accumulate until the deferment ends. The negotiation of each loan is between the student and the lending institution. Individuals who desire more information or wish to initiate a loan should discuss the matter with the lender and the school financial aid administrator.

e. Stafford Loan (formerly Guaranteed Student Loan—GSL). This program provides loans to students for educational expenses, and is available from eligible lenders such as banks, credit unions, savings and loan associations, State agencies and schools. Students must be enrolled on at least a half-time basis in participating postsecondary institutions, ranging from vocational and technical schools to degree-granting institutions. All applicants must undergo a needs test. For new borrowers, the interest rate is 8 percent for the first 4 years of repayment and 10 percent after that. A 5 percent origination fee is charged, which will be deducted proportionately from each loan payment. The money is passed on to the Federal Government to help reduce the Government's cost of subsidizing these low-interest loans. Your lender may also charge you an insurance premium of up to 3 percent of the loan principal.

Loans must be repaid. Repayment normally is over a 5-10 year period. The amount of the student's repayment depends on the size of his or her debt. The more the student borrows, the higher the payment will be. Failure to repay on a timely basis can damage a person's credit rating and may lead to legal action to recover the debt.

Deferment of payment may be granted for a variety of reasons. Deferments are not automatic and must be applied for through your lender. Check with your lender for deferment information.

Depending on your need, you may borrow up to $2,625 a year, if you're a first or second-year undergraduate student; $4,000 a year, if you have completed 2 years of study and have achieved third-year status; $7,500 a year, if you're a graduate student. The total Stafford Loan debt you can have outstanding as an undergraduate is $17,250. The total for graduate or professional study is $54,750, including any loans made as an undergraduate.

f. Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grant [SEOG] Program. This grant program is for students with exceptional financial need (priority given to PELL grant recipients). Students must be enrolled as an undergraduate or vocational student in a regular program of study at an educational institution participating in the program. In some cases, awards may be made to less than half-time students. Graduate students are not eligible. The amount of the award may be up to $4,000 yearly. There are other Federal programs you can get information about from your State educational agencies. These programs are:

G. THE PAUL DOUGLAS TEACHER SCHOLARSHIP.

Encourages outstanding high school graduates to pursue teaching careers after they finish postsecondary education. Provides scholarships of up to $5,000 for each year of postsecondary education to students who graduate from high school in the top 10 percent of their class, and who meet other selection criteria their State educational agency may establish. Generally, students are required to teach two years for each year of scholarship assistance they receive. Check with your State Scholarship Agency for information.

H. THE ROBERT C. BYRD HONORS SCHOLARSHIP.

Students who demonstrate outstanding academic achievement and show promise of continued excellence may receive $1,500 for their first year of postsecondary education. These scholarships are based solely on merit, and are not renewable. Recipients are selected by the agency in the State responsible for supervising public elementary and secondary schools.

2. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services administers programs of assistance

for students enrolled in health professions programs.

a. Exceptional Financial Need Scholarship Program [IV-1] provides a scholarship to encourage students with exceptional financial need to pursue careers in medicine, osteopathic medicine, dentistry, optometry, podiatric medicine, pharmacy, or veterinary medicine. Applicants should be citizens, nationals or lawful permanent residents of the United States or District of Columbia, the Commonwealths of Puerto Rico, or the Marianna Islands, the Virgin Islands, Guam, the American Samoa, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, the Republic of Palau, the Republic of the Marshall Islands and the Federated State of Micronesia. Scholarships will cover all or a part of the cost of tuition, and other reasonable educational expenses including fees, books, laboratory expenses and other costs of attending school. No service or financial obligation accompanies the scholarship. For information, write: Health Resources and Services Administration, Bureau of Health Professions, Division of Student Assistance, Parklawn Building, Room 8-38, 5600 Fishers Lane, Rockville, MD 20857. To apply for the program, contact the Director of Student Financial Aid at the school where you intend to apply for admission or where you are enrolled.

b. Program of financial assistance for disadvantaged health professions students is a program that provides financial assistance without a service or financial obligation to disadvantaged health professions students who are of exceptional financial need to pursue a degree in medicine, osteopathic medicine, or dentistry by providing financial support to help pay for their costs of education. Federal funds for this program are allocated to participating accredited health professions schools located in the United States and Puerto Rico. These schools are responsible for selecting the recipients of such assistance. You are eligible to apply if you are a citizen, national or lawful permanent resident of the United States or the District of Columbia, the Commonwealths of Puerto Rico or the Mariana Islands, the Virgin Islands, Guam, the American Samoa or the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, the Republic of Palau, the Republic of the Marshall Islands, and the Federated State of Micronesia; are accepted for enrollment or are enrolled in a participating health professions school as a full-time student; and are determined by your school's Financial Aid Director to be of "exceptional financial need" and to meet "disadvantaged" criteria.

Depending on funding available, a student may receive funds to cover the costs of tuition and other reasonable education expenses including fees, books, laboratory expenses and other costs of attending school.

To apply, contact the Director of Student Financial Aid at the school where you intend to apply for admission or where you are enrolled, or write to the address in (a) above.

c. The Health Education Assistance Loan (HEAL) Program is a federally insured loan program for eligible graduate students in schools of medicine, osteopathy, dentistry, veterinary medicine, optometry, podiatry, public health, pharmacy, chiropractic, or in programs in health administration, clinical psychology, or allied health.

Eligible Borrower—must be a citizen, national or permanent resident of the United States and accepted for enrollment as a full-time student, or already in full-time attendance and in good standing at an eligible HEAL school. Pharmacy students must have satisfactorily completed three years of training toward a pharmacy degree.

Eligible Schools—Accredited health professions schools are eligible to participate in the HEAL Program if the school has an agreement with the Secretary. Foreign schools are not eligible under the HEAL Program even though some are eligible for the Guaranteed Student Loan Program.

Eligible Lenders—Financial or credit institutions (including banks, savings and loan associations, credit unions, or insurance companies), State agencies, pension funds, eligible HEAL schools, and non-profit private entities designated by a State.

Loan Limitations—Medical, osteopathic, dental, veterinary, optometric or podiatric students may borrow up to $20,000 per year, not to exceed $80,000 for all years. Pharmacy, chiropractic, health administration, clinical psychology, public health or allied health students may borrow up to $12,500 per year not to exceed $50,000 for all years.

Loans may be used solely for tuition, other reasonable educational expenses, including fees, books, supplies and equipment, and laboratory expenses, reasonable living expenses, reasonable transportation costs that relate directly to borrowers' educational expenses, and the HEAL insurance premium.

Interest—The HEAL program does not provide a subsidy payment for interest. The amount of interest which may be charged to the borrower on the unpaid balance of the loan may not exceed the average bond-equivalent rate during the prior calendar quarter for 91-day Treasury bills sold at auction, plus three percent, rounded to the next higher ⅛ of one percent. Payment of principal and interest may be deferred while the borrower is a full-time student and during specific eligible periods of deferment. For more information contact the Director of Student Financial Aid at your school, or write to address in (a) above: Room 8-39.

d. The Health Professions Student Loan Program is a program of long-term, low interest loans to assist students having need for financial assistance to undertake the course of study required to become a physician, dentist, osteopathic physician, optometrist, pharmacist, podiatrist, or veterinarian. Funds are allocated to accredited schools of medicine, dentistry, osteopathic medicine, optometry, pharmacy, podiatric medicine, and veterinary medicine which are located in the United States and Puerto Rico, and which participate in the student loan program.

Each school participating in this program is responsible for selecting the recipients of loans and for determining the amount of assistance a student requires. Students applying for assistance under this program should apply through the school in which they have been accepted for enrollment or in which they are enrolled.

You are eligible to apply for a loan at a school that participates in the Health Professions Student Loan Program if you are:

1. A citizen, national, or a lawful permanent resident of the United States or the District of Columbia, the Commonwealths of Puerto Rico or the Marianna Islands, the Virgin Islands, Guam, the American Samoa, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, the Republic of Palau, the Republic of the Marshall Islands, and the Federated State of Micronesia;

2. Accepted for enrollment or enrolled as a full-time student in a course leading to a degree of doctor of medicine, doctor of dental surgery or equivalent degree, doctor of osteopathic medicine, doctor of optometry or equivalent degree, bachelor of science in pharmacy or equivalent degree, doctor of pharmacy degree, doctor of podiatric medicine or equivalent degree, or doctor of veterinary medicine or equivalent degree; and

3. In need of the loan to be able to pursue the course of study.

Note: Students enrolled in schools of medicine or osteopathic medicine must demonstrate exceptional financial need.

Pre-professional students, interns, residents, and students seeking advanced training are not eligible for assistance under this program.

The maximum amount you may borrow for each school year is the cost of tuition plus $2,500 or the amount of your financial need, whichever is the lesser. The interest rate is five percent (5%) for all loans made on or after November 4, 1988.

For information, contact the Director of Student Financial Aid at your school, or write to the address in (a) above.

e. National Health Service Corps (NHSC) Scholarships [IV-2] are awarded to U.S. citizens enrolled or accepted for enrollment as full-time students in accredited U.S. schools in the Fields of Allopathic or Osteopathic Medicine, Dentistry, Nurse Practitioner Education (Post-Baccalaureate), Nurse Midwifery Education (Baccalaureate or Post-Baccalaureate) and Primary Care Physician Assistant Training (Baccalaureate or beyond). These scholarships include a monthly living stipend and payment of school tuition. Each year of scholarship support incurs a year of Federal service obligation. The minimum service obligation is 2 years.

The NHSC places full-time primary health care practitioners in selected federally-designated Health Manpower Shortage Areas of the United States. Virtually all of these practitioners owe service obligations of 2 to 4 years due to their participation in the NHSC Scholarship Program.

If appropriated funds are available, applications for competitive awards for the 1991-92 school year may be limited to students who have participated at their schools in the Federal "Scholarship Program for First-Year Students of Exceptional Financial Need."

The scholarship program is administered by the Bureau of Health Care Delivery and Assistance, Division of Health Services Scholarships. For further information write to: NHSC Scholarships, Parklawn Building, Room 7-18, 5600 Fishers Lane, Rockville, Maryland 20857. Telephone: (301) 443-1650, or for toll-free message tape, call 1-80-638-0824 (except Maryland).

f. National Health Service Corps Loan Repayment Program: [IV-2]. The NHSC Loan Repayment Program invites applications from licensed allopathic (M.D.) or osteopathic (D.O.) physicians in the specialties of family practice, obstetrics-gynecology, pediatrics, internal medicine, and osteopathic general practice.

This federal program pays up to $20,000 annually toward a participant's qualified medical education loans (including HEAL) in return for 3 or 4 years of full-time professional practice at an approved HNSC Loan Repayment Service Site in the USA. (Two-year agreements will pay up to $25,000 per year.) Over 200 positions are available, mainly at private, non-profit community health centers serving the poor, the homeless, and migrant farm workers and their families. Compensation packages are negotiable and compare favorably with similar physicians in the same geographic area. Matches to sites must be concluded by February 15, 1992 and employment begin no later than August 1, 1992.

For an application, a list of NHSC Loan Repayment Service Sites, and a complete de-

scription of the Program, write to: *Division of Health Services Scholarships, Room 7-18, Parklawn Building, 5600 Fishers Lane, Rockville, MD. 20857* or telephone during office hours: 1-301-443-1650.

g. National Health Service Corps Loan Repayment Program for Graduate Nurses [IV-2]

The National Health Service Corps (NHSC) Loan Repayment Program pays for each year of full-time salaried practice at an approved NHSC Loan Repayment Service Site, up to $20,000 (up to $25,000 for certain sites under contract to Indian Tribes) toward a participant's qualified Government and commercial health professions education loans.

