



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 103^d CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

SENATE—Tuesday, January 25, 1994

The 25th day of January being the day prescribed by House Joint Resolution 190 for the meeting of the 2d session of the 103d Congress, the Senate assembled in its Chamber at the Capitol at 12 noon.

The Senate was called to order by the President pro tempore [Mr. BYRD].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate will come to order.

The prayer will be led by the Senate Chaplain, the Reverend Dr. Richard C. Halverson.

Doctor Halverson, please.

PRAYER

The Senate Chaplain, the Reverend Richard C. Halverson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Let us pray:

For there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God.—Romans 13:1.

Eternal God, Lord of history, Sovereign of the nations, on this 1st day of the 2d session of the 103d Congress, we pray for a mighty visitation of the Holy Spirit upon our Nation. Men and women in leadership, whether it is the White House, the Congress, the Judiciary, or any position of power, are under the ordination of God. We pray for the President, the Vice President, the Members of Congress, and the Judiciary, and all who hold power in our Nation, that they may somehow be made aware of their accountability to God. They chose their position, they were elected or appointed, but they hold power by virtue of divine intervention. Help them take this fact seriously.

Almighty God, Congress faces a very challenging year, a difficult agenda loaded with controversy, and there is always the daily possibility of a global crisis somewhere. Grant to Thy servants wisdom, strength, courage to fulfill their ultimate responsibility to Thy Living God.

We pray this in the name of Him who is the Way, the Truth, and the Life. Amen.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, under a previous order, there was to be at this time a vote on a motion to instruct. I now ask unanimous consent that I and then the Republican leader be recognized for the purpose of making brief opening statements and that upon the completion of the Republican leader's remarks, the Senate proceed to vote on the motion to instruct.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, will the majority leader tell me how long that will last?

Mr. MITCHELL. I anticipate our remarks in total should be no more than 15 minutes or so.

I apologize for any inconvenience to Senators by virtue of this change. It is to accommodate other Senators.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Hearing no objection, the request is granted. The majority leader is recognized.

SECOND SESSION OF THE 103D CONGRESS

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, today marks the beginning of the 2d session of the 103d Congress. The agenda before us is ambitious. But the workload that needs attention is large.

We should be prepared to act promptly on disaster relief aid for southern California. The enormous damage inflicted by the earthquake has disrupted the life of one of the Nation's great cities and threatens economic revival in the region.

Our economy has also been dealt a short but sharp blow by the record-breaking freeze that immobilized much of the Midwest and East this month.

Conditions abroad require our attention and action. Reform in Russia, the removal of nuclear weapons from Ukraine and ratification of START II are all important to the ultimate security of the Nation, and we cannot allow ourselves to be distracted from them. President Clinton's successful trip to Europe and Russia laid a basis on which we must be prepared to act.

The world has changed, and even though our principal work is here at home, we cannot afford to ignore those changes and what they mean for us.

I spent a good deal of the recess traveling in my State, talking to Maine's citizens about their hopes and fears for the new year. Their concerns—job security, economic growth, health care, crime, education, the environment—all are reflected in this year's legislative agenda.

The hopes and dreams my constituents shared with me are not unreachable or unreasonable. They want to earn a decent living and enjoy a measure of job security. They want to feel safe on their own city streets. They want neighborhoods safe enough to play in and schools where children can learn without fear. They want the security of knowing that if a family member needs health care, it will be there.

These are minimal needs in a civilized society. The Congress has a role in addressing those concerns. I am determined we will do so this year.

Last session, we took the first steps to rebuild the economy and put the deficit on a downward path. There is evidence that the \$500 billion deficit reduction package we approved last August is working.

Before we acted, the deficit forecast for 1995 was in the range of \$300 billion. Today, with the budget plan in place, giving us stronger growth, lower inflation, and low interest rates, the deficit forecast has been credibly cut by more than \$100 billion, to an anticipated \$180 billion. That is a huge saving in borrowing costs that have hindered economic growth for too many years.

Interest rates are the lowest in a generation, with mortgage rates averaging under 7 percent. Low rates have allowed million of Americans to buy homes—I note that the purchase of homes, existing homes, set a record in 1993, the highest ever in our Nation's history—and given millions of others more disposable income from refinancing their mortgages at lower rates. Retailers enjoyed a solid holiday season. Economists predict that fourth-quarter economic performance could be as high

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

as 6 percent, the best in a very long time. Overall 1993 economic growth was in the range of 3 percent, the strongest showing in the Western industrialized world.

Housing starts are at their highest level in 4 years. Consumer price inflation ran at 2.7 percent last year, the lowest since the collapse of world oil prices in 1986, and the first time in more than 30 years that inflation was below 3 percent for 2 consecutive years.

After 4 years of virtually no growth, the rate of job creation in the last 12 months has been impressive. Almost 2 million new jobs were created last year. Unemployment, which was at 7.3 percent a year ago, is now at 6.4 percent. That is still too high, but the underlying direction downward is sound. Productivity has risen, which means American workers are again laying the groundwork for higher living standards. Most important, a year of solid economic growth and strong job creation has reversed public attitudes. Americans are more confident of their economy and of themselves. Consumer confidence is up and the economy is beginning a strong recovery.

These are all positive signs, but they do not mean our work is done. We have to continue to focus on balancing the services Americans expect with a declining deficit. That is needed to keep the economy robust. We must continue to look for ways Government can do what people demand more efficiently and more productively.

The productivity gain that is already showing up reflects the effects of investment in modernized equipment and structural efficiencies in the workplace. We should work to promote those gains to keep American workers and businesses more competitive. An important step we can take is to pass the National Competitiveness Act early this session. This legislation will broaden the base for modernizing our manufacturing capability. Its purpose is to help the United States regain world leadership in developing, deploying, and using advanced manufacturing technology.

Another significant step for sound economic growth is in the solid progress made in world trade. Passage of NAFTA last year and agreement on GATT this year puts us on the threshold of an expanded world trading economy, from which American businesses, workers, and consumers will all benefit.

We will take up the implementing legislation for the GATT agreement. GATT will reduce nontariff barriers to trade and gradually lower tariffs on a reciprocal basis. It will expand the potential market for American made goods without abandoning safeguards against unfair foreign trade practices. Americans have always prospered from expanded trade, and the combination of NAFTA and GATT creates an oppor-

tunity for renewed economic growth and expansion into the next century.

A strong economy gives us the opportunity to move effectively on long-delayed but essential reforms. The most important will be health care reform.

Health care costs now affect one-seventh of our economy. No other advanced nation spends as much of its resources, private and public, on health care. But despite our enormous investment, our citizens do not have health care security. The taxpayers of many other countries have that security—they do not have to fear losing coverage when they have an illness. Their career choices are not dictated by health insurance considerations. In many instances, they have better health outcomes, in terms of life expectancies, infant mortality rates, and other broad measures of well being.

At its best, American health care cannot be matched. It is the best in the world; the highest quality health care that is available anywhere. But too many Americans do not have access to that high quality care. Too many get virtually no care. We have to correct that and I believe we can. I will do everything in my power to see that we do.

Health care reform must guarantee all Americans access to high quality, affordable health care. It must restrain rising health care costs that are sending Americans, both as individuals and as a nation, deeper into debt. We have to reform the system to preserve its best features and correct its failings. I believe that can be done.

After more than a decade of negative reports on our schools and piecemeal reforms, we are going to respond to the demand of parents that the schools provide the education and the basic skills our children need.

One of the first bills we will take up this year is Goals 2000, an effort to provide nationally what many individual schools and communities have learned locally: That reforms can work, American children can and do learn eagerly, and Americans will support schools when they are effective.

No child graduating from high school into the workplace should be without the skills to compete for a decent job. No child moving to higher education should have to face remedial courses in basic skills such as reading and comprehension. Goals 2000 is the first practical step in bringing reforms into the educational mainstream.

Children are our No. 1 resource. We have to invest in their education now to reap the benefits of a well-trained, competitive workforce in the future.

We must also make a beginning on ending the waste of human resources represented in our welfare system. President Clinton is committed to ending welfare as we know it.

We have to take measures to move welfare recipients into the workforce

so they can become productive, self-supporting members of the community, so their families can grow up in an environment of work and security, where people daily earn and renew the self-respect that comes from work and effort.

We can restore and preserve the original purpose of welfare: A safety net for those suffering misfortune, the loss of a breadwinner or serious illness or disability. But we must end welfare as a way of life.

We have to provide individuals the support and assistance they need to move into the workforce, to replace a system which today provides strong disincentives to leaving welfare. That will not be easy and it will not be cheap. But in the long term, it is the most cost-effective answer and it is the only answer for the children now trapped in the system.

Americans expect and have a right to expect that their homes and neighborhoods will be safe. Violence has reached unprecedented and unacceptable levels when American children are 15 times more at risk of death from shooting than the children of Northern Ireland—let me repeat that: American children are now more than 15 times at risk from shooting than are the children of Northern Ireland; that is unacceptable—when 50,000 elementary and middle school children were shot to death between 1979 and 1991, when homicide is the third leading cause of death for minors.

Even in rural Maine, which has been spared the worst of the crime epidemic, people are frightened of random violence.

The Senate has passed its major crime package and we are going to work with the House to move it to conference and passage as quickly as possible. Our cities and neighborhoods need the police presence that the bill will fund. Our corrections personnel need the drug treatment funding to end the revolving prison door of arresting and releasing addicts without end.

All Americans should know that those who abide by the law, who play by the rules, are the focus of public safety. We have to give the people trying to make a decent life in the midst of crime a better chance.

Americans expect safety from violence, but they also expect to live in a clean, safe environment. The reports of massive drinking water threats in the Midwest and in the Nation's Capital recently have highlighted the importance of a safe environment.

This year we will take up the reauthorizations of the Safe Drinking Water Act, the Clean Water Act, and Superfund. These are all important parts of the whole which protect fundamental health and well-being in our communities.

Americans want government to respect and respond to their needs, not to the needs of narrow special interest

groups. The most important step we can take in that respect is to complete action on campaign finance reform legislation. American voters should feel their volunteer work and their votes count as much as the wealth of special interests. I hope we will finally be able to act on campaign finance reform this year.

We have a lot of work to do. I expect the session to be a tough one. It is going to demand hard work, many hours and a willingness to look beyond partisan advantage for solutions that will work best for all Americans—not for Democratic or Republican solutions, but for solutions that work for all Americans. Our first session was very productive: Family leave, national service, solid deficit reduction, motor voter legislation, the Brady bill. I hope we will, this year, build on that success.

If we can, this Congress could, in the end, do more to improve the lives of American families than any in the last quarter century.

RECOGNITION OF THE REPUBLICAN LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the order, the Republican leader, Mr. DOLE, is recognized.

THE 2D SESSION OF THE 103D CONGRESS

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I join with my friend, the distinguished majority leader, in welcoming back our colleagues and also our Senate Chaplain, Reverend Halverson, to the 2d session of the 103d Congress.

I share the views expressed by the majority leader with reference to southern California. I have just spoken to Governor Wilson by telephone 30 minutes ago. He indicated his interest and his concern about not moving so quickly that we do not have the accurate figures. But I assure my colleagues from California and the House delegation that the Republican leader will be happy to work with them.

We do have an ambitious agenda to tackle this session, and we are ready to roll up our sleeves and go to work.

I think everybody who went home during the recess got a pretty good idea what the American people are thinking about. I think the first thing they are thinking about is crime. The American people want decisive action on crime in America.

There is also concern about welfare reform and, obviously, concern about health care reform.

I think one thing that I, at least, picked up when I went home is that people reflect time and again that we have the best health care system in the world; let us not try to mess it up; it is the envy of the world. I think we need to be careful as we look at health care reform.

And I would hope the President tonight would embrace the Senate-passed crime bill and say this is a good bill. There are some provisions that probably are not that good. But I think primarily there are a lot of good provisions with reference to the victims of crime and also those who commit crimes with a gun, those who commit three violent crimes, and death for drug kingpins. There are a lot of good provisions that I think would stem the tide and indicate that we are serious about doing something.

But, when it comes to spending taxpayers' dollars, of course we are going to have the balanced budget debate. I see one of the principal sponsors on the floor. That will take some time, as I understand it, looking at the Presiding Officer. I am not certain where the votes are. But, in addition, we have a 50-point plan on this side that we will be talking about, a 50-point plan to save \$50 billion during the next 5 years.

And with reference to the deficit, it is forecast to be \$180 billion, about \$100 billion lower than expected. I think it is well to understand where the \$180 billion came from: \$50 billion came from new taxes, imposed by our colleagues on the other side of the aisle; only about \$5 billion in spending cuts; the rest of it was reestimates, \$38 billion alone in reestimating the savings and loan costs.

So, reestimates and \$5 billion in cuts, and 10 to 1 in taxes is how that deficit has been reduced. I assume if you raise taxes enough, you probably will reduce the deficit some.

We stand ready with our colleagues on the other side of the aisle, as we did on the North American Free-Trade Agreement, not only to cooperate but to vote and support the majority leader in every way we can. And when we have fundamental differences, it is our obligation as the minority, just as it was when the Democrats were in the minority, it is our obligation not just to oppose but to provide alternatives. Try to work it out, try to help, but where we have a basic, fundamental difference in principle then we will flatly oppose efforts if we think they are taking America in the wrong direction.

So we look forward to the year ahead. We will be talking about specific issues outlined by the distinguished majority leader.

We look forward to a busy year ahead, which will kick off tonight with the President's State of the Union Message and the Republican response. And I know the President is preparing his State of the Union Message, probably as we speak. And we look forward to hearing the President. It is important to have the President outline what his goals are for 1994. As I indicated earlier, where we can be helpful, where we think they are moving America in the right direction, certainly we want to be supportive and cooperative in every way that we can.

So we are back. We are ready to go to work. We hope that we can accomplish many of the things outlined by the majority leader, and I thank the Chair and I yield the floor.

VOTE ON MOTION TO INSTRUCT THE SERGEANT AT ARMS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the order, the Senate will now proceed to vote on the motion to instruct the Sergeant at Arms to request the attendance of absent Senators. A rollcall vote has not been ordered.

The majority leader.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The yeas and nays have been requested. Is the demand sustained?

It is.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 100, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 1 Leg.]

YEAS—100

Akaka	Feingold	McConnell
Baucus	Feinstein	Metzenbaum
Bennett	Ford	Mikulski
Biden	Glenn	Mitchell
Bingaman	Gorton	Moseley-Braun
Bond	Graham	Moynihan
Boren	Gramm	Murkowski
Boxer	Grassley	Murray
Bradley	Gregg	Nickles
Breaux	Harkin	Nunn
Brown	Hatch	Packwood
Bryan	Hatfield	Pell
Bumpers	Heflin	Pressler
Burns	Helms	Pryor
Byrd	Hollings	Reid
Campbell	Hutchison	Riegle
Chafee	Inouye	Robb
Coats	Jeffords	Rockefeller
Cochran	Johnston	Roth
Cohen	Kassebaum	Sarbanes
Conrad	Kempthorne	Sasser
Coverdell	Kennedy	Shelby
Craig	Kerrey	Simon
D'Amato	Kerry	Simpson
Danforth	Kohl	Smith
Daschle	Lautenberg	Specter
DeConcini	Leahy	Stevens
Dodd	Levin	Thurmond
Dole	Lieberman	Wallop
Domenici	Lott	Warner
Dorgan	Lugar	Wellstone
Durenberger	Mack	Wofford
Exon	Mathews	
Faircloth	McCain	

So, the motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is present.

The majority leader is recognized.

AUTHORIZATION TO APPOINT COMMITTEE TO ESCORT THE PRESIDENT

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President of the Senate be authorized to appoint a committee on the part of the Senate to join with a like committee on the part of the House of Representatives to escort the President of the United States to the House Chamber for the

Joint Session to be held at 9 p.m. this evening.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the request of the majority leader is agreed to.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, parliamentary inquiry. Is it appropriate now for the Presiding Officer to appoint the members of the committee pursuant to the resolution just adopted?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. MITCHELL and Mr. DOLE as members of the committee.

NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I send a resolution to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 177) informing the President of the United States that a quorum of each House is assembled.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 177) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 177

Resolved, That a committee consisting of two Senators be appointed to join such committee as may be appointed by the House of Representatives to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that a quorum of each House is assembled and that the Congress is ready to receive any communication he may be pleased to make.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was agreed to.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

NOTIFICATION TO THE HOUSE

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I send a resolution to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 178) informing the House of Representatives that a quorum of the Senate is assembled.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 178) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 178

Resolved, That the Secretary inform the House of Representatives that a quorum of the Senate is assembled and that the Senate is ready to proceed to business.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was agreed to.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, under the previous order, the Senate was to now go into recess to accommodate the respective party conferences. I ask unanimous consent that I be recognized to address the Senate for 3 minutes, and that following my remarks Senator FEINSTEIN be recognized to address the Senate for 10 minutes, and that thereafter Senator BOXER be recognized to address the Senate for 10 minutes, and that thereafter Senator GRAMM of Texas be recognized to address the Senate for 8 minutes, and that upon the conclusion of Senator GRAMM's remarks the Senate stand in recess.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the several requests? Hearing no objection, the requests are agreed to.

The majority leader is recognized for 3 minutes.

ORDER FOR RECESS TIME TO REMAIN IN EFFECT

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the provision of the previous order that the recess continue until 2:30 p.m. remain in effect.

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

FORMER SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE TIP O'NEILL

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President and Members of the Senate, recently the Nation lost one of its great public servants, the former Speaker of the House of Representatives, Tip O'Neill.

It is one of my regrets that I never had the honor of serving in leadership with the late Speaker.

He was proof that the American political system can and does elevate people of ability and effectiveness to high public office.

His warmth, humor, and love of public service and politics were legendary in his own lifetime. His passing was as sincerely mourned by those who knew him only at a distance—indeed by those who did not know him personally—as by those who knew him best.

Speaker O'Neill was a man of the people and he never forgot those who elected him to office or where he came from. He was a loyal Democrat, but he sought to be loyal to the Party's ideals, not to any one individual.

When he thought the Party was mistaken he stood up and said so, as he did in breaking with President Johnson on the war in Vietnam. He remained on good personal terms with President

Reagan even when they disagreed, as they frequently did.

His career in public life spanned half a century, from the years of President Franklin Roosevelt to the years of President Ronald Reagan. He came to Washington in 1953, at the beginning of the Eisenhower era, to continue the work he began amid the great hardships of the Depression years to keep on helping the people of his district realize the American dream of a secure life and a good future for their children. The achievement of the American dream for all people was a goal he never abandoned.

He never turned his back on the confidence that fueled the years of the New Deal, when Americans knew that Government could be a tool for innovative and positive action to help its people.

He believed that Government exists for the people, not the other way around, and he believed it was the obligation of the Government to serve the vast majority of the people, not to force the bulk of the people to serve the interests of a narrow few.

Speaker O'Neill was harshly criticized in his last years in office, but he never allowed the voices of critics to drown out the authentic voice of the people on whose behalf he worked. He remained, to his last days in office, a servant of the public and proudly so. His is a career of which Democrats should be proud, and one from which all Americans can learn much.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the order, the Senator from California [Mrs. FEINSTEIN] is recognized for not to exceed 10 minutes.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Thank you very much, Mr. President, I thank you for this opportunity.

THE CALIFORNIA QUAKE OF 1994

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I would like to take a few moments to report on the tragic 6.6 earthquake that struck southern California just 8 days ago. I know my colleague, Senator BOXER, will also want to speak. We were both able to fly over the earthquake area, to visit the rubble in Northridge, Santa Monica, Hollywood, and all throughout the San Fernando Valley. I visited shelters and schools.

The harsh reality is that more people were left homeless by the Northridge earthquake than by Hurricane Andrew, which until now was considered the worst natural disaster in modern American history.

Now, those who lost homes, businesses, and loved ones turn to the Federal Government and to this Congress, as well as to the State, for assistance.

Let me talk about the damage caused by the earthquake. This was a newly discovered fault which had a lateral thrust up on the two converging plates.

This resulted in sudden and very strong vertical acceleration so that the damage that was done was considerably higher than other 6.6 earthquakes. The epicenter was in the heart of an urban area for the first time. The devastation is worse than the 7.1 Loma Prieta earthquake in 1989, or any earthquake in California, with the possible exception of the 1906 San Andreas temblor in San Francisco.

In the last 8 days, there have been 2,500 aftershocks, each one rendering more damage, and some of them close to 5 on the Richter scale. Hospitals such as St. John's in Santa Monica have been condemned. Freeways were closed, including the one freeway that carries more people than any other in America—350,000 people a day.

After 8 days, here are some statistics: 57 people dead; of 20,000 buildings inspected, 1,057 structures, including about 13,000 dwelling units, have been declared uninhabitable, and this is less than half of the buildings that need inspection; 9,000 people have been treated for injuries, and 1,241 hospitalized.

In excess of 20,000 people, I estimate, are homeless. More than 14,000 have been given shelter in tents erected by the Army and the National Guard; in shelters operated by the Red Cross and the Salvation Army; and with supplies from volunteer organizations.

As many as four hospitals have been closed and 10 percent of the hospital beds in the area cannot be used. These are St. John's, the Panorama-Kaiser Hospital, the U.S. Veterans Affairs Medical Center in Sepulveda, and the Los Angeles County/USC Psychiatric Pavilion.

As many as 76 schools will not open today because of the earthquake. As a result, 65,000 students who attend these schools will stay home today.

There is a great need for Federal assistance.

According to the Federal Emergency Management Agency, the need for assistance—particularly housing assistance—is even greater than Hurricane Andrew.

In 1 hour alone, FEMA received 15,000 calls for help which it could not answer. To date, 99,000 applications for assistance have been filed with FEMA.

Initially, FEMA set up 11 disaster assistance centers. I sent members of my staff to each site, where they have helped cut redtape, responded to human needs, and alerted me of progress.

These centers were initially overwhelmed by demand. FEMA has been flexible, and they have ironed out problems. They have extended hours. There will be 16 centers by the end of today located in Northridge, Santa Monica, Tarzana, Santa Clarita, Sylmar, Simi Valley, Van Nuys, Fillmore, Hollywood, Sherman Oaks, Calabasas, San Fernando, Glendale, and three in Los Angeles.

The early damage estimates range from \$15 to \$30 billion. But it is still too early to know the full extent of the damage since much of the damage will only be known once full structural surveys have been completed.

I would like to compliment the administration, particularly the President, who took the time to fly out to see the damage firsthand; Secretary Cisneros, who is still in southern California and who has made 10,000 section 8 housing vouchers available which provide rental assistance for 1½ years.

Secretary of Transportation Pena was out there to bring in additional rail cars for the Metrolink system which provides rail transportation from the affected areas to Los Angeles.

I would like to thank FEMA Director James Witt, who is still in the region, for his hands-on authority. FEMA has responded. They have responded with alacrity.

I want to thank the mayor of Los Angeles, Mayor Riordan; the Governor of the State of California, Pete Wilson; and his emergency operations director, Dick Andrews.

This has been a true bipartisan effort to respond. And now our job is to keep it that way because this morning Leon Panetta, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, met with the California congressional delegation, and right at this time he is announcing that a supplemental appropriations bill will be proceeding forthwith through the House of Representatives.

The figures in this supplemental—and I want to stress this, because the Governor of California has just called—can be amended. I know the Governor has spoken to the Republican leader indicating his concern that an early supplemental will not reflect the true nature of the vastness of the devastation.

The fact of the matter is that the supplemental can be amended as it moves through the process and as figures are cleared. The administration has also indicated their commitment to do just that.

I have spoken directly with chairman of the Appropriations Committee, ROBERT C. BYRD, who has assured me of his 100-percent support to move the supplemental appropriations bill forward as rapidly as possible. We very much appreciate the Senator's support.

I also spoke with my chairman on the HUD/VA Subcommittee, who spoke with singular enthusiasm, as only Senator MIKULSKI can, about her willingness to see that that subcommittee responds promptly and with alacrity. I also appreciate her support.

As a member of the Appropriations Committee, I will do everything I possibly can to see that funds are expedited and that they are adequate once they reach the committee.

Yet, the Federal Government alone cannot possibly secure all of the funds necessary for a full recovery. I believe

it is critical that the State of California put together a fair-share plan whereby all State resources—bond issues, tax increases, if necessary—are used to assist in the recovery.

Anything short of a full partnership between the State and the Federal Government will not be sufficient to meet this tremendous need.

Immediately following the disaster, as you know, FEMA pays 100 percent of the cost of the first 72 hours, and the President extended this for 5 additional days. From that point on, it is usual for FEMA to pay 75 percent and the local jurisdiction 25 percent. The administration has waived this, and so the match will be 90-10. That is very helpful to the hard-pressed State of California.

While the first priority of government is to provide emergency assistance for the disaster, I also believe it is incumbent upon all California officials to reevaluate the building code. In both Loma Prieta and this earthquake, I observed where wood frame construction was not adequate, and the loss of life in housing, both in Loma Prieta as well as in this earthquake, came in wood frame construction. And so improvements need to be made and codes need to be updated.

It has also been reported that only 25 percent of Californians have earthquake insurance because of the high cost of premiums and the high deductibility. It is incumbent upon us, I believe, to produce legislation to mandate affordable earthquake insurance. Senator BOXER and I will work together in that regard, and the administration has made the secretary of the cabinet available as a point person to help us in that effort.

But throughout this tragedy, what has been the most amazing, has been the people. This is just remarkable. Volunteers of the Salvation Army reported immediately to work, despite the fact that their homes were demolished. Corporate Citizens donated food, tents, supplies. Firefighters and police from Los Angeles and from the neighboring communities worked around the clock.

The amazing resilience and the determination of people came through over and over again. In a crisis, people who have never ever asked for a handout for the first time came for help. I saw one elderly woman in her eighties whose husband had just died, who was standing outside of a shelter, homeless, saying, "What will I do now? How will I be able to live? First my husband and now this."

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of a recent Los Angeles Times story be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

[From the Los Angeles Times, Jan. 24, 1994]
TRAGEDY BEFORE DAWN—EARTHQUAKE WAS MERCILESS, INDISCRIMINATE IN CLAIMING ITS VICTIMS

(By J. Michael Kennedy, Sheryl Stolberg, Marc Lacey, Doug Smith, and John Johnson)

The numbers kept climbing as first the hours, then the days, slipped by.
 The names of the dead.

The young, the old. Businessmen and homemakers. An ex-con on Skid Row. A 4-year-old girl who loved frilly skirts and pink cowboy boots. More than 50 in all.

Roughly a third were in a single apartment complex whose upper two floors collapsed. One couple died when their vast collection of books and model trains fell on them as they slept. An electrician died when he picked up a high voltage wire draped across a car, an act of heroism turned to tragedy.

A woman may have literally died of fright as she rushed to check on her infant son. In the dark, a motorcycle policeman did not see where the temblor had opened a gash in an overpass.

Most of the victims were still in bed when Monday's quake shook the earth at 4:31 a.m. with unrelenting anger. Others risked danger to help someone else. Together, they were the grimmest statistics in this, one of the costliest disasters in U.S. history.

Here are some of their stories.

YOUNGEST VICTIM HAD A LAST BEAUTIFUL WEEKEND

Amy Tyre-Vigil.—It had been, in Anastacio Vigil's words, "a beautiful weekend." His wife, Nancy Tyre, and 4-year-old daughter, Amy, had gone to a concert. He had taken Amy on a bike ride. The whole family had gone to the zoo. And Amy had sampled her first meatball Sunday night.

Vigil and Tyre, both 40, had chatted happily about the future, about the second baby, a boy, on the way, about the new house they were going to buy once their Sherman Oaks home sold. Tyre, who like her husband is a family-practice doctor, told a friend she looked forward to having a bigger place when the baby came.