Applicants must be nurses who are U.S. citizens, preferably in their last year of graduate training for the M.S.N. A signed NHSC Loan Repayment Contract must be submitted with application agreeing to practice at an approved Site for 2, 3, or 4 years. Preference for selection will be given those who have completed graduate training in certified family nurse practitioners, pediatric nurse or nurse midwives. For applications write to NHSC Loan Repayment Program for Graduate Nurses, Room 7-16, Parklawn Building, 5600 Fishers Lane, Rockville, Md. 20857.

h. Minority Access to Research Careers Program (MARC) Honors Undergraduate Research Training Awards. [IV-3] The Minority Access to Research Careers Program's Honors Undergraduate Research Training Program is designed to increase the number of well-prepared minority students who can compete successfully for entry into graduate programs leading to the Ph.D. in biomedical research. Its goal is also to help develop strong science curricula and research opportunities to prepare students for careers in biomedical research. A formal research experience for the recipient is an essential feature of the program. Summer study and research should be part of the overall training program at outstanding institutions or laboratories selected to enhance and supplement the trainee's formal course work and research training experience. The criteria for selection of trainees includes evidence that the candidate has clear potential to perform at a high level in the biomedical sciences and that the candidate demonstrates a determination to subsequently enter graduate programs leading to the Ph.D. degree. Applicants must be honor students in all four years of college. The college or university must have an enrollment drawn substantially from ethnic minority groups such as Am. Indians, Blacks, Hispanics, and Pacific Islanders.

Each school will make awards for stipend and tuition support for five or more students. The award may include travel expenses to one national meeting closely related to a project.

Graduates of this undergraduate program are then eligible to compete for a MARC Predoctoral Fellowship which supports 5 years of training toward either the Ph.D. or M.D./Ph.D. at any high quality graduate institution.

Applications may be filed by January 10, May 10 or September 10. Apply for information or application to: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, National Institutes of Health, National Institute of General Medical Sciences, Westwood Building, Room 950, Bethesda, Maryland 20892.

3. Other U.S. Department of Health and Human Service Programs Are:

a. Commissioned Officers Student Training and Extern Program (COSTEP) [iv-4]. COSTEP is a recruiting device for Commissioned Corps of the Public Health Service (PHS) which offers excellent opportunities for students in health-related fields to get maximum benefit during free periods (31-120 days) of the academic year. Students may apply for assignments at any time during the year; however, the majority of students are hired for the summer period. To be eligible a student must have completed a minimum of one year of study in a medical, dental, or veterinary school; or have completed a minimum of two years of a professionally accredited baccalaureate program in the following course of study: dietetics, engineering, nursing, pharmacy, therapy, sanitary science, or medical record administration; or be enrolled in a masters or doctoral program in a health related field other than those mentioned above. The student must expect to return to college as a full-time student in an accredited field of study following completion of the COSTEP assignment. Students must be free of any obligation that would conflict with extended duty in the PHS Commissioned Corps, may not be a member of another unformed service nor owe a service obligation to another unformed service, and must meet the qualifications for appointment in the Commissioned Corps. These include being a citizen of the United States, meeting the physical standards of the corps, and being under 44 years of age. Transportation is paid to and from the location of the assignment. For applications, contact: Division of Commissioned Personnel, ATTN: COSTEP, 8201 Greensboro Dr. Suite 600 McLean, VA 29102

Deadline for applications: October 1 for assignments from January through April, February 1 for May through August, and May 1 for September through December. COSTEPs are commissioned as junior assistant health service officers in the Commissioned Corps of the PHS. The pay of a single COSTEP officer is $1,444.20 salary. $269.80 quarters allowance, $129.00 subsistence for a total of $1,863.00 per month. For COSTEP officers with dependents, the quarters allowance is $3393.30 for a total of $1,966.50 per month. The quarters and subsistence allowances are not taxable. COSTEP are eligible for medical and dental care while on duty and receive many of the benefits of commissioned officers. For additional information, you may call the COSTEP office at (703) 734-6855.

b. Professional Nurse Traineeship Program. [IV-5]. Professional nurse traineeships are available through participating training institutions to help registered nurses prepare to teach in the various fields of nurse training, to serve in administrative or supervisory capacities, to serve as nurse practitioners, or to serve in other professional nursing specialities requiring advanced training. Traineeships provide a living stipend (not to exceed $8,800) and tuition and fees as set by the participating training institution. Trainees are selected by the training institutions. Further information is available from: Division of Nursing, Bureau of Health Professions, Health Resources and Services Administration Room 5C26, Parklawn Bldg., 5600 Fishers Lane, Rockville, MD 20857. Students should request information through the Dean of Nursing at their institution. NOTE: this assistance is only for students studying at the master's or doctoral level or studying to become nurse midwives.

c. Nursing Student Loan Program. [IV-5.1] The program is intended to assist students to achieve careers in nursing by providing long-term, low-interest loans to help meet costs of education.

Federal funds for this program are allocated to accredited schools of nursing education. These schools are responsible for selecting the recipients of loans and for determining the amount of assistance a student requires. Students applying for assistance under this program should apply through the school in which they have been accepted for enrollment or in which they are enrolled.

You are eligible to apply for a Nursing Student Loan it you are a citizen, national, or a lawful permanent resident of the United States or the District of Columbia, the Commonwealths of Puerto Rico or the Marianna Islands, the Virgin Islands, Guam, the American Samoa, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, the Republic of Palau, the Republic of the Marshall Islands and the Federated State of Micronesia; are accepted for enrollment or are enrolled as a full-time or half-time student in a course leading to a diploma in nursing, an associate degree in nursing, a bachelor's degree in nursing or an equivalent degree, or a graduate degree in nursing.

You may borrow $2,500 for an academic year, $4,000 for each of the final two years, or the amount of your financial need, whichever is the lesser. The total amount of student's loan for all years may not exceed $13,000.

In determining the amount of assistance you may require, the school considers: All financial resources available to you, including other sources of aid, such as scholarships or other repayable loans, and the costs reasonably necessary for attendance at the school.

The interest rate is five percent (5%) for all loans made on or after November 4, 1988. *To apply, contact the Director of Student Financial Aid at your school.*

4. The U.S. Department of Interior Administers a Program of Indian Tribal Grants. [IV-6.1] Over 45 Indian tribes have established their own grant programs to promote higher education for their members. Contacts for tribal assistance should be made through the U.S. Dept. of the Interior, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Washington, DC 20240, or through the Tribal Headquarters.

5. Indians Higher Education Grant Program. [IV-6] is a program for students who are members of a tribal group being served by the Bureau and who are enrolled in accredited institutions of their choice in pursuit of an undergraduate or graduate degree; must demonstrate financial need to the institution they are or will be attending. For information, write to: *Department of the Interior-BIA, Office of Education Programs, MS 3512, Code 522, 18th & C Street, NW., Washington, DC 20240.*

6. The U.S. Information Agency Sponsors: The Fulbright Teacher Exchange Program. [IV-7] Under the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act, qualified American educators may work in elementary and secondary schools abroad, and, in some instances, institutions of higher education in various countries. To be eligible, an applicant must be teaching currently as an elementary or secondary school teacher, college instructor, assistant, associate or full professor. Candidates must have at least a bachelor's degree, be a U.S. citizen at the time of application, proficiency in the language of the host country and have at least three years of successful full-time teaching experience. Two years are required for participation in summer seminars held in Italy and the Netherlands. Evidence of good health and stability also is required.

Round-trip transportation to some countries for those selected to participate may be provided. A maintenance allowance may also be provided, paid in the currency of the host

country, based upon that country's cost of living. For teachers participating in the Exchange Program, the successful applicant's U.S. salary is continued by the participant's own school. Seminar grants may include round trip transportation and tuition costs, but for some, the participants are responsible for their own maintenance expenses. Regional interviewing committees conduct preliminary screening of applicants. Annual application deadline date is October 15. Application forms can be obtained from and then submitted to the Teachers Exchange Branch, E/ASX, Room 353, U.S. Information Agency, 301 4th Street, SW., Washington, DC 20547.•

HONORING DONALD SCHUENKE AND NML

• Mr. KASTEN. Mr. President, at a time when the attention of America is finally being drawn to the plight of our inner cities, I think it is very important that we recognize those who are already making a difference for the better in these communities.

In Milwaukee, Northwestern Mutual Life Insurance Co. has announced that will contribute up to $500,000 to the rehabilitation of 50 homes in the west side of the city.

Donald J. Schuenke, the chairman and chief executive officer of Northwestern Mutual, also heads the inner city task force of the Greater Milwaukee Committee—a group of 175 civic leaders. Mr. Schuenke believes that home ownership is one of the keys to rescuing our inner cities—and he is doing what he can to make this happen.

I ask my colleagues to join me in applauding the efforts of this distinguished citizen. I further ask that an article on this subject in the Milwaukee Journal be included in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The article follows:

[From the Milwaukee Journal, May 11, 1992]

WEST SIDE: NML OFFERS $500,000 FOR HOUSING

(By Marilynn Marchone)

Northwestern Mutual Life Insurance Co. announced Monday that it would contribute up to $500,000 to a project to rehabilitate 50 homes in Merrill Park on the near West Side in an effort to bolster home ownership there.

The grant is the largest NML has ever made to a housing program in Milwaukee and one of the largest housing grants ever by a private firm here.

The money will be given to Westside Conservation Corps, a 14-year-old neighborhood-based development agency that owns more than 80 single- and two-family houses in Merrill Park.

"We believe that home ownership is the cornerstone of a neighborhood, and we believe Merrill Park has an excellent chance to flourish if it's populated with more homeowners," said a statement from Donald J. Schuenke, Northwestern Mutual's chairman and chief executive officer.

RELATED PUSH BY GMC

In a related matter, the Greater Milwaukee Committee, a group of 175 key business and civil leaders, on Monday was to encourage its member companies to help employees buy houses in Milwaukee. Companies with more than 15,000 employees will be asked to take part, possibly helping provide down payments and/or closing costs.

Some companies, including Wisconsin Electric Power Co. and Wisconsin Gas, already have programs encouraging home ownership in certain areas of the city.

Schuenke, who heads the GMC's Inner City Task Force, said his company's program "is not an official part of the GMC effort [but] certainly dovetails with it."

Merrill Park is bounded by N. 27th St. on the east, N 35th St. on the west, W. Wisconsin Ave. on the north and Interstate 94 on the south.

Schuenke said NML had been developing the grant program for more than a year.

"We think we've come up with a solid plan," he said.

Westside Conservation Corps. will be the general contractor and will work on at least five homes at a time. Each house will be offered for sale when it is about halfway through the rehabilitation process.

Purchasers must live in the houses they are buying and attend the community group's Home Buyers Clinic, which helps potential homeowners with the purchase process and teaches them such skills as how to spot structural problems.

"Neighborhood crews will perform some of the tasks such as carpentry, drywall installation and painting," the statement from Schuenke says. "We strongly encourage them to hire minority-owned and staffed companies as subcontractors."

AVERAGE FIX-UP COST: $42,000

The average cost to rehabilitate a home is expected to be $42,000, said John T. Cleary, executive director of the Westside Conservation Corps. Commercial bank construction loans, a Community Development Block Grant from the City of Milwaukee and in-kind services contributed by Wisconsin Gas and Wisconsin Electric will cover about 80% of the cost, and NML will play the rest, Schuenke's statement says.

"We expect to grant the WCC an average of $8,500 per house," the statement says. "The average selling price per house will be $35,000."

The program is expected to take two years.

Northwestern Mutual is involved in other housing programs in the city as a grantmaker and investor, Schuenke said. The company sponsored two Habitat for Humanity homes at $25,000 apiece that were rehabilitated largely by company volunteers.

As an investor, NML contributed $1 million in long-term financing for Project Hope, a program of Wheaton Franciscan Services, to provide affordable housing on the Near North Side.

Last month, the company invested $1.5 million in Johnson Square, a project to convert six boarded-up buildings on the Near West Side into 179 apartments for low-income families.

And last week, Aurora Health Care, the parent company of Sinai Samaritan Medical Center, announced it would contribute 29 properties and $4.1 million to a housing rehabilitation effort spearheaded by Marquette University through its Campus Circle Project. That target area is adjacent to the Johnson Square project.•

NATIONAL SHERIFFS' WEEK—SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 273

• Mr. SEYMOUR. Mr. President, on March 18, I joined with 21 of my colleagues to introduce Senate Joint Resolution 273, a resolution to designate the week of June 21 as "National Sheriffs' Week." Since then, 14 additional Senators have added their support for my resolution.

Again, I want to urge my colleagues to cosponsor this important legislation. This resolution will bring much deserved recognition to our Nation's sheriffs and county law enforcement officers, as well as enhance the public's knowledge of the important role our local sheriffs' departments play in our communities.