All of that, gone in an instant. Amy was buried Friday afternoon, the youngest victim of the temblor. More than 200 mourners said goodbye to the dark-haired girl who loved her artwork, her nursery school, and chocolate chip cookies without nuts.

Her mother was not among those present. Instead, a rabbi went to Valley Presbyterian Hospital to join Tyre, seven months pregnant and bedridden with a broken pelvis, in reciting Yizkor, the Jewish prayer for the dead.

Amy was crushed when the earthquake sent her home hurtling down its hillside, collapsing it into a flattened wreck of wood and stucco, tile and glass. Her father does not remember much about what happened.

"It felt like somebody picked up the house and just violently shook it. Nancy said, 'Get Amy!' As I was getting up there was a big flash of light and a terrible crashing sound. The next thing I remember, I was trapped."

In the darkness, pinned under boards, able only to wiggle his right foot, Vigil heard his wife moaning that she could not breathe. He listened for his daughter, but heard nothing. The silence worried him. He concentrated on trying to calm his wife. "Breathe slowly," he told her. "Breathe slowly. We're going to be OK."

The couple lay there for at least an hour on the ground amid the ruins, too far away to touch one another, talking as they shivered in the cold. Finally, they heard voices.

It was the neighbors, venturing outside for the first time.

It took an hour for the rescue workers to pick their way through the rubble. They freed Vigil first. "I felt a human hand on my leg," he said, "and it was just the most beautiful feeling."

He suffered a broken rib, and injuries to his leg and jaw, but he told the doctor who treated him at Sherman Oaks Hospital that he could not stay, that he needed a taxi. He had to find his wife and daughter. Sit down, the doctor told him. He would make some calls.

The emergency physician learned that Tyre and Amy had been taken to Valley Presbyterian. He also learned what had happened to Amy. Gently, he told Vigil that his daughter had been killed. Though the crisis was mounting at his own hospital, the doctor drove Vigil to see his injured wife.

Tyre looked better than he expected. And the baby would be fine.

He grabbed her, held her close, and whispered the wrenching words: "We lost her."

AND HER SON WILL REALLY NOT HAVE KNOWN HER AT ALL

Elizabeth Brace.—Earthquakes terrified Elizabeth Brace. As a young girl, her family's home had been heavily damaged by the Sylmar quake in 1971. Her husband, Thomas, said there was a certain way she acted when the earth rumbled, a kind of tenseness until the shaking stopped and the danger passed.

At the time of their marriage, he was 43, she 31. They had set about quickly to begin a family. Elizabeth had quit her job when Michelle was born five years ago, followed by Christopher 3½ years later.

Three years ago, the Braces moved to Rancho Cucamonga in San Bernardino County. They wanted a bigger house and a decent school district. Elizabeth had become a Scout leader when Michelle was old enough to be a Daisy. She volunteered as a room mother a couple of days a week when Michelle started kindergarten this year.

It was the good life in a quiet, suburban way.

There was little to make Sunday evening apart from others. Elizabeth had an appointment Monday morning. She was trying to earn some extra money while working at home and was thinking of doing the billing for a local doctor.

And then, before dawn, the quake hit.

The couple held each other in those first frightening moments. They did it instinctively because of Elizabeth's fears. Then, a few seconds later, she got up and raced for Christopher's room. Thomas went to Michelle's.

What Thomas remembers next was a loud noise in the next room. Not a cry. More like something falling.

"She was just lying on the floor," said Thomas, a computer programmer. "She was unconscious and bleeding from the nose and mouth. I tried CPR but I don't think I did a good job of it. I'm not trained for that kind of thing."

"I called 911 and when I came back she was still," Thomas said. "I couldn't feel a pulse." Paramedics arrived in minutes, but could not revive her.

Early on, there was speculation that Elizabeth, 37, may have died when she tripped on a toy.

The San Bernardino coroner's office said it would take at least six weeks for the test results. Deputy Coroner Gabriel Morales said fright as a cause of death, perhaps in the form of a huge adrenal rush, is not being ruled out.

That's what Thomas suspects: "If I were to speculate, I would guess she died of fright and panic."

Thomas, sitting on his living room couch a few days after the earthquake, worked hard to hold back his tears as he talked about his wife and how good their life had been.

"She was such a terrific mother and had gotten the job of raising the children started so well," he said. "And her son will really not have known her at all."

SON WROTE HIS EPITAPH: "IF IT WEREN'T FOR FATE * * *"

Howard and James Lee.—Just weeks before his death, Howard Lee wrote his epitaph.

"If it weren't for fate, I might be somewhere else," the 14-year-old boy wrote in an autobiography for school entitled "My Life."

The sentence proved as cruelly ironic as anything connected with the quake. Howard was killed in his bed, a Golf digest he had been reading close at hand.

Rescuers who arrived at the Northridge Meadows apartments could still hear Howard—a tall, always-smiling boy who was thinking of becoming a priest—calling out from the ruins of Apartment 101. Around him in the darkness, 15 other people died in the building collapse. Among them was his father, Pil, 46, trapped in the bathroom where he had been brushing his teeth before heading off to work as an RTD mechanic.

"Help me! Help me!" Howard shouted.

Rescuers kept telling the voice to hold on, just a little longer. But the building had shifted 10 feet to the north when it collapsed and they could not locate them, even with the help of Howard's mother, who had been pulled from the wreckage earlier, along with her other son, 12-year-old Jason. Finally, they found a pillow and showed it to Hyun Lee, who said, yes, that belonged to Howard, whom she affectionately called her "big son."

Then they found him.

"This son is dead, ma'am," said the firefighter. "He is dead."

Hyun Soon Lee, a deeply religious woman with a cascade of rich black hair, burst into tears, letting go of the thin thread of hope she had held onto for four hours. "Can I see him?" she asked. Hours later, her husband's body was brought out, the last recovered from the ruins.

EX-CON HAD A TEMPER, BUT HE WAS A "FUN-LOVING GUY"

Jose Louis Hernandez.—The initial news reports were sketchy: A mentally ill ex-convict had either jumped or fallen from a Skid Row flophouse during the quake. Good Samaritan Hospital called him John Doe No. 17 and said he died of head injuries caused by a very long fall.

The police report provided a bit more information: He lived in Room 610 of the Frontier Hotel. His window had been open. He was found by police lying on his back on the sidewalk, wearing only blue boxer shorts.

A down-and-out drifter when he died, Jose Louis Hernandez had a hearty laugh, a violent temper and a long criminal record. He also had four sons, a daughter and a granddaughter, although he had been out of touch with his family for two years.

"He had a temper but he was a good man," said his niece, Eileen Moreno. "He was a fun-loving guy."

Just out of state prison, the 49-year-old Hernandez settled into a studio at the Frontier, a once-grand hotel at Main and 5th streets that had fallen victim to the grittiness around it. Across the street from two porn theaters and a liquor store, the Frontier charges \$11.99 a night.

A childhood friend, John Seanez, used to joke with Hernandez about his short, pudgy build. Growing up on the Eastside in the 1950s, Seanez and Hernandez were homeboys, partying together and once getting thrown off a city bus for guzzling beers.

"He was a pretty good guy when we were young," said Seanez, who also lives at the Frontier.

But Hernandez drifted from his friends and drifted from his family. He also drifted in and out of jail. Since 1962, he served time for resisting arrest, petty theft, possession of heroin and cocaine, driving while intoxicated, assault with a deadly weapon and hit and run.

He once threatened a hotel employee's life when his toilet got clogged. But he also said "thank you" after picking up his mail. He sometimes heard voices and was taking psychotropic drugs for his condition.

His parole officer, Robert Humphrey, had no problems with Hernandez. Since leaving prison on Thanksgiving, Hernandez had reported regularly, found a place to live and applied for government aid.

Said Humphrey: "He was doing pretty good on parole, up until his recent demise."

OFFICER "WAS QUICK TO HELP AND THAT NEVER CHANGED"

Clarence Wayne Dean.—Minutes after the earthquake hit, Clarence Dean was putting on his uniform. He was a motorcycle cop.

He had spent more than half his life with the Los Angeles Police Department, graduating from the academy in 1968 after four years in the Marines. He had worked the streets—first as a patrol officer and later as a motorcycle cop—for nearly 25 years.

A colleague said his blond hair "always looked like he had just taken his helmet off."

On the morning of the earthquake, Dean was not scheduled to start work until 7 a.m., but the tremor apparently jolted him out of bed. The 46-year-old officer left his Lancaster home and headed for work on his motorcycle, blue lights flashing in the night.

As he drove south in the darkness, he rounded a bend on an Antelope Valley Freeway interchange. Dean and his motorcycle plunged 30 feet from the roadway, which had been severed in the quake. As he fell, the lights of the motorcycle continued to flash.

"No one called him, no one made him come in that morning," said Danny Staggs, president of the Los Angeles Police Protective League, who knew Dean. "He was doing this to help people."

Dean, the divorced father of two children, was remembered as a gregarious man who was quick with a joke or a story.

"He was quick to work and quick to help and that never changed," Sgt. Rod Grehek said. "You wonder what was going through his mind those last few seconds."

IF ANYONE NEEDED HELP, KEVIN WAS THE FIRST TO OFFER

Kevin C. Maher.—A grim reminder of one quake tragedy is burned into the ground.

On a grassy patch at Murietta Avenue and Valleyheart Drive in Sherman Oaks, two charred footprints show exactly where a downed power line electrocuted Kevin C. Maher.

The line was dangling over a car with a young child inside; the distraught mother stood nearby. Maher a 25-year-old electrician who grew up in Ireland, ran back to his apartment for tools. He ignored the warnings of others at the scene.

"People were yelling at him, 'No! Don't touch it!'" said James Pianezola, 30, who

saw the whole thing. "He turned around and said, 'Don't worry, I'm an electrician.' But as soon as he touched the line, his body went stiff as a board." (The child was snatched from the car by another onlooker.)

Maher, who was from Carrick-on-Shannon and never lost his brogue after 10 years in the U.S., was hailed as a hero in Ireland, his death making the front pages of the dailies back home. In the San Fernando Valley, his friends recalled him as a generous man who died doing what he always did.

"If anyone needed help, Kevin was the first to offer," said Paula Shields, a friend who lived in the same apartment complex.

"The Irish community always comes together when something like this happens," said Kathleen Harney, Maher's sister. "We're all far away from home so we stick close together out here."

COUPLE LABORED HARD TO EARN THEIR HOUSE ON THE HILLSIDE

Marc Yobs and Karen Osterholt.—Marc Yobs was going places. Just ask anyone who knew him.

He was 32 and on top of his game. Good-looking, with a caring way and easy grin, he had accomplished the nearly impossible early in his career, getting a foot in the door into Hollywood with nary a connection. Now, he was handling some of the industry's biggest accounts for The Post Group, which does sound and special effects for film. His bosses had recently promoted him.

"There's a lot of phoniness and glad-handing in Hollywood," said Kristen Ralph, the company president. "Marc never had that kind of self-opinion. He was confident, and very bright, and quite sure of his own abilities. But he was not one of the let's-do-lunch types."

Two years ago, Yobs bought the house of his dreams: a \$400,000 hillside home in Sherman Oaks, with a sweeping view of the San Fernando Valley, where he grew up. He shared it with Karen Osterholt, 30, his girlfriend of nine years.

The place was a showpiece. Yobs was meticulous about maintaining it, as he was about everything else in his life. Osterholt had a flair for decorating, and she filled it with antiques. If he was the go-getter, she was the quiet power behind him. She was with him when he had nothing, supporting him with her earnings as a waitress while he struggled to climb the Hollywood ladder.

The house made Waldrop nervous, no matter how many times her daughter assured her it was safe. It was 30 years old and had survived both the Sylmar and the Whittier Narrows quakes. But fears of a tremor must have passed through Yobs' mind, because a year ago he bought earthquake insurance.

In 10 seconds, it came crashing down, taking them with it. They were to be buried side by side.

There is nothing left of the Sherwood Place house. It is a pile of twisted metal and wood. The homes to the right and left, built at the same time, by the same builder, according to Dave Yobs, are still standing. Uninhabitable, but standing. "Why his house?" Dave Yobs said tearfully. "With all those homes, why his?"

IF THERE IS A BRIGHT SPOT . . . IT'S THAT THEY WENT TOGETHER

Robert Pauline and Judith Ng.—When they met at Riverside City College in the early 1970s, Robert (Sarge) Pauline had just retired from a 20-year career with the Chula Vista Police Department. Judith Ng, 30 years younger, was just out of high school.

The couple married, beginning an eccentric life together.

"In the beginning the whole family was against the situation," said one of Ng's brothers, Kenneth. "We thought: 'What was this old guy doing with our sister?' But over the years, we've come to love him like family. It was unique but it was right for them."

The couple squirmed themselves away in their Van Nuys home, inviting neither friends nor family inside. In this neat suburban neighborhood, they had shrubs and vines shielding their house from the street. Inside, their living quarters were unconventional as well.

They were avid collectors. Everywhere, there were stacks of old letters, out-of-date calendars, model trains, stereo equipment and cameras.

When the earthquake hit, neighbors and relatives became concerned about the mysterious pair. Their house survived but there was no word from Ng, 42, or Pauline, 72. The next day, authorities entered their Kittridge Street home and discovered the couple in bed, crushed by hundreds of pounds of their own collectibles.

"If there is a bright spot to this," said Ng's sister, Kathy Ng Norwood, "it's that they went together."

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. This article describes the victims, Mr. President, who lost their lives in the initial hours of the earthquake. Everybody knows somebody who was affected; 57 people died, but among them was a 4-year-old by the name of Amy Tyre-Vigil. Her father described the weekend before the earthquake as "a beautiful weekend." He had taken Amy on a bike ride. The whole family had gone to the zoo. Amy had sampled her first meatball Sunday night. Amy's parents had chatted happily about the future, about a second baby, a boy, on the way, about the new house they were going to buy once their Sherman Oaks home sold, and that was gone in an instant on Monday. Amy was crushed to death when the earthquake sent her home hurtling down a hillside, collapsing the home into a flattened wreck of wood and stucco, tile and glass.

For the victims of the earthquake, for the parents of 4-year-old Amy Tyre-Vigil, the time for action is now. I look forward to working with my colleague, Senator BOXER, and my colleagues in the Senate of the United States, on the Federal Government's response to set a new standard for all future emergency recovery efforts. I thank all of those from Washington who have cared so much about the State of California and responded so positively.

I thank the Chair and I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the order, the Senator from California [Mrs. BOXER] is recognized for not to exceed 10 minutes.

THE SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EARTHQUAKE OF 1994

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, thank you for the opportunity to speak to the Senate today about the southern California earthquake. Many of our colleagues here in the Senate have ex-

pressed concern, and I am very grateful. The people of California need us all right now to assist them, and most of them have never asked a thing from their Government.

The 6.6-Richter scale earthquake that devastated parts of the Los Angeles region on January 17, impacted an area the size of Cleveland. The President has declared three counties—Los Angeles, Ventura, and Orange Counties—as disaster areas.

I know many of you have been following the televised reports on the quake. Many of these moving pictures have focused really on a few scenes: the awful collapse of the Northridge apartment complex that killed 17 people, the crumbled bridges and the crowded shelters. It has been called the Los Angeles earthquake, but that is misleading. In addition to parts of L.A., this quake ripped through the cities of Santa Monica, San Fernando, Santa Clarita, Burbank, Glendale, Fillmore, Simi Valley, and Thousand Oaks as well as parts of Orange and Ventura Counties. Let me present you the larger picture of an entire region that has undergone horrendous havoc:

The initial earthquake left 20,000 to 25,000 homeless. To date 57 have died and 7,500 have been injured. The first day there were 70 structure fires. About 25,000 structures have been damaged, 11,000 are uninhabitable.

Initially, electric power was lost to more than 1.4 million customers, with damages to two electric generating plants and severe damage to two substations. Fifty-seven percent of the electric generating power of the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power was down, affecting 800,000 customers.

About 20,000 water customers were without service. A water aqueduct was broken in San Fernando Valley, with five major breaks in the area's water system. About 20,000 natural gas customers were without service.

The Los Angeles Unified School System shut down, sending 800,000 students home; 150 schools are damaged.

A Southern Pacific train derailed. Fifteen of 29 cars filled with sulfuric acid wrecked. One tankcar ruptured spilling 5,000 gallons of acid.

A crude oil pipeline ruptured in Valencia with oil flowing into the Santa Clara River. An oil pipeline in Huntington and Laurel Canyons caught fire. Crude oil spill into Lake Castaic.

Ventura County suffered the partial collapse of the residential Fillmore Hotel. Van Nuys Airport suffered damages including shattered windows in the control tower.

Four hospitals were evacuated. A total of 18 hospitals had problems serious enough to force closing of floors or wings.

Forty public buildings closed in Los Angeles County were closed due to damage. Another 20 State buildings were closed.

By week's end, the Red Cross and Salvation Army had established 41 shelters, plus five National Guard tent sites, housing thousands of people. In addition, the city of Los Angeles set up temporary shelters in 13 parks.

Mr. President, when I say this tragedy is continuing; it is no rhetorical exaggeration. Aftershocks Sunday morning forced the evacuation of 83 people at the San Fernando High School shelter into nearby tents. The area has suffered more than 1,500 aftershocks, including two that exceeded 5.0 on the Richter scale.

This morning the area is under a flash flood watch by the National Weather Service. Mud and debris flows from the nearby hillsides burned in last fall's firestorms are possible.

Electrical power was restored to everyone only yesterday. There are still 5,000 without water, and more than 200,000 water customers still have to boil their water because of damaged filtration systems.

All but 50 schools will reopen today, still leaving 40,000 students out of class. About 500 Los Angeles classrooms are unusable, according to Education Secretary Riley.

At least nine Federal-aid highways were damaged, including 12 bridges. Portions of the Santa Monica Freeway—the busiest highway in the world with about 200,000 cars a day—was severely damaged, including the collapse of two bridges. Interstate 5, the Golden Gate Freeway, the major north-south artery for the Los Angeles basin suffered major damage at three intersections. About 100,000 commuters face tortuous delays. Even with using all available bus and HOV lane options, Caltrans says the affected routes could handle only half the normal volume of traffic. All total, 37 miles of highway are unusable.

One piece of good news from the highway scene is that seismic retrofit works. No graphic example exists better than the span of Interstate 10 at Venice-La Cienega. The east and west bound lanes are held up by separate bridges. The span that had seismic protection stood. The lanes where this protection had not yet been retrofitted collapsed.

We need to do more to fix our bridges to withstand earthquakes. That was the intent of Congress when it passed the Intermodal Surface Transportation and Efficiency Act, but the way it was interpreted, it is not possible to use Federal bridge funds for seismic upgrade unless the bridge is structurally deficient in other ways. My legislation in committee this week will be on the Senate floor soon.

Meanwhile, the economic tremors from this devastation are rippling throughout southern California.

The human toll, in addition to the casualties, is equally astounding. There have been more than 100,000 dis-

aster aid applications to date and James Lee Witt, the Director of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, has predicted his Agency could receive 300,000 applications. By comparison, 5 days after the Midwest floods, FEMA received 2,463 requests for aid.

Since the quake my California staff has pitched in at the disaster centers and seen the human side of this disaster. They have helped serve meals; helped distribute food, diapers and clothing; and translated for non-English speaking victims making their applications. My staff here in Washington is also volunteering at the FEMA tele-registration phone banks.

They heard from a Santa Clarita man, living in his business after his home was destroyed by last fall's fire storms. Now, the earthquake destroyed his business. Lightning did strike twice for his hard working man.

A 28-year-old single mother of three was just getting by working at a fast-food restaurant and living at a residential hotel in Ventura County. The quake damaged the hotel, destroying what possessions she had. There was the Sherman Oaks woman escaping with her cat and an armload of clothes. And I will never forget the homes that I saw where precious possessions of families were strewn on the floor—broken—with TV's toppled and refrigerators and dreams too.

As I visited Granada Hills, I talked with some young children who were really scared. One told me he barely saved his cat from a falling ladder. He looked at me and asked when he would be in school. Would this be fixed? He was about 11 years old, and he did not have even a little smile. I told him we would fix it—and we must, just as we did for Hurricane Andrew, the Midwest floods and the Loma Prieta earthquake.

The President tonight will talk to the Nation about the State of the Union. He will present this week a supplemental appropriations that will help California. He will ask for emergency spending for this measure, as Presidents have done before. Since the enactment of the 1990 Budget Act, there have been four bills including emergency designation for appropriations totaling \$8.6 billion in natural disaster assistance.

I am very grateful to this President for his strong leadership.

The President said in Los Angeles after surveying the scenes of destruction that "this is a national problem." Emergencies are a national problem. California has gone through some very rough spots. In the good years we gave as a State more than we took. And I am convinced that the good years are on the way—with an economic strategy for this Nation that includes the information highway, conversion funds, environmental clean-up technologies and increased trade opportunities. I know

that California will be back stronger than ever.

In the meantime, we are fixing a bumpy road. I know if we all pull together we will smooth out the bumps and will add to our national economic recovery.

Mr. President, I thank my colleague, Senator FEINSTEIN. We are a team for California. It seems that we have had more than our share of emergency situations, but we will continue to work together to respond to the needs of the people.

Many of our colleagues here have expressed concerns both to Senator FEINSTEIN and to me, and I am very grateful to all of them. The people of California need it right now to assist them and, as Senator FEINSTEIN has pointed out, many of them have never asked for Government help before.

The 6.6 Richter scale earthquake that devastated parts of the Los Angeles region impacted an area the size of Cleveland. I say to my friends and colleagues that we have had very strong earthquakes before, but we have not ever had them in the center of such a heavily populated region. So all of the problems that we have had before from disasters, you need to multiply tenfold, twentyfold, thirtyfold, because of the density of the populations.

Senator FEINSTEIN talked about this earthquake and its magnitude, which was extraordinary. I read an article in the Los Angeles Times which said that the energy release in this earthquake was enough to launch 2 million NASA space shuttles—2 million NASA space shuttles. We are talking about an extraordinary amount of energy released and damage that followed.

Many of you have seen the televised reports, and many of you have seen photos like this one of what happened to the freeway. It is important to note that these freeways that are damaged, including I-5 and Interstate 10, are extremely heavily traveled freeways. Interstate 10 is traveled by maybe as much as 300,000 cars a day, Mr. President. I-5 is the lifeline from northern California to southern California. I think it is important to note that in southern California the freeways are our economic and our personal lifeline. That is why we are so very grateful to this administration and to our colleagues for showing their concern and moving quickly forward, in many cases waiving the laws such as the \$100 million cap per State and also certainly the 25 percent match. We are very, very grateful. Instead of taking the time to repeat the names Senator FEINSTEIN put out there, let me just say that I add my thanks to those very same people.

We know that regarding the homelessness, at first they said 2,000, but I knew that was wrong. I said to the President when he came out last Wednesday, "Mr. President, it is 10

times as much," and it is, it is about 25,000 homeless. At one time, 1 million customers, Mr. President, had no electricity. We still have thousands of homes without water and electricity, and that is a public health nightmare.

I ask unanimous consent that my entire statement be included in the RECORD, and I will continue to summarize from it.

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

Mr. President, I think when you hear us tell these personal stories, it really brings it home. When the President came out on Wednesday, he did a walking tour, and I went off, as did Senator FEINSTEIN, on my own to meet with the people. We went into homes and I saw refrigerators toppled on the floor and television sets and all of the people's dreams and possessions just shattered. They were grateful that they had their lives, but they need to rebuild. The Small Business Administration, and Erskine Bowles was out, who is our Director of the SBA, and he was most helpful.

We are going to rebuild. I remember this young man who said to me, "Senator, when can I go to school? I want to go back to school." Then he said, "I saved my cat. The ladder was going to fall on my cat, and I saved my cat. When are you going to fix this, and when are we going to go back to school?" What you saw among the children always is the trauma, because they need to have their normal life returned, and we need to move quickly. Secretary Riley flew out. He is working with the State officials to get schools reopened. These children need us right now, Mr. President. If they have a sense of normalcy, I think that we can move beyond this crisis.

One piece of good news from the highway scene is that seismic retrofit works. We can look at, for example, the span of Interstate 10 at Venice-La Cienega. The east and westbound lanes are held up by separate bridges. The span that had seismic protection stood. The lanes where this protection had not been retrofitted collapsed. So it is very important that we continue the seismic retrofit.

I must quickly add here that we need to fix many, many bridges. There are about 300 bridges now that need fixing, and they cannot, because of a technicality in the law, apply for seismic retrofit. In the Public Works Committee on Thursday, we hope to make this fix, and that would enable these bridges to be retrofitted.

Let me say that my staff has joined with Senator FEINSTEIN's staff. They are feeding people. They, in many cases, recruited their friends; they recruited their spouses. They are working hard. They are working as interpreters.

We are hearing stories, for example, of a Santa Clarita man who had his

business destroyed in last fall's firestorms and now the earthquake destroyed his home. This is a case where lightning struck twice for this gentleman.

We have stories like this on and on. Of course, that is what it is all about—responding to these stories, restoring a sense that people are in control of their destiny.

I know that the State of California will work very cooperatively with us. I have never seen such bipartisanship in the congressional delegation in the State. We have many Republicans representing the area and many Democrats. We see people pulling together.

So, I am very much an optimist in the long run for California. We already know we are pulling out of this recession. As we look at the strategy of this administration, which includes the information highway and economic conversion funds and environmental cleanup technologies, increased trade opportunities, I know that California will be back stronger than ever.

But, in the meantime, we have this bumpy road. I know, Mr. President, with your help and the help of everyone who has expressed it thus far, we can pull together, we can smooth out the bumps in the road, and then California will add to this Nation's economic recovery.

I thank you very much for your courtesy, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the order previously entered, the Senator from Texas [Mr. GRAMM] is to be recognized for not to exceed 8 minutes.

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, I would like to say to the Presiding Officer that when I asked for this time, I assumed it would come at the beginning of the session after lunch. I apologize to our distinguished President pro tempore for interrupting his lunch.

PROPOSED INTRODUCTION OF THE CONSENSUS INTERIM HEALTH ACT

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, today I am introducing the Consensus Interim Health Act. I think this is an important bill. Let me explain why.

We have had seven bills that have been put forward to reform America's health care system, and they vary greatly in terms of how they would go about the task. They represent varying philosophies. They represent various levels of transformation of the current system.

But one thing I have noticed is that there are several features that are common to all of these bills. Every one of the health care reform packages put together and introduced or discussed to this point has had a provision to make it possible for people to change jobs in America without losing their health insurance.

Every proposal that has been put forward would make health insurance per-

manent so that when Americans get health insurance, even if they get very sick, they can be guaranteed that they will never see their health insurance policy canceled. Every proposal that has been put forward in some form makes it possible for small business to pool its resources, to be more competitive in being able to spread risk in the purchase of private health insurance.

Every proposal that has been put forward in all of the seven bills tries to deal with the overwhelming burden of paperwork. And every one of the proposals put forward in some way or another tries to make it possible for health care providers to purchase health care equipment jointly and to operate it jointly to reduce overhead and reduce cost.

Mr. President, I will be introducing later a comprehensive bill of my own, which I am proud to say has been co-sponsored by many of my colleagues in the Senate and many of my colleagues in the House.

But today, I want to introduce a bill which simply does the things that we agree on. This bill, which I call the Consensus Interim Health Act, tries to do the things that we all agree on. My suggestion is that we go ahead and adopt a bill similar to this bill and that we use the consensus that we agree on to hammer out the tough issues later this year to adopt a comprehensive health reform package.