Mr. President, time is short. We must add 15 additional cosponsors before the end of May to ensure passage of the bill in time to properly honor these dedicated men and women of the law enforcement community. I ask that the text of my resolution be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

The text of the joint resolution follows:

S.J. RES. 273

Whereas the members of the National Sheriffs' Association consistently endeavor to exhibit the highest standards of integrity in serving their communities and their country while devoting themselves to the cause of law and justice;

Whereas our Nation's sheriffs are committed to the development, implementation, and support of crime prevention projects at national, State, and local levels;

Whereas the National Sheriffs' Association is unwavering in its support of sheriffs and their employees throughout the United States in their efforts to discharge their law enforcement, corrections, and judicial responsibilities in a constitutional, effective, and professional manner;

Whereas our Nation's sheriffs are instrumental in planning and conducting programs designed to foster respect for the law by juveniles and to combat delinquency and unlawful behavior by youths;

Whereas the National Sheriffs' Association demonstrates its ongoing commitment to foster cooperation with public and private organizations dedicated to the reduction of crime and to the improvement of law enforcement, corrections, and other criminal justice activities throughout the United States;

Whereas for over 50 years, the National Sheriffs' Association has endeavored to develop and encourage the practice of the highest standards of personal and professional conduct among sheriffs and other law enforcement officers; and

Whereas the National Sheriffs' Association is holding its 1992 conference and exhibition in San Diego, California, from June 20 through 24, 1992, and it is expected to attract more than 3,000 persons to San Diego to participate in executive meetings, general educational seminars, and other activities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the week commencing June 21, 1992, is designated as "National Sheriffs' Week". The President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities, including programs designed to heighten the awareness of all citizens to the importance of our local sher-

iffs and county law enforcement officers in bringing peace to America's neighborhoods and streets.●

NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, I rise today to remind the Nation about the supreme sacrifice of life made by so many members of our law enforcement community. In March 1992 I rose to pay tribute to the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial in Washington, DC, which was dedicated to the memory of the more than 12,500 officers who died in the line of duty throughout our Nation's history. We should especially remember the service of these dedicated public servants during National Police Week, May 10–16, 1992.

During the month of May, the Fraternal Order of Police has asked that police departments and communities across our Nation join them by displaying a blue ribbon on our automobiles in memory of our law enforcement officers who have been killed in the line of duty. This blue ribbon also will pay tribute to the survivors of these heroes and heroines as well as to all law enforcement officers who serve and protect our country every day. Even though unfortunate situations occur, such as in Los Angeles, most incidents involving police are handled professionally.

These simple blue ribbons are a symbol that a thankful Nation appreciates the continued service of our Nation's 500,000 law enforcement officers. I am proud to note that this blue ribbon project was born in my great State of Illinois. In 1991, blue ribbons were displayed in Illinois in memory of our law enforcement officers.

The State of Illinois was the first and only State to display the blue ribbon. The Fraternal Order of Police passed a resolution at their national convention in Pittsburgh last year that all FOP lodges throughout the country participate in the blue ribbon project. Our country often takes for granted the service of so many in protecting our communities. This simple gesture connotes our thanks.●

U.S. ARMY YUMA PROVING GROUND: A NATIONAL ASSET

● Mr. DECONCINI. Mr. President, one of the major lessons to be learned from the Persian Gulf war is that our fighting forces deserve the best equipment possible. Therefore we must continually upgrade our conventional weapon systems. Although our massive budget deficit requires us to reduce the size of the overall defense budget, it is imperative that we must fund the research and development of new technologies and maintain our capability to fully test these improvements under realistic conditions.

This is why I wish to discuss research and development activities at the U.S. Army Yuma Proving Ground [YPG], located along the Colorado River in southwestern Arizona. Yuma Proving Ground—roughly the size of Rhode Island—employs a work force of 2,000 civilian and military personnel.

A wide variety of military equipment is tested annually at the proving ground. Approximately 100 tests typically occur at any one time. Major testing categories include: aircraft armament; artillery and tank weapons; tracked and wheeled vehicles of all shapes, sizes, and types, and air delivery systems.

The installation offers a parched, arid environment closely resembling that of the Middle East. In testing equipment at the proving ground, Army personnel encounter nearly every problem that might be experienced in a harsh desert region. Yuma Proving Ground personnel routinely develop improved maintenance procedures and identify problem areas for correction.

The proving ground's longest running mission—difficult desert environmental testing—began during World War II under the aegis of Maj. Gen. George S. Patton who was preparing his troops for combat duty in the North African campaigns. That effort was highly successful and led to the expansion of the proving ground's mission throughout the years.

Yuma Proving Ground's remoteness and natural terrain provide the installation with several highly instrumented test areas. These include the 75,000-meter long Kofa Range for testing long-range artillery, tanks, mortars, mines, and other ordnance. The Cibola Range is the primary area for testing aircraft armament systems such as the successful Apache Helicopter Gunship Program, air delivery testing, and a variety of other manned and unmanned aerial vehicle tests. The Cibola Range is approximately 20 miles wide by 30 miles deep and features pinpoint space positioning and event imaging using laser trackers, high-speed video and global positioning receivers.

Yuma Proving Ground's unique Middle East cross country course, which replicates many of the primary terrain features found in the Persian Gulf region, adds to its other unique features to underscore the importance of realistic testing in the research and development mission. Artificial simulation methods, while cost effective and useful up to a point, simply cannot substitute for the real thing. Decades of experience have shown that if you want to find out what happens to military equipment in the desert, that's where you must test it. Surface temperatures exceeding 150° Fahrenheit literally fry unprotected electronic components. Minute particles of abrasive sand and dust sift through seals and filters into moving parts to cause accelerated wear. Liquids evaporate faster and, under long-term storage, ultraviolet radiation alters the chemical properties of nylons, rubbers, and plastics.

Many critical systems used during Operation Desert Storm were tested at Yuma Proving Ground, including the M–1 Abrams main battle tank, the Bradley fighting vehicle, the Apache helicopter, mine-clearing equipment, and much more.

In the years prior to the conflict, nearly 100,000 miles of stringent performance and durability testing were logged on the Abrams—the main component of America's modern armored force. The M–1 owes its excellent credentials, in part, to testing at YPG. When the tank first arrived at the proving ground for testing in 1981, it experienced problems caused by the desert environment. But years of realistic testing and continuous improvements have made it an extremely reliable vehicle that operates well in the desert.

During this year's Defense Appropriations Subcommittee hearings concerning the continuing role of the U.S. Army Yuma Proving Ground in future testing. The Secretary of the Army stated that:

> There are very limited facilities that we have anywhere in the United States to conduct the type of training that goes on at Yuma. Yuma has been in the past a very valuable facility for the Army.

Almost $60 million in military construction is slated to occur at the proving ground in fiscal year 1993 to accommodate the ammunition acceptance mission of the Jefferson Proving ground in Indiana which will be transferred to the Yuma Proving ground by fiscal year 1995.

Important test programs continue to be scheduled at the proving ground. The Marines are consolidating all light armored vehicle testing at Yuma Proving Ground and the British, Israeli, and Japanese Governments have recently completed test programs at the installation. The Technical Research and Development Institute of the Japanese Defense Agency is currently developing a 155 mm artillery projectile which will be tested at Yuma.

Emerging technologies to be tested at the proving ground include: work on a new liquid propellant for U.S. artillery; "fire and forget" artillery and missile rounds which will allow fired submunitions to independently target and destroy individual targets, and field testing of electric gun technology which will offer tank and ship-based weapons a revolutionary increase in firepower by propelling munitions faster, farther, and safer than by existing methods. Yuma Proving Ground is at the forefront of these innovative and exciting technologies.

The Army and the other branches of America's military face the challenge of operating in nearly any climate on the face of the globe. Realistic environ-

mental testing is absolutely necessary to ensure equipment reliability and, thereby, to save lives. Information gathered from testing at Yuma ensures the proper design of military hardware and identifies required maintenance procedures to be incorporated into manuals for use by soldiers in the field. This commitment to rigorous testing certifies America's solemn commitment to military excellence to its soldiers, its citizens, and its allies around the world.

I applaud the hard work of the men and women at the Yuma Proving Ground and their dedication and service to their Nation and its defense.●

ORDERS FOR TOMORROW

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in recess until 8:45 a.m., Thursday, May 14; that following the prayer, the Journal of proceedings be deemed approved to date and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that there then be a period for morning business, not to extend beyond 10:30 a.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 5 minutes each; that immediately after the Chair's announcement, Senator HEFLIN be recognized to speak for up to 10 minutes, to be followed immediately by Senator PRYOR for up to 30 minutes; Senators GLENN and NUNN for up to 20 minutes each, and Senators ROTH and LEAHY for up to 10 minutes each; further that at 10:30 a.m., morning business be closed and the Senate resume consideration of S. 250, the motor-voter bill; that upon conclusion of the vote on the motion to table the Kasten amendment, the Senate then stand in recess until 1:30 p.m.

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

RECESS UNTIL 8:45 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I see no other Senator wishing to speak, and if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess as previously ordered.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:55 p.m., recessed until Thursday, May 14, 1992, at 8:45 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 13, 1992:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

DAVID J. DUNFORD, OF ARIZONA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE SULTANATE OF OMAN.

ROBERT F. GOODWIN, OF MARYLAND, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO NEW ZEALAND, AND TO SERVE CONCURRENTLY AND WITHOUT ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION AS AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO WESTERN SAMOA.

MARILYN MCAFEE, OF FLORIDA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF GUATEMALA.

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER REAPPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE OF LIEUTENANT GENERAL WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 601(A):

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. WILLIAM G. PAGNOIS, [redacted] U.S. ARMY.

THE U.S. ARMY RESERVE OFFICER NAMED HEREIN FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES IN THE GRADE INDICATED BELOW, UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTIONS 593(A), 3371 AND 3384:

To be brigadier general

COL. JAMES J. SULLIVAN, [redacted]

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER TO BE PLACED ON THE RETIRED LIST IN THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 1370:

To be vice admiral

VICE ADM. JOHN A. BALDWIN, JR., U.S. NAVY, [redacted]

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER TO BE PLACED ON THE RETIRED LIST IN THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 1370:

To be vice admiral

VICE ADM. FRANCIS R. DONOVAN, U.S. NAVY, [redacted]

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER TO BE PLACED ON THE RETIRED LIST IN THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 1370:

To be vice admiral

VICE ADM. JAMES G. REYNOLDS, U.S. NAVY, [redacted]

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER TO BE PLACED ON THE RETIRED LIST IN THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 1370:

To be vice admiral

VICE ADM. JAMES D. WILLIAMS, U.S. NAVY, [redacted]

THE FOLLOWING OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE OF VICE ADMIRAL WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) NORMAN W. RAY, U.S. NAVY, [redacted]

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE U.S. OFFICERS FOR PROMOTION IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF SECTIONS 593 AND 8379, TITLE 10 OF THE UNITED STATES CODE. PROMOTIONS MADE UNDER SECTION 8379 AND CONFIRMED BY THE SENATE UNDER SECTION 593 SHALL BEAR AN EFFECTIVE DATE ESTABLISHED IN ACCORDANCE WITH SECTION 8374, TITLE 10 OF THE UNITED STATES CODE. (EFFECTIVE DATE FOLLOWS SERIAL NUMBER)

LINE OF THE AIR FORCE

To be lieutenant colonel

MAJ. MILTON E. AMES JR., [redacted] 12/1/91
MAJ. JAMES F. BAIRD, [redacted] 12/13/91
MAJ. JACK D. BRADY JR., [redacted] 12/7/91
MAJ. ANDRES F. CONTRERAS, [redacted] 12/19/91
MAJ. JAMES R. COOPER, [redacted] 11/12/91
MAJ. CLAUDE J. EICHELBERGER, [redacted] 12/7/91
MAJ. JAMES R. IRISH, [redacted] 12/13/91
MAJ. CONRAD W. KRABBENHOFT, [redacted] 12/12/91
MAJ. DAVID D. LINDSEY, [redacted] 11/26/91
MAJ. BRENT W. MARLER, [redacted] 12/10/91
MAJ. THOMAS S. MARTIN, [redacted] 12/3/91
MAJ. ANDREW F. MCRORIE III, [redacted] 12/16/91
MAJ. LOUIS J. PAWLIK, [redacted] 12/19/91
MAJ. TIMOTHY R. RUSH, [redacted] 11/22/91
MAJ. RONALD A. WESTBROOK, [redacted] 12/5/91

JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERALS DEPARTMENT

To be lieutenant colonel

MAJ. CHARLES W. PEDERSEN, [redacted] 12/2/91

CHAPLAIN CORPS

To be lieutenant colonel

MAJ. ROBERT L. NISSLY, [redacted] 11/16/91
MAJ. EDWIN A. QUALMANN, [redacted] 12/14/91
MAJ. JAMES R. REED, [redacted] 12/7/91

MEDICAL CORPS

To be lieutenant colonel

MAJ. ALAN R. BLOOM, [redacted] 12/7/91
MAJ. GREGORY T. RALEY, [redacted] 12/8/91
MAJ. PHILIP E. STEEVES, [redacted] 12/7/92

NURSE CORPS

To be lieutenant colonel

MAJ. ANNE M. ADAMS, [redacted] 12/8/91
MAJ. MAJORIE H. DEARTH, [redacted] 11/25/91
MAJ. RICHARD H. SLOAN, [redacted] 12/6/91

DENTAL CORPS

To be lieutenant colonel

MAJ. MICHAEL A. REOTT, [redacted] 12/8/91

THE FOLLOWING AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR PROMOTION IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF SECTIONS 593 AND 8379, TITLE 10 OF THE UNITED STATES CODE. PROMOTIONS MADE UNDER SECTION 8379 AND CONFIRMED BY THE SENATE UNDER SECTION 593 SHALL BEAR AN EFFECTIVE DATE ESTABLISHED IN ACCORDANCE WITH SECTION 8374, TITLE 10 OF THE UNITED STATES CODE. (EFFECTIVE DATE FOLLOWS SERIAL NUMBER)

LINE OF THE AIR FORCE

To be lieutenant colonel

MAJ. RONALD E. BAKER, [redacted] 1/9/92
MAJ. JEFFREY W. BARNES, [redacted] 12/11/91
MAJ. THOMAS R. BEAM, [redacted] 1/12/92
MAJ. ELLIS D. BOLING, [redacted] 12/15/91
MAJ. TOD M. BUNTING, [redacted] 1/27/92
MAJ. RANDY L. BUSHORE, [redacted] 12/11/91
MAJ. STEPHEN E. COUCHMAN, [redacted] 1/23/92
MAJ. DARRYL S. ENGLISH, [redacted] 12/19/91
MAJ. KENNETH R. FREEMAN, [redacted] 1/17/92
MAJ. MARC M. GUTTMAN, [redacted] 12/27/91
MAJ. THOMAS F. HAASE, [redacted] 1/16/92
MAJ. WILLIAM J. HALLAM, [redacted] 1/25/92
MAJ. WILLIE D. HARRIS II, [redacted] 1/28/92
MAJ. MARTIN V. HILL II, [redacted] 1/17/92
MAJ. HENRY H. HOLT, [redacted] 9/17/91
MAJ. THOMAS P. JONS, [redacted] 12/12/91
MAJ. DAVID D. KIRTLEY, [redacted] 1/28/92
MAJ. JOSEPH B. LOGISZ, [redacted] 1/11/92
MAJ. BENJAMIN C. MCLEAN, [redacted] 1/12/92
MAJ. NEIL J. MILES, [redacted] 1/11/92
MAJ. LOUIS NAVARRO, [redacted] 1/28/92
MAJ. RICHARD C. PFAFF, [redacted] 1/2/92
MAJ. DAVID M. REIN, [redacted] 12/13/91
MAJ. STEVEN D. SCHWANINGER, [redacted] 1/15/92
MAJ. RANDOLPH C. SHEPARD, [redacted] 1/25/92
MAJ. ARBIE TURNER JR., [redacted] 1/28/92
MAJ. RAY A. TURNER JR., [redacted] 1/27/92
MAJ. FRANK D. TUTOR, [redacted] 1/10/92
MAJ. ARTEMUS N. WERTS, [redacted] 12/6/91

JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERALS DEPARTMENT

To be lieutenant colonel

MAJ. BRUCE E. VANDERVEN, [redacted] 1/15/92
MAJ. STEVEN K. YOUNG, [redacted] 1/11/91

MEDICAL SCIENCE CORPS

To be lieutenant colonel

MAJ. DON E. TRIMBLE, [redacted] 12/20/91

MEDICAL CORPS

To be lieutenant colonel

MAJ. STEPHEN D. RICHARDS, [redacted] 1/11/92
MAJ. ROBERT E. THOMPSON, [redacted] 1/4/92

NURSE CORPS

To be lieutenant colonel

MAJ. LESLIE D. DYSARD, [redacted] 12/20/91

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING LIEUTENANT, U.S. NAVY, RETIRED, TO BE REAPPOINTED PERMANENT LIEUTENANT FROM THE TEMPORARY DISABILITY RETIRED LIST, PURSUANT TO TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 1211:

GEORGE P. FIORE

THE FOLLOWING LIEUTENANT, U.S. NAVY, RETIRED TO BE REAPPOINTED PERMANENT LIEUTENANT FROM THE TEMPORARY DISABILITY RETIRED LIST, PURSUANT TO TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 1211:

ROGER L. WERBELOW

THE FOLLOWING NAMED DISTINGUISHED NAVAL GRADUATES TO BE APPOINTED PERMANENT ENSIGN IN THE LINE OR STAFF CORPS OF THE U.S. NAVY, PURSUANT TO TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 531:

JON E. BILLINGSLEY	DONALD L. GARCIA
CORY S. BIRKEMEYER	HUGH A. GILLAM, JR.
MICHAEL K. BLECH	JEFFREY L. JOHNSON,
CHRISTOPHER J. BUBASH	SCOTT A. KARTVEDT
KEITH A. BURKHARDT	ERIC D. STURGILL
JOHN J. CUMMINGS	RANDOLPH J. TUPAS

THE FOLLOWING FORMER U.S. NAVY OFFICER TO BE APPOINTED PERMANENT COMMANDER IN THE MEDICAL CORPS OF THE U.S. NAVAL RESERVE, PURSUANT TO TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 593:

DOUGLAS B. MCMULLEN

THE FOLLOWING MEDICAL COLLEGE GRADUATE TO BE APPOINTED PERMANENT COMMANDER IN THE MEDICAL CORPS OF THE U.S. NAVAL RESERVE, PURSUANT TO TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 593:

JOHN R. AHLERING

THE FOLLOWING NAMED U.S. NAVY OFFICERS TO BE APPOINTED PERMANENT COMMANDER IN THE MEDICAL CORPS OF THE U.S. NAVAL RESERVE, PURSUANT TO TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 593:

GARELD W. ANDERSON
WILLIAM A. BOWLER
RONALD J. ESCUDERO
JAMES J. GALLO
JAMES E. SNYDER
TIMOTHY B. WATSON

THE FOLLOWING U.S. NAVY OFFICER TO BE APPOINTED PERMANENT COMMANDER IN THE DENTAL CORPS OF THE U.S. NAVAL RESERVE, PURSUANT TO TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 593:

MARK W. BIOLO

THE FOLLOWING NAMED U.S. NAVY OFFICER TO BE APPOINTED PERMANENT COMMANDER IN THE LINE OF THE U.S. NAVAL RESERVE, PURSUANT TO TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 593:

MICHAEL L. CRAMER

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE OF GENERAL WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 601(A):

To be general

LT. GEN. DAVID M. MADDOX, xxx-xx-x..., U.S. ARMY.

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING CADETS, UNITED STATES AIR FORCE ACADEMY, FOR APPOINTMENT AS SECOND LIEUTENANTS IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE, UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF SECTIONS 9353 (B) AND 531, TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, WITH DATES OF RANK TO BE DETERMINED BY THE SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE.