What this bill will do is provide a vehicle whereby every American can change jobs without losing his or her health insurance; where every American will know that if they buy a health insurance policy or if they have one now it can never be canceled because they get sick, and if they buy one in the future the rates cannot vary based on their state of health.

This bill will allow small businesses to pool their resources to purchase health insurance. It will let groups like the Farm Bureau, churches, and even communities pool resources together to get better rates.

It will deal with paperwork by going to the source. The Federal Government pays 31 percent of the bills in health care today and it generates two-thirds of the paperwork.

What this bill does is sets out a 5-year program to reduce the amount of paperwork required in Federal programs by 75 percent. It requires the States to do the same. It sets up a private commission made up of health care providers and health insurance purchasers to come up with one form and then, in order to get Government reimbursement, everybody has to use that form.

Finally, we change our antitrust laws to let health care providers jointly purchase medical technology to hold down costs and to spread overhead. Every one of these provisions is present in each of the health care reform pack-

ages. These are the things that we agree on.

Mr. President, I think we should begin by acting to give the American people some success.

Now, some people say, it is not worth improving the system if you are not going to throw it out and reinvent it. And 75 percent of the 37 million Americans who at least 1 day last year did not have health insurance would see their problems solved if we made insurance portable and if we made insurance permanent.

So I think this is an important action.

I am disappointed that the President issued a statement today opposing this bill. The President's basic view is if you are not going to reinvent the health care system, if you are not going to destroy what we have and start over in building the health care system in the image of Government, it is not worth doing.

Well, I disagree with that, Mr. President. But I think more importantly the American people do. This is something we could do now. This is something we could do for the American people. This is something we agree on. And my view is, why should we wait?

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a summary of the Consensus Interim Health Act be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE CONSENSUS INTERIM HEALTH ACT

I. ENHANCE SECURITY FOR THOSE PRESENTLY INSURED BY MAKING PRIVATE INSURANCE PORTABLE AND PERMANENT

Portability

To enhance the capacity of American workers to change jobs without losing their health insurance coverage, existing law under COBRA (which allows individuals temporarily to continue their health insurance coverage after leaving their place of employment by paying their premiums directly) would be modified to allow individuals two additional lower-cost options to keep their health insurance coverage during their transition between jobs. Workers could:

(A) Continue their current insurance coverage during the 18 months covered by COBRA by paying their insurance premiums directly;

(B) Continue their current insurance coverage during the 18 months covered by COBRA by paying their insurance premiums directly, but with a lower premium reflecting a \$1,000 deductible; or

(C) Continue their current insurance coverage during the 18 months covered by COBRA by paying their insurance premiums directly, but with a lower premium reflecting a \$3,000 deductible.

With these options, the typical monthly premium paid for a family of four would drop by as much as 20 percent when switching to a \$1,000 deductible and as much as 52 percent when switching to a \$3,000 deductible.

In addition, individuals would be permitted to make penalty-free withdrawals from their Individual Retirement Accounts and 401(k)s to pay for health insurance coverage during the transition period.

The transition period of coverage would end once a person is in a position to get coverage from another employer.

Permanence

Health insurance would be made permanent (belonging to the family or individual) by these three reforms.

Those with individual coverage

(A) No existing health insurance policy can be cancelled due to the state of health of any person covered by the policy. Insurance companies must offer each policy holder the option to purchase a new policy under the conditions of part B of this section with the terms to be negotiated between the buyer and seller of the policy.

(B) All individual health insurance policies written after the enactment of this legislation must be guaranteed renewable, and premiums cannot be increased based on the occurrence of illness.

Those with group coverage

(A) Existing group policies must provide each member of the group the right to convert to an individual policy when leaving the group. This individual policy will be rated based on actuarial data, but cannot be cancelled due to the state of health of those covered by the policy. In addition, any group policy holder (i.e. employer obtaining coverage on employees' behalf) will have the right to purchase a new group policy under the conditions stated under part B of this section with the terms to be negotiated between the group's benefactor or representative and the seller of the group policy.

(B) All group policies issued after enactment of this legislation must be permanent, and premiums cannot be increased based on the health of the members covered under the group policy. In addition, similar to part A of this section, new group policies must provide each member of the group the right to convert to an individual policy when leaving the group. However, the premium charges of the individual leaving the new group plan cannot be based on the individual's state of health and cannot be cancelled except for nonpayment of premiums.

Those with employer-provided self-funded coverage

(A) Companies currently operating self-funded plans must make arrangements with one or more private insurers to offer individuals leaving the self-funded plan individual coverage. The individual policy will be rated based on actuarial data, but cannot be cancelled due to the state of health of those covered by the policy.

(B) All self-funded plans created after enactment of this legislation must (like part A of this section) make arrangements with one or more private insurers to offer individuals leaving the self-funded plan individual coverage. However, the premium charges of the individual leaving the self-funded plan cannot be based on the individual's state of health and cannot be cancelled except for nonpayment of premiums.

II. ALLOW SMALL BUSINESSES TO POOL THEIR HEALTH INSURANCE PURCHASES

Regulatory and legal impediments that restrict the ability of small businesses and other organizations (trade and professional groups, churches, etc.) to group together voluntarily to allow their employees or members to pool their health insurance purchases will be removed.

III. ENHANCE EFFICIENCY THROUGH PAPERWORK REDUCTION

(A) Medicaid, Medicare, and all other federal entities involved in the funding or deliv-

ery of health care shall standardize their health care forms and must reduce their total health care paperwork burden by 50 percent within two years of enactment of this legislation. The paperwork burden must be reduced by another 50 percent over the following three years, achieving a total paperwork reduction of 75 percent over a 5-year period.

(B) State agencies involved in the funding or delivery of health care, like federal entities, shall standardize their health care forms. Also like federal entities, within five years of enactment, states must reduce their total health care paperwork burden by 75 percent in order to remain eligible for federal health assistance.

(C) A private commission will be established to develop, within 12 months from enactment, standardized forms to be used by private health care providers and private insurers. In order to receive federal reimbursement, private health care providers and private insurers must use these standardized forms. This commission shall be comprised solely of private health care providers and private insurers.

IV. PROMOTE EFFICIENCY IN THE HEALTH CARE MARKET BY REMOVING ANTITRUST BARRIERS

By limiting certain antitrust impediments that restrict cooperative efforts, communities and providers will be given an opportunity to coordinate the delivery of health care and enter into joint ventures that promote greater efficiencies, and expand access.

(The remarks of Mr. GRAMM pertaining to the introduction of S. 1788 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. GRAMM. I think these are important bills. I want to thank the Chair for staying during lunchtime to allow me to speak about them, and I will introduce them at the end of the session.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bills will be received when introduced at the end of the session and appropriately referred.

RECESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the order previously entered, the Senate will now stand in recess until the hour of 2:30 p.m. today.

Thereupon, at 1:20 p.m., the Senate recessed until 2:30 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. KOHL).

FOREIGN RELATIONS AUTHORIZATION ACT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the hour of 2:30 p.m. having arrived, the Senate will now proceed to the consideration of S. 1281, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1281) to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1994 and 1995 for the Department of State, the United States Information Agency, and related agencies, to provide for the consolidation of international broadcasting activities, and for other purposes.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. PELL addressed the Chair. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL].

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, we all welcome my colleagues back to Washington and to this, the second session of the 103d Congress. I am only hopeful that we can get the year off to a fast and productive start with consideration of S. 1281, the Foreign Relations Authorization Act for fiscal years 1993 and 1994. This legislation authorizes appropriations for the Department of State, the USIA, and the Board for International Broadcasting.

Although this may sound rather prosaic, in fact what the Senate is about to debate is legislation that will shape key instruments of American foreign policy into the 21st century. In no small measure, our Nation's success and prominence in world affairs is the result of these institutions' effectiveness.

The legislation before the Senate makes changes in these structures to meet the new challenges to U.S. foreign policy such as: Enhancement of trade opportunities for U.S. businesses, protection of the global environment, and prevention of the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. Our success in this effort will have a very direct and tangible impact on the lives of U.S. citizens for years to come.

For example, the legislation incorporates and endorses the administration's restructuring of the Department of State, particularly the attempt to reduce bureaucratic layering and make Assistant Secretaries more effective in the policy process. Further, it creates a new under secretary for global affairs to oversee policy on many of the issues that transcend national borders.

In addition, the legislation as reported by the committee will implement the administration's proposal for the consolidation of United States international broadcasting. As many of my colleagues know, this has been a contentious issue. Later in this debate, the Senate can expect an amendment by Senators BIDEN and FEINGOLD aimed at resolving their differences over the treatment of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty and Radio Free Asia under the consolidation proposal. It preserves the cost savings envisioned in the administration and committee-reported proposal, which I know is very important to Senator FEINGOLD, and provides for grantee status for both radios which I know Senator BIDEN believes is essential to their effective operation. I very much appreciate the two Senators' efforts to work out their differences.

Mr. President, there are a number of provisions that I have either authored or cosponsored in this legislation. I would like to highlight just two. In particular, I would draw our attention to a provision which requires USIA to open an office in Lhasa, Tibet. In my

view, the establishment of such an office will provide the United States with an important on-the-ground presence in Tibet, enabling better understanding of the situation there and promoting more open contacts between the United States and Tibet. As the United States and China seek to improve their relations, this office would be a key outpost in an area of mutual concern.

Later in this debate, I will also be offering an amendment to strengthen the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. In conjunction with the administration's own efforts, I think this legislation will significantly enhance our Nation's efforts to combat the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.

Mr. President, the legislation contains a number of other provisions, but I will leave a more detailed discussion of the bill to my colleague from Massachusetts, Senator KERRY, who is the chairman of the Subcommittee on Terrorism, Narcotics, and International Operations. It is his subcommittee that has jurisdiction over this legislation and I want to congratulate him on the fine work that he has done in bringing the bill to the floor. The Senate has and will benefit from his able leadership on this issue.

I will conclude with one general observation. As we all know, we are operating in a time of budgetary stringency. Each part of the Government must bear its share of budget cuts. That includes the Department of State and the USIA. This necessity is reflected in S. 1281. The Foreign Relations Committee cut roughly \$500 million out of the administration's request of \$6.4 billion for the Department of State, USIA, and the Board for International Broadcasting. I supported that cut, but with some reluctance. I am concerned that if this cutting trend continues, our Nation's long-term security interests will be undercut.

In my view, prudent spending on the Department and its related agencies is a tremendously cost-effective way to promote the well-being of our Nation and its citizens. Indeed, although it may not be realistic in the near time, I hope that at some point we will be able to increase our support for the Department of State and our other foreign policy agencies.

Mr. President, to conclude I want to thank the majority leader and the Republican leader for their assistance in bringing this important piece of legislation to the floor. I also want to thank the ranking member on the committee, Senator HELMS, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Terrorism, Narcotics and International Operations, Senator KERRY, and the ranking member on the subcommittee, Senator PRESSLER, for their fine work in helping to get S. 1281 reported from the committee and up onto the Senate floor.

I now turn to my colleague from North Carolina for his opening statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HELMS].

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I thank the Chair. I, of course, thank my friend, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations. It has always been a pleasure to work with him. He and I have managed a number of bills in the years that we have been here. He has been here longer than I have, and he has managed more bills. But I have to say, Mr. President, that none of the pieces of legislation with which I have dealt in my 21 years in the Senate have met with the cooperation and the effective working together by all Senators and all staff members to produce this bill that we call the Foreign Relations Authorization Act for fiscal years 1994 and 1995. The short form on that is, of course, the State Department authorization bill. I say to my friend from Rhode Island, it is a pleasure to work with him always.

Mr. President, every committee has to make some tough choices in an effort to save the taxpayers money at a time when this Congress has run up a total of nearly \$4.5 trillion in debt. I am pleased that the Foreign Relations Committee did an adequate job in connection with this bill in that respect.

In committee, I offered an 8.5 percent budget reduction amendment designed to require the State Department to review its organizational and operational requirements seriously. You know how bureaucrats in this town operate. They hear a mandate or presumed mandate of Congress and then they go about doing what they want to do instead of what Congress has asked them to do. My amendment, as perfected by Senator KERRY and Senator PRESSLER, cut the administration's fiscal year 1994 request by \$504 million, out of a \$6.4 billion request. It cut it down to about \$5.9 billion in terms of an authorization bill. And it reduced the administration's fiscal year 1995 budget authority by almost \$450 million. That is a \$950 million reduction over 2 years. As the saying goes, that is not exactly chopped liver.

The authorized levels in this bill are \$253 million below last year's actual level for the State Department, the USIA, and related agencies. S. 1281—this bill—also includes authorization for the Peace Corps at virtually no-growth levels in terms of expenditures. Ordinarily, the Peace Corps is authorized as a separate bill or included in the foreign aid authorization bill.

It is a little bit different this year. In addition to the budget reduction, there are some positive legislative provisions in this bill. For the first time, this bill caps—puts a cap on—the end strength of the Foreign Service officers who can

be hired. I intend to offer a technical amendment giving the Secretary of State authority to RIF—that means reduction in force—the Foreign Service office employees if he finds it necessary to do so. The bill eliminates Foreign Service performance pay. It ensures adherence to statutory pay ceilings so that nobody can make more than the Secretary of State. And it provides mandatory reassignment or retirement of Presidential appointees within 90 days.

I am going to seek to eliminate the "hall walkers" at the State Department, that is to say, those Foreign Service employees who refuse to accept new assignments to meet urgent personnel needs. If they are offered an assignment they do not want, they turn it down and they walk the corridors of the State Department still being paid by the taxpayers, and I think that is an outrage. I wish to stop that.

The bill creates a capital investment fund, a much needed management tool, to encourage investment in information technologies to improve and modernize the State Department's functions. This bill promotes cost-effective property management techniques. It proposes to ensure that rewards may be provided for information about acts of terrorism, and it proposes to reduce the number of mandated reports, which nobody reads in the first place.

The Foreign Relations Committee also agreed to direct the President of the United States to conduct a Government-wide review of all Government-sponsored international educational and cultural exchange programs. This year the American taxpayers will spend, or be forced to furnish more than \$800 million in exchange programs managed by 22 different Federal agencies. That, too, is an outrage. These programs have been expanded and enlarged by 45 percent in just the past 3 years and have doubled since 1980. Nobody even knows how many programs there are. Nobody knows how much money is being spent. You try to get the information from anybody in this Government, and they say, "Well, we don't know. We will look it up." And you never get a return telephone call.

Now, Mr. President, the point is this. We cannot tolerate and the American taxpayers ought not to be required to finance such unbridled growth. I suggest that anybody who may doubt what I am saying should look at the figures. I cannot justify to my constituents—and no other Senator can really—the spending of almost \$1 billion of the taxpayers' money to educate foreign students when we have such tight budget constraints here at home. So there are many, many things that we need to look at, and this bill addresses most of what I had in mind. The rest of them I am going to try to do by amendment.

Now, title III authorizes the international broadcasting activities of

VOA, RFE/RL, TV and Radio Marti, Radio Free Asia, and other broadcasting elements under the new International Broadcasting Bureau to be guided and directed by the Broadcasting Board of Governors. This kind of broadcasting effort has been fraught with great controversy, and I intend to listen carefully to the debate on all the provisions. My mind is pretty well made up, but I wish to hear both sides of the argument.

In June of last year, the administration contended that the only way to save \$250 million over the next 4 years was to consolidate VOA and RFE/RL. And today, January 1994, the administration contends that it can accede to the Senate—what do you know—and permit there to be true surrogate broadcasting, that is to say, keep RFE/RL and Radio Free Asia and still save \$250 million. So you might say that saving \$250 million in a budget like ours is not a giant step, but it is a step in the right direction.

Either Mr. Duffey was wrong in June or he is wrong now, and I look forward to the debate on this issue. We will have friendly debate, and I hope that the Senate will carefully measure the information on both sides.

Now, Mr. President, I do not think I have ever been more disappointed in the good-intentioned efforts announced at the beginning of this administration a year ago to restructure the State Department.

Oh, I had bureaucrat after bureaucrat come up to see me saying, "Senator, you are going to love this." And I did like what they were saying. But nothing happened. Nothing happened. The administration and Congress deserve a D minus on this matter.

When the Foreign Relations Committee heard from Secretary-designate Christopher on January 13-14 last year, 1993, the Secretary-to-be said: "We need to do more with less."

I am sitting there applauding, saying, "Praise the Lord." But subsequently, his Deputy Secretary, Cliff Wharton, and his Under Secretary for Management, Brian Atwood—two nice fellows—appeared before the committee and—I am quoting them exactly—they promised to "streamline the bureaucracy, consolidate responsibilities, reduce personnel, and reinvigorate management."

What happened? They were off in the stratosphere, wild blue yonder, or whatever you want to call it.

Now, we heard the Secretary and Deputy Secretary announce with great fanfare a broad-based reorganization to, guess what, reduce excessive layering, that is, bureaucracy on top of bureaucracy on top of bureaucracy. The State Department would, according to the Secretary a year ago, "do its fair share" to participate in, guess what, "reductions and cutbacks that President Clinton would impose on the

entire Federal Government." Promises, promises.

But I could not believe my ears when I heard all that good news a year ago. I remember pulling out my hearing aid to see if it was working right. I thought finally somebody had acknowledged that the State Department was a topheavy, bloated, inefficient bureaucracy in need of massive reorganization and reductions. No wonder I said, "Glory, glory, hallelujah," because that had been something on my agenda for a long time, at least 21 years or more.

But what happens? Mr. President, as we have seen in endless and countless instances over the years, the State Department's rhetoric far exceeded its actions.

One year later Secretary Atwood with his good intentions to reorganize the State Department—and I have no doubt about his good intentions. I believe that he meant what he said a year ago. Anyway, Secretary Atwood is gone—promoted, I guess you might call it, to AID, the Agency for International Development, to tackle that behemoth of a mess.

Dr. Wharton may be a good and decent man, praised for his organizational abilities a year ago to spend substantial efforts on reorganizing and restructuring the State Department. But to the dismay of a lot of us, we waited a much "ballyhooed" reorganization report which was delayed, rewritten, scrubbed, and never materialized beyond another document that was leaked to the press.

A year later, here we are. We find Dr. Wharton in a caretaker status dismissed supposedly because of a lack of attention to policy matters. One of the only substantive records we have of the administration's reorganization effort is the administration request for a 33 percent increase in the number of Assistant Secretaries, from 18 to 24 in number, and an increase in the number of Executive Level IV positions in the State Department.

Mr. President, what an incredible response to the promise last year to streamline the bureaucracy. Maybe all of this has been reported in the media, but I have not seen it. They are too busy with other things.

Bureaucratic costs associated with such needless additional jobs, if you want to call them jobs, is astounding. The cost of the salaries for these 12 additional political appointee positions is more than \$1.2 million a year—a small amount. It depends on where you are from. To the taxpayer down there in Chinquapin, NC, it is not a small amount of money, and I certainly do not think it is small.

Every new bureau at the U.S. State Department will mean at least \$2 million per year in additional costs, and support costs. You have to have secretaries, and you have to have all of

the rest that goes with it—more people to sit around and say, "Oh, I have to clip this fingernail before I do anything else." The administration request is antithetical I think to our purpose in being here today.

Mr. President, in committee I offered an amendment to remove all statutory requirements for the creation of Assistant Secretaries. We have enough of them. They fall all over each other. The most important thing they do, most of them, in today's time, is arrange where they are going to have lunch. Over time Congress has mandated six such positions. And my amendment authorizes the Secretary of State to organize as may be necessary within the ceiling of 16 Assistant Secretaries. Lord knows that ought to be enough. It is the same number Mr. Christopher had when he was with the State Department in the Carter administration.

The committee rejected my amendment, and further rejected the administration's request to repeal the six mandatory positions. But not a word of that was in the paper. Nobody on television mentioned it. The committee's majority told Secretary Christopher, "We don't trust your promise to keep our favorite Assistant Secretary positions, but we will give you two more Assistant Secretary bureaucracies to grow on." That is what the committee did with the vote that defeated my proposal.

The other body, the House of Representatives, did the administration one better. The House guys provided three new bureaucracies which is totally unacceptable. And during consideration of this bill I intend to offer an amendment and have the Senate vote on it to rectify the Foreign Relations Committee's judgment on this matter, and thereby prevent the further bloating of the Federal bureaucracy.

I do hope that Senators will support that.

One other area that deserves our closest attention is the funding level reporting requirements and approval for U.S. participation in the United Nations and other international organizations. Sometimes, Mr. President, I wonder if the U.S. Government has the slightest idea what goes on in the United Nations and the other international organizations. The United States voted in the U.N. Economic and Social Council Organization to grant consultative status to self-proclaimed homosexual pedophiles. How about that? I do not recall anything in the Washington Post about that, or even in the Washington Times, as far as I know.

This group, a known homosexual pedophile organization, was elevated to consultative status by the United Nations and the State Department as well. What is new?

I intend to offer an amendment to correct this grotesque embarrassment

to the United States, and particularly the people back home. But we tried to encourage reform in the U.N. budget process and mandate timely reports to Congress when this administration uses U.S. funds for international peacekeeping activities.

My intent is, as a manager of this bill, to strongly support Senator DOLE and Senator PRESSLER when they offer major amendments to restructure the U.S. participation in the U.N.-sponsored activities and require withholding of U.N. assessments until an inspector general is appointed at the United Nations.

Mr. President, Somalia, Bosnia, and Haiti are all disasters, every one of them, disasters that must not be repeated. The answer is not in rewriting the War Powers Resolution. Forget that. The answer is better decision-making, a much closer scrutiny of U.N. actions, and a more thoughtful understanding of the practical consequences of pursuing a policy of what they call aggressive multilateralism.

The same people who throughout the 1980's wanted to blame America first have now written a new draft of a Presidential decision, Directive PD-13, that is intended, and I quote, "sacrifice Americans first." This new invented game of surrender your sovereignty is to be played out in the United Nations by the nonelected officials committing the U.S. Treasury and the troops of the United States to U.N. objectives without congressional approval. They just go ahead and do what they want to do.

I do not know about other Senators. But this Senator says no, not with my vote would it happen.

In some respects, the authorized levels for the U.N. peacekeeping operations in this bill are nothing short of disingenuous. The Department of State, the U.S. Mission of the United Nations and OMB have known for just about a year now that U.S. peacekeeping assessments in 1994 will be \$1 billion more than Congress has authorized and appropriated, and there will be \$1 billion more than authorized for next year, fiscal year 1995. In fact, the U.S. State Department has already spent all of the fiscal year 1994 funds that were appropriated, and we are only 3 months into the fiscal year. As they say in North Carolina, "How do you like them apples?" If the American people had a vote on it, we would find out pretty quickly.

This administration continues to write the United Nations blank checks every time we vote in the U.N. Security Council to approve another peacekeeping mission. Thus far, the State Department has been sucking hundreds of millions of dollars from the Department of Defense every year to support U.N. peacekeeping operations.

Mr. President, the money is drying up. We the people—and I consider myself one of the people—of the United

States populace have spent in excess of \$2 billion in Somalia, over \$800 million in direct support to the U.N. mission. And when the United States pulls out, watch it; the United Nations is going to send the American taxpayers a bill for over \$500 million more to pay the 31.7 percent assessed cost for U.N. peacekeeping in Somalia. How dumb can we get?

This cannot continue, and it must not continue, and will not continue after Senator DOLE's amendment, of which I am a cosponsor, is enacted. It is an amendment to the U.N. Participation Act. Again, I hope all Senators and their staffs will take note of the Dole amendment and what it means and stands for and what it calls for.

There is one provision in this bill that every Senator should know something about. Senators should familiarize themselves with the dangerous impact of section 170(a) relating to the creation of an international criminal court. I remember Sam Ervin sitting over there warning us about this. He was disturbed about the so-called genocide treaty, and I tried to pick up when he departed and do the best I could. We finally defanged the genocide treaty so that it amounted to nothing. But here they go again.

Efforts to establish such an international criminal court drives right to the core of our basic constitutional liberties and guarantees. But you will not read that in the press. They will say, "What is that fellow talking about?" If they say anything at all. Well, the constitutional lawyers know what I am talking about, and you watched Sam Ervin talk about it. This court, Mr. President, has the potential of sitting in judgment of American citizens, U.S. corporations, the U.S. Government, and, yes, even the legislative acts of Members of Congress. So it does matter. It does need and deserve and cry out for consideration of the implications of such a court.

This provision should not be included in this bill in any shape, fashion, or form—not one. I wish Sam Ervin were back here. The committee reported a freestanding resolution some months ago to find its way to the other committees' jurisdictions. I hope the Senate anticipates that the Senate Judiciary Committee will conduct a thorough, careful review of the impact that this proposal threatens to our constitutional prerogatives. We will ignore this issue at our own peril, and worse, at the peril of the governance of the American people.

The Armed Services Committee may wish to explore the legal advisers' concerns that the draft of the international criminal court statute pending before the sixth committee of the United Nations could impact in an extremely negative way upon "the status of forces' agreements or the prosecution of war crimes." These are not just

words, they have meaning and they have implications, a constitutional question.

The Finance and Energy and Commerce Committees may be interested in the potentially devastating impact that this proposal may have on the cost to U.S. companies doing business overseas. The jurisdictional authority of such a court is expansive and its impact is unknown. We are flying blind by the seat of our britches. It should be excluded from this bill. It is totally unwise. It is dangerous to act precipitously on this provision, and I hope that my efforts to strike this provision will be supported by a majority of the Senate. I hope the public will require their Senators to explain why they oppose it or not.

Mr. President, before I conclude, I feel obliged to comment briefly on two amendments that I intend to offer, designed to assist U.S. citizens who have had their property confiscated—that is to say illegally stolen—by foreign governments receiving foreign aid from the taxpayers of the United States. The Senate passed one of these amendments 96 to 4. I stood down there during the vote and Senators came in and said, "good amendment" and all of the rest of it. The State Department, however, and other U.S. officials turned a deaf ear to U.S. citizens whose property had been unlawfully taken from them. Unfortunately, the Senate must again send a wakeup call to the U.S. State Department. That message must go to the countries abusing the rights of U.S. citizens, and those countries ought to be denied even one dime of foreign aid money until they cut this out.

In closing, I reiterate my appreciation to Senator PELL and Senator KERRY and Senator PRESSLER and their respective staffs for their stewardship in guiding this legislation through subcommittee and to floor debate. I say again, as I have said so many times publicly, I am most grateful for the consideration and cooperation of CLAIRBORNE PELL for his efforts to accommodate the concerns of Senators on this side of the aisle. I do hope we can move this legislation on to conference in an expeditious fashion.

That concludes my statement, Mr. President, and I yield the floor.

Mr. KERRY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WELLSTONE). The Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. KERRY, is recognized.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, first of all, I thank the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island, Senator PELL, the chairman of the committee, both for his summary of the bill today, but more particularly for his assistance and trust in the process as we have moved along here, and for his leadership of the committee. I also thank the distinguished Senator from North Carolina. He and I have worked to-

gether all of the time I have been here, going way back to the initial efforts we made on the Philippines and other areas, and I have enjoyed that collaboration. We disagree sometimes, but we have never found any disagreeableness in our disagreeing. I look forward to working with him in continuing to move this particular bill through the process.

I might point out to colleagues that this bill was reported unanimously by the committee. It reflected a lot of consensus work in the early stages, bringing together, first, the subcommittee and then, subsequently, the full committee.

The 19-to-0 vote by which the full committee reported it to the floor reflects that, despite the fact that there are today, as there always are, issues that the ranking member of the full committee disagrees with or other members may disagree with, we have basically put together an important statement on the U.S. Senate Foreign Relations Committee's attitude about the agencies that are involved here—the State Department, the U.S. Information Agency, the Peace Corps, and the broadcasting entities. I think this reflects a well-formulated, strongly supported approach to those issues.