JAMES T. ABERNETHY, JR, xxx-x...
JOSEPH M. ACCARDO, xxx-x...
ORLANDO A. ACOSTA, xxx-x...
PAUL E. ADAMS, xxx-x...
MICHAEL P. AERSTIN, xxx-x...
JASON R. AHLGREN, xxx-x...
ANTHONY J. AJELLO, JR, xxx-x...
LISA D. AKERS, xxx-x...
MARK A. ALBINO, xxx-x...
DAVID J. ALBRECHT, II, xxx-x...
LEWIS E. ALFORD, III, xxx-x...
CYNTHIA K. ALLEN, xxx-x...
DANIEL L. ALLEN, JR, xxx-x...
THADDEUS P. ALLEN, xxx-x...
WALTER C. ALLEN, II, xxx-x...
NATHAN A. ALLERHEILIGEN, xxx-x...
MATTHEW W. ALLINSON, xxx-x...
RAYMOND I. ALVES, xxx-x...
STEVEN C. AMMONS, xxx-x...
LEIGHTON T. ANDERSON, JR, xxx-x...
MONTE D. ANDERSON, xxx-x...
STEVEN E. ANDERSON, xxx-x...
STEWART G. ANDERSON, III, xxx-x...
THEODORE J. ANDERSON, xxx-...
TIMOTHY W. ANDERSON, xxx-x...
CHRISTOPHER T. ANTHONY, xxx-x...
GRADY A. ARKIN, xxx-x...
JASON R. ARMAGOST, xxx-x...
JAMES T. ARNETT, JR, xxx-x...
JONATHAN D. ARNETT, xxx-x...
CHRISTINE R. ATKINS, xxx-x...
ROBERT J. ATKINS, xxx-x...
JOEL E. ATKINSON, xxx-x...
TAFT O. AUJERO, xxx-x...
AMY L. AUKEMA, xxx-...
SCOTT J. BABBITT, xxx-x...
JEREMY O. BAENEN, xxx-x...
ARTHUR F. BAGOMOLNY, II, xxx-...
RICHARD J. BAILEY, JR, xxx-x...
TIMOTHY S. BAILEY, xxx-...
BRANDON E. BAKER, xxx-x...
DONALD C. BAKER, xxx-x...
GILBERT W. BAKER, xxx-x...
BRADLEY C. BALL, xxx-x...
DAVID BALLEW, xxx-x...
ANTHONY E. BAMSEY, xxx-x...
MICHAEL A. BANKS, xxx-x...
JAMES W. BARBER, xxx-x...
ERIC J. BARELA, xxx-x...
MICHAEL D. BARG, xxx-x...
BRANDI S. BARHAM, xxx-x...
MARK A. BARONI, xxx-x...
CHASE C. BARRETT, xxx-x...
STEPHEN P. BARROWS, xxx-x...
JEFFREY M. BASS, xxx-x...
ANDREW J. BATES, xxx-x...
JONATHAN M. BAUGHMAN, xxx-x...
STEPHEN J. BAUMGARTE, xxx-x...
SCOTT A. BAUNE, xxx-x...
DAVID L. BEAVER, xxx-x...
DOUGLAS J. BECK, xxx-x...
THOMAS R. BECKER, xxx-x...
MATTHEW R. BECKLEY, xxx-x...
NEIL P. BEGALMAN, xxx-x...
JOEY C. BELANO, xxx-x...
THOMAS W. BENDER, III, xxx-x...
KRISTINE M. BERGEMANN, xxx-x...
DANIELLE E. BERNARD, xxx-x...
GRETCHEN V. BERRY, xxx-...
NORMAN P. BERTKE, xxx-x...
GREG D. BIGLEY, xxx-x...
DON D. BIRDWELL, xxx-x...
SHAWN L. BLACK, xxx-x...
DOUGLAS F. BLACKLEDGE, xxx-x...
KAREN P. BLAINE, xxx-x...
MARK H. BLAKE, xxx-x...
BARRY A. BLANCHARD, xxx-x...
BRETT R. BLANK, xxx-x...
JENNIFER A. BLOCK, xxx-x...
JAMES A. BLOIR, 5148856
THEODORE B. BLOOMER, xxx-x...
TAMMY J. BODTKE, xxx-x...
DEAN G. BOERRIGTER, xxx-x...
JENNIFER L. BOLLINGER, xxx-x...
DAVID W. BOND, xxx-...
LESLIE W. BONDE, JR, xxx-x...
NICHOLE L. BONGEN, xxx-x...
JAMES R. BOOKHART, JR, xxx-...
EUGENE A. BOOTH, JR, xxx-x...
LUIS A. BORGEN, xxx-x...
OLEG BORUKHIN, xxx-...
WILLIAM K. BOSCH, xxx-x...
JOHN C. BOSTWICK, xxx-x...
JEFFREY D. BOUMA, xxx-x...
SCOTT L. BOUSHELL, xxx-x...
PAUL S. BOVANKOVICH, xxx-x...
CORY W. BOWER, xxx-x...
ERIK T. BOWMAN, xxx-x...
MARK H. BOYD, xxx-...
ROOSEVELT F. BOYLAND, JR, xxx-x...
EDWARD J. BRACE, JR, xxx-...
ANDREW J. BRACKEN, xxx-x...
CHRISTINA D. BRAGDON, xxx-x...
TROY A. BRASHEAR, J, xxx-x...
DEAN E. BRAUNBECK, xxx-...
FREDERICK C. BRAVO, xxx-...
STEVEN J. BREEZE, xxx-x...
LOUIS W. BREMER, xxx-x...
CHAD S. BREMMON, xxx-x...
BRANDIS D. BRENDERA, E, xxx-...
WILLIAM O. BRENTON, xxx-...
JOSEPH D. BREWER, xxx-x...
WILLIAM D. BREWER, xxx-x...
ALEXANDER W. BRID, xxx-x...
DONALD R. BRIDGES, xxx-x...
YUSEF D. BRIDGES, xxx-x...
PATRICK R. BRIEN, xxx-x...
EDWARD S. BRODERICK, JR, xxx-...
BOBBIE J. BROWN, xxx-x...
BRANDON D. BROWN, xxx-...
RICHARD J. BROWN, xxx-x...
RONALD E. BROWN, xxx-x...
MARK T. BRULE, xxx-...
GLENN R. BRUNNER, xxx-x...
MICHAEL A. BRUZZINI, xxx-x...
ALBERT D. BRYSON, xxx-x...
JAMES E. BUCK, xxx-x...
LANCE R. BUNCH, xxx-...
JEFFREY S. BURDETT, xxx-x...
JOSHUA C. BURGESS, xxx-x...
MICHAEL S. BURKE, xxx-x...
STEVEN J. BURNS, xxx-x...
CHRISTIAN F. BURTON, xxx-x...
THOMAS F. BURTSCHI, xxx-x...
CAROL BUSH, xxx-x...
BRENT B. BUSS, xxx-x...
JERRELL S. BUTLER, xxx-x...
WADE C. BUXTON, xxx-...
ROBERT J. BYRON, xxx-x...
PAUL D. CAIRNEY, xxx-x...
KENNETH D. CALLAHAN, xxx-x...
JAMES H. CAMARENA, xxx-x...
BARBARA CAMERON, xxx-x...
DONALD J. CAMPBELL, xxx-x...
ANTHONY B. CAPOBIANCO, II, xxx-...
CHRISTOPHER P. CAPUTO, xxx-x...
BRIAN E. CARBAUGH, xxx-x...
MICHAEL R. CARDOZA, xxx-x...
SCOTT H. CARDOZO, xxx-...
ERIN L. CARMICHAEL, xxx-x...
BRIAN L. CARR, xxx-x...
MATTHEW B. CARROLL, xxx-x...
MICHELLE T. CARSON, xxx-x...
STEPHEN T. CARSON, xxx-x...
GREG W. CASA, xxx-x...
JOHN J. CASEY, IV, xxx-x...
MARK K. CASEY, xxx-x...
EUGENE G. CASSINGHAM, xxx-x...
THOMAS E. CAVANAUGH, xxx-...
JOSEPH R. CDEBACA, xxx-...
BRYAN K. CESSNA, xxx-x...
DAVID C. CHANEY, xxx-x...
DANIEL J. CHARBONNEAU, xxx-x...
KEVIN M. CHARRON, xxx-x...
HASTINGS M. CHASE, xxx-x...
ALLYSON C. CHAUVIN, xxx-x...
SAMUEL J. CHESNUT, IV, xxx-...
VINCENT J. CHIOMA, xxx-x...
DAVID B. CHISENHALL, JR, xxx-x...
JASON J. CHRIST, xxx-x...
TERRY L. CHRISTIANSEN, xxx-x...
DEAN CIBOTTI, xxx-x...
MATTHEW C. CICCARELLO, xxx-x...
EDWARD C. CILKE, xxx-x...
JOHN L. CLARE, III, xxx-x...
ANNE L. CLARK, xxx-x...
MICHAEL J. CLARK, xxx-...
CHRISTINA M. CLAUSNITZER, xxx-x...
JASON E. CLEMENTS, xxx-x...
WILLIAM F. CLINCHARD, xxx-x...
PHILIP A. CLINTON, xxx-x...
ERIC T. COBBE, xxx-...
PETER J. COHEN, xxx-...
CHRISTOPHER R. COLBERT, xxx-x...
CHRISTOPHER L. COLCLASURE, xxx-x...
BARRY W. COLE, xxx-x...
HERMAN A. COLE, III, xxx-x...
STAN G. COLE, xxx-...
JAMES E. COLEBANK, xxx-x...
ANTHONY E. COLEMAN, xxx-x...
BRIAN D. COLLINS, xxx-x...
RANDALL O. COLTRIN, xxx-x...
JASON C. COLVIN, xxx-x...
KEITH A. COMPTON, JR, xxx-x...
VERNON W. CONAWAY, xxx-...
JOHN P. CONMY, xxx-...
CHRISTOPHER P. CONNELL, xxx-...
SIDNEY S. CONNER, xxx-x...
MICHAEL A. CONNOLLY, xxx-x...
CHRISTOPHER A. CONNOR, xxx-x...
BLAIR W. CONROY, xxx-x...
GREGORY A. COOK, JR, xxx-x...
ROBERT J. COOK, xxx-x...
WENDY D. COOK, xxx-...
BRYAN S. COON, xxx-x...
CHARLES J. COOPER, xxx-x...
DARYL E. COOPER, xxx-x...
JAMES A. COPHER, xxx-x...
CHARLES S. CORCORAN, xxx-x...
SUZANNE M. COREJ, xxx-x...
ROBERT S. COREY, xxx-x...
JOHN M. COSGROVE, xxx-...
LAURA J. COSTANTINO, xxx-x...
KELLY A. COSTIGAN, xxx-x...
ELIZABETH A. COSTILLA, xxx-x...
SHERMAN L. COTTRELL, xxx-x...
MICHAEL S. COURINGTON, xxx-x...
STEVEN M. COX, xxx-x...
CHRISTOPHER P. COZZI, xxx-x...
TODD A. CRAIGIE, xxx-x...
CATHERINE L. CRAWFORD, xxx-x...
REBECCAH L. CREECH, xxx-x...
ANDREW A. CRUM, xxx-x...
ALBERTO E. CRUZ, xxx-x...
ENRIQUE A. CRUZ, xxx-x...
KEVIN P. CULLEN, xxx-x...
WILLIAM C. CULVER, xxx-x...
MICHAEL W. CUMMINGS, xxx-x...
JEFFREY R. CUOIO, xxx-x...
SEAN T. CURRAN, xxx-x...
KENT S. CURRIE, xxx-x...
JONATHAN B. CUSHMAN, xxx-x...
PATRICK W. DABROWSKI, xxx-x...
PATRICK J. DANAHER, xxx-x...
DONALD J. DAVIS, xxx-x...
NICOLE A. DAVIS, xxx-x...
THOMAS E. DAVIS, xxx-x...
CHRISTOPHER J. DAWSON, xxx-x...
MARGARET J. DAWSON, xxx-x...
MICHAEL J. DEAN, xxx-x...
BRIAN J. DELAMATER, xxx-x...
DONNA M. DELANGO, xxx-x...
CHARLES J. DELAPP, II, xxx-x...
JERRY R. DEMAIO, xxx-x...
THOMAS E. DEMPSEY, III, xxx-x...
LEA L. DENNIE, xxx-x...
MARK M. DERESKY, xxx-x...
JULES F. DESAMOURS, xxx-x...
LARUE R. DEWALD, III, xxx-x...
DANIEL H. DEWENTER, xxx-x...
JOHN H. DEYARMON, xxx-x...
GARY N. DEYOUNG, xxx-x...
CHRISTOPHER D. DILLIS, xxx-x...
DAVID A. DILLMAN, xxx-x...
STEVE A. DINZART, xxx-x...
ROBERT J. DITTMAN, xxx-x...
JAMES E. DITTUS, xxx-x...
BRANDON K. DOAN, xxx-...
THOMAS W. DOBBS, xxx-x...
JERRY T. DODD, III, xxx-x...
MICHAEL A. DODSON, xxx-x...
SHAWN T. DONAHEY, xxx-x...
JOHN W. DOOLITTLE, II, xxx-x...
MAXIM K. DORNBUSCH, JR, xxx-x...
PETER W. DOTY, xxx-x...
ROBERT A. DOWNEY, xxx-x...
NORMAN A. DOZIER, xxx-x...
THOMAS G. DRAPE, xxx-x...
MARY J. DROZDOWSKI, xxx-x...
JAMES D. DRYJANSKI, xxx-x...
TERRY S. DUNCAN, xxx-...
BRUCE S. DUNN, xxx-x...
JAMES W. DUNN, xxx-x...
DAVID L. DURBIN, xxx-x...
CHARLES A. DURFEE, xxx-x...
TANIA L. DUTKO, xxx-x...
DARREN A. EASTON, xxx-x...
JAMES J. EBEL, JR, xxx-x...
RITCHIE J. EDGE, xxx-...
ERIC I. EGLAND, xxx-x...
LESLIE P. EHRMAN, xxx-x...
CHRISTOPHER B. ELAM, xxx-x...
ANDREW J. ELBERT, xxx-x...
CHARLES C. ELDER, xxx-...
TODD M. ELLINGTON, xxx-x...
JENNIFER E. ELSING, xxx-x...
MARK R. ELY, xxx-x...
TODD M. EMMONS, xxx-x...
BYRL R. ENGEL, xxx-x...
JAMES N. ENGLE, xxx-x...