The bill authorizes almost \$6 billion, and I will not go into all of the breakdowns. I do not think it is necessary. I think the chairman has adequately pointed out what is basically covered in the bill.

But I do want to underscore the fact that this reflects real cuts during difficult times. This bill—and I think the reason for the bipartisan support for it—represents a serious effort by the committee to bring to the floor something that really reflected a real effort to be responsible in the field of foreign policy about the expenses of this country at a time when everybody is trying to pay a price in restraining the cost of government. So I think we have demonstrated our serious approach in this bill.

The 1994 authorization for the State Department, the USIA, and broadcasting entities represents, as the Senator from North Carolina said, a half billion dollars of real reductions. And that is, when you look at the total budget of \$6 billion, a very significant cut.

It is underscored by the fact that the President's request to us, which we went under, was already at a freeze level for 1993. The committee achieved the cuts that we made by reducing the State Department budget by some \$333 million and the USIA budget by about \$179.5 million.

I might also point out that the authorization levels in this bill for fiscal year 1995 are a straight line of the 1994 levels in the bill, so there is not a large outyear increase or some hidden amount of money on the back end of this bill.

This bill will require the State Department to make reductions, and we have specified where some of those reductions ought to be.

The Senator from North Carolina has raised the issue of the United Nations. We will undoubtedly debate that at some point in the course of this legislative effort. But I would just like to point out very quickly that we considered restraints on the expenditures pending certain reforms within the United Nations.

I have joined with the Senator from South Dakota, Senator PRESSLER, in I think a serious message to the United Nations. The entire committee has been very clear that we are not sanguine about the rate of change or the implementation of an Inspector General process, and so forth.

But we did, a majority of the members of the committee, come to the conclusion that it is not serving the best interests of the United States at this juncture to place a formal restraint on the expenditure of our moneys to the United Nations because of the fact that we have spent a large part of the last decade at war with the process of withholding money, and indeed creating an awfully lot of a credibility gap between our intentions and desires at the United Nations and our position here in Washington. We think we are on the right course.

The Ambassador to the United Nations has testified before the committee. We think we are achieving a certain amount of the reform that we need, and we are not convinced that there is a need to move forward on any further restraints at this time.

I might simply add, before opening the bill up to amendment, that this is basically a nuts-and-bolts bill that faces questions of the administration and management and organizational needs of the agencies involved of our foreign policy sector.

The bill implements key aspects of the administration's reorganization plan for the State Department, including the creation of a fifth Under Secretary position for global affairs, as well as revisions in structure and duties of various bureaus. The bill does mandate a reduction in the size of the senior Foreign Service, and I think that is very important.

My colleague from North Carolina points out that there are a couple of additional Assistant Secretary positions. Indeed, there are, and I have just articulated a fifth Under Secretary position. The reason for this is that we are living in a very different world today, with enormous demands on the upper level decisionmaking of the State Department.

So we have done a tradeoff. We have permitted the Secretary to organize at the upper level in a way that streamlines decisionmaking, that augments the ability of the Department to face

up to larger responsibilities and more diverse, complex responsibilities in the world, while simultaneously mandating reductions in so-called bureaucracy.

And so I think we are serving some of the complaints of the Senator from North Carolina, and I think we are being responsible.

We have also prohibited performance pay awards for both fiscal years of 1994 and 1995. We have mandated an annual report on the financial aspects of the United Nations peacekeeping operations.

Now, a final comment I would make is that this bill incorporates, with a few modifications, the administration's plan to consolidate the international broadcasting activities of the U.S. Information Agency and the Board for International Broadcasting. As colleagues know, we have spent a lot of money over the years, and I think to great success, in bringing information to people behind the former Iron Curtain and in helping people who live in totalitarian countries to learn something both about democracy and our world, as well as about the reality of what is happening in their world. And that is a very important function.

With the fall of the Berlin Wall, with the emerging, hopefully sustained, democratic states of Eastern Europe, those demands have changed, and it is simply not sensible for the United States to be spending the kind of money or to be supporting the kind of overhead and bureaucracy in order to achieve those goals. The goals have not departed. As my colleagues, Senator FEINGOLD and Senator BIDEN, will discuss no doubt, the goals are still very real. We want to guarantee the integrity of the broadcasting capacity of the United States, while simultaneously maximizing our ability to be able to restrain the costs and overhead.

I think, thanks to the good efforts of the Senator from Wisconsin, Senator FEINGOLD, and the Senator from Delaware, Senator BIDEN, who have cooperated together with the administration and Joe Duffey of USIA, we now have the compromise that preserves integrity and independence, while simultaneously permitting consolidation to take place. I would thank both of those Senators for their significant contributions to this legislation and, frankly, for having brought the process to a head and created the dynamics which have brought us to the point of having, I think, a very significant reduction.

We are saving some \$240 million on this broadcasting effort in real money in the short term. I suggest that that represents an intelligent and strong way of approaching the changes that we face in the international community.

I might also add that I think there is a unanimity within the United States Senate—certainly within the Foreign Relations Committee, but almost with-

in the Senate—on the value of exchange programs.

We are consistently hearing the success stories of students who have come to this country from various parts of the world, learned something about America—pursued their studies here, learned something about democracy, the free world, the free enterprise system—and gone back to their countries as new practitioners of many of those ideals, or lived at least with their eyes open.

There are many who feel this is perhaps one of the strongest things we can do in the market place of foreign ideas. Indeed, in keeping with that unanimity of approach, there is an addition, a small addition which is mostly symbolic—we would like to have done more but it is what we can do within the limits of the budget now—an increase of some \$11 million for international exchanges.

I add, this increase was offset by other cuts within our own budget in this bill. I think it does provide for important new scholarship programs, particularly in Southeast Asia, East Timor, and Cambodia—among others.

So, finally, I would echo the statement of the Senator from North Carolina. There really should not be a lot that is overly contentious here. We hope we will be able to move this bill, and I look forward to cooperating with colleagues in an effort to try to bring those amendments to the floor as rapidly as possible, and do so.

Mr. BIDEN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware is recognized.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, let me begin by complimenting Senator KERRY, the floor manager of the authorization bill, along with the ranking member of the full committee, as well as the subject jurisdiction subcommittee. It is not always the most fun to handle this bill. But it is very, very important. And I want to compliment Senator KERRY on the skill with which he has dealt with the issues contained in this legislation, particularly with regard to a couple of the more contentious aspects of it.

I am pleased today to join my colleagues, the chairman of the full committee, Senator PELL, and the distinguished—and a Senator who is not only bright but extremely tenacious—the Senator from Wisconsin, [Mr. FEINGOLD], in presenting a substitute amendment for title III of the bill.

AMENDMENT NO. 1246

(Purpose: To provide for the consolidation of international broadcasting activities)

Mr. BIDEN. On behalf of myself, Senator FEINGOLD, Senator PELL, and Senator WOFFORD, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BIDEN], for himself, Mr. FEINGOLD, Mr. WOFFORD, Mr. PELL, Mr. KERRY, and Mr. HELMS, proposes an amendment numbered 1246.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

(The text of the amendment is printed in today's RECORD under "Amendments Submitted.")

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, the amendment I sent to the desk is a product of a compromise, a genuine hard-fought compromise, after months of deliberation and debate, not only in the Foreign Relations Committee but also within the executive branch and between the two branches. The debate has been arduous. It has not always been harmonious. But we have found a way forward that I believe all interested parties can agree on.

This proposal literally reinvents an important instrumentality of U.S. foreign policy: International broadcasting. When I say "reinvent," I mean that literally. We are fundamentally changing the way in which we organize our international broadcasting.

Radio Free Europe, Radio Liberty, the Voice of America, and soon-to-be-established Radio Free Asia are not merely the names of radio services for millions of listeners around the globe. For those people, they represent a lifeline of news and information about their own countries and about the United States. I will not take the time of the Presiding Officer or my colleagues on the floor today to recite numerous examples where Central and Eastern European leaders who were behind the Iron Curtain as the curtain fell and the Berlin Wall came down credited—literally credited—Radio Free Europe, Radio Liberty and other broadcasting services with playing a major role in bringing an end to the Soviet domination of Eastern and Central Europe. They have a very, very proud past.

Last summer, President Clinton—coming to office committed to the notion of reinventing Government and saving taxpayers' money and consolidating where that can be done—proposed an ambitious plan to consolidate these services; that is, all the radios under one roof, merging the administrative and technical staffs of the radios under an umbrella of the U.S. Information Agency. And I might say that a new and young Senator from Wisconsin, who campaigned on the same principles of cutting costs and waste in Government, came to this Senate and to the Foreign Relations Committee and was truly the engine behind which this entire process was pulled through the Senate. I must say very bluntly that I have never stated as strongly my firmly held conviction about how something should turn out as it relates to legislation.

But I cannot, nor do I, claim credit for the savings that appear in this bill. The savings are a consequence of the initiative of the President of the United States and the Senator from Wisconsin, with the able leadership of the Senator from Massachusetts. I support the savings, but it was the Senator from Wisconsin who drove us toward these savings. So I want to be clear about that. I want to give credit where it belongs. It belongs with the chairman of the subcommittee, Senator KERRY, and the Senator from Wisconsin, who has been absolutely, as I said, relentless on this issue, to the credit of the people of his State and the country. Finally, credit belongs to the President of the United States.

The President's plan is a farsighted proposal that preserves the best elements of the various radio services, and achieves important savings by consolidating the administrative and technical staffs where appropriate. This transformation will provide a firm foundation for the long-term post-cold-war effort to promote democracy and U.S. interests around the world.

I might add, by the way, I, and I suspect my friend from Wisconsin and others, and my friend from North Carolina—whom I might also thank for weighing in on the same side of this issue as the Senator from Delaware when we had to work out a compromise here—would all state that there is as much need for the radios today as there was before the Berlin Wall came down. It is not the case that all of a sudden, as the Berlin Wall came down and the cold war has dissolved, that peace and tranquility reign and democracy is the watchword around the world. This is a case, for the next decade at least, where the Central and Eastern European countries will struggle, along with the former Soviet Union and the only gigantic totalitarian regime left in the world—that is, China—until their people enjoy access to information and a free and independent media. It is as important today as it was in 1948 or 1955 or 1967.

Equally important, the plan will achieve cost savings of over \$250 million over the next 4 years, and more, depending how you calculate this, over the next 10-year period.

For all these months, the participants in this debate have been divided only about the details of the proposal. Never once did we disagree about the basic framework of the consolidation or the cost savings that had to be met.

What divided us was the organizational question, one that I believe is critical to the independence of Radio Free Europe, Radio Liberty, and the newly established Radio Free Asia, which is established by this legislation.

We have now resolved this issue to the satisfaction of all the interested parties, and I want to take a moment now to summarize the agreement as I see it.

The overall purpose of the provision is the same as the original committee bill: To consolidate the international broadcasting services of the U.S. Government for the purpose of saving money and eliminating duplication. This amendment differs from the committee bill only insofar as it permits the so-called surrogate radios, meaning Radio Free Europe, Radio Liberty, and Radio Free Asia, to be established as "grantees"—a term of art—of the U.S. Government, supported by Federal dollars but operationally independent of the Government.

I believe, as my colleagues have come to learn, I think to their surprise, how strongly I believe in the notion of what I believe to be the credibility and independence of these radios, for that has been the reason for their effectiveness for over four decades.

Under the committee bill, the broadcasters of RFE/RL and the new Radio Free Asia would have become direct employees of the United States Government, leading to the creation of a heretofore unknown breed, a "U.S. Government journalist." I "ain't" never heard of such a thing as a "U.S. Government journalist." I think if one were teaching a high school course and you wanted a definition of an oxymoron, you would say "U.S. Government journalist."

It was a staple of the cold war that Americans mocked countries that deployed journalists in the employ of the governments. It would have been nice but an unpleasant irony were we to mark the end of the cold war by adopting this practice ourselves. Had we done so, the radios would have had neither the appearance nor the reality of journalistic independence.

I might add, I do not think many of my colleagues felt as strongly as I did that, in fact, the provision under the original legislation would have done that, but that was my view.

This amendment contains another important provision: The budget ceilings on the amount to be expended by RFE and RL and Radio Free Asia; a study of the effectiveness of Radio Free Asia after 3 years; and a sunset provision requiring a reauthorization of Radio Free Asia by the end of the decade. I would note parenthetically that I have long supported the concept of sunset—I introduced legislation in 1974 when I was a young Senator on this subject and I still think the principle holds true, as strongly as I feel the need for Radio Free Asia. I think we should look at it at the end of the decade and see whether or not it is still needed.

Third, numerous provisions to strengthen the oversight by Congress and the executive branch to ensure that the radios are operating consistent with U.S. foreign policy objectives and within budgetary constraints. My distinguished friend from Wisconsin, I

am sure, will point out to us, as he should, some of the outrageous spending practices that did take place over the past several decades, and this will bring this to an end.

At this point, I would like to express my appreciation to the administration, particularly to Joseph Duffey, Director of the USIA and an old friend for 20 years now, and our former colleague, Congressman Dan Mica, now chairman of the Board for International Broadcasting, with whom we have worked closely. Both men came to see me more times than they probably care to remember.

I would also like to thank the chairman and ranking member of the committee, Senator PELL and Senator HELMS, as well as the chairman and ranking member of the subcommittee, Senator KERRY and Senator PRESSLER.

Finally, Senator FEINGOLD, who joined our committee last year and jumped in with both feet on this broadcasting issue, to his great credit. We started out on opposite sides of the fence, but we now have a meeting of the minds. My hat is off to him for his persistence, his insight, and for his insistence on the amount of money being saved the American taxpayer.

Mr. President, the proposal before the Senate represents what I believe to be—and I think few would argue with it—a carefully crafted compromise that balances two important interests: Maintaining effective international broadcasting, as well as independence, and ensuring fiscal responsibility. I strongly urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I yield the floor.

Mr. FEINGOLD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin is recognized.

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Bob Gerber, a congressional fellow in my office, be granted privilege of the floor during consideration of S. 1281 and all rollcall votes thereto.

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

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I rise to speak as one of the principal cosponsors of the amendment being offered to consolidate and update U.S. overseas broadcasting operations.

Let me begin by offering my thanks and gratitude to the chairman of the subcommittee, Senator JOHN KERRY, who was enormously helpful to me in understanding all the intricacies of the overseas broadcasting system and to get this matter through committee. Of course, also to the Senator from Delaware. I appreciate his kind words. It was my first good, tough year-long battle as a Senator. I enjoyed it, and I think we have come up with something that does actually meet the deficit reduction goals and also, at the same time, shows some consideration for the journalistic independence issue that he

obviously identified many years ago as something that was very important for the people of Eastern Europe to achieve freedom.

This consolidation has been a long time in the making and is the culmination of many discussions. I have been an active player in the debates since a year ago January when I introduced my first bill in the U.S. Senate, Senate bill 51. The Overseas Consolidation and Deficit Reduction Act was intended to reduce Federal expenditures for overseas broadcasting. The whole purpose in introducing it was to reduce the Federal deficit. I had no particular animus or concern about Radio Free Europe or Radio Liberty or anything that had been done with those organizations. It just appeared that it was time, given our deficit, to cut back. That remains the primary reason why I think we ought to do this amendment today.

But I must say, Mr. President, that as I investigated the issue further and after I had introduced the bill, I found something that troubled me a little bit more. I found extensive fiscal abuses in the current system which also demanded reform. The legislation that we hopefully will adopt today or sometime this week will not only achieve deficit reduction but will also address some of these concerns about abuses that have occurred with regard to the Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty operation in Munich.

Mr. President, Senate bill 51 was based upon proposals made by the Congressional Budget Office which estimated that the changes that we were going to make would save roughly \$1 billion over 5 years, a solid step toward reducing the Federal deficit and toward restructuring our foreign policy tools in the post-cold war era.

It was very helpful when the President gave his State of the Union Address last year and focused on the economy and focused on the budget and the deficit. In his 150 proposed cuts, he included the issue of combining, consolidating overseas broadcasting and, in particular, the two surrogate radio services, RFE and RL.

Mr. President, RFE and RL were established more than 40 years ago as a covert operation by the CIA that, in addition to the VOA, was to broadcast behind the Iron Curtain. All three of these entities—RFE, RL, and VOA—played a tremendous role in bringing news and information to people in Communist countries. I certainly would be one of the first ones to say they did help set in motion the forces that brought an end to the cold war. But it is very difficult today in 1994 to justify the American taxpayers continuing to spend literally over \$200 million a year to operate these radio services in Europe in addition to the VOA, and then to throw on top of that another \$2 million for the administrative costs of maintaining the Board for

International Broadcasting, an agency whose sole function has been to administer funding for these radio services. It is a task they have not done in a very effective manner.

The administration's original budget proposal assumed deficit savings of \$263 million over the next 4 years. The President's February proposal, however, created a deep controversy in foreign policy circles. By June, the administration had restructured its proposal for the consolidation of overseas broadcasting. To oversee all the broadcasting functions, USIA was to create a Broadcasting Board of Governors which would allocate resources to four broadcasting bureaus. RFE and RL and Radio Free Asia were to be included as programs within this new office of surrogate broadcasting. This would have meant private grantee status would have been abolished. The administration contended the same savings in January would have been achieved; that is, the \$263 million.

Recognizing even though this was not exactly the bill I had introduced, that these were real savings, I became one of the leading proponents of the new plan, although my insistence has been, and the insistence of the Senator from Massachusetts has been that the savings be locked into law by placing a 4-year ceiling on spending for international broadcasting.

When the Senate Foreign Relations Committee marked up the bill in July, we did adopt the administration's position by a strong 15-to-4 vote. However, as the Senator from Delaware has indicated, he had grave reservations about the so-called federalization of RFE, RL, and Radio Free Asia. While I believe that continuing private status for RFE/RL and creation of a private RFA would cut into political savings, Senator BIDEN was most concerned about the issue of journalistic independence which he talked about.

After months of discussion, the administration again changed its position and recently announced that it now supports continuing grantee status for these radio services and the creation of a private grantee status for Radio Free Asia. The grants would still be made by the so-called BBG which would also serve as the board for the private entities. The administration however—and this is the important item for me—indicated it would support several very important conditions relating to fiscal constraints. In the past month Senator BIDEN and I have been working together to develop an amendment which addresses each of our concerns.

Mr. President, one of the reasons I believe the Senator from Delaware and I were able to reach an agreement regarding this amendment is that we have had different priorities. As he said, the Senator from Delaware has repeatedly demonstrated his commitment to the concept of journalistic

independence as being critical to the functioning of the radios and stated that very forcefully. I want to say here because this issue can obviously come back over the years, I have some difficulty appreciating that argument about the independence.

First, Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty were established by the CIA, a fact that is widely known.

Second, they have been funded by U.S. taxpayers since their inception, a fact that is also widely known.

Third, the Board of Directors of the RFE/RL, Inc., is required, by law, to consist solely of individuals appointed by the President of the United States. These individuals also serve as members of the Board for International Broadcasting. Under the new legislation, this interlocking Board of Directors will continue, with the Broadcasting Board of Governors appointed by the President of the United States serving as the Board of Directors of RFE/RL, Incorporated.

Fourth, each year, Congress debates and appropriates funds for the operation of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty and a number of congressional committees as well as the General Accounting Office conduct oversight of their activities on a regular basis.

Fifth, the rest of the world views these Radios as belonging to the United States.

Earlier this month, when the President of the United States was in Prague, the Government of the Czech Republic offered to President Clinton, not to some private organization, facilities within Prague to house the headquarters of RFE/RL, underscoring the fact that the entire world recognizing that these Radios are funded by the United States and operate under the policy directives of the Government of the United States.

That will be true with respect to the new Radio Free Asia which President Clinton has asked be established under the same grantee status.

The Governments of Asia, including China, view this new entity as an instrument of United States foreign policy.

It is being established by the Government of the United States, it will be funded by the United States, and it is being, and will be used, by the United States to achieve certain foreign policy goals.

The fact that we are debating its creation on the floor of the United States Senate before the entire world makes that inevitable.

Nevertheless, I recognize that the Senator from Delaware believes that the current structure provides for at least the fiction of independence and that is important to supporters of the surrogate broadcasting.

My concern in this area from the beginning has been quite different and unrelated to the issue of journalistic independence.

My interest is in deficit reduction, eliminating duplication and waste and curbing the kinds of fiscal abuses that have plagued this program, not just in the past few years, but apparently from the inception of this program under the auspices of the CIA.

As I will describe in a little bit of detail in a few moments, the fiscal abuses by the management of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty are not new. The record stretches back over 20 years.

During my research into these issues, I found headlines in the New York Times, and statements in the Senate, dating back to 1976 decrying the lavish spending and salaries provided to RFE/RL employees. The reports by the General Accounting Office over the past two decades have documented over and over problems with the management and fiscal controls over Federal funds by RFE/RL.

The amendment that we are offering today contains approximately 20 different fiscal restrictions that we have proposed, aimed at finally bringing this program under control.

I intend to describe briefly some of these restrictions and the abuses which generated my concern because it is important that the Members of the Senate and the public have a clear picture regarding the fiscal problems in this program.

Now, I know the time of the Senate is precious, and I know that the supporters of the Radios hope that because an agreement had been reached, I would not make a lengthy statement which might tarnish the reputations of the Radios. I believe, however, that this is an issue that has to be publicly discussed.

As I have indicated before, many of these problems are not new. Excessive salaries and compensation for the higher level executives have been challenged in the past. Earlier this year, when I released a chart showing really the outrageous compensation and benefit packages provided to the top 15 executives, the biggest uproar apparently came from the RFE/RL headquarters in Munich where the employees for the first time learned what kind of benefits their top executives had been providing for themselves. Suppressing this kind of information does not serve the interests of the Radios, or the interests of open Government, or the interests of the Federal taxpayers who are paying the bills for this program.

The information I have gathered during the past year about the fiscal abuses represents apparently only the tip of the iceberg.

I have been informed that the compensation and benefit data I released last June did not include the special benefits provided to the top executives since that time, and I have learned a great deal more about these special benefits, particularly the benefits pro-

vided to Mr. Eugene Pell, who served as the president to RFE/RL, Inc. for a decade.

Mr. President, I will begin addressing fiscal constraints contained in the amendment by talking about the one that is probably the most egregious, and that is the excessive compensation and benefits provided to RFE/RL employees.

Mr. President, the amendment contains three provisions relating to salaries and compensation payable to employees of the grantees.

First, it places a limit on salary and other compensation which can be paid to employees funded by these grants.

These employees cannot be provided salary or other compensation which exceeds that payable to Federal employees under title V and title XXII of the United States Code.

Second, it contains a definition of salary and compensation which makes it clear that we intend to cover a range of fringe benefits and special benefits provided to RFE/RL employees.

In the past, it appears that the management of the Radios have used a variety of techniques to provide additional compensation beyond basic salaries.

The amendment makes it clear that this practice cannot continue and that employees of these grantees cannot receive benefits in excess of those available to regular Federal employees.

Third, it requires a review of the system of job classification by the Office of Personnel Management to determine if there are disparities in terms of classifications used by RFE/RL compared to those employed by the Voice of America.

Earlier this year, the Office of Management and Budget prepared an analysis of the salary costs of VOA employees and RFE/RL employees which found that RFE/RL employees are paid significantly higher than VOA employees performing comparable functions.

For example, OMB found that the average annual salary and benefits for VOA employees in one representative Eastern European language service was approximately \$54,000 compared to \$89,000 for the same RFE language service.

I also asked GAO to provide me with an analysis of the disparities in compensation provided to RFE/RL employees in contrast to VOA employees.

I ask unanimous consent that a chart containing this information be printed in the RECORD.

As this chart demonstrates, in virtually every category and level, RFE/RL provides benefits and compensation for its employees at levels that significantly exceed the benefits and compensation provided to VOA employees at comparable levels.

For example, at the GS-9 level, GAO found that RFE/RL employees were receiving an average of \$13,000 more than VOA employees.

At the GS-12 level, the difference was close to \$15,000;

At the GM-15 level, the difference grows to \$31,000;

At the SES-4 level, the difference is \$44,000.

So, Mr. President, I ask now unanimous consent that a chart containing

this information be printed in the RECORD.

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

COMPARISON OF SELECTED RFE/RL AND VOA SALARIES AND BENEFITS

[Based on single employee with no dependents]

Entity	RFE/RL	VOA	RFE/RL	VOA	RFE/RL	VOA	RFE/RL	VOA
Grade	GS 9	GS 9	GS 12	GS 12	GM 15	GM 15	SES 4	SES 4
Hours worked	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40
Salary ¹	\$45,759	\$30,567	\$63,159	\$44,327	\$77,559	\$73,269	\$107,300	\$107,300
Annual leave	26-30 days	12-26 days						
Post allowance	None	\$1,560	None	\$1,820	\$27,146	\$2,500	\$37,500	\$3,000
Housing allowance	\$7,920	\$15,400	\$9,324	\$17,900	\$16,776	\$17,800	\$24,216	\$17,800
Benefits ²	\$8,861	\$3,499	\$9,627	\$5,073	\$11,663	\$7,416	\$12,708	\$9,205
Pension	\$6,406	\$4,860	\$8,842	\$7,048	\$10,858	\$11,649	\$15,022	\$17,061
Total	\$68,946	\$55,886	\$90,952	\$76,068	\$144,002	\$112,634	\$198,801	\$154,356
Difference		\$13,060		\$14,884		\$31,368		\$44,435

¹ RFE/RL has a tax protection plan for Executive employees at the SES 1-6 levels, located outside the United States. This plan compensates employees for the higher German taxes they incur as a result of living overseas. SES 5-6 level employees receive 100 percent compensation for the difference between their hypothetical German and United States income tax obligation. SES 1-4 level employees are compensated at 50 percent of the difference between their hypothetical German and United States tax obligation. The hypothetical taxes are then reconciled against actual taxes at the year's end. The dollar value of tax protection for the SES 4 position is not included in this table.
² Benefits for both RFE/RL and VOA employees consist of health and life insurance. Social security costs are also included in this category.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, the BAO data indicate that these disparities exist at every pay level, but what is readily apparent is that disparity becomes far greater at the highest levels.

It is at the executive levels, and particularly, the compensation provided to the President, where the greatest problems arise.

When the Senate Foreign Relations Committee met to consider this legislation, I released a chart based upon information I had obtained the night before the committee meeting which indicate that the top 15 executives at RFE/RL were receiving compensation and benefit packages that totaled \$3.6 million, with an average salary and

benefit package of over \$240,000 per executive. I ask unanimous consent that a chart containing this information be printed in the RECORD.

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

COMPENSATION—RFE/RL EXECUTIVE SERVICE

Position and SES level	Monthly base salary	Monthly post allowance	Monthly tax protection payments—we pay taxes for them	Monthly housing allowance	Other benefits	Annual total—rounded
President—6	\$9,641.67	\$4,338.75	\$6,651	\$3,169	\$31,236	\$317,000
Exec. VP—6	9,641.67	4,338.75	5,587	3,115	31,236	303,000
VP, finance, in D.C.—5	9,316.67	N/A	N/A	N/A	30,180	142,000
VP, engineering—5	9,316.67	4,192.50	5,421	3,163	30,180	195,000
RFE director—5	9,316.67	4,192.50	7,313	3,167	30,180	318,000
RL director—5	9,316.67	4,192.50	4,345	1,479	30,180	262,000
Res. inst. director—5	9,316.67	4,192.50	5,415	2,609	30,180	289,000
ISD director—3	8,483.33	3,817.50	1,996	1,595	27,480	218,000
NCA director—3	8,483.33	3,817.50	3,047	1,627	27,480	231,000
Personnel director—3	8,483.33	3,817.50	2,360	2,442	27,480	233,000
Corp. affairs in D.C.—2	8,116.67	NA	NA	NA	26,292	124,000
RFE dep. director—2	8,116.67	3,652.50	2,694	2,652	26,292	232,000
RI dep. director—2	8,116.67	3,652.50	2,307	2,532	26,292	225,000
Admin. director—2	8,116.67	3,652.50	2,334	2,754	26,292	229,000
Int. auditor—1	7,741.67	3,483.75	2,143	2,286	25,080	213,000
Annual Total for 15 people						3,630,588

Mr. FEINGOLD. What I then learned subsequently, after already having the opportunity to reveal this information about the salaries, was that I really did not have all the information. In fact, the benefit packages may even be higher. That is certainly true with regard to the president of RFE/RL.