ROBERT L. ESTRADA, JR. xxx-x...
DAVID F. EVANS, JR. xxx-x...
JAMES A. EVERITT, xxx-x...
MICHAEL J. FAIN, xxx-x...
JOHN M. FAIR, xxx-x...
ROBERT J. FAIRBANKS, xxx-x...
RICHARD S. FARNSWORTH, II xxx-x...
CLINTON W. FARRAR, xxx-x...
JARA N. FATOUT, xxx-x...
MARCUS L. FEATHERSTON, xxx-x...
MICHAEL A. FELICE, xxx-x...
THOMAS E. FENNELL, xxx-x...
CRISTOPHER P. FERRIS, xxx-x...
RICHARD A. FICKEN, xxx-x...
PHILLIP L. FIELDS, JR. xxx-x...
EDMUND E. FIGUEROA, xxx-x...
CHRISTOPHER E. FINERTY, xxx-x...
THOMAS J. FINNERAN, xxx-x...
JON K. FISCHBACH, xxx-x...
JON R. FISHER, xxx-x...
SCOTT C. FISHER, xxx-...
ARMANDO E. FITERRE, xxx-x...
RICHARD R. FLAKE, xxx-x...
ROBERT L. FLETCHER, xxx-x...
PHILLIP M. FLEUREN, xxx-x...
FRANK A. FLORES, xxx-x...
MICHAEL R. FLORIO, xxx-x...
CHARLES L. FORD, JR. xxx-x...
CHRISTOPHER M. FOSTER, xxx-x...
NICOLE E. FOSTER, xxx-x...
CHARLES M. FOWLER, EDW. xxx-x...
ROGER A. FOWLER, JR. xxx-x...
JAMES T. FOX, xxx-x...
JAMES T. FOY, xxx-x...
DEREK C. FRANCE, xxx-x...
ANTHONY L. FRANZ, xxx-x...
BRADLEY D. FRAZIER, xxx-x...
ANDREW B. FREEBORN, xxx-x...
MICHAEL E. FREIMUTH, xxx-...
KARL L. FRERKING, xxx-x...
CHRISTOPHER J. FREY, xxx-x...
ERIC W. FRIESEL, xxx-x...
ROBERT W. FRITZ, xxx-...
JOHN J. FROEHLICH, xxx-x...
JASON S. FROMM, xxx-x...
PAUL J. FRONAPFEL, xxx-x...
WESLEY A. FRYER, xxx-x...
BRENT D. FULTON, xxx-x...
RICHARD M. FULTON, xxx-x...
SCOTT A. GAAB, xxx-x...
JUAN C. GACHARNA, xxx-x...
BRETT M. GALLAGHER, xxx-x...
JAMES J. GALLAGHER, xxx-x...
DANIEL D. GARBER, xxx-...
DAVID A. GARCIA, xxx-x...
WERNER G. GARNER, xxx-x...
JEFFREY B. GARTMAN, xxx-x...
JOHN M. GARVER, xxx-x...
KARL S. GASHLER, xxx-x...
MICHAEL J. GAYER, JR. xxx-x...
HOWARD A. GENTRY, xxx-x...
STEPHEN B. GENUNG, xxx-x...
ARTHUR L. GEPNER, JR. xxx-x...
DAVID P. GERHARDT, xxx-x...
KEITH P. GIBSON, xxx-x...
CARMELO J. GIOVENCO, JR. xxx-x...
JOHN C. GLASS, xxx-x...
ROY G. GLASSCO, xxx-...
SCOTT A. GLAZA, xxx-x...
PAUL D. GLEASON, II xxx-x...
STEVEN F. GLENDENNING, II xxx-x...
JOHN W. GLOYSTEIN, III xxx-x...
LONGINOS J. GONZALEZ, xxx-x...
PEDRO I. GONZALEZ, xxx-x...
DANA C. GOODMAN, xxx-x...
WAYNE H. GOODRICH, xxx-x...
MICHAEL B. GOODWIN, xxx-x...
TERRY R. GOSTOMSKI, xxx-x...
MARK R. GRABAU, xxx-x...
CAROLINE L. GRASSHOFF, xxx-x...
DANIEL A. GRAY, xxx-x...
RONALD M. GRAY, xxx-x...
TREVOR E. GRAY, II xxx-x...
BRIAN J. GREEN, xxx-x...
GREGORY S. GREEN, xxx-x...
JASON D. GREEN, xxx-...
BRENT M. GRIFFIN, xxx-x...
GANTRY C. GRIFFIN, xxx-...
PATTY G. GRIFFIN, xxx-x...
MICHAEL W. GRISMER, JR. xxx-x...
PATRICK M. GROGAN, xxx-x...
DONALD B. GROVE, xxx-x...
MICHAEL C. GRUB, xxx-x...
PETER B. GUBSER, xxx-x...
MARK A. GUERRERO, xxx-x...
GODFREY A. GUERZON, JR. xxx-x...
RYAN E. GUIBERSON, xxx-x...
JAYANTH GUMMARAJU, xxx-x...
SCOTT D. GUNDLACH, xxx-x...
JOHN B. GURRIERI, xxx-x...
ARLIE V. HADDIX, xxx-x...
KENNETH P. HAERTLING, xxx-x...
KEVIN R. HAFF, xxx-x...
JANET E. HAGADORN, II xxx-x...
JOSEPH E. HALL, xxx-x...
VINCENT L. HAMACHER, xxx-x...
ANDREW K. HAMANN, xxx-x...
HAROLD C. HAMBY, xxx-x...
SHANE P. HAMILTON, xxx-x...
TODD E. HAMMONDS, xxx-x...
JEFFREY M. HANDY, xxx-x...
JASON L. HANOVER, xxx-...

CHERILYN R. HARGIS, xxx-x...
STEPHEN J. HARMON, xxx-x...
MONTE S. HARNER, xxx-x...
KERMIT M. HARNESS, R. xxx-x...
MATTHEW W. HARPER, xxx-x...
MICHAEL S. HARPER, xxx-x...
RODNEY C. HARRIS, xxx-x...
JAMES C. HARWOOD, xxx-x...
JEFFREY R. HASBROUCK, xxx-x...
JEFF H. HASSANNIA, xxx-x...
STEVE C. HASSTEDT, M. xxx-x...
DARRON A. HAUGHN, xxx-x...
ROBERT J. HAWKING, III xxx-x...
MARK T. HAYES, xxx-x...
TERRY D. HAYGOOD, xxx-x...
LEONARD W. HAYNES, III xxx-x...
CHRISTOPHER J. HAYS, xxx-x...
HELMUT K. HEIDEMANN, xxx-x...
WALTER J. HEIDMANN, JR. xxx-x...
JOSEPH W. HEILHECKER, xxx-x...
STEVEN E. HEINLEIN, xxx-x...
TIMREK C. HEISLER, xxx-x...
TROY D. HEITHCOCK, xxx-x...
CHARLES R. HENDERSON, xxx-x...
JASON T. HERMAN, xxx-x...
ROBERT E. HERNDON, JR. xxx-x...
MARK A. HERSANT, xxx-...
MARCUS W. HERVEY, xxx-x...
VAUGHN R. HEYER, xxx-x...
PAUL E. HICKEY, xxx-x...
JONATHAN W. HICKS, xxx-x...
JASON M. HIGA, xxx-x...
JESSICA L. HILDAHL, xxx-x...
SCOTT M. HINES, xxx-x...
GEORGE E. HINMAN, JR. xxx-x...
SAMUEL C. HINOTE, xxx-x...
JEFFREY S. HINRICHS, xxx-x...
DEAN T. HITCHCOCK, xxx-x...
ERIC J. HODGE, E. xxx-...
FRANK L. HOLDER, xxx-x...
THOMAS A. HOLLER, II xxx-x...
WILLIAM T. HOMEWOOD, III xxx-x...
MICHAEL K. HONMA, xxx-x...
JASON K. HOPPER, xxx-x...
LISA Y. HORTON, xxx-x...
BRET L. HOUK, xxx-x...
CHARLES W. HOWARD, IV xxx-x...
JAMES J. HOWELL, xxx-x...
MICHAEL E. HOYLE, xxx-x...
NILS A. HUBERT, xxx-x...
THOMAS C. HUDNALL, xxx-...
DENNIS G. HUEY, xxx-x...
JENNIFER L. HUGHES, xxx-x...
JEFFREY W. HUMPHRIES, xxx-x...
ROGER C. HUNT, xxx-x...
SHANA M. HUNT, xxx-x...
JAMES R. HUNTER, xxx-...
DERON L. HURST, xxx-x...
JULIE A. HUSTON, xxx-x...
JOHN P. HUTTON, xxx-x...
DAVID W. HYNES, xxx-x...
WALTER N. INGRAM, xxx-x...
COLLIN T. IRETON, xxx-x...
ROMAN O. ISAJIW, xxx-x...
JAMES T. JACKSON, xxx-x...
JOEL D. JACKSON, xxx-x...
KAREN J. JACKSON, xxx-x...
MICHAEL L. JACKSON, JR. xxx-x...
JESSE W. JAMES, xxx-x...
RONALD L. JAMES, xxx-x...
EFREN J. JAMIR, JR. xxx-x...
FREDERICK J. JANACK, JR. xxx-x...
MICHAEL S. JANSEN, xxx-x...
MICHAEL JASON, xxx-x...
MICHAEL B. JEANES, xxx-x...
EDWARD L. JENKINS, xxx-...
GARY D. JENKINS, II xxx-x...
JEFFREY R. JOERS, xxx-x...
LEONARD G. JOHNS, xxx-x...
CLARENCE A. JOHNSON, JR. xxx-x...
DONALD A. JOHNSON, xxx-...
JAMES C. JOHNSON, xxx-x...
JAY C. JOHNSON, xxx-x...
JESSE L. JOHNSON, JR. xxx-x...
MONTE A. JOHNSON, xxx-x...
DARII A. JONAS, xxx-x...
JASON C. JONES, xxx-x...
MARK R. JONES, xxx-x...
MELISSA A. JONES, xxx-x...
REGINALD D. JONES, xxx-x...
SAMUEL O. JONES, IV xxx-x...
SCOTT H. JONES, xxx-x...
TIFFANY N. JORDAN, xxx-x...
THOMAS B. JOSLYN, xxx-...
TIMOTHY P. JUNG, xxx-x...
ROBERT F. KACPROWICZ, xxx-x...
WARREN R. KADRMAS, xxx-x...
ROBERT S. KAFKA, xxx-x...
ADAM B. KALB, xxx-...
MACE R. KANT, xxx-x...
JOSEPH KANYOK, xxx-x...
MICHAEL A. KASIC, xxx-x...
LAYNE E. KASPER, xxx-x...
AMANDA G. KATO, xxx-...
LORI E. KATOWICH, xxx-x...
SHARRON N. KEELS, xxx-x...
BRIAN L. KELLER, xxx-x...
RICHARD L. KELLER, JR. xxx-x...
JOHN M. KELLY, xxx-x...
MICHAEL S. KELLY, xxx-x...
DAVID D. KENYON, xxx-x...
ROBERT E. KIEBLER, xxx-x...

CHRISTOPHER T. KIENINGER, xxx-x...
JONATHAN H. KIM, xxx-x...
NAM H. KIM, xxx-x...
TONY S. KIM, xxx-x...
KELLY C. KIMSEY, xxx-x...
DAVID N. KINCAID, JR. xxx-x...
STEVEN M. KINDSVATER, xxx-x...
PAUL M. KIRCHHOFFER, xxx-x...
KELLY J. KIRKPATRICK, xxx-x...
MICHAEL R. KITCHING, xxx-x...
DONALD A. KLECKNER, xxx-...
CYNDA J. KLEEMAN, xxx-x...
PAUL E. KNAPP, xxx-...
SCOTT A. KNIEP, xxx-x...
KEVIN W. KNOX, xxx-x...
PETER T. KNOX, xxx-x...
TODD T. KOBAYASHI, xxx-x...
CHRISTOPHER L. KOELZER, xxx-x...
EDWARD J. KOHARIK, III xxx-x...
RICHARD P. KOLBERG, xxx-x...
KURT D. KONOPATZKE, xxx-x...
MICHAEL C. KOONS, xxx-x...
MICHAEL G. KOSCHESKI, xxx-x...
MARK T. KRAMIS, xxx-x...
JASON R. KRINSKY, xxx-x...
MOHAN S. KRISHNA, xxx-x...
JOHN C. KUBINEC, xxx-x...
CHARLES D. KUHL, xxx-x...
DAVID J. KUMASHIRO, xxx-x...
ELIZABETH A. KUREY, xxx-x...
JOSHUA M. KUTRIEB, xxx-x...
TINA M. LAMB, xxx-x...
DAVID P. LAMBERT, xxx-x...
JOHN D. LAMONTAGNE, xxx-x...
MICHELE K. LAMONTAGNE, xxx-x...
JOHN A. LANCE, xxx-x...
KEVIN M. LANDER, xxx-x...
LANCE K. LANDRUM, xxx-x...
CHARLES A. LARSON, xxx-x...
PAULETTE D. LASSITER, xxx-x...
JERRY R. LAUTENSCHLAGER, xxx-x...
WILLIAM M. LAW, JR. xxx-x...
SEAN M. LAWLER, xxx-x...
BILLY J. LAWSON, JR. xxx-x...
MICHAEL D. LAY, xxx-x...
EDRIC L. LEABO, xxx-x...
JAMES L. LEE, xxx-x...
JIM H. LEE, xxx-x...
LINDA O. LEE, xxx-x...
RONALD A. LEE, xxx-x...
SAINTNET Z. LEHTINEN, xxx-x...
JASON D. LEIGHTON, xxx-x...
KENDALL M. LEMLEY, JR. xxx-x...
EDWARD J. LENGEL, xxx-x...
JACK P. LEON, xxx-x...
BROOK J. LEONARD, xxx-x...
MARK E. LEONARD, xxx-x...
JONATHAN M. LETSINGER, xxx-x...
CHRISTOPHER P. LEVY, xxx-x...
GREGG W. LEWIS, xxx-...
MARK C. LIEBICH, xxx-x...
PHILIP D. LIMBACHER, xxx-x...
DAVID C. LINDSAY, xxx-x...
DOUGLAS R. LINDSAY, xxx-x...
RICHARD J. LINEHAN, III xxx-x...
MICHAEL J. LINGOR, xxx-x...
ROD R. LITTLE, xxx-x...
STEED A. LOBOTZKE, xxx-x...
DARRELL LOCKHART, xxx-x...
SHANE D. LOHMAN, xxx-x...
BRANDON J. LOKEN, xxx-...
SEAN F. LONDRIGAN, xxx-x...
PERRY M. LONG, III xxx-x...
DRON LONGINO, xxx-x...
BYRON K. LOVE, xxx-x...
JAMES C. LOWE, xxx-x...
JASON D. LOWRY, xxx-x...
CLARENCE W. LUKES, JR. xxx-x...
GREGORY I. LUNG, F. xxx-x...
JOHN W. LYONS, xxx-x...
JESSICA A. MACDONALD, xxx-x...
ROBERT S. MACKENZIE, xxx-x...
RICHARD A. MACLEOD, xxx-x...
ROBERT T. MACMILLAN, xxx-x...
WILLIAM M. MACMILLAN, IV xxx-x...
LALENYA R. MADDOX, xxx-x...
MICHAEL R. MAGUIRE, xxx-x...
JOHN A. MAJEWSKI, JR. xxx-x...
HOLLY J. MANNING, xxx-x...
JASON MANTARO, xxx-x...
RYAN D. MANTZ, xxx-x...
CHRISTOPHER P. MARCUS, xxx-...
YOSHIKO MARINKO, xxx-x...
STEVEN P. MARKOWSKY, xxx-...
JEFFREY S. MARKS, xxx-x...
JASON L. MARSHALL, xxx-x...
DANIEL N. MARTICELLO, JR. xxx-x...
TIMOTHY M. MARTIN, xxx-x...
MICHAEL A. MARTINEZ, xxx-x...
STEVEN L. MARTINEZ, xxx-x...
DONALD E. MATHEWS, III xxx-x...
KENDRA S. MATHEWS, xxx-x...
RICHARD S. MATHEWS, xxx-x...
MATT M. MATHIS, xxx-x...
WILLIAM A. MATNEY, xxx-...
VALERIE J. MATTHEWS, xxx-x...
MARK F. MATTICOLA, xxx-x...
THOMAS R. MAURER, xxx-x...
MARK A. MAY, xxx-...
ROBERT H. MAY, xxx-x...
THOMAS P. MCATEE, xxx-x...
DAVID C. MCAULEY, JR. xxx-x...

CHAUNDRA D. MCCANNA, xxx-x...
SHELLEY R. MCCOMBS, xxx-x...
ANDREW S. MCCOY, xxx-x...
LANCE P. MCCUISTON, xxx-x...
PATRICK S. MCCULLOUGH, xxx-x...
TERESA M. MCCULLOUGH, xxx-x...
THOMAS M. MCCURLEY, xxx-x...
CHRISTOPHER B. MCDAVID, xxx-...
TODD E. MCDOWELL, xxx-...
ANDREA C. MCELVAIN, xxx-x...
BRIAN P. MCGILL, xxx-x...
WILLIAM A. MCGUFFEY, xxx-x...
PATRICK S. MCGUIRK, xxx-x...
DAVID S. MCKENNEY, xxx-x...
NICK R. MCKENZIE, xxx-x...
BRIAN D. MCLAUGHLIN, xxx-x...
BRADLEY S. MCMATH, xxx-x...
DANIEL W. MCNEILL, xxx-x...
KIMBERLY G. MCQUARRIE, xxx-x...
THOMAS S. MCWEENEY, xxx-x...
LAWRIE A. MEEK, xxx-x...
ROBERT T. MEEKS, III xxx-x...
JAMES P. MEGER, xxx-x...
JAMES S. MEHTA, xxx-...
PETER H. MENNE, xxx-x...
JOHN J. MENOZZI xxx-x...
LANCE R. MEREDITH, xxx-x...
JEFFERY S. MERRITT xxx-x...
WILLIAM V. MESHACK, JR xxx-x...
KIRSTEN R. MESSER, xxx-x...
MICHELE L. MEYER, xxx-x...
TERRI A. MEYERS, xxx-x...
KRISTINA M. MEYLE, xxx-x...
GRANT C. MIDGLEY, xxx-...
BRADLEY O. MIDTLIEN xxx-x...
SHANNON J. MIKUS, xxx-x...
STACIE M. MILINSKI, xxx-x...
ALBERT G. MILLER, xxx-x...
JACOB J. MILLER, xxx-x...
JOEL C. MILLER, xxx-x...
MATTHEW P. MILLER, xxx-x...
MICHAEL R. MILLER, xxx-...
MICHAEL T. MILLER, xxx-x...
REX H. MILLER, xxx-x...
TIMOTHY D. MILLER, xxx-...
FRANCIS J. MILON, IV xxx-x...
JOHN H. MILTNER, JR xxx-x...
JACQUELINE M. MONGEON, xxx-x...
MARCO A. MOOR, N. xxx-x...
BRIAN L. MOORE, xxx-...
CASEY K. MOORE, xxx-x...
ERIC Y. MOORE, xxx-x...
FREDERICK D. MOORE, xxx-x...
MEREDITH L. MOORE, xxx-...
RICHARD G. MOORE, JR xxx-x...
SCOTT P. MOORE, xxx-x...
THOMAS A. MOOSE, xxx-x...
LYNN E. MOREHEAD, xxx-x...
ERIC J. MORITZ, xxx-x...
ROCCO J. MORO, C xxx-x...
DOUGLAS R. MORTON xxx-x...
KENNETH E. MOSS, xxx-x...
MICHAEL D. MOTE, xxx-...
DAVID R. MOTT, xxx-...
MARK A. MOUNT, xxx-x...
STEPHEN M. MOUNTS, xxx-...
STEPHEN R. MOYES, xxx-...
JAMES F. MUELLER, xxx-x...
TIMOTHY S. MUELLER, xxx-x...
PAUL H. MULLIS, xxx-x...
HASPARD R. MURPHY, JR xxx-x...
SEAN M. MURPHY, xxx-x...
THOMAS E. MURPHY, xxx-x...
DANIEL P. MURRAY, xxx-x...
JOSEPH W. MURRIETTA xxx-x...
TONEY F. MYCKA, III xxx-x...
ANDREW W. NATALE, xxx-x...
BRIAN D. NEAL, xxx-x...
STEVEN K. NEAVILLE, xxx-x...
DANIEL A. NEFF, xxx-x...
CHRISTOPHER J. NELSON, xxx-x...
RANDALL J. NELSON, xxx-x...
DAVID W. NERY, xxx-x...
EDWARD S. NEUMANN, JR xxx-x...
ARTHUR J. NEWSOME, xxx-x...
ALLEN T. NEYLAND, xxx-x...
DAO M. NGUYEN, xxx-x...
HIEN T. NGUYEN, xxx-x...
JOHN J. NICHOLS, xxx-x...
KIRK W. NICHOLS, xxx-x...
THOMAS W. NICHOLSON, xxx-x...
CHRISTOPHER F. NICK, xxx-x...
DEREK R. NIELSEN, xxx-x...
SUSAN M. NILSEN, xxx-x...
ALAN R. NOLAN, xxx-x...
KENNETH J. NOTARI, xxx-x...
ROBERT G. NOVOTNY, xxx-...
SCOTT R. NOWLIN, xxx-...
BLAINE F. NYE, JR xxx-x...
MICHAEL A. OCONNOR, xxx-x...
KENNETH W. OHLSON, xxx-x...
PETER P. OHOTNICKY, xxx-x...
JON M. OLEKSZYK, xxx-x...
KYLE E. OLEWNIK, xxx-x...
DEREK M. OLIVER, xxx-x...
JOHN M. OLSON, xxx-x...
DEAN P. ORFIELD, xxx-x...
KRISTIN A. ORLANDONI, xxx-x...
JEFFREY L. ORR, xxx-x...
ERIC L. ORRILL, xxx-x...
WILLIAM A. OSTROM, xxx-...
THOMAS J. PACHECO, xxx-x...
DENNIS M. PAKULSKI, JR xxx-x...
PAUL F. PALMIER, xxx-x...
MICHAEL S. PANSE, xxx-x...
TIMOTHY A. PARKER, xxx-x...
MILAN M. PATEL, xxx-x...
PATRICK B. PATTERSON xxx-x...
DEREK J. PAULK, xxx-x...
MARTIN F. PAYNE, xxx-x...
STEVEN A. PEEPLES, xxx-x...
ROBERT E. PEREZ, xxx-x...
SCOTT E. PERKINS, xxx-x...
CRAIG W. PETERSON, xxx-x...
ELIZABETH A. PETERSON xxx-x...
GEORGE E. PETTY, xxx-x...
TIMOTHY M. PHILLIPS, xxx-x...
HUNG Q. PHO, xxx-x...
PAUL D. PIDGEON, xxx-x...
ERIC R. PIERCE, xxx-x...
RONALD L. PIERI, xxx-x...
CHRISTIANE J. PINDAT xxx-x...
JOSE A. PINEDO, xxx-x...
LAURA A. PIPER, xxx-x...
CHAD E. PITOG, A. xxx-x...
EDIE L. PITTARD, xxx-x...
ROBERT N. PITTMAN, xxx-x...
GARY T. PLASTER, xxx-x...
RAYMOND M. PLATT, xxx-x...
WILLIAM C. PLEASANTS, xxx-x...
KEVIN A. PLESCHA, xxx-x...
STEVEN PLUMHOFF xxx-x...
DAVID B. PODRASKY, xxx-x...
MARK E. POLOMSKY, xxx-x...
CHRISTINE R. POPRIK, xxx-x...
BRIAN H. PORTER, xxx-x...
TERI L. POULTON, xxx-x...
HARRY J. POWELL, xxx-x...
CHRISTOPHER T. PREJEAN, xxx-x...
SKIP C. PRIBYL, J. xxx-x...
DAVID M. PRICE, xxx-x...
MICHAEL J. PRICE, xxx-x...
ARTHUR W. PRIMAS, JR xxx-x...
TRACY A. PRITCHARD, xxx-x...
MATTHEW S. PRUITT, xxx-x...
JAMES R. PUTLOCK, xxx-x...
VICTOR B. PUTZ, JR xxx-x...
DAVID L. QUACKENBUSH, xxx-x...
RICHARD D. QUARBERG, xxx-x...
PAUL J. QUIGLEY, xxx-x...
AARON S. QUINICHETT, xxx-x...
JOHN F. RADCLIFFE, xxx-x...
DAVID L. RADEMACHER, xxx-x...
STEPHANIE M. RADFORD, xxx-x...
PAUL S. RADOVAN, xxx-x...
MATTHEW E. RAFTER, xxx-x...
LEIBO R. RAIBSTEIN xxx-x...
CHARLES G. RAIFORD, xxx-x...
KEVIN L. RAINEY, xxx-x...
BRIAN G. RALL, xxx-x...
JAVIER T. RAMOS, xxx-x...
JAMES A. RAMSEY, xxx-x...
JASON S. RAMSEY, xxx-x...
BLANE J. RASCH, xxx-...
CHRISTOPHER R. RATE, xxx-x...
JENNIFER M. RAWLINS, xxx-x...
THOMAS P. REARDON, xxx-...
HOWARD T. REDD, xxx-x...
KEITH W. REEVES, xxx-x...
SCOTT W. REINHARD, xxx-x...
MICHAEL J. REMUALDO, xxx-x...
MICHAEL A. RESCHKE, xxx-x...
HEIDI L. RETHMEIER, xxx-x...
ANGELA B. REYNOLDS, xxx-x...
GEORGE M. REYNOLDS, xxx-x...
RODERICK E. RICARD, xxx-...
THOMAS B. RICE, xxx-x...
WALTER H. RICE, IV xxx-x...
WILLIAM J. RICE, xxx-x...
JOSEPH P. RICHARDS, xxx-x...
MICHAEL G. RICKARD, xxx-x...
ELAINE J. RILEY, xxx-x...
SHELLEY A. RIPPLE, xxx-x...
REGAN T. RITCHIE, xxx-x...
MICHAEL H. RIVERS, xxx-x...
JOSEPH M. RIZZUTO, xxx-x...
ROBERT L. ROANE, xxx-x...
ERIC B. ROBERSON, xxx-x...
CHRISTIAN D. ROBERT, xxx-x...
BRENT C. ROBERTS, xxx-x...
TOMMY A. ROBERTS, II xxx-x...
GREGORY M. ROBERTSON, xxx-x...
DANIEL S. ROCCONI, xxx-...
KABRENA E. RODDA, xxx-x...
ANTHONY L. ROE, xxx-x...
WILLIAM J. ROFF, JR xxx-x...
CHRISTOPHER S. ROGOWSKI, JR xxx-x...
MICHAEL K. ROKAW, xxx-x...
RICHARD B. ROLLER, xxx-x...
J. R. ROLLINS, xxx-x...
RICHARD M. ROSA, xxx-x...
ANDREW P. ROSS, xxx-x...
BRADLEY G. ROSS, xxx-x...
DAVID A. ROSS, xxx-x...
JAMES R. RUFFING xxx-x...
TREVOR A. RUSH, xxx-x...
JOHN H. RUSSELL, xxx-x...
SUNCHLAR M. RUST, xxx-x...
ALLEN C. RUTH, xxx-...
ERIK D. RYDBERG, xxx-x...
MATTHEW B. RYTTING, xxx-x...
JADE R. SADOSTY, H. xxx-x...
MANUEL F. SAENZ, xxx-...
ROBERT D. SAGRAVES, xxx-x...
TRACY J. SAILER, xxx-x...
BENNETT T. SAMUELS, xxx-x...
FRANK J. SANCHEZ, xxx-x...
GEOFFREY S. SANDERS xxx-x...
TROY L. SANDERS, xxx-x...
DORAL E. SANDLIN, xxx-x...
BRIAN P. SANFORD, xxx-x...
JOSEPH E. SAPERE, xxx-x...
ROSS S. SAUTER, xxx-x...
KELLY D. SCHAEFER, xxx-x...
JOSEPH W. SCHAEFFER, xxx-x...
MARC D. SCHALLER, xxx-...
ANTHONY W. SCHENK, xxx-...
SCOTT J. SCHENO, xxx-x...
ARNOLD L. SCHOENFELD, xxx-x...
JOHN P. SCHOEPPNER, III xxx-x...
FRANK D. SCHORZMAN, xxx-x...
JAY H. SCHUELER, xxx-x...
PAUL J. SCOTT, xxx-x...
TAYLOR W. SCOTT, C. xxx-x...
ROBERT J. SEIFERT, xxx-x...
DAVID A. SEITZ, xxx-x...
TIFFANY L. SELNESS xxx-x...
SCOTT C. SELZ, xxx-x...
DAVID M. SENA, xxx-...
BYEONGSOOK SEO, xxx-x...
DAVID A. SERATT, xxx-x...
GREGORY T. SHAFFER, xxx-x...
TROY D. SHAFFORD, xxx-x...
CHRISTINE M. SHEEHAN, xxx-x...
JAMES R. SHELL, II xxx-x...
DAVID R. SHEPLER, xxx-...
LYLE D. SHIDLA, xxx-x...
JAMES S. SHIGEKANE, xxx-x...
KENNETH A. SHUGART, JR xxx-x...
SCOTT W. SILVA, xxx-x...
CHARLES T. SIMMONS, xxx-x...
TROY J. SIMON, xxx-x...
ERIK L. SIMONSEN, xxx-x...
ANTHONY G. SIMPSON, xxx-x...
DANIEL L. SIMPSON, xxx-x...
OMAR J. SIMPSON, xxx-x...
DOUGLAS S. SIRK, xxx-...
JAMES B. SKIPWORTH, xxx-x...
ANGELA K. SLAGEL, xxx-x...
JEREMY T. SLOANE, xxx-x...
MARK H. SLOCUM, xxx-x...
ROBERT D. SMALLWOOD, JR xxx-x...
CHARLES L. SMITH, III xxx-x...
CHRISTOPHER M. SMITH, xxx-...
DAVID W. SMITH, xxx-x...
JASON A. SMITH, xxx-x...
JOHN D. SMITH, xxx-x...
LESLIE T. SMITH, JR xxx-x...
MARK D. SMITH, xxx-x...
MICHELLE R. SMITH, xxx-...
NATHAN A. SMITH, xxx-...
ROBERT E. SMITH, II xxx-x...
SCOTT A. SMITH, xxx-...
STEPHEN F. SMITH, JR xxx-x...
SUSAN E. SMITH, xxx-x...
WILLIAM G. SMITH, xxx-x...
MICHAEL D. SNAPP, xxx-x...
MATTHEW O. SNYDER, xxx-x...
HERMAN SO, xxx-x...
CHU H. SOH, xxx-...
TOMAS J. SOHAYDA, xxx-x...
JEFFREY S. SOMERS, xxx-x...
SEAN K. SORENSON, xxx-x...
GREGORY J. SOUKUP, xxx-x...
DAVID M. SOUZA, xxx-x...
WILLIAM S. SPAGNA, III xxx-x...
WILLIAM A. SPANGENTHAL, xxx-x...
BRADLEY R. SPOMER, xxx-x...
TREVOR D. STAIGER, xxx-x...
JEFFREY W. STAMP, xxx-x...
MICHELE A. STANG, xxx-x...
JASON T. STANLEY, xxx-...
BILLY L. STARKEY, B. xxx-x...
WILLIAM N. STEELE, III xxx-x...
AARON W. STEFFENS, xxx-x...
CONRAD R. STEGEMAN, xxx-x...
MARK A. STEGER, xxx-x...
CINDY D. STEIN, xxx-x...
ANDREW J. STELMACK, xxx-x...
RONALD D. STENGER, xxx-x...
RODNEY A. STEPHAN, xxx-x...
MARK A. STEPHENS, xxx-x...
MICHAEL S. STEVENSON, xxx-x...
SAMUEL D. STEWART, xxx-x...
SUZANNE P. STOKES, xxx-x...
STEVEN A. STOLLY, xxx-x...
JOHN P. STONE, xxx-x...
TIMOTHY M. STONG, xxx-x...
WILLIAM J. STRAUS, III xxx-x...
JENNIFER Y. STREBECK xxx-x...
SUZANNE M. STREETER, xxx-x...
KRISTIN M. STREUKENS, xxx-x...
TROY L. SULLIVAN, III xxx-x...
TIMOTHY J. SUNDVALL, xxx-x...
DAVID K. SUTTON, xxx-x...
DAVID J. SWANKE, xxx-x...
BRAD A. SWEZEY, xxx-x...
DEREK A. TAGGARD, xxx-...
JESSICA C. TALBERG, xxx-x...
JAMES W. TANIS, xxx-x...
DAVID W. TANNER, xxx-x...
VINCENT M. TARANTINO, xxx-x...
DAVID J. TATE, xxx-x...
FRED D. TAYLOR, xxx-x...
JOELYN E. TAYLOR, xxx-x...
JOHN D. TAYLOR, xxx-x...