GAO issued an opinion on September 9, 1993—and this is after our committee work—regarding the illegality of an additional benefit provided the president of the RFE/RL, and this benefit has been provided to him since 1985.

In addition to the salary he received listed on this chart, Mr. Pell also received a yearly allowance of \$15,000 which he was not required to account for and payments to a special supplemental retirement plan. GAO determined that the Federal Government has paid \$126,000 into this special fund in Mr. Pell's behalf and that the total

value of this supplemental retirement plan has risen to over \$200,000 today. Again, the American taxpayers are paying for this outrageous compensation package.

When Mr. Pell voluntarily resigned last fall, he was also paid \$137,000 in severance benefits for what was a voluntary resignation. It was not even a termination.

Both the BIB inspector general and GAO have determined that the payments to the special retirement plan were deferred compensation and actually violated the explicit provisions of the authorizing statute. Indeed, when the House Foreign Affairs Committee in 1983 placed a ceiling on the president's salary, in this case the RFE/RL president, they specifically pointed to an annuity plan established for Mr. Pell's predecessor as being a concern to the committee in terms of excessive

compensation provided to the president of this organization. This is over 11 years ago.

Nevertheless, Mr. President, the RFE/RL management used these 10 years to establish an even more generous plan for the president of RFE/RL. Perhaps even more disturbing than the revelation of the additional \$200,000 in special pension and the \$137,000 in severance pay is the latest information, the latest wave of concern about this operation, and that information is contained in the most recent report of the inspector general. The report was dated October 21, 1993 regarding the other perks that the taxpayers have been providing the president of the RFE/RL.

Regarding other personal perks that the taxpayers have been providing the president of the RFE/RL, we as Members of Congress know how concerned, upset or even violently angry constitu-

ents can become about perks that Congress has. I suggest people listen to these that are even more hidden than the ones that Congress has benefited from in the past.

This report indicates that in addition to the salary and the benefits which I have already described, grant funds have been used to pay for a twice weekly maid service in Mr. Pell's personal residence amounting to \$750 per month, and not only that, weekly gardening services amounting to \$1,000 per month. That is on top of the lavish salary and the other benefits that the Federal taxpayers have been paying, \$1,750 a month for maid and gardening services for Mr. Pell.

Mr. President, I see no justification for these kinds of benefits being provided to any employee on top of a very generous salary. The amendment makes it clear that this type of payment is considered an additional compensation and must be included in the descriptions on salary and other benefits.

I am sorry to say the report goes on and it identifies a number of other abuses. The report indicates that \$237,000 in Federal dollars was spent over a 2-year period on fixing up and decorating two apartments for Mr. Pell. The inspector general's report provides details on this spending, including decorating costs that exceeded even RFE/RL policy for imported wallpaper, and a new kitchen with a solid oak floor that costs three times the allowable allowance for other RFE/RL executives.

Mr. President, also purchased with Federal funds, four hand-woven Afghan rugs costing \$6,230, and three brass lanterns imported from London, totaling \$2,100, which he subsequently took with him when he resigned last fall and reimbursed the corporation only at 50 percent value.

In addition, the report reveals that \$25,000 of grant funds were used to rent a guest apartment for 14 months for the personal use of the RFE/RL president because his own apartment, which contained a piano room, a library, and a changing room, was allegedly too small to accommodate his personal guests.

The inspector general, Mr. President, noted that the previous tenants of that apartment had included a larger family with two children. I assume that means more people rather than larger individuals. But it is clear that RFE/RL knew that this apartment was additional compensation being provided to their president because the inspector general report notes they reported the cost for the guest apartment to the German Government as taxable income of Mr. Pell, not an official expense of the corporation.

Finally, and perhaps this is the smallest amount that will stick out in our minds, the inspector general's re-

port notes that Mr. Pell also charged the United States taxpayers \$100 to tune his piano after his move.

Mr. President, I could continue reading into the RECORD quotes of the reports of the inspector general regarding the various abuses. It includes such things as unauthorized first-class travel for Mr. Pell and his spouse, but I believe it is unnecessary to continue with this already lengthy list of abuses. But I hope, Mr. President, that the picture now is very, very clear. This is an agency which has been milking the Federal taxpayers for decades for lavish salaries and benefits for top executives. It is very important to understand that this is not some new problem of RFE/RL that we assume they will fix up because we have had a chance to expose some of it. The lavish salaries and benefits did not begin with Mr. Pell's appointment in 1985.

In 1976, GAO released a report noting that RFE/RL employees, which were funded almost 100 percent by U.S. taxpayers, were provided compensation and benefits in excess of that provided to other U.S. Government employees, including the Voice of America employees.

When the details of the salaries provided to RFE/RL employees leaked to the news media, the New York Times ran a story headlined, "2 U.S. Run Radios Chided on Salary: Report Finds Excessively High Pay Scale in Stations Beamed to Soviet Bloc."

The article describes a letter written by former Senator John Pastore to the head of the Board for International Broadcasting, citing the GAO report, which described the RFE/RL salaries as shocking.

At that time, RFE/RL employees in Munich were receiving an average salary and extra allowances which were approximately \$15,000 above a comparable VOA employee in Munich. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of this article, dated July 2, 1976 be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.
(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, the Senate majority leader at that time, Mike Mansfield, discussed this problem on the Senate floor on July 2, 1976, with Senator Pastore and they both agreed that RFE/RL needed to be brought under control.

Senator Pastore stated:

The abuse has reached the point of becoming almost scandalous: The salaries that are being paid; the fact that most of the employees are not Americans; that every time we say that we would like to either limit it, cut it down or move it we have almost an international diplomatic situation.

It reminds me very much of what happened when we proposed some of these cuts earlier this year.

In 1983, there was another attempt by Members of Congress to exert some

control over the lavish salaries paid to RFE/RL employees.

The House Foreign Affairs Committee in the 1983 reauthorization placed a ceiling on the salary that could be paid to the president of RFE/RL.

The committee report described that provision as being necessary because of "The substantial increase in salary and benefits granted to the President of the radios".

The report stated, "At a time of severe budgetary constraints and personnel cutbacks the committee believes that RFE/RL, Inc., should also exercise restraint."

Mr. President, what Senator Pastore said almost two decades ago on the Senate floor could be said in exactly the same terms today.

It continues to be true that any attempt to rein in RFE/RL creates a virtual international diplomatic crisis.

The slightest suggestion that funds could be reduced or that closer oversight should be imposed produces a chorus of outrage from the defenders of the radios.

I frankly do not believe it is necessary for the U.S. taxpayers to pay these lavish salaries and benefits to the executives and employees of RFE/RL in order to accomplish the goals of these grants.

Mr. President, this amendment makes it very clear that this misuse of Federal funds has to end now. I hope that the management and supporters of RFE/RL and the administration get the message we are trying to send: It is real simple. This is Federal money, taken from taxpayers who live in Wisconsin, Delaware, Massachusetts, North Carolina, and across this Nation—taxpayers who work hard every day and don't want to see their money going into lavish salaries, handwoven afghan rugs, or maid service for the executives who are running RFE/RL.

If this raiding of the Federal Treasury for personal benefits does not end, this program will not survive. I hope that those who believe that RFE/RL continues to be essential—I think that is open to question—will work as hard as I will to clean up this mess and put an end to these abuses.

Mr. President, I have discussed the \$137,000 severance payment that was provided to the president of RFE/RL when he voluntarily resigned last fall.

GAO has not ruled on the legality of that payment although the inspector general has raised questions about the severance payment as well as the pension program and \$15,000 annual allowance provided to the president.

The inspector general also previously reported on the unauthorized practice of RFE/RL making these payments to employees who voluntarily resign or retire.

The March 1991 inspector general report concluded that the corporation's practice of paying severance benefits

to these employees violated existing OMB regulations.

The corporation agreed to change its policy for all new employees not covered by legal agreements. This language flatly prohibits them from entering into any new contracts or obligations for any such payments beyond the amount required by U.S. law or the law of the country where the employee resides. According to the inspector general report, these payments have grown in recent years and were being used by the corporation as an incentive to hire and retain employees. This is clearly another backdoor method of providing additional compensation and benefits to RFE/RL executives and employees that cannot continue.

Mr. President, the amendment provides that the grantee may not enter into freelance contracts without the specific approval of the Director of the International Bureau for Broadcasting.

This provision is designed to address yet another abuse that has persisted throughout RFE/RL's lifetime.

In 1985, GAO issued a report on the freelance contracting practices at RFE/RL and found widespread abuses and lack of controls. In numerous cases, GAO found that RFE/RL entered into freelance contracts with its own full-time employees, in violation of general Federal agency prohibitions against such practices.

The GAO audit found that RFE/RL managers were not required to demonstrate that their needs could not be otherwise met.

In certain cases, RFE/RL employees were given contracts to perform work that was within the scope of their regular duties.

There was little verification that the contract work was not being performed during the regular work day. The GAO report also noted that the radios had concealed their extensive use of freelance contractors in their budget justifications to OMB and Congress.

Last July, the inspector general of BIB issued a report criticizing the freelance contracting practices of RFE/RL, and raised numerous questions about the inadequacy of the agency's control over the selection, use, and payment of freelancers.

Repeatedly, in his semi-annual audit reports, the inspector general has cited specific cases of abuse, including hiring back retirees on a full-time basis through contracts, the size of payments made, and the lack of documentation of work performed.

Nine years after the first GAO report focusing on this issue and after repeated reports from the inspector general, the abuse of freelance contracts has continued.

Our amendment would attempt to put some restraints upon this practice by requiring specific approval by the Director of the Bureau for Broadcasting.

Having these contracts approved by an outside individual will hopefully provide some restraint upon their misuse.

Clearly, there are instances where it is necessary to have a freelance contractor perform work. But in the past, these contracts have been used for things like providing secretarial support and performing work within the scope of the employees own duties.

The amendment also prohibits the use of grant funds for lobbying activities. In the past year, it is clear that a number of RFE/RL employees and executives have engaged in efforts to dissuade Congress from instituting any changes in the operations of RFE/RL.

Obviously, they are free to lobby on their own time and at their own expense. The Federal taxpayers, however, should not have to foot the bill for this type of activity.

One of the top executives whose lobbying efforts in Washington, DC have been fairly visible made five trips to Washington in a 6-month period during the last year, billing the taxpayers almost \$10,000 for these trips.

We do not allow other Federal grantees to use grant funds to pay for trips to Washington, DC to lobby Congress and this grantee should be subject to similar prohibitions.

The rules for other programs are quite clear—grant funds cannot be used to support lobbying activities in any way or for developing grass roots campaigns to attempt to influence Congress.

Mr. President, there are several conditions which are being placed upon the grant itself that I will describe together.

First, the grant to RFE/RL is limited to \$75 million beginning in fiscal year 1996.

The current funding level is approximately \$210 million.

The corporation has already begun the necessary steps to bring its operations down to the level required to operate on an annual basis below \$75 million, and I congratulate them for taking these painful, but necessary steps.

Under the plan, the number of RFE/RL employees will be reduced from the fiscal year 1993 level of approximately 1,600 to 900.

In the past several months, termination notices have gone to several hundred employees in Munich and there appears to be a clear understanding that the size of this grant is being significantly reduced.

These changes will require termination of certain language services and elimination of overlap and duplication with the Voice of America in certain areas.

The legislation requires that the grant agreement contain the conditions which the Board determines are necessary to reduce overlap and duplication.

It also requires that the grant agreement contain specific and detailed provisions relating to the purposes for which the grant funds will be expended and prohibitions against using the grant funds for other purposes without prior approval.

Additionally, the legislation provides that the Board may terminate RFE/RL, Inc. as the grantee and award the grant to another entity if it determines that RFE/RL, Inc. is not carrying out the terms of the grant in a cost effective manner.

This provision is intended to send a very strong signal that this is not an entitlement program; RFE/RL, Inc. can lose this grant if they continue to operate in the fiscal manner which I have outlined.

In the past year, other proposals have been advanced to have the surrogate broadcasting provided through entities such as the Corporation for Public Broadcasting or the Voice of America.

If RFE/RL, Inc. fails to meet the challenge to clean up its fiscal operations, another entity can be selected to carry out the grant activities.

Mr. President, two issues are addressed in this legislation relating to the location of the activities of RFE/RL.

First, the legislation requires that the senior administrative and managerial personnel be relocated within the geographic area of Washington, DC.

For years, the General Accounting Office has been recommending that the headquarters of RFE/RL be moved to Washington, DC, a move which is feasible both from a technical and cost-effective perspective. Several years ago, the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. GLENN], authored an amendment requiring RFE/RL to develop a plan for movement of portions of their activities to the United States in order to reduce the incredible high cost of operations in Munich.

The RFE/RL management has strenuously resisted any such move.

This legislation would mandate that a portion of the senior management do so immediately.

Obviously, if this corporation is to assume responsibility for both the broadcasting activities in Europe and the former Soviet Union and Asia, it should be located in the United States.

This provision does not require movement of the operational components of the radios, simply the top management.

It requires a report to Congress within 90 days on the number of administrative, managerial, and technical personnel who will be relocated to the United States.

My staff has already had informal discussions with GAO on the number of administrative and managerial personnel who could be relocated back to the United States and we will be working

closely to monitor implementation of this provision.

Second, the legislation requires a detailed plan be submitted to Congress and GAO regarding the proposed move from Munich to Prague.

We need to know precisely the cost implications of this move.

The legislation requires specific congressional approval before funds can be utilized to facilitate such a move.

The amendment also requires certain management audits and reviews of the grantees activities.

It requires that the inspector general's office in the U.S. Information Agency maintain a special unit to audit and monitor the activities of the grantee.

The inspector general for the Board for International Broadcasting was established under the 1988 amendments to the Inspector General Act that created inspectors general at a number of small Federal agencies. Since the Inspector General at BIB began his reports on RFE/RL in 1989, he was provided invaluable oversight and information about the fiscal and management problems within the grantee. Under the proposed legislation, these functions would be assumed by the inspector general at USIA, who already has a broad area of responsibility for USIA activities. In order to assure that RFE/RL continues to be subjected to the same level of inspector general scrutiny that has taken place over the past 4 years, the legislation mandates the creation of a special unit to continue these activities after the consolidation.

Mr. President, it is clear that BIB has provided little, if any, effective managerial oversight of the activities of RFE/RL in the past.

Hopefully, under the new structure, greater efforts will be made by the Bureau of Broadcasting to do some effective oversight and corrections of the management weaknesses in RFE/RL.

It is unfortunate that we have been forced to rely solely upon the inspector general's office to bring to light the fiscal abuse that BIB's staff should have been monitoring and correcting.

(Mr. MATHEWS assumed the Chair.)

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I think it is also important to spend a moment or two on the issue of privatization. What happens at the end of this process? The Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from Delaware have already talked about the significant dollar savings involved. If we get this done today, get it to the House and through conference, this could be a \$1 billion savings item. My goal at end of this process, by 1999 is that we no longer have American taxpayers paying for any of this operation. We can achieve that.

This legislation includes a declaration by Congress that Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty's activities

should be transferred to the private sector no later than 1999 and that the Research Institute should be transferred at the earliest possible time. In other words, when we say privatization, we do not mean privatization using Federal taxpayer dollars; we mean privatization. If somebody wants to continue it, go ahead and raise the money, but do not take it from American taxpayers.

This provision recognizes that it is neither feasible nor appropriate for the U.S. Government to continue to maintain these radios in perpetuity. These were established for the purpose of undermining Communist governments.

As the media develops in Eastern Europe, there is less and less reason to have a U.S. Government-funded surrogate radio service. I, frankly, think that we can cut back a lot farther, a lot sooner in Eastern Europe than the agreement contemplates.

The justification for Radio Liberty on the other hand, is a little stronger than the other justification, given the situation we are all aware of in the former Soviet Republics. There is agreement nevertheless that the end goal here should be to transfer these radios to the private sector no later than 1999, no more taxpayer dollars after that point.

The administration, in this amendment, is directed not just to look at this, but to provide annual reports on the steps that it is taking to facilitate the complete transfer of this cold war relic from taxpayer-funded entities to entities provided for by any private organization that may want to do it.

I have almost reached the conclusion of these rather lengthy remarks, but I feel the need to spend a minute or two on something else that is being accomplished through this legislation, something that I am not sure about, something that I am not enthusiastic about at this point, but something that I think we can also limit and make sure that it does not get into the kind of situation that RFE/RL has gotten into. The amendment also provides for a new surrogate broadcasting service, Radio Free Asia, to be established as a private grantee.

The legislation provides for the grant to be administered by RFE/RL, incorporated, under the terms and conditions applicable to the grants for Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty, as well as a number of other conditions which I have proposed.

I am concerned, given the history we have just outlined of the private grantee arrangement, that unless there are very stringent fiscal controls applied to Radio Free Asia, we may well see the development of the same types of problems that have plagued the management of RFE/RL for decades.

The amendments I have provided for RFA seek to prevent these problems in the future.

First, the amendment provides that the administration must provide a detailed plan before it can commit funds for the establishment of this new broadcasting service.

In authorizing Radio Free Asia, we are not giving the administration a blank check.

OMB has provided members of the committee with a budget estimate that assumes that the new service can be operated at an annual cost of \$22 million, with one-time capital expenditures of \$8 million.

This budget assumes that the new service will be able to utilize existing transmitters, either VOA transmitters or other existing transmitters.

The amendment requires that the administration certifies that they have acquired access to utilize those transmitters before moving forward with establishing the new service.

This provision is designed to prevent a situation where we are told by OMB that this service will cost less than \$22 million and once commitments are made, Congress receives a much bigger bill because the existing transmitters are either not accessible to Radio Free Asia or don't meet its technical needs.

This provision is intended to prevent a situation where the administration comes back in a year or two and says they need another \$50 or \$60 million to build new transmitters.

If the administration cannot put together a detailed plan to operate this service with the budget constraints imposed in the legislation, they are directed to propose a different plan, which might well include simply increasing VOA broadcasting in the region.

The legislation also requires GAO to review the administration's budget projections and advise Congress as to whether the fiscal assumptions are adequate and whether the plan can be implemented within the budget limitations.

Second, the legislation requires an effectiveness study of Radio Free Asia after 3 years to determine whether it is technically sound and cost-effective, is received by a sufficient audience to warrant its continuation, the extent to which the targeted audiences are receiving similar broadcasts from other credible sources, and the extent to which the interests of the United States are being served by continued broadcasting.

The legislation also contains a sunset provision, terminating authority to continue grants to operate RFA after September 30, 1998, with a 1-year extension if the President of the United States determines continuation is in the national interest.

The effectiveness study and sunset provision are designated to prevent a situation developing where the United States continues to fund RFA, regardless of whether it is still relevant.

Many people believe that shortwave radio broadcasting may soon be obsolete.

It is important that we are not locked into continuing this service when it is no longer needed or effective.

The amendment also requires that any contracts which the grantee enters into regarding RFA clearly specify all obligations are assumed by the grantee, not the United States and that funding for RFA may not be available after 1999.

In attempting to reduce RFE/RL activities, we have repeatedly been told that the cost of terminating various contracts will be enormous and that the U.S. Government, not the grantee, will be held liable for RFE/RL's debts.

In the case of RFA, we are asking that they notify employees and others in advance of the limitations, under which this program is being established. Finally, the amendment requires that to the maximum extent possible any lease agreements entered into should be assignable to the United States. Again, in the case of RFE/RL, we have been told that a full merger with VOA is not possible because some of the lease agreements are not assignable. That situation should be avoided in the future.

Fourth, the legislation requires that the principal place of business of RFA shall be located within the United States, in the Washington area, unless the board determines that another location within the United States would be necessary to carry out the functions of RFA effectively and in a cost effective manner.

As GAO has reported over the years, there is technically no reason why any of the radios cannot be operated out of the United States.

If the new service is located in Washington, DC, it can pool resources and administrative functions with existing broadcasting services and achieve greater savings.

The lower the overhead, the more funds can go into broadcasting, rather than administrative costs.

Fifth, the legislation requires notification and consultation regarding displacement of Voice of America broadcasting in order to accommodate the broadcasting activities of Radio Free Asia.

The legislation contemplates that the new service will utilize at least a portion of the VOA transmitters, but it is not contemplated that the very well regarded Asian broadcasting activities of VOA be reduced in order to accommodate this new service.

Millions of people in Asia now listen to VOA and many use the English-language transmissions to learn English.

In addition, VOA this year enhanced its operation in Hong Kong to include a bureau broadcasting Chinese domestic news in Mandarin.

The new bureau includes four full-time journalists who travel regularly into China to report news and feature stories. The China Focus Program, already off to a strong start, currently broadcasts 1 hour a day, and plans are underway to expand it to 3 hours.

It is very important that we do not fail to recognize the importance of the Voice of America in reaching out to all of the people of Asia, not simply the Communist countries.

If the administration's plan for the new service requires a significant reduction in broadcasting activities of VOA, Congress should be notified and consulted before such a plan is put into operation.

The purpose of establishing RFA is to enhance U.S. broadcasting in Asia, not diminish the effective work in this region of VOA.

To conclude my statement, on this issue that we have been working on pretty hard for over a year, enactment of this amendment represents a major step forward in our efforts to reorganize and reorder our spending priorities in light of the end of the cold war. It has not been an easy task. Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty have many supporters, and they have made important contributions to U.S. foreign policy interests over the last four decades. It is totally understandable that there would be strong resistance to any change in the status quo. But this, we hope, Mr. President, is really a new era of fiscal constraints. We have to focus upon places in the Federal budget where savings can be achieved and the kinds of consolidations and downsizing that this amendment achieves.

This amendment would eliminate one Federal agency, the Board For International Broadcasting. It would achieve important administrative savings by consolidating overseas broadcasting within USIA.

It would make substantial reductions in the funding level for RFE/RL, cutting it by 64 percent—this is a significant number—as of 1996, and the budget would not be \$210 million a year but only \$75 million a year, with the expectation and hope that by 1999 it can be eliminated altogether from the point of view of Federal funding.

The 4-year savings from our changes in overseas broadcasting will be approximately \$400 million. That includes \$162 million for the termination of the Israeli transmitter, which we have approved.

Each year thereafter, the savings from reduced funding for RFE/RL will amount to \$135 million per year. In other words, instead of like everything else we do, where we spend and forget about how much it is going to cost every year, this item will cause our Federal budget to go down \$135 million every year as time goes on.

It has been a long and challenging process to reach this agreement, but it

was well worth the effort. The task is not finished, and we still have to complete a conference with the House of Representatives.

Moreover, implementation of this legislation after it is signed into law will involve a lot of oversight and monitoring to help make sure that the goals Congress intended are actually achieved. That did not always happen in the past, as I have indicated.

Today marks a significant milestone in our efforts to achieve spending reductions, especially in the foreign relations area, and to reorganize Federal efforts in the area of international broadcasting to reflect the end of the cold war.

I conclude by thanking and congratulating all of the individuals and Members of the Senate who played important roles in achieving these changes. Again, I thank Senator KERRY, chairman of the subcommittee, who helped enormously; Senator PELL, the chairman of the committee and his staff; also, of course, Senator KERRY's staff, who were incredibly patient and supportive as we wrangled through this process; the members of the Foreign Relations Committee on both sides of the aisle, who lent me their strong support on this first initiative in foreign relations; and finally, of course, Senator BIDEN and his staff, who, although we approached this issue from very different perspectives, were gracious and forthcoming with regard to our areas of disagreement, and we did work hard to achieve an agreement.

Finally, to the members of my own staff, Susanne Martinez and Robyn Lieberman, who I know spent almost an outrageous amount of hours to get this thing done.

Mr. President, I apologize for the length of my remarks. I believe this is a rare instance where we are actually cutting back on a Federal program—not just cutting the increase, but actually bringing the spending down—and I wanted the Senate and the people of the country to know the details of it.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the New York Times, July 2, 1976]

TWO U.S.-RUN RADIOS CHIDED ON SALARY—REPORT FINDS EXCESSIVELY HIGH PAY SCALE IN STATIONS BEAMED TO SOVIET BLOC

(By David Binder)

WASHINGTON, July 1.—A General Accounting Office study of the United States-operated Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty has disclosed cases of office secretaries receiving annual salaries of over \$36,000 and middle-rank executives \$67,000, amounts far in excess of regular government pay scales.

The report made public earlier this week has drawn criticism from Congress and a promise by the Ford Administration to review pay scales of the two Munich-based stations that broadcast to Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union.

In a letter to David M. Abshire, chairman of the Board for International Broadcasting, which supervised the stations, Senator John

O. Pastore, Democrat of Rhode Island, cited the pay scales and said: "These are shocking figures."

By way of comparison, the study showed that a regular Government employee posted in Munich, with a base salary of \$23,670 received extra allowances raising income to \$31,870. A Radio Free Europe employee with the same base pay received the equivalent of \$45,603.

HIGH CONVERSION RATE

The difference was made up almost entirely by the favorable conversion rate from dollars to West German marks accorded Radio Free Europe employees. The favorable rate, as in the early days of allied occupation of West Germany, is 4 marks to the dollar.

But following a series of revaluations since 1971, the mark is now officially pegged at about 2.50 to the dollar.

The accounting study showed that almost 70 percent of the total cost of the radio stations, or \$39.2 million, was attributable to personnel compensation and benefit practices, including \$3 million in housing allowances for 600 employees.

Senator Charles H. Percy, Republican of Illinois, declared in response to the report: "It is just intolerable to continue these practices."

Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty were founded and secretly financed by the Central Intelligence Agency in the early 1950's to provide news and analysis for Soviet and East European audiences in 25 languages. They have been under Congressional funding authority since 1971.

TO REVISE PAY SCALES

The General Accounting Office study concluded that the best way to deal with "inequities" and "duplication" it found in the Munich operations was to move the major part of the stations to the United States.

At a meeting in mid-April with the directors of the Board for International Broadcasting, Sig-Michelson, president of the two radio stations for the last year, said he agreed with the general thrust of the accounting recommendations and was moving to carry them out, including a revision of the pay scales.

The housing and other special compensations for the radio station employees were an outgrowth of the early occupation practices in what was then the American zone of Germany.

An official familiar with the special benefits said that 80 percent of the two station's 1,786 employees were probably being fairly compensated, but that "top executives are getting indefensibly high salaries." These executives are almost all American citizens.

Mr. KERRY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I congratulate the Senator from Wisconsin and express my appreciation to him for his efforts in this. This has been a first-class and very significant effort, his first, as he described it, within the Foreign Relations Committee.

But the Senator has really raised some extremely important questions about the administrative process, about management decisions, about the overall structure. He really has been the most important push, if you will, or force asking the committee and the Senate as a whole to really take a hard look at this and do what is correct.

I thank him also not only for his initial effort but also for the work he did in reaching what I think is a very sensible compromise with the Senator from Delaware.

I also express my appreciation to the Senator from Delaware. He and I did not agree at the outset on this. We had a vote in the committee and the outcome was adverse to the Senator from Delaware. But the Senator also persevered and continued to make his point and I think persuaded a number of people that his commitment on this was steadfast and that he saw a different vision of how this should and could work.

I think what we have had in the final analysis is an amalgamation of the best of both of those views in a way that addresses the concerns of both Senators, but at the same time provides the savings that we need.

It may be that down the road we are going to have to review this more. It may be that there will be adjusting yet to be done. But, for the moment, I think this gets us off the dime and provides an important service to the country and particularly to the goals of the foreign policy information promulgation effort.

So I really tip my hat to the Senator. I think he has done a terrific job here. Mr. HELMS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I certainly join the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts in his praise of the Senator from Wisconsin and Senator BIDEN. For a year or more, they have been pushing a subject which is of great interest and concern to me. I just want you to know, I say to the Senator from Wisconsin, that I appreciate your efforts and you have been successful.

Now, the Senator from Wisconsin has made clear the outcome of the negotiations for the establishment of a new Radio Free Asia patterned after a Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty. Broadcasting to Tibet and to the Communist countries of Asia, North Korea, Burma, Communist China, Laos, and Vietnam, must, Mr. President, remain a high priority in order to encourage fledgling democracy movements in those countries.

When the administration first presented its consolidation proposal to Congress last June 15, as I recall, the administration stated vigorously that the only way to save \$243 million over the next 4 years was to consolidate all broadcasting functions under the U.S. Information Agency umbrella. Today, just about 6 months later, give or take, the administration has been promising that these same savings can be achieved under the new and improved consolidation plan which allows Radio Free Asia, Radio Free Europe, and Radio Liberty to stand as private grantees. Either somebody was mis-

informed then or they have seen the light or whatever.

But that is not the important issue. What is important is that the U.S. Information Agency, Mr. Duffey, Director of USIA, and Mr. Mica, who is Chairman of the Board of International Broadcasting, have made a significant positive decision in accepting the terms of the Biden-Feingold amendment.

Incidentally, I ask unanimous consent that I be added as a cosponsor of this amendment, as modified.

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

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I will explain the modification in just a moment.

This policy ensures that the U.S. Government will continue broadcasting Radio Free Europe, Radio Liberty, and Radio Free Asia. All will maintain their independent grantee status. It does all of that and so forth.

In all candor, I am not persuaded that this bill gives this new creation the resources it will need to please everybody and still save the money that everybody talks about. So I hope that Mr. Duffey and his associates in the White House have thought through that issue. This point is important and that is the reason I am stressing it.

USIA should be prepared to provide those resources out of its own budget, if necessary, to fulfill the broadcasting priorities that are being defined here today.

So, again, I express my gratitude to the able Senator from Delaware, Mr. BIDEN, and the equally able Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. FEINGOLD, for accepting a modification that I proposed, that will ensure that this will happen. I commend them for their efforts, because the American taxpayer will not be willing to spend more money on these projects than is currently authorized in this bill. So, in committing to this course of action, I hope that the administration is prepared to use its energy and resources to see these projects through to their completion.

Now, to make legislative history and have it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that lines 6-17 on page 24 of the bill, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

SEC. 310. TRANSITION.

(a) AUTHORIZATION.—(1) The President is authorized to direct the transfer of all functions and authorities from the Board for International Broadcasting to the United States Information Agency, the Board, or the Bureau as may be necessary to implement this title.

(2)(A) Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the United States Information Agency and the Chairman of the Board for International Broadcasting shall jointly prepare and sub-

mit to the President for approval and implementation a plan to implement the provisions of this title. Such report shall include at a minimum a detailed cost analysis to implement fully the recommendations of such plan. Additionally, such plan shall identify all costs in excess of those authorized for such purposes and shall provide that any excess cost to implement such plan shall be derived only from funds authorized in title II, part A, section 201(a)(1) of this Act.

Mr. HELMS. Then, Mr. President, immediately following that, I desire to have printed in the RECORD the modification that I proposed to Senators BIDEN and FEINGOLD and which they graciously accepted. And I want it to follow immediately after the preceding insert.

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

Mr. HELMS. Reading the modification:

Such report shall include at a minimum a detailed cost analysis to implement fully the recommendations of such plan. Additionally, such plan shall identify all costs in excess of those authorized for such purposes and shall provide that any excess cost to implement such plan shall be derived only from funds authorized in title II, part A, section 201(a)(1) of this Act.

IRRESPONSIBLE CONGRESS? HERE'S TODAY'S BOX SCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, along another line for just a moment. As a Senator from North Carolina, I have begun presenting to the Senate each day for the third year what I call the box score on Federal deficit spending.

I started this on February 25, 1992. I reported the precise, exact Federal debt run up by the Congress of the United States down to the penny. The first report was on February 25. The latest report we had available on February 25 was the close of business of February 21, 1992. As of February 21, 1992, the Federal debt stood at \$3 trillion—\$3,823,909,309,474.57.

At the close of business yesterday, Mr. President, the Federal debt stood at \$4,506,790,072,963.29. That means that since February 21, 1992 the Federal debt has increased by \$682,880,763,488.72.

This means that on per capita basis, as of today, with the debt, and I repeat, as of close of business yesterday standing at \$4,506,790,072,963.29—that means that on a per capita basis every man, woman, and child in the United States owes \$17,286.54 as his or her share of that national debt.

I thank the Chair and I yield the floor.

FOREIGN RELATIONS AUTHORIZATION ACT

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I am very pleased to join my colleagues in sponsoring this amendment, and I want to

reiterate my appreciation to Senator BIDEN and Senator FEINGOLD for their efforts to resolve their differences on broadcasting. I know that both Senators have been very engaged in this issue.

This amendment preserves the critical cost savings provisions of the administration's proposal while it also retains for Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty the independence that has made them such effective voices in the past. We have received testimonials from a number of Eastern European leaders on the importance of RFE/RL to their countries over the past years.

The amendment establishes the same sort of independence for Radio Free Asia. At the same time, the amendment imposes tight cost controls to ensure that the radio operates in the most cost effective manner possible. I commend Senator FEINGOLD for his efforts in this area.

To conclude, I think U.S. foreign policy and American taxpayers will benefit from this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I believe we are going to ask to set this aside indefinitely?

Mr. HELMS. Exactly.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent this amendment be set aside, subject to the call of the managers of the bill.

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

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, that means, of course, that the bill is open to further amendment, is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HELMS. I thank the Chair.

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 1247

(Purpose: To amend the Foreign Service Act of 1980 to provide the Secretary with authority to take reduction in force actions with regard to members of the Foreign Service, and for other purposes)

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HELMS] proposes an amendment numbered 1247.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place in title II, part B, add the following:

SECTION 1. REDUCTION IN FORCE AUTHORITY WITH REGARD TO THE FOREIGN SERVICE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—(1) Title VI of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (22 U.S.C. 4001 et seq.) is amended—

(A) by redesignating sections 611, 612, and 613 as sections 612, 613, and 614 respectively; and

(B) by inserting after section 610 the following new section:

"SEC. 611. REDUCTIONS IN FORCE.—(a) The Secretary may conduct reductions in force and may prescribe regulations for the separation of members of the Service under such reductions in force which give due effect to—

"(1) organizational need;

"(2) documented employee qualifications, knowledge, skills, or competencies;

"(3) documented employee performance;

"(4) tenure of employment; and

"(5) military preference.

"(6) For purposes of this section the term 'members of the Service' means the individuals described under section 103."

(2) The table of contents for the Foreign Service Act of 1980 is amended by striking out the items related to section 611, 612, and 613 and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"Sec. 611. Reductions in force.

"Sec. 612. Termination of limited appointments.

"Sec. 613. Termination of appointments of consular agents and foreign national employees.

"Sec. 614. Foreign Service awards."

(b) MANAGEMENT RIGHTS.—Section 1005(a) of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (22 U.S.C. 4105(a)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (3) through (6) as paragraphs (4) through (7), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following new paragraph:

"(3) to conduct reductions in force, and to prescribe regulations for the separation of employees under such reductions in force conducted under section 611;"

(c) CONSULTATION.—The Secretary of State shall consult with the Director of the Office of Personnel Management before prescribing regulations for reductions in force under section 611 of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (as added by subsection (a) of this section).

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, this amendment will give the Secretary of State the same authority over his employees that the Secretaries of every other agency or department has over his or her employees. This amendment expands the flexibility of the Secretary of State in organizing and structuring the Department of State staffing levels as he deems necessary. A rather unique situation exists here. The situation needs to be changed.

This amendment amends the Foreign Service Act of 1980 by giving the Secretary of State the authority to reduce, but not increase, the number of employees at the State Department. Currently, the U.S. Code provides each

Cabinet-level Secretary the authority to reduce the number of civil servants in his or her own agency. This authority does not apply to the Foreign Service. Unlike the Civil Service, the Foreign Service is protected from Government downsizing through a reduction in force. It is incredible, it seems to me, that the Secretary of State does not have the authority to reduce in force anybody in the Foreign Service. Oh, sure, he may allow the size of the Service to shrink through attrition or through the elimination of promotion positions in future years, but he has only limited ability to downsize, and he has now only the authority to reduce in force the civil servants.

This is purely an employee-management issue. If the head of an organization finds that his staff is bloated, top-heavy, of course he should be able to restructure around the needs and objectives of the organization, in this case the Department of State. Members of the Foreign Service should not be treated as a protected class of privileged individuals. They should be treated no differently than members of the civil service on this issue.

In order to have the flexibility to establish fair personnel practices at the State Department, the Secretary of State should have the authority—whether he has the guts or not is another question—this amendment offers. If the President directed the Secretary of State to reduce personnel levels tomorrow, all reductions would fall upon civil servants, regardless of need. The Secretary would be absolutely unable under the law to structure personnel levels based on need or skills necessary to carry out a mission.

The Secretary of Defense has made significant downsizing decisions, and the Secretary of State may have to do the same. This bill approved a reduction of \$50 million in State Department salaries and expenses, and the report language on this provision directs the Secretary of State to take those cuts in the Washington headquarters bureaucracy and not in the field operations; just plain, common, economic good sense. The Secretary of State should have the authority necessary to do what Congress is directing him to do. That is the purpose of this amendment.

There is no guarantee that this authority will ever be exercised by the Secretary of State. I am not sure he is standing up down there applauding this amendment. I do not care whether he is or not. What I care about is playing fair with the American taxpayers and not having this elite crowd down there wearing striped pants walking around doing nothing. This amendment merely affords the Secretary of State the opportunity to take action when the State Department personnel system is bloated and burdened with an excess of superfluous employees. Needless to say,

I hope he uses the authority, but nothing in my amendment requires him to use it.

This amendment follows the spirit of the Vice President's plan for improving the Federal Government. Plain and simple, Mr. President, it is a good-Government amendment that deserves to be adopted. I yield the floor.

Mr. KERRY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from North Carolina. This is a good amendment. The Secretary has that authority already for the civil service, and there is really no rationale for his not having it with respect to the Foreign Service, and he ought to.

So we join with the Senator from North Carolina, and we are willing to accept this. I do not believe there is anybody else desiring to speak on it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate on the amendment? If not, the question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 1247) was agreed to.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KERRY. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 1248

(Purpose: To withhold funds for fiscal years 1994 and 1995 from the funds authorized to be appropriated for "Contributions for International Organizations" until the President certifies that no United Nations agency or United Nations-affiliated agency grants any recognition to an organization that condones pedophilia.)

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HELMS] proposes an amendment numbered 1248.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 9, line 16, after "purposes" insert the following new subsection (b) and renumber the rest of the section accordingly:

(b) WITHHOLDING OF FUNDS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the funds au-

thorized to be appropriated for "Contributions for International Organizations" shall be reduced in the amount of \$118,875,000 for each fiscal year 1994 and 1995, and for each year thereafter, unless the President of the Senate that no United Nations Agency or United Nations-Affiliated agency grants any official status, accreditation, or recognition to any organization which promotes, condones, or seeks the legalization of pedophilia, or which includes as a subsidiary or member any such organization.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, as the distinguished occupant of the chair has perceived, I think, this is Save the Taxpayers Day in the U.S. Senate.

This amendment, the pending amendment, reduces the U.S.-assessed contribution to international organizations by, as the clerk has just indicated, \$118,875,000 for fiscal year 1994 and fiscal year 1995 unless the President of the United States certifies to Congress that no United Nations agency grants any official status, accreditation, or recognition to any organization that promotes, condones, or seeks the legalization of pedophilia. If we are not willing to do that, we ought not to talk about family values or anything else. If we support bums like that in the United Nations, we ought to get out of town and stay gone.

I have argued for a long time—as have other Senators, including the distinguished occupant of the chair—that the values and objectives of the United Nations seldom coincide with those of the vast majority of the American people. Actions of the United Nations Economic and Social Council underscore a crucial point: We should never, never look to the United Nations to safeguard American interests and values.

I never fathomed that the day would come when the United Nations would officially condone the sexual molestation of children. Tragically and shockingly, that is precisely what has happened, and it is outrageous. Where were the U.S. officials, who are paid by the American taxpayers and confirmed by the Senate to safeguard American interests at the United Nations? Once again, they were fast asleep at the switch.

Let me be specific, Mr. President. This past summer, the United Nations Economic and Social Council, [ECOSOC], granted what is termed consultative status to an outfit called the "International Lesbian and Gay Association."

Now, this International Lesbian and Gay Association is a worldwide umbrella group of homosexual organizations headquartered in Brussels, Belgium. According to documents supplied by the International Lesbian and Gay Association, one of its member organizations in the United States is the notorious North American Man Boy Love Association, frequently referred to by its acronym NAMBLA, [N-A-M-B-L-A].

Now, NAMBLA is a pro pedophile organization. There is no question about

it, no contest to that description of it. This organization makes little effort to hide its objectives. On page 2 of NAMBLA's publication—the name of it is the NAMBLA Bulletin—it states—and this is a direct quote from the publication:

We work to organize support for boys and men who have or desire consensual sexual and emotional relationships and to educate society on their positive nature.

Mr. President, as the little girl in the comic page used to say, "I may 'fro' up."

Now, some may think that the International Lesbian and Gay Association did not know about NAMBLA's pro pedophile agenda. However, the International Lesbian and Gay Association readily admits that it has known about NAMBLA's agenda since 1984.

So, Mr. President, it had to be crystal clear to anyone who conducted any research whatsoever into NAMBLA, that this is an outfit catering to the twisted desires of pedophiles. NAMBLA made no effort to hide those objectives—and guess who has embraced them with open arms—the United Nations.

Somehow, nobody at the U.S. mission to the United Nations was alarmed by these organizations when it came time to vote. The vote in ECOSOC to recognize this group took place July 30 of last year. ILGA, including NAMBLA, was approved for consultative status by a vote of 22 to 4 with 17 countries abstaining. Believe it or not, the United States of America, along with 21 other nations, put our stamp of approval, our stamp of approval, on this international homosexual lobbying organization, a group that condones sexual molestation of children.

See why I am offering the amendment, Mr. President? What does it mean for ECOSOC to provide a consultative status to this pro pedophile organization? Good question. ECOSOC, the U.N. Economic and Social Council, according to a handbook published by the United Nations is, and I quote:

The principal organ to coordinate the economic and social work of the United Nations.

It purportedly deals with a broad spectrum of issues ranging from human rights and economic and social and cultural and educational and health and related matters.

As with most U.N. agencies, finding out how many dollars are actually spent each year by ECOSOC, the U.N. Economic and Social Council, is impossible; you cannot tell. You cannot find out anything. But according to a memorandum dated September 28, 1993, the Congressional Research Service estimated that ECOSOC spent \$951 million for the years 1992-93 to carry out programs and activities.

Now, Mr. President, in addition to the funding provided by ECOSOC, the United Nations has developed a system for granting what is called consultative

status to private, nongovernmental organizations. According to U.N. documents, and I am quoting:

ECOSOC may consult with nongovernmental organizations which are concerned with matters within the council's competence.

It goes on to say:

The council recognizes that these organizations should have the opportunity to express their views and that they often possess special experience and technical knowledge of value to the council in its work.

What is the special competence that NAMBLA contributes to the United Nations? I have obtained, and I can make copies available to any Senator who wants to read about it, copies of the NAMBLA Bulletin, to which I referred just a moment ago. That is the official publication of that organization. Let me give the Senate, for the purpose of making it clear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, a few direct quotes from this bulletin published by and for perverted individuals.

The North American Man Boy Love Association is both political and educational. We work to organize support for boys and men who have or desire consensual sexual and emotional relationships and to educate society on their positive nature.

Then it goes on to say:

We speak out against the oppression endured by men and boys who love one another and support the right of all people to consensual intergenerational relationships.

What hogwash.

Then it goes on to point out that "NAMBLA was founded in 1978, within Boston's gay and lesbian community, in response to a witch hunt against man boy lovers in that city.

An article entitled "Staying Safe and Happy as a Man-Boy Lover," in the October 1991 issue of the Bulletin, which is the official NAMBLA publication, provides tips for men wishing to engage in sexual relationships with little boys and how not to get caught doing it. Talking to the police, the Bulletin suggests, is a bad idea. Do not say anything. If a cop comes around, just keep quiet.

Another suggestion offered in the Bulletin is: "Don't keep photos of your partner in a place where police might find them." It also suggests: "Never discuss the specifics of an illegal relationship with therapists or social workers."

In other words, Mr. President, the NAMBLA Bulletin is a how-to guide for child molesters.

There is no question that the larger organization recognized by the United Nations and the International Lesbian and Gay Association knew about NAMBLA's despicable agenda. They knew it. They do not deny it. Indeed, the ILGA has even passed resolutions of its own supportive of pedophilia.

Consider the following: A 1990 resolution under the heading of "Man-Boy/Woman-Girl Love" referred to

pedophiles as a sexual minority and called on members to treat them "with respect, and to engage in instructive dialog with them." It will never happen, as far as I am concerned, Mr. President.

In 1986, a resolution stated support for "the right of young people to sexual and social self-determination," and a 1990 resolution declared "the right of every individual, regardless of age, to explore and develop her or his sexuality." For its part, NAMBLA insists that it is by no means a fringe member of the ILGA. In fact, NAMBLA contends that for years, NAMBLA was that group's only member organization in the United States of America.

Another article, in the September 1992 issue of the NAMBLA Bulletin, to which I referred earlier, boasts, brags, about its influence in the umbrella decision. It states that an effort had been made several years ago by the ILGA to "repeal positions that support sex between men and free boys," but that the lobbying of NAMBLA and many other fringe pedophile and civil rights groups prevented this from happening.

Do you not see, Mr. President? The United Nations has created a sort of hierarchy among these groups which are given consultative status. The homosexual group, which includes NAMBLA, was given what is called roster status, which is the lowest degree. However, that group has stated its desire to seek category 2 status, which would allow it to request hearings and then later to seek category 1 status, which would allow it to propose agenda items to ECOSOC. Groups in all three categories can send representatives to official ECOSOC meetings and submit written statements for circulation to the ECOSOC delegation.

Mr. President, it is important to recognize, I think, that any category of so-called consultative status, even the "roster" status conferred on this homosexual group, which includes NAMBLA, is seen as a major achievement by them in terms of official recognition, and as they say in gaining legitimacy. Receiving any degree of respectability or consultative status is a message that the recognized group has special competence in the issues with which it is involved and which are pertinent to the United Nations.

Needless to say, the U.N. action was seen as a big victory by the national homosexual organizations. They danced in the streets. Oh, they slapped each other on the backs and maybe other things as well.

The local newspaper which caters to the homosexual community, the Washington Blade, crooned. Let me quote the headline. The headline was: "Gays Win Voice at United Nations." That was on page 1 in the August 20, 1993 issue of the Blade.

A spokesman for the international homosexual group approved by

ECOSOC stated in that newspaper, the Blade: "We now have direct access into the U.N. machinery, whereas before we were always on the outside knocking on the door. Now we are in the system."

This amendment proposes to keep them out of the system, or at least not put a nickel of the American taxpayers' money into that crowd.

In reply to press inquiries about this oversight—I am being charitable when I say oversight—the State Department says they did not know that NAMBLA was a part of this international homosexual umbrella group. "Goodness gracious," they said, "how did that happen?" In view of this administration's record of bumbling on foreign policy matters, this is an entirely plausible explanation, I suppose. I will just let it slide.

Privately, I have to say to some of the folks down at the State Department—they are horribly embarrassed about this episode, and they should be. They should be outraged, as a matter of fact. I guess it is fair to assume that they are being candid when they said they did not know about the umbrella group's pedophile resolutions.

Since the administration is unable to monitor which groups are being recognized by the United Nations, this amendment is intended to provide and to ensure some accountability because it cuts off a portion of the U.S. contribution to international organizations unless and until the President of the United States certifies to the Congress that no U.N. agency—I repeat, no U.N. agency—grants recognition to pedophile organizations.

Maybe that will provide some incentive to check into this sort of thing the next time around before the United Nations gets any more American tax dollars.

Mr. President, we do not have necessary Senators present. But at the appropriate time, I shall ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 1246

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, after consulting with my distinguished colleague from Massachusetts, who is managing this bill, he and I agree that it will not be necessary to have a vote on amendment No. 1246, so I ask unanimous consent that the yeas and nays be vitiated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HELMS. I thank the Chair.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, if the yeas and nays are now vitiated, then the pending business would be that amendment. Could we have a vote on that amendment? I do not believe there is any further debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further debate, then the question is on agreeing to amendment No. 1246.

The amendment (No. 1246) was agreed to.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. HELMS. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROBB). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I have a parliamentary inquiry to which I know the answer. Just for the record, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business is amendment No. 1248 offered by the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that that amendment may be laid aside temporarily in order that I may call up another amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, the amendment is temporarily laid aside.

Mr. HELMS. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, it is my intent, when Senator KERRY returns to the floor, to seek the yeas and nays on the amendment which we just laid aside. But we will take care of that in due course.

AMENDMENT NO. 1249

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HELMS] proposes an amendment numbered 1249.

On page 179, line 6, after the word "agreement" add the following: "or a bilateral U.S. nuclear cooperation agreement."

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, before I begin, I will say to my colleagues, or their staff members in their offices who may be watching the proceedings on television, that I do not want to hog the show. If Senators have amendments, or even if one Senator has an amendment that he would like to deal with this afternoon, I will certainly yield the floor for that purpose.

But in the meantime, this is a very clear and brief amendment, because this amendment is basically only a clarification of a provision which already exists in the bill.

Currently, section 713(b) of S. 1281 states that a nonnuclear weapons state which abrogates an International Atomic Energy Agency full scope safeguard agreement cannot and will not receive foreign aid from the United States or any other aid, for that matter. We simply must put our national foot down and say we will not have it.

This amendment adds to this prohibition simply by stating that if a country violates a nuclear cooperation agreement with the United States, that country would lose its U.S. aid. Clear enough.

Let me read the section with the pending amendment included.

(b) Prohibition. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no U.S. assistance, under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 shall be provided to any nonnuclear weapon State that is found by the President to have terminated, abrogated, or materially violated an IAEA full-scope safeguard agreement, or—coming to the pending amendment: or a bilateral U.S. nuclear cooperation agreement.

That is the way that provision will read with and including the pending amendment.

I think that the United States should care as much about adherence to U.S. bilateral agreements as it cares about adherence to an international agency agreement. It makes no sense to me, to say that a country cannot receive U.S. aid after breaking an IAEA agreement, but it can receive such aid after breaking an agreement with the United States.

As a sovereign nation, the United States has the right to determine how it will react to a breach of a binding obligation by another country. We are not rewriting any rules. The United States is simply stating how we will react to a breach of a binding obligation by another country.

This does not apply IAEA standards to agreements with the United States. This amendment, I reiterate for the purpose of emphasis, simply would require compliance with agreements that have already been signed.

I think most of us would agree that compliance with nuclear cooperation agreements is extremely important to our national interests, and potentially extremely dangerous if nuclear material is not treated with the utmost concern and caution.

The pending amendment makes very clear the seriousness that the United States places on compliance with nuclear agreements.

Now, who would this affect? Well, it would not affect any country that adheres to its agreements, obviously. And our friends have nothing to worry about, unless—unless—they violate the

provisions of a nuclear cooperation agreement, and then they ought to have to worry a little bit.

Most agreements contain a mechanism for cancellation for the official abrogation between two sovereign nations. The main difference, Mr. President, is that we will know—the entire world will know—about those nations that officially abrogate IAEA or bilateral nuclear agreements.

Now, I would emphasize that this amendment is absolutely prospective and would not immediately sanction any country. However, the United States has a number of bilateral nuclear cooperation agreements throughout the world which potentially could be affected in the future.

Again, for the purpose of emphasis, this provision will affect only those countries who violate their commitments to IAEA or to the United States of America.

I, of course, hope that my fellow Senators will agree to this amendment.

I yield the floor. Since I am the only one on the floor, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum has been suggested. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HELMS. 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 Chair recognizes the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, having the right to modify my amendment I send such modification to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has that right. The amendment is modified accordingly.

The amendment (No. 1249), as modified, is as follows:

On page 179, line 6, after the word "agreement" add the following: "or materially violated a bilateral U.S. nuclear cooperation agreement."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate on amendment 1249, as modified? If there be no further debate, the question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 1249), as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. HELMS. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KERRY. 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

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, first of all, with respect to the amendment of the Senator from North Carolina, which is currently temporarily set aside, amendment No. 1248, I ask unanimous consent that no second-degree amendments be in order to that amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PELL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island, Senator PELL.

AMENDMENT NO. 1250

(Purpose: To amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act to strengthen the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency and to improve congressional oversight of the activities of the Agency)

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, amendment No. 1248, which is pending, is temporarily laid aside and the clerk will report the amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL] proposes an amendment numbered 1250.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 179, after line 6, add the following new title:

TITLE VIII—ARMS CONTROL AND NONPROLIFERATION ACT OF 1994

SEC. 801. SHORT TITLE; REFERENCES IN ACT; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This title may be cited as the "Arms Control and Nonproliferation Act of 1994".

(b) REFERENCES IN TITLE.—Except as specifically provided in this title, whenever in this title an amendment or repeal is expressed as an amendment to or repeal of a provision, the reference shall be deemed to be made to the Arms Control and Disarmament Act.

SEC. 802. CONGRESSIONAL DECLARATIONS; PURPOSE.

(a) CONGRESSIONAL DECLARATIONS.—The Congress declares that—

(1) a fundamental goal of the United States, particularly in the wake of the highly turbulent and uncertain international situation fostered by the end of the Cold War, the disintegration of the Soviet Union and the resulting emergence of fifteen new independent states, and the revolutionary changes in Eastern Europe, is to eliminate chemical and biological weapons and to reduce and limit the large numbers of nuclear weapons in the former Soviet Union and, more generally, to prevent the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and their means of delivery, and of high-technology conventional armaments as well as to prevent regional conflicts and conventional arms races; and

(2) an ultimate goal of the United States continues to be a world in which the use of force is subordinated to the rule of law and international change is achieved peacefully without the danger and burden of destabilizing and costly armaments.

(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this title is—

(1) to strengthen the United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency; and

(2) to improve congressional oversight of the arms control, nonproliferation, and disarmament activities of the United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

SEC. 803. PURPOSES.

Section 2 (22 U.S.C. 2551) is amended in the text following the third undesignated paragraph by striking paragraphs (a), (b), (c), and (d) and by inserting the following new paragraphs:

"(1) The preparation for and management of United States participation in international negotiations and implementation fora in the arms control and disarmament field.

"(2) When directed by the President, the preparation for, and management of, United States participation in international negotiations and implementation fora in the nonproliferation field.