MICHAEL E. TENNEY, xxx-x...
MATTHEW W. TERPSTRA, xxx-x...
MARCUS D. TERRY, xxx-x...
RONALD J. TEWKSBURY, II xxx-x...
ALISA M. THOMAS, xxx-x...
BOBBY J. THOMAS, JR xxx-x...
IAN O. THOMPSON, xxx-x...
JONATHAN A. THOMPSON, xxx-x...
NEAL R. THOMPSON, xxx-x...
PHILLIP J. THOMPSON xxx-x...
THEODORE J. THOMPSON, xxx-x...
TOMMIE C. THOMPSON, JR xxx-x...
DANIEL M. THORN, xxx-x...
RONALD W. THORNTON, xxx-x...
CHRISTOPHER J. TOBIAS xxx-x...
ROBERT M. TOBLER, xxx-...
MARK S. TOPOLSKI, xxx-x...
THOMAS D. TORKELSON, xxx-x...
TIMOTHY J. TOWNSEND, II xxx-x...
BRIAN M. TOY, xxx-x...
MICHAEL J. TRAVIS, xxx-x...
STERLING E. TREE xxx-x...
JOHN W. TRESLER, xxx-x...
KYRIACOS S. TSIRCOU xxx-x...
DAVID P. TUPAJ, xxx-x...
JAMES R. TWIFORD xxx-x...
JEAN E. TWOMEY, xxx-x...
ERIC A. UJFALUSY xxx-x...
DONALD W. UNWIN, xxx-x...
THOMAS S. URBAN, xxx-x...
WILLIAM M. VALENTINE, xxx-x...
ANTHONY E. VALERIO, xxx-x...
TIEM J. VAN, L xxx-x...
RACHEL E. VANLANDINGHAM, xxx-x...
STEPHEN J. VANLANDINGHAM, xxx-x...
DEREK D. VARBLE, xxx-xx...
CARL D. VEGAS, xxx-x...
PETER C. VEHLOW, xxx-x...
JOHANN R. VERRET, xxx-x...
MICHAEL W. VETTER, xxx-x...
EDUARDO E. VEVE, xxx-...
ROBERT A. VICKERS, xxx-x...
KAREN L. VIOLET, xxx-x...
CHRISTINE M. VISCO, xxx-x...
JEFFREY A. VISH xxx-x...
ERIC A. VITOSH, xxx-...
MICHAEL V. WAGGLE, xxx-x...
TODD S. WALDVOGEL, xxx-x...
CHRISTIAN E. WALLACE, xxx-x...
JAMES WALLACE, xxx-...
HOWARD T. WALLER, xxx-x...
BRADLEY J. WARD, xxx-x...
DONNA M. WARD, xxx-...
SCOTT C. WARD, xxx-...
JAMES E. WARMA, H xxx-x...
JEFFREY E. WARMKA xxx-x...
BRIAN P. WARREN, xxx-x...
RONALD B. WARREN, xxx-x...
AARON C. WATSON, xxx-x...
JOHN A. WATSON, xxx-x...
CHRISTOPHER A. WEBER, xxx-x...
WILLIAM R. WEBSTER, xxx-x...
THEODORE G. WEIBEL, xxx-x...
MICHAEL T. WEISS, xxx-x...
SUSAN L. WENDT, xxx-x...
BRADLEY R. WENSEL, xxx-x...
CRAIG J. WENZ, xxx-x...
EDWARD J. WERNER, xxx-x...
KIMBERLY A. WERTHMAN, xxx-x...
KEVIN G. WESTBURG, xxx-x...
CHAD H. WHITE, xxx-x...
JASON D. WHITE, xxx-x...
SAMUEL G. WHITE, III xxx-x...
SHELDON G. WHITE, xxx-x...
JEFFREY S. WHITEMAN, xxx-x...
JULIE M. WHITMAN, xxx-x...
STEPHEN A. WHYTE, xxx-x...
ROBERT A. WIEMAN, xxx-x...
SCOTT D. WIERZBANOWSKI, xxx-x...
LANCE R. WIKOFF, xxx-x...
PETER C. WILEY, II xxx-x...
CHRISTOPHER S. WILKOWSKI, xxx-...
BENJAMIN G. WILLIAMS, xxx-x...
ELIZABETH A. WILLIAMS, xxx-x...
PAUL N. WILLIAMS, xxx-...
RASHEAD J. WILLIAMS, xxx-x...
MARK L. WILLIAMSON, xxx-...
JACQUES J. WILSON, xxx-x...
JOHN H. WILSON, xxx-x...
KEVIN A. WILSON, xxx-x...
TODD V. WILSON, xxx-x...
WILLIAM J. WILSON, xxx-x...
WILLIAM V. WINANS, xxx-x...
MARK L. WINNS, xxx-x...
LYNN H. WINWARD, xxx-x...
GARY L. WITOVER, xxx-...
CHRISTOPHER D. WOLF xxx-x...
JASON D. WOLF, xxx-x...
KATHERINE H. WOLF, xxx-x...
STEVEN M. WOLF, xxx-x...
WILLIAM M. WOLFE, xxx-x...
JOSEPH L. WOOD, xxx-x...
JON C. WOZNIAK, xxx-x...
CHRISTIAN E. WRIGHT xxx-x...
MATTHEW R. YAKELY, xxx-x...
SCOTT D. YANCY, xxx-x...
SHANON R. YATES, xxx-x...
MATTHEW H. YETISHEFSKY xxx-x...
DAVID K. YOUNG, JR xxx-x...
DAVID T. YOUNG, xxx-x...
JEFFREY M. YOUNG, xxx-x...
RANDY K. YOUNG, xxx-...
JENNY E. YUNG, xxx-x...
TIMOTHY A. ZACHARIAS xxx-x...
DENNIS K. ZAHN, xxx-x...
ROBERT R. ZERBE, xxx-x...
ROBERT W. ZID, xxx-x...

WITHDRAWALS

Executive messages transmitted by the President to the Senate on May 13, 1992, withdrawing from further Senate consideration the following nominations:

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR REAPPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE OF LIEUTENANT GENERAL WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 601(A):

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. DAVID M. MADDOX xxx-xx-x... U.S. ARMY

THE U.S. ARMY RESERVE OFFICER NAMED HEREIN FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES IN THE GRADE OF BRIGADIER GENERAL, WHICH WAS SENT TO THE SENATE ON MARCH 12, 1992:

To be brigadier general

COL. JAMES C. SULLIVAN, xxx-xx-x...