"(3) The conduct, support, and coordination of research for arms control, nonproliferation, and disarmament policy formulation.

"(4) The preparation for, operation of, or, as appropriate, direction of, United States participation in such control systems as may become part of United States arms control, nonproliferation, and disarmament activities.

"(5) The dissemination and coordination of public information concerning arms control, nonproliferation, and disarmament."

SEC. 804. REPEALS.

The following provisions of law are hereby repealed:

(1) Section 26 (22 U.S.C. 2566), relating to the General Advisory Committee.

(2) Section 36 (22 U.S.C. 2578), relating to arms control impact information and analysis.

(3) Section 38 (22 U.S.C. 2578), relating to reports on Standing Consultative Commission activities.

(4) Section 1002 of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1986 (22 U.S.C. 2592a), relating to an annual report on Soviet compliance with arms control commitments.

SEC. 805. DIRECTOR.

Section 22 (22 U.S.C. 2562) is amended to read as follows:

"DIRECTOR

"SEC. 22. (a) APPOINTMENT.—The Agency shall be headed by a Director appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. No person serving on active duty as a commissioned officer of the Armed Forces of the United States may be appointed Director.

"(b) DUTIES.—(1) The Director shall serve as the principal adviser to the Secretary of State, the National Security Council, and the President and other executive branch Government officials on matters relating to arms control, nonproliferation, and disarmament matters. In carrying out his duties under this Act, the Director, under the direction of the President and the Secretary of State, shall have primary responsibility within the Government for matters relating to arms control and disarmament, and, whenever directed by the President, primary responsibility within the Government for matters relating to nonproliferation.

"(2) The Director shall attend all meetings of the National Security Council involving weapons procurement, arms sales, consideration of the defense budget, and all arms control, nonproliferation, and disarmament matters."

SEC. 806. BUREAUS, OFFICES, AND DIVISIONS.

Section 25 (22 U.S.C. 2565) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 25. BUREAUS, OFFICES, AND DIVISIONS.

"The Director, under the direction of the Secretary of State, may establish within the Agency such bureaus, offices, and divisions as he may determine to be necessary to discharge his responsibilities pursuant to this Act, including a bureau of intelligence and information support and an office to perform legal services for the Agency."

SEC. 807. PRESIDENTIAL SPECIAL REPRESENTATIVES.

(a) Sections 27 and 28 (22 U.S.C. 2567, 2568) are redesignated as sections 26 and 27, respectively.

(b) Section 26 (as redesignated by subsection (a)) is amended to read as follows:

"PRESIDENTIAL SPECIAL REPRESENTATIVES

"SEC. 26. The President may appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, Special Representatives of the President for Arms Control, Nonproliferation, and Disarmament. Each Presidential Special Representative shall hold the personal rank of ambassador. Presidential Special Representatives appointed under this section shall perform their duties and exercise their powers under direction of the President and the Secretary of State, acting through the Director. The Agency shall be the Government agency responsible for providing administrative support, including funding, staff, and office space, to all Presidential Special Representatives."

SEC. 808. POLICY FORMULATION.

Section 33 (22 U.S.C. 2573) is amended to read as follows:

"POLICY FORMULATION

"SEC. 33. (a) FORMULATION.—The Director shall prepare for the President, the Secretary of State, and the heads of such other Government agencies as the President may determine, recommendations and advice concerning United States arms control, nonproliferation, and disarmament policy.

"(b) PROHIBITION.—No action shall be taken pursuant to this or any other Act that would obligate the United States to reduce or limit the Armed Forces or armaments of the United States in a militarily significant manner, except pursuant to the treaty-making power of the President set forth in Article II, Section 2, Clause 2 of the Constitution or unless authorized by the enactment of further affirmative legislation by the Congress of the United States."

SEC. 809. NEGOTIATION MANAGEMENT.

Section 34 (22 U.S.C. 2574) is amended to read as follows:

"NEGOTIATION MANAGEMENT

"SEC. 34. (a) RESPONSIBILITIES.—The Director, under the direction of the President and the Secretary of State, shall have primary responsibility for the preparation, conduct, and management of United States participation in all international negotiations and implementation fora in the field of arms control and disarmament and shall have primary responsibility, whenever directed by the President, for the preparation, conduct, and management of United States participation in international negotiations and implementation fora in the field of nonproliferation. In furtherance of these responsibilities

Special Representatives of the President for Nonproliferation, established pursuant to section 26, shall, as directed by the President, serve as the United States Government representatives to international organizations, conferences, and activities relating to the field of nonproliferation, such as the preparations for and conduct of the review relating to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.

"(b) FUNCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO THE UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY.—The Director shall perform functions pursuant to section 2(c) of the Reorganization Plan 8 of 1953 with respect to providing to the United States Information Agency official United States positions and policy on arms control, nonproliferation, and disarmament matters for dissemination abroad.

"(c) AUTHORITY.—The Director is authorized—

"(1) to formulate plans and make preparations for the establishment, operation, and funding of inspections and control systems which may become part of the United States arms control, nonproliferation, and disarmament activities; and

"(2) as authorized by law, to put into effect, direct, or otherwise assume United States responsibility for such systems."

SEC. 810. REPORT ON MEASURES TO COORDINATE RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.

Not later than March 31, 1995, the President shall submit to the Congress a report prepared by the Director of the United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, in coordination with the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Energy, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the Director of Central Intelligence, with respect to the procedures established pursuant to section 35 of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act (22 U.S.C. 2575) for the effective coordination of research and development on arms control, nonproliferation, and disarmament among all departments and agencies of the executive branch of Government.

SEC. 811. NEGOTIATING RECORDS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Arms Control and Disarmament Act is amended by inserting after section 35 the following:

"NEGOTIATING RECORDS

"SEC. 36. (a) PREPARATION OF RECORDS.—The Director shall establish and maintain records for each arms control, nonproliferation, and disarmament agreement to which the United States is a party and which was under negotiation or in force on or after January 1, 1990, which shall include classified and unclassified materials such as instructions and guidance, position papers, reporting cables and memoranda of conversation, working papers, draft texts of the agreement, diplomatic notes, notes verbal, and other internal and external correspondence.

"(b) NEGOTIATING AND IMPLEMENTATION RECORDS.—In particular, the Director shall establish and maintain a negotiating and implementation record for each such agreement, which shall be comprehensive and detailed, and shall document all communications between the parties with respect to such agreement. Such records shall be maintained both in hard copy and magnetic media.

"(c) PARTICIPATION OF AGENCY PERSONNEL.—In order to implement effectively this section, the Director shall ensure that Agency personnel participate throughout the negotiation and implementation phases of all arms control, nonproliferation, and disarmament agreements."

(b) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than January 31, 1995, the Director of the United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency shall submit to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate a detailed report describing the actions he has undertaken to implement section 36 of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act.

SEC. 812. VERIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE.

Section 37 (22 U.S.C. 2577) is amended to read as follows:

"VERIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE

"SEC. 37. (a) IN GENERAL.—In order to ensure that arms control, nonproliferation, and disarmament agreements can be adequately verified, the Director shall report to Congress, on a timely basis, or upon request by an appropriate committee of the Congress—

"(1) in the case of any arms control, nonproliferation, or disarmament agreement that has been concluded by the United States, the determination of the Director as to the degree to which the components of such agreement can be verified;

"(2) in the case of any arms control, nonproliferation, or disarmament agreement that has entered into force, any significant degradation or alteration in the capacity of the United States to verify compliance of the components of such agreement; and

"(3) the amount and percentage of research funds expended by the Agency for the purpose of analyzing issues relating to arms control, nonproliferation, and disarmament verification.

"(b) STANDARD FOR VERIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE.—In making determinations under paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a), the Director shall assume all measures of concealment not expressly prohibited could be employed and that standard practices could be altered so as to impede verification.

"(c) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Except as otherwise provided for by law, nothing in this section may be construed as requiring the disclosure of sensitive information relating to intelligence sources or methods or persons employed in the verification of compliance with arms control, nonproliferation, and disarmament agreements.

"(d) PARTICIPATION OF THE AGENCY.—In order to ensure adherence of the United States to obligations or commitments undertaken in arms control, nonproliferation, and disarmament agreements, and in order for the Director to make the assessment required by section 51(a)(5), the Director, or the Director's designee, shall participate in all interagency groups or organizations within the executive branch of Government that assess, analyze, or review United States planned or ongoing policies, programs, or actions that have a direct bearing on United States adherence to obligations undertaken in arms control, nonproliferation, or disarmament agreements."

SEC. 813. AUTHORITIES WITH RESPECT TO NON-PROLIFERATION MATTERS.

(a) AMENDMENTS TO THE ARMS EXPORT CONTROL ACT.—(1) Section 38(a)(2) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2778(a)(2)) is amended to read as follows:

"(2) Decisions on issuing export licenses under this section shall be made in coordination with the Director of the United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, taking into account the Director's assessment as to whether the export of an article would contribute to an arms race, support international terrorism, increase the possibility of outbreak or escalation of conflict, or prejudice the development of bilateral or

multilateral arms control or nonproliferation agreements or other arrangements. The Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency is authorized, whenever the Director determines that the issuance of an export license under this section would be detrimental to the national security of the United States, to recommend to the President that such export license be disapproved."

(2) Section 42(a) of such Act (22 U.S.C. 2791(a)) is amended—

(A) by redesignating clauses (1), (2), and (3) as clauses (A), (B), and (C), respectively;

(B) by inserting "(1)" immediately after "(a)";

(C) by amending clause (C) (as redesignated) to read as follows:

"(C) the assessment of the Director of the United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency as to whether, and the extent to which, such sale might contribute to an arms race, support international terrorism, increase the possibility of outbreak or escalation of conflict, or prejudice the development of bilateral or multilateral arms control or nonproliferation agreements or other arrangements"; and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

"(2) Any proposed sale made pursuant to this Act shall be approved only after consultation with the Director of the United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. The Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency is authorized, whenever the Director determines that a sale under this section would be detrimental to the national security of the United States, to recommend to the President that such sale be disapproved."

(3) Section 71(a) of such Act (22 U.S.C. 2797(a)) is amended by inserting "and the Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency" after "The Secretary of Defense".

(4) Section 71(b)(1) of such Act (22 U.S.C. 2797(b)(1)) is amended by inserting "and the Director of the United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency" after "Secretary of Defense".

(5) Section 71(b)(2) of such Act (22 U.S.C. 2797(b)(2)) is amended by inserting "and the Director of the United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency" after "The Secretary of Commerce".

(6) Section 71(c) of such Act (22 U.S.C. 2797(c)) is amended by inserting "to include the Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency" after "other appropriate Government agencies".

(7) Section 73(d) of such Act (22 U.S.C. 2797(d)) is amended by inserting "and the Director of the United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency" after "The Secretary of Commerce".

(b) AMENDMENT TO THE NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION ACT.—Section 309(c) of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Act of 1978 (42 U.S.C. 2139(a)) is amended in the second sentence by striking out ", as required."

SEC. 814. APPOINTMENT AND COMPENSATION OF PERSONNEL.

Section 41(b) (22 U.S.C. 2581(b)) is amended by striking all that follows "General Schedule pay rates," and inserting in lieu thereof "except that—

"(1) the Director may, to the extent the Director determines necessary, appoint in the excepted service, and fix the compensation of, employees possessing specialized technical expertise without regard to provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointment or compensation of employees of the United States,

"(2) an employee who is appointed under this provision may not be paid a salary in ex-

cess of the rate payable for positions of equivalent difficulty or responsibility, and in no event, may be paid at a rate exceeding the maximum rate in effect for level 15 of the General Schedule, and

"(3) the number of employees appointed under this paragraph shall not exceed ten percent of the number of positions allowed under the Agency's full-time equivalent limitation."

SEC. 815. SECURITY REQUIREMENTS.

Section 45(a) (22 U.S.C. 2585) is amended in the third sentence—

(1) by inserting "or employed directly from other Government agencies" after "persons detailed from other Government agencies"; and

(2) by striking "by the Department of Defense or the Department of State" and inserting "by such agencies".

SEC. 816. ANNUAL REPORT TO CONGRESS; AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title IV of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act is amended—

(1) by striking sections 49 and 50;

(2) by redesignating sections 51 and 53 as sections 49 and 50, respectively; and

(3) by inserting after section 50 (as redesignated by paragraph (2)) the following new sections:

"ANNUAL REPORT TO CONGRESS

"SEC. 51. (a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than January 31 of each year, the President shall submit to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate a report prepared by the Director, in consultation with the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Energy, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and Director of Central Intelligence, on the status of United States policy and actions with respect to arms control, nonproliferation, and disarmament. Such report shall include—

"(1) a detailed statement concerning the arms control and disarmament objectives of the executive branch of Government for the forthcoming year;

"(2) a detailed statement concerning the nonproliferation objectives of the executive branch of Government for the forthcoming year;

"(3) a detailed assessment of the status of any ongoing arms control or disarmament negotiations, including a comprehensive description of negotiations or other activities during the preceding year and an appraisal of the status and prospects for the forthcoming year;

"(4) a detailed assessment of the status of any ongoing nonproliferation negotiations or other activities, including a comprehensive description of the negotiations or other activities during the preceding year and an appraisal of the status and prospects for the forthcoming year;

"(5) a detailed assessment of adherence of the United States to obligations undertaken in arms control, nonproliferation, and disarmament agreements, including information on the policies and organization of each relevant agency or department of the United States to ensure adherence to such obligations, a description of national security programs with a direct bearing on questions of adherence to such obligations and of steps being taken to ensure adherence, and a compilation of any substantive questions raised during the preceding year and any corrective action taken; and

"(6) a detailed assessment of the adherence of other nations to obligations undertaken in all arms control, nonproliferation, and disar-

mament agreements to which the United States is a participating state, including information on actions taken by each nation with regard to the size, structure, and disposition of its military forces in order to comply with arms control, nonproliferation, or disarmament agreements, and shall include, in the case of each agreement about which compliance questions exist—

"(A) a description of each significant issue raised and efforts made and contemplated with the other participating state to seek resolution of the difficulty;

"(B) an assessment of damage, if any, to the United States security and other interests; and

"(C) recommendations as to any steps that should be considered to redress any damage to United States national security and to reduce compliance problems.

"(b) CLASSIFICATION OF THE REPORT.—The report required by this section shall be submitted in unclassified form, with classified annexes, as appropriate.

"AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

"SEC. 52. (a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—To carry out the purposes of this Act, there are authorized to be appropriated—

"(1) \$57,500,000 for fiscal year 1994 and \$59,375,000 for fiscal year 1995; and

"(2) such additional amounts as may be necessary for each fiscal year for which an authorization of appropriations is provided for in paragraph (1) of this subsection for increases in salary, pay, retirement, other employee benefits authorized by law, and other nondiscretionary costs, and to offset adverse fluctuations in foreign currency exchange rates.

"(b) TRANSFER OF FUNDS.—Funds appropriated pursuant to this section may be allocated or transferred to any agency for carrying out the purposes of this Act. Such funds shall be available for obligation and expenditure in accordance with the authorities of this Act or in accordance with the authorities governing the activities of the agencies to which such funds are allocated or transferred.

"(c) LIMITATION.—Not more than 12 percent of any appropriation made pursuant to this Act shall be obligated or reserved during the last month of the fiscal year."

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—So much of the amendment made by subsection (a) as inserts section 52 of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act shall be deemed to have become effective as of October 1, 1993.

SEC. 817. CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.

(a) Section 2 (22 U.S.C. 2551) is amended—

(1) in the second undesignated paragraph, by inserting "nonproliferation," after "Arms control"; and

(2) in the second and third undesignated paragraphs, by inserting "nonproliferation," after "arms control" each place it appears.

(b) Section 28 (22 U.S.C. 2568) is amended—

(1) in the first sentence, by striking "field of arms control and disarmament" and inserting "fields of arms control, nonproliferation, and disarmament"; and

(2) in the second sentence, by inserting "nonproliferation," after "arms control".

(c) Section 31 (22 U.S.C. 2571) is amended—

(1) in the text above paragraph (a), by striking "field of arms control and disarmament" each of the three places it appears and inserting "fields of arms control, nonproliferation, and disarmament";

(2) in the first sentence, by inserting "and nonproliferation" after disarmament; and

(3) in the fourth sentence, by inserting "nonproliferation," after arms control each of the eight places it appears.

(d) Section 35 (22 U.S.C. 2575) is amended by inserting "nonproliferation," after "arms control".

(e) Section 39 (22 U.S.C. 2579) is amended by inserting "nonproliferation," after "arms control" each of the two places it appears.

At the bottom of page 5, add the following:

**TITLE VIII—ARMS CONTROL AND
NONPROLIFERATION ACT OF 1994**

- Sec. 801. Short title; references in title; table of contents.
- Sec. 802. Congressional declarations; purpose.
- Sec. 803. Purposes.
- Sec. 804. Repeals.
- Sec. 805. Director.
- Sec. 806. Bureaus, offices, and divisions.
- Sec. 807. Presidential special representatives.
- Sec. 808. Policy formulation.
- Sec. 809. Negotiation management.
- Sec. 810. Report on measures to coordinate research and development.
- Sec. 811. Negotiating records.
- Sec. 812. Verification of compliance.
- Sec. 813. Authorities with respect to nonproliferation matters.
- Sec. 814. Appointment and compensation of personnel.
- Sec. 815. Security requirements.
- Sec. 816. Annual report to Congress; authorization of appropriations.
- Sec. 817. Conforming amendments.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, this amendment is the same as S. 1182, a bill strongly endorsed by the Committee on Foreign Relations. This legislation has the full support of the Clinton administration. This important legislation will revitalize and strengthen the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency [ACDA] by clarifying its role in the national security structure, assigning ACDA major new responsibilities, and by redirecting its energies to the arms control challenges of the future. It would build upon the Agency's solid core of professionals to re-create the Agency as the strong and forceful entity envisaged when ACDA was created in 1961 in the first year of the Kennedy administration.

This act is the result of an excellent and continuing cooperation between the executive branch and the Congress. It represents a consensus as the best course for ACDA and it enjoys broad bipartisan support on the Hill, as well as the support of the administration.

Mr. President, Secretary of State Christopher deserves particular credit for the time and attention he devoted to this issue, for his farsighted decision that ACDA should be strengthened and revitalized and for his recommendation along those lines to the President. President Clinton became directly involved in this issue, and it is to his strong credit that he recognized both the arms control challenges of the future and the critically important role ACDA can play in meeting these challenges.

In 1991, the Committee on Foreign Relations, concerned by the reduced stature and effectiveness of the Arms

Control and Disarmament Agency, approved unanimously an amendment offered by Senator SIMON requiring a report by the State/ACDA inspector general, not later than December 15, 1992, with regard to the Agency's fulfillment of the primary functions specified in law. The amendment specified:

Such report shall address the current ability and performance of the Agency in carrying out these functions and shall provide detailed recommendations for any changes in executive branch organization and direction needed to fulfill these primary functions.

The inspector general, Sherman Funk, appointed a panel, led by Ambassador James F. Goody, to prepare the report. After a wide-ranging and thorough effort, the report was submitted to President Bush and the requesting committees in December 1992. The panel judged that two concepts are most likely to promote U.S. national interests and meet the challenges of our changed world were either to refocus and rejuvenate ACDA as a separate agency or to fold it into the State Department.

The panel opted for a reshaped and rejuvenated ACDA. Mr. Funk wrote:

The review concluded that it remains important to the nation to have a specialized, technically competent, and independent arms control institution, and therefore recommends retaining a separate, but reorganized, refocused, and rejuvenated ACDA.

I reviewed Sherman Funk's excellent report with great care. At the same time, I weighed the judgments in a comprehensive report prepared independently by the Henry L. Stimson Center, as well as related studies by others.

It was clear from these assessments that ACDA could not go on as it was. It remained the only independent governmental Agency in the world devoted to arms control and it retained a solid corps of professionals, but it was in sore need of nurturing. I concluded that we needed both to help it truly live up to its mandate and to give it new authorities so that it would not only have a seat at the arms control table, but a strong voice at the table.

Accordingly, I directed the preparation of a draft bill that would strengthen the Agency and maintain its independence, and sent the bill to the National Security Council [NSC] for review. At the same time, at my direction, the committee staff worked with ACDA, State, and NSC officials to see whether common agreement on strengthening the Agency could be reached.

Some in the Department of State favored absorption of ACDA by State. Others inside and outside the executive branch, however, preferred an independent role for ACDA. There was a general agreement that the proper choices were merger or revitalization and strengthening, but not the status quo. Those who favored absorption believed sincerely that there would be

major cost savings. My own review indicated that the cost savings would only be realized by cutting people and capabilities. To realize the savings envisaged, experts in ACDA would have had to be put out on the street and with them their expert knowledge. According to a study by Steven A. Hildreth for the Congressional Research Service:

... a new analysis of State's proposal suggests the estimated annual cost saving in the near term may only be about \$3 million or less. This figure could vanish altogether if the State Department created new positions to replace those assumed to be abolished by the proposed transfer. Abolishing ACDA, therefore, is not likely to save money without a substantial RIF or statutory enactment. None of these analyses included the additional costs of shutting down ACDA.

Moreover, according to the study:

The major current alternative to the State Department's proposal is to attempt to strengthen or revitalize ACDA. Most of the proposals for revitalizing ACDA do not cost money.

Mr. President, throughout this process of review and assessment, I worked closely with Secretary of State Christopher and the President's National Security Adviser, Anthony Lake.

On July 3, 1993, the President, in a radio address to the Nation, called for the preservation and revitalization of ACDA. President Clinton stated:

... I am also taking steps to revitalize the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, so that it can play an active role in meeting the arms control and nonproliferation challenges of this new era. I am committed to protecting our people, deterring aggression and combating terrorism. The work of combating proliferation of weapons of mass destruction is difficult and unending, but it is an essential part of this task. It must be done.

On July 12, 1993, Secretary Christopher followed up the President's statement with a letter to me confirming the decision of the administration to revitalize ACDA. The Secretary wrote:

The President and I are fully committed to a revitalized ACDA through a combination of strong ACDA leadership, internal agency changes, full participation of ACDA in Executive Branch policy making, and legislative changes.

In response to the President's announcement and Secretary Christopher's letter, another series of discussions were held to resolve all outstanding differences before the bill went to mark up. These discussions were fruitful, and all issues were settled by September 14, 1993. On that date, National Security Adviser Anthony Lake expressed support for the act in a letter on behalf of the administration.

The Arms Control and Non-Proliferation Act, as amended and favorably reported out of committee, has several key provisions. As described in the committee's report, the act:

Codifies the President's decision of July 3, 1993, to retain and revitalize the Agency;

Enhances the role of the ACDA in the areas of arms control and nonproliferation policy and negotiations in several ways: First, ACDA is given primary responsibility for all arms control negotiations and implementation fora, including any negotiation of a comprehensive nuclear test ban; second, positions for Presidential Special Representatives for Arms Control, Nonproliferation, and Disarmament are created and placed under the ACDA Director; and third, ACDA's role in nonproliferation is underscored by giving the Agency primary responsibility for managing U.S. participation in the 1995 review conference of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty and primary responsibility for other nonproliferation activities when so directed by the President;

Improves ACDA's role regarding arms transfers and nonproliferation. ACDA is given mandatory prior consultation and review rights with respect to export licenses and other matters under both the Arms Export Control Act and the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Act;

Streamlines the functions of the Agency by eliminating a number of outdated or redundant reporting requirements and by disbanding the General Advisory Committee, thereby permitting the Agency to reassign personnel to other substantive areas; and

Authorizes the appropriation for fiscal year 1994 of \$57,500,000 for ACDA and \$59,375,000 for fiscal year 1995 for ACDA.

Mr. President, in 1961 when I was a freshman Senator, I was privileged to go with the late Senator Joseph Clark and the late Senator Hubert H. Humphrey to the White House to discuss the status in the bureaucracy of the new arms control agency. We argued strongly that the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency should not be created by executive fiat, but rather should have the imprimatur of a statutory agency. The White House accepted our advice and shortly thereafter the new U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency was born.

We hoped for a great deal, but to a certain degree our reach exceeded our grasp, and the Agency was never to have the clout and authority we hoped for at the start. You do not have opportunities always in life to fix those things that have not measured up to your expectations, but we fortunately have such an opportunity now with ACDA.

We must remember that this is an agency that despite its adversities has shown great resolve and purpose that have redounded to the credit of the United States. It was because of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency that the United States was the leader of the effort to reach agreement on the critically important Non-Proliferation Treaty in 1968. ACDA was in the

lead of the effort to negotiate the ABM Treaty of 1972 and it remained steadfast in much adversity in its defense of that treaty in the mid-1980's so that it still remains the cornerstone of our strategic arms limitation effort. Through the Arms Control Agency's good offices the extraordinarily complex Chemical Weapons Convention has been achieved to complement the earlier Biological Weapons Convention, which the United States is adhering to because of ACDA's efforts.

Many of the problems unique to the cold war have disappeared only to be replaced by new and urgent concerns. Central to the future arms control effort will be our own activities to stem the proliferation of chemical, biological and nuclear weapons, and their means of delivery.

The Arms Control and Nonproliferation Act gives the Arms Control Agency, its Director, and other senior ACDA officials substantially broadened authorities and responsibility in the nonproliferation area. We are trying to give ACDA some of the muscle it needs to have to ensure that it carries the necessary weight in the interagency deliberative process. I believe that this act will build upon ACDA's successes and the Agency's talents to give it the lead role in our arms control and nonproliferation efforts of the future. The Agency will lead in setting course and direction in arms control and nonproliferation, and I believe that it will be a very successful voyage into a future with many threats and challenges to be met.

I do hope that we accept and pass this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate?

Mr. HELMS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HELMS].

Mr. HELMS. Does the Senator want to proceed now?

Mr. KERRY. I am happy to wait. The Senator is going to address this amendment?

Mr. HELMS. Yes, I say to my friend. Mr. President, thank you for recognizing me.

The administration's strong endorsement of S. 1182, the ACDA reauthorization bill before us today, is indicative of a colossal downturn. The original State Department reorganization of the foreign policy decisionmaking apparatus was to send ACDA to the Federal bureaucracy scrap heap. That may be an indelicate way of saying it, but it is pretty accurate. The truth of the matter is that ACDA's stature and effectiveness have greatly diminished over the past 6 years.

Certainly since the end of the cold war, ACDA has been an agency in search of a mission to justify its existence. ACDA is sort of a cold war dinosaur on an evolutionary slide to extinction.

Every report or recent study conducted on the continued existence of ACDA has concluded ACDA was never the dynamic, energetic, or critically important policy adviser to the President and Secretary of State originally envisioned in 1961. Matter of fact, this agency has never played the critical mission, been the independent decisive information broker or the policy confidant to the President and key arms control decisionmakers in the executive branch.

Granted, the agency has had its moments and played an important role in the past 33 years—for example, the Non-Proliferation Act of 1968, negotiation of the 1972 ABM Treaty, and the Chemical and Biological Weapons Convention. But the fact remains that ACDA was an unwanted congressional appendage, affixed to the executive branch by legislative fiat. Consequently, the Agency has been treated like an unwanted stepchild for years.

As Chairman PELL points out, the Agency was never to have the clout and authority we hoped for from the start. Even ACDA's greatest accomplishments were achieved under the watchful eyes and guiding hands of NSC's Policy Planning Coordination Committee, the Department of Defense, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Department of Energy, the CIA, the DIA, and a plethora of advisers, consultants, and academicians on the U.S. payroll. The fact is ACDA was always on the outside looking in on policy decisions.

Even with ACDA, there was the "Un Group." This was an unofficial group of key ACDA analysts and specialist who provided unofficial guidance to the real policymakers because formal recommendations from ACDA were so slow to emerge and were never listened to.

For these and other reasons, the Clinton administration originally endorsed and supported the recommendation contained in the Bush administration study, "State 2000," to abolish ACDA and fold its functions into the State Department and other related departments where appropriate.

Before Secretary Designate Christopher had the benefit of congressional foresight, he was advocating and recommending termination of ACDA, but he did an about face when he discovered in Executive hindsight that it was much easier to discuss the positive aspects of ACDA from the vantage point as a confirmed Secretary of State.

Whatever the reason for the administration's reversal of direction, it was dramatic. I think the administration should thank Chairman PELL and other Senators for the administration's new found cooperative insight. Everyone can quote their own study on this issue, but some of the original cost saving estimates—State 2000 and GAO—were that a major reorganization could save almost half of the ACDA budget—

\$25 million per year, or one quarter of a billion dollars in 10 years. That is a lot of money to spend on an agency in search of an identity. Every study I have seen has clearly stated that ACDA cannot continue under its existing mandate—either reshape it or abolish it. One study said, contrary to a previous study, that “a new analysis . . . suggests . . . an estimated cost saving in the near term may only be \$3 million.” CRS further stated: “Abolishing ACDA, therefore, is not likely to save money without a substantial RIF—reduction in force—or statutory enactment.” Even with shutdown costs—I call termination of an agency a substantial long-term RIF, saving millions of taxpayer funds. The same CRS study said, “the major current alternative to the State Department’s proposal is to attempt to strengthen or revitalize ACDA. Most proposals for revitalizing ACDA do not cost money.” The last finding appealed to me. I offered an amendment in committee to reduce the ACDA budget by 8 percent, or \$5 million, from \$62.5 million to \$57.5 million in 1994. Based on acceptance of my amendment, I supported reporting out S. 1182, the ACDA authorization bill. I found this bill deficient in several respects. But quite frankly, I found the state Department’s original proposal of folding ACDA and related functions into State similarly deficient. I have always thought the Department of Defense should have the final say in whether or not the proliferation or export of certain high technologies are detrimental to the national security interests of the United States. Second, ACDA’s integration into State should be at the Undersecretary level and encompass the responsibilities of ACDA, parts of the Political and Military Bureau, the Office of Ambassador-at-Large for Proliferation, and other offices. This way the person responsible for nonproliferation would be on the inside of the policymaking process, and would carry a big stick to boot. But this is not where we are. I think we should watch this new organization like a good bird dog hunts—with a keen nose and good eyes. I am not convinced that the organizational structure of ACDA has found the proper balance. ACDA currently has a fine Director, but I am concerned that ACDA’s success may depend more on the personal relationship of Mr. Holum and Secretary Christopher than on the so-called “revitalized and strengthened” authorities in this bill. I feel we should wish Mr. Holum well but keep a close eye on the future of ACDA.

I thank the Chair and I yield the floor.

Mr. SIMON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized. Mr. SIMON.

Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, I thank you.

Mr. President, I rise in support of the amendment. I am pleased to be a cosponsor of it. I was not on the floor when it came up, but I heard Senator HELMS, my friend from North Carolina, say at the end we have to keep a close eye. We have to do that on everything in Government. That includes particularly things that have such a vital part in the future, such as things that concern security.

I was pleased to join Senator PELL in cosponsoring this to try to give ACDA, frankly, some new life. The Arms Control and Disarmament Agency has been a weak sister. Let us face it. And with rare exception it just has not had any kind of muscle. The idea of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency was that here would be an entity that could come in, and whether it was a question of proliferation, whether it was a question of conventional arms, whatever it would be, there would be an entity that could question whether it makes sense to increase arms sales or grants to any area of the world or to any country.

The difficulty in this area of arms sales and grants is that those who manufacture, understandably, are interested in getting their products out wherever they can, and sometimes that is not in the interest either of the United States or of the country or countries involved.

I would particularly like to commend Senator PELL, who has shown leadership in the area of education, and who has shown a sensitivity in this whole area of foreign relations.

The Presiding Officer, the distinguished Senator from Virginia, Senator ROBB, sits on the Foreign Relations Committee. There are probably a few occasions when I have voted differently from Senator PELL on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, but not very many. One of the reasons is that I find myself in general agreement with him, and the second is I trust his judgment. And when it is a marginal call, frankly, Senator PELL through the years has learned some practical things.

One of the things he has learned is that we have to reinvigorate ACDA. He is one of those who helped to create this entity. I think his amendment is a step in the right direction. I am pleased to be here and to join in supporting it.

I yield the floor, Mr. President.

Mr. PELL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island, Senator PELL.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Illinois for his very kind remarks. He is correct; I do take great interest in ACDA since it was in 1961 when we made the decision to make it a statutory body and not set up by Executive order.

Mr. President, I ask that when we come to vote on this issue, we have a rollcall vote. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. PELL. I yield the floor.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KERRY. 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. KERRY. Mr. President, as the Chair well knows, this is an issue which we discussed at some length within the committee about where to go with ACDA. It is fair to say that it has disappointed a lot of people’s expectations over the years for a lot of different reasons, not the least of which was during a certain period of time we had the administration that was not particularly concerned about arms control and consciously tried to move the agency off to the side. Other things have conspired to make it difficult for the Agency to be able to perform.

I would like to congratulate the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, Senator PELL, because I think if there is any issue that he has identified with and which he has cared about throughout his years in the Senate, it is the issue of proliferation. He has constantly shown leadership in the effort to try to guarantee not only that we have a strong ACDA, but that we have other initiatives in an effort to rein in the incredible increase in the proliferation of weapons, not just nuclear proliferation, but the general weapons of warfare.

As Senator PELL has served on the Arms Control Observer Group during those critical years of the cold war when that was particularly active, he has consistently pushed this issue. I know how hard he has worked to frame a new structure for ACDA and a new dynamic within which, hopefully, we can address the growing proliferation issues that we face, I might add the important complex proliferation issues that we face in the wake of the changes with the demise of the Soviet Union.

The question of control over both tactical and strategic weapons, the process of destruction, the questions of the defense arrangement, security arrangements with which we will address the new NATO, and the Partnership for Peace, all of these are very significant. And to have a revitalized ACDA in that context I think embodies a lot of our hopes, all of us, that we are going to have an agency and an entity that really can frame these issues and assist the President in putting good choices in front of the Congress and the American people.

So I congratulate the chairman of the committee. I hope that this effort to revitalize ACDA will bear fruit.

Mr. President, I do not think there is any further debate.

Mr. HELMS. I believe he has the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate?

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the yeas and nays be vitiated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KERRY. I do not believe there is further debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate? If not, the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Rhode Island, Mr. PELL.

The amendment (No. 1250) was agreed to.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PELL. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. HELMS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order to ask for the yeas and nays on amendment No. 1248.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, if I could just reserve the right to object—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The request is in order at this time.

The pending business of the Senate at this point is amendment No. 1248 offered by the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. HELMS. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. HELMS. I thank the chair.

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. KERRY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. BOXER). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KERRY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment of the Senator from North Carolina be temporarily set aside.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 1251 AND AMENDMENT NO. 1252,
EN BLOC

Mr. KERRY. Madam President, I send two amendments to the desk on behalf of Senator GLENN and ask for their immediate consideration, en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KERRY], on behalf of Mr. GLENN, proposes amendments numbered 1251 and 1252, en bloc.

Mr. KERRY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendments be dispensed with.

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

The amendments are as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 1251

(Purpose: To eliminate the provisions relating to an Inspector General of the Department of State and the Foreign Service, and for other purposes)

On pages 2 and 3 strike out the items relating to sections 136 through 140 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

Sec. 136. Refugee affairs.

Sec. 137. Office of foreign missions.

Sec. 138. Women's human rights protection.

Sec. 139. Repeals.

On page 41, beginning on line 5, strike out all through line 3 on page 42.

On page 42, line 4, strike out "SEC. 137." insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 136."

On page 43, line 22, strike out "SEC. 138." insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 137."

On page 46, line 7, strike out "SEC. 139." insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 138."

On page 46, line 20, strike out "SEC. 140." insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 139."

AMENDMENT NO. 1252

At the appropriate place in the bill, add the following new section:

SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the Sense of the Senate that—

(a) There is a growing concern among some of the Members of this body that the unlimited terms of Office of Inspectors General in federal agencies may be undesirable, therefore,

(b) The issue of amending the Inspector General Act to establish term limits for Inspectors General should be examined and considered as soon as possible by the appropriate committees of jurisdiction.

Mr. KERRY. Madam President, in the current section 136 of the bill that the committee has submitted, there is a 6-year term limit in the position of the State Department inspectors general. This amendment was adopted as part of the en bloc package within the full committee markup, and it was offered by Senator HELMS because of concern over the inspector general's performance, and that concern was shared particularly by Senator DODD and by other Senators on the committee.

After the bill was reported, Senator GLENN, as chairman of the Governmental Affairs Committee, contacted us and expressed some concern about the jurisdictional issue of the Governmental Affairs Committee and this particular amendment.

I might say to the Chair and to my colleagues that the Foreign Relations Committee clearly has jurisdiction over the State Department's inspector general, and that is established in the Foreign Service Act of 1980. The committee simultaneously recognizes the Governmental Affairs Committee's in-

terest in and jurisdiction over the question of inspectors general within certain agencies and departments of the Government. Therefore, we have worked out a compromise, which these two amendments represent.

The first amendment strikes section 136, dealing with the term of the inspector general's service, and the second amendment adds a new section at the appropriate place in the bill which expresses the sense of the Senate regarding unlimited terms for inspectors general.

We adopted this section because, frankly, a number of Members on the committee were very concerned about this sort of open-ended potential for service, a kind of life tenure, if you will, without, in our feelings, sufficient performance to merit that or oversight capacity.

So, Senator GLENN has now assured the committee that he is going to address this question of term limits for inspectors general in upcoming hearings with possible amendments to the Inspector General Act. And he has indicated his personal support for the sense-of-the-Senate language which urges the examination of the term limit question by the appropriate committee as early as possible.

So in light of this, the committee is prepared, and has agreed, I think, to delete the section 136 language and add the sense-of-the-Senate language.

I urge adoption of these amendments, en bloc.

Mr. HELMS. Madam President, I confess that it is with hesitation and reservation, but with full respect of the Senator from Massachusetts, that I support the amendment of Senator KERRY.

I should make it a matter of record that I have not been in agreement with the thrust of this amendment. The Senator's amendment, for reasons he has explained, deletes the current provision to establish a 6-year term limit on inspectors general and replace it with a watered-down, sense-of-the-Senate language, noting that some of us are concerned about the unlimited terms of some executive branch inspectors general.

As the Senator has explained—and he did so very clearly—there was a debate over the turf aspect of this question. I have all the respect in the world for Senator GLENN. I have, on occasion, stood up for my committee's turf.

So we agreed to let this issue rest until the Senate debates the Inspector General Act of 1980 later this year.

As my friend from Massachusetts has indicated, the original provision was bipartisan and cooperative, in terms of an effort on the part of the members of the committee, demonstrated by the fact that this provision was included in an en bloc package of amendments prior to the committee markup of a bill.

It may sound complicated, but it really is not. I contend to this moment that the Foreign Relations Committee has had and will continue to have jurisdiction over the inspector general for the State Department. It was our committee that created the position in the Foreign Service Act of 1980. No question about that. It is our committee, the Foreign Relations Committee, that receives the IG reports. We are the Senators who know whether or not the inspector general is performing up to par.

Therefore, on the jurisdictional issue, with all due respect, I must beg to differ with my colleagues who want to claim the jurisdiction for their committees. Since the current inspector general announced his retirement a few weeks ago, the original language of section 136 loses just a bit of its urgency. However, I do hope that later this year the Senator from Ohio [Mr. GLENN] will take up the issue of term limits for inspectors general.

I commend my colleague from Massachusetts for his amendment, and I support it fully at this point. I regret that he had to offer, or felt obliged to offer, a watered down version. But we can get to that later and take care of it.

I thank the Chair, and I yield the floor.

Mr. KERRY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KERRY. Madam President, let me say I could not agree with my colleague more. He understands the situation. I understand the situation. We are bowing to the necessities of jurisdiction, and we respect that. We would probably—not probably; we would ask the same thing.

But I think both the Senator and I do not want, and others concerned with it do not want, a lot of time elapsing, or this to become somehow a permissiveness for this egregious situation to not somehow be addressed. I certainly commit to the Senator that we will join together in guaranteeing that that is not the situation.

I do not believe there is any further debate, Madam President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further debate, the question is on agreeing to the amendments, en bloc.

The amendments (Nos. 1251 and 1252), en bloc, were agreed to.

Mr. HELMS. Madam President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendments were agreed to.

Mr. KERRY. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum has been noted. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. PRESSLER. Madam President, I rise to say that on this State Department authorization bill, I shall be active in supporting amendments that would push toward reform of the United Nations. I believe the Secretary General should appoint an Inspector General at the United Nations. It has seemed very strange to me that after many years of audits that have consistently reported mismanagement and corruption within the U.N.'s bureaucracy, very little has been done to clean it up from a management point of view. I know that management is one of the dullest of subjects. I happen to believe, for example, that Congress should hold a whole session of oversight hearings rather than legislating new agencies and legislating new programs. I think we should make the Government that is already established work to our advantage.

Within our various Departments, we have an inspector general who roots out corruption and finds if funds are being misused. The American taxpayers pay nearly 35 percent, if you add it all up, of the expenses of the United Nations. Indeed, I am for our being in the United Nations. I have always been pro-United Nations. I think the United Nations has a role to play, but that role is crippled when we cannot deliver supplies, when we cannot deliver food without it being stolen and resold in the streets the next morning. Various regional headquarters of the United Nations receive medical materials, we are subsequently told they were stolen out of the warehouses and the next day they are for sale on the black market.

There have been a variety of United Nations internal audits that have pinpointed individuals and offices that have engaged in thievery and corruption, not to mention just bad management. The time has come for the American taxpayers to be assured that the United Nations is interested in reform and good management. It has long been my feeling that the State Department has been too soft in terms of pushing for reform at the United Nations. The U.S. delegation to the United Nations under both Republican and Democratic Presidents thinks of itself, basically, as a diplomatic mission and does not emphasize management reform. We did get Dick Thornburgh appointed to be the number two manager within the United Nations, but he was fired after a year and the report he wrote was shredded. No copies are available. Thornburgh, the former Governor of Pennsylvania, has spoken on this subject a good deal. So we have a situation in which our taxpayers are asking us what is going on?

One of the amendments that I shall offer would require that an Inspector

General be appointed or our contributions will decrease. I know that I have worked closely with Senator DOLE, the Republican leader, on a package of amendments for reform at the United Nations I think most Americans support our involvement in the United Nations. We hope the United Nations can carry out missions of peace and delivery of food and medicine throughout the world. We hope the United Nations can be an instrument for peace, but we think it will be a better United Nations if there are management reforms.

Madam 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. KERRY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. KERRY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a period for morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

RANGELAND REFORM

Mr. WALLOP. Mr. President, I received these letters during the debate on the rangeland reform measures in the 1994 Interior Appropriations bill. When they were submitted to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as part of the debate, they were not printed in their complete form. I would like to resubmit them now, so they can be appreciated in their entirety.

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

SUN LAND AND CATTLE CO.,

HUB AND SPOKE RANCH CO.,

Rawlins, WY, October 20, 1993.

OPEN LETTER TO SECRETARY BABBITT AND JIM BACA: As ranchers, our backs are to the wall and our lives are passing before our eyes. Our destiny seems to rest on Malcolm Wallop and his ability to avoid cloture and filibuster the appropriations bill that contains the death sentence for the Western livestock industry as we know it.

A segment of people in this country want an end to livestock grazing on Federal lands. That is a given. Right now those people have the upper hand.

The stated goal of the Clinton administration in proposing "rangeland reform '94" is to alleviate the "poor" condition of the Western range. Let's take them at their word and assume they really want to improve rangeland conditions.

Each range is different. Each allotment is unique. Each should be studied by range conservationists in complete cooperation with the rancher involved. The type of soil, topography, vegetation, precipitation and climate,

including micro-climates, wind direction, etc. must be considered. There are many things that can be done that are productive, at least as long as it rains.

As an example, Dr. Alan Savery has had great success with his holistic resource management techniques. Intensive grazing, when thoroughly understood and done properly can produce astounding results. Let's use it on Federal land.

The rating system used by BLM, at least in this area, is very inadequate. While I understand the system is being changed, or is going to be, it has resulted in very misleading ratings in many areas. Many species, even though native, are not listed in the technical guide, so their presence gives no rating. Other species, many highly desirable, give negative ratings because they are not considered "native" to this particular area. Whether they are or not, is not always positively known.

The percentage of species allowed in each type of soil seems to be set in stone. Over 30% sagebrush in sandy soil will produce a poor rating even though old pioneer journals recount how the brush was so tall and thick 150 years ago as to almost stop their wagons from proceeding. And these are the areas that are critical winter habitat for antelope.

Areas with an abundance and wide variety of woody species are given lower ratings, yet are excellent deer habitat. Too many willows with little diversity along a stream produces a poor rating, yet is great for moose. The desirability of habitat for wildlife is not considered in this rating system.

If the range is to be rated strictly on biodiversity and forage for cattle and sheep, let's reseed it to what is desired. We know it can be done with great success, as long as we get moisture.

O.K. Let's be realistic. Those two options probably won't happen. Not right away.

We know the powers that want us off the Federal land. A June 23 memo from assistants Kevin Sweeney and Lucia Wyman to Secretary of the Interior Babbitt, Jim Baca and Tom Collier stated, "Our own statistics can be used to show the range is in better shape than at any point in this century. With that in mind, we must make deliberate and public attempts to prove how bad the conditions are in many riparian areas." In other words, "Our arguments are lies so we must really push them."

So if they want us off Federal land I have three suggestions. Ranchers should be given a choice:

1. Buy us out. Just the ranch, not the cattle. That includes paying for our private land, our improvements on Federal land and the grazing permits that we bought and paid hard money for before we ever got to the grazing fee, and on which we have been taxed. Get a fair appraisal of pre-Mike Synar prices and buy us out.

A few years ago there was a dairy buy-out. The Government bought quite a few dairy herds. Enough to wreck the cattle market for a while. Vermont Senator Jim Jeffords said he wanted his dairy farmers to be able to "retire with dignity." We would like to do the same rather than start over in our "golden years."

2. Instead of buying us out, buy a private land ranch—probably in another state—of equivalent value and trade us. We'll just move our cows.

3. Swap private and Federal land in the checkerboard areas so ranchers there could get off the Federal land and block up the private land. This would provide pastures with strictly private holdings and large blocks of

Federal and with no private land intermingled. Of course, it would provide the rancher with just half of the pasture he had before. He would have to be compensated for his grazing permits and improvements, at the very least.

4. Small Federal land parcels surrounded by private lands should be sold at a nominal cost to the owners of the surrounding lands. These small pieces are always bare, rocky hills or an equivalent. That is why no one took title to them.

Last, but probably most important, let's use real science instead of pseudo-science where the procedures are tailored to fit the desired outcome.

Boulder, WY, October 20, 1993.

Senator MALCOLM WALLOP,
Russell Senate Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR WALLOP: Hello, my name is Suzy Michnevich. I am one of three working partners on our cattle ranch in Sublette County, Wyoming. We own 3,083 deeded acres. We also hold one state school section and a 583 AUM Forest Service lease most of which is on the Bridger Wilderness and 1,043 AUMs of Bureau of Land Management leases located in two tracts, one 14 miles southwest of and the other two miles northeast of our deeded land. We have approximately 1,000 cattle, 20 horses, several herds of antelope, deer, elk, and a few moose, many birds, rabbits, rodents, trout, and three families including six children for which we feel responsible.

My great-grandfather took excellent care of his and the government's land by being instrumental in the formation of the New Fork East Fork Grazing Association in 1902. Today, we are still members of this association which is committed to the conservation of our resources. So much so that in 1992 our association was nominated by the U.S. Forest Service for a stewardship award. My family is involved in agriculture for the long haul. For as long as we can afford to raise cattle, we will do so. We raise our children beside us feeding cattle, moving cattle, irrigating, fixing fences, and putting up hay.

My son spent his first two years with me in a backpack or in a truck or tractor, not in daycare. He is taught our work ethic and our morals from before sunup to after sundown. He is not raised by someone else. Now as a kindergartner, he reflects this by going to school and enjoying his classmates and taking his classwork seriously. He is one confident little boy.

My husband is a carpenter and works away from the ranch as does my sister-in-law. We could not make ends meet were it not for their outside jobs. Both of them help on the ranch when they can.

Our deeded ranch land along with the state and federal leases has a greater carrying capacity than we now utilize so we are in the painful process of rebuilding. Each partner receives \$800 per month. We are working toward increasing this salary in the near future. Along with the outside jobs mentioned, our families live on this amount of money without welfare, free school lunches, or free health care. Our lives are rich in other rewards besides money. We do, however, have a breaking point.

Ranching in northwestern Wyoming is difficult at best. Profit margins are very thin. Every day we wage war with weather we cannot change and disease. We have made enormous strides with animal health, but if our neighbors do not take the same precautions we do, then our animals' health can be in

jeopardy. We have to count on our ranching neighbors to do the right thing not only for themselves personally but for us also.

In our community they do for the most part. We work together even though we all have differences of opinion concerning ranching practices, i.e. different types of haying operations, horses vs. mechanization, fertilizer usage, and how much water is used to irrigate a particular piece of ground. We do, however, all agree on the following points:

1. We are opposed to overgrazing and try to improve our resource which is grass. We have been excellent stewards of the land.

2. Families are the mainstay of the ranching industry. Our children need to know they can continue to make a decent living in agriculture.

3. We all enjoy wildlife and enjoy providing habitat for them, however, if cost and regulations cause us to abandon leases, the wildlife and hunters who chase them will no longer be welcome visitors.

My family is among fourth-generation ranchers in the East Fork valley, but we see changes occurring. A few of our neighbors have had financial problems and decided to sell out. Our new neighbors, not having the experience of four generations, have made stewardship errors that make our peers in the community cringe. Some have decided not to raise cattle, allowing the land to go fallow. Some have decided to keep cattle but do not realize the work, feed, and care necessary to raise cattle at an elevation of 7,200 feet. It takes years for them to learn to shift priorities from their own personal comfort to their animals' care. Newcomers do not allow fishing or hunting on their properties even to those visitors polite enough to ask permission. I have noticed that the cowboy mystique wears off within a few years after purchase and for-sale signs go up. To whom will these places be sold? The serious livestock raisers cannot afford to pay land prices that have been inflated by sale after sale. Is this valley doomed to become an unproductive vacation spot for the wealthy who put their own personal interests first? Each year our land taxes increase because of inflated land values caused by our new neighbors' ability to buy land that cannot pay for itself through production. Due to these continually inflating prices, the land must be sold again and again at an ever higher price eventually to someone who will subdivide or to someone who is just a part-time resident and who does not feel the need to become a responsible member of the community.

If a substantial grazing-fee increase is voted into law, it will be one more nail in the ranching industry's coffin. If petty regulations designed to assist in the demise of ranchers using and paying for federal lands are also voted in, then each one of those will be yet another nail in that same coffin. This community and our local town of Pinedale has a stable economy augmented by agriculture. If agriculture is removed so will a year-around economic stabilizer.

Ranching provides not only a safe, economical food source but also responsible community members and a recreational resource to those who respect us and our land. I feel a large grazing-fee increase and increased regulations are the government's solution to rid themselves of users of federal lands. When the cattle go, the grass will go also. The ability to graze on Federal lands has allowed us to improve this resource. Private grazing leases are virtually unavailable and should be put on the endangered species list.

Honorable Senators, please try to understand western ranching practices before you vote for something that could devastate an entire industry in the western states. Before you decide and vote, I invite you to come see our ranch and stay with my family. Come see and understand our industry firsthand. I invite any of you to come any time. My address is 88 Scab Creek Road, Boulder, Wyoming. We can all survive and prosper together. Thank you.

Sincerely,

SUZY MICHNEVICH.

OCTOBER 19, 1993.

DEAR SENATOR WALLOP: This last gasp letter is written on behalf of ourselves and especially our relatives and neighbors who have a longer heritage of sheep and cattle ranching on the west side of the Big Horn mountains. Several participated in the Bozeman, MT hearing held by Secretary Babbitt and responded in writing as he requested, and again in response to "Rangeland Reform '94."

None of us are against a fair increase in grazing fees and all want to continue to improve rangeland conditions. We sincerely believed in July that the current Administration would sort out fact from rhetoric, as Secretary Babbitt repeatedly stated. The facts would speak for themselves, and we assumed he would work with the western states, governors, local communities and others through the hearing process.

It is now obvious we were wrong. The Administration has become increasingly arrogant and clearly intends to increase fees by 125% and implement new regulations designed to force many small business ranchers into liquidation. Mr. Babbitt concealed his true agenda while in the West. He obviously planned all along to drastically reduce livestock grazing on public lands as part of the political payback commitments to the new big business environmental groups. Many of us were naive to believe the Interior Department appointees would do what is right for our country, and that jobs would be considered somewhat important.

Unless you and your fellow senators are successful in achieving a commonsense compromise that establishes a fair fee system and responsible regulation changes through the EIS process, you can be assured that up to one-third of western federal land livestock producers will be out of business in 3 years. Up to 50,000 jobs will be lost only to be exported. Imports of boxed beef will increase by over 300 million pounds per year with an equivalent annual increase in the deficit. Social impact and welfare payment increases of another \$400 million per year are the last thing our country needs at this time. All for what—a \$30 million maximum increase in annual fees and questionable environmental improvement. If this keeps up, our economy will collapse.

JIM AND VIRGINIA FOREMAN.

STATEMENTS OF REPRESENTATIVE SKELTON, SECRETARY OF THE ARMY WEST, AND CHIEF OF STAFF SULLIVAN

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I want to take this opportunity to welcome back my colleagues and to wish everyone a healthy and rewarding new year. This will be a challenging session; however, I am optimistic that it will be a productive one which will achieve historic legislation on crime and health care.

Mr. President, it should be no surprise to any of us that despite the absence of the Congress, life in the Nation's Capitol continues. During the past 2 months, I had the opportunity to participate in two ceremonies during which I was privileged to hear several noteworthy speeches. I want to share three of those statements with the Senate and ask that they be included in the RECORD immediately following this statement.

The first statement is by our distinguished House colleague, the Honorable IKE SKELTON. Representative SKELTON spoke at the 357th birthday celebration of the National Guard. His statement is notable not only for its praise of the National Guard, but also for its visionary view on the future of NATO.

The second statement is by the Honorable Togo West, the Secretary of the Army, at his welcoming ceremony at Fort Meyer, VA. Secretary West simply and eloquently outlined his goals to provide our Nation the best trained and ready Army in its history.

Finally, I submit Gen. Gordon Sullivan's statement welcoming Secretary West. As the Army's senior military officer, General Sullivan graciously spoke on behalf of the Army's over 1 million men and women and their families in tribute to Secretary West.

Mr. President, I hope my colleagues will take a moment to become familiar with these statements. Each of these men will have a prominent role as we deal with the Nation's problems during the coming months.

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

THE 357TH BIRTHDAY OF THE NATIONAL GUARD—AN ADDRESS BY CONGRESSMAN IKE SKELTON

I. INTRODUCTION

It is a pleasure to be with you today on this 357th anniversary of the National Guard. Let me thank Major General Rees for the honor he has done me by his kind invitation to address this group today. It is also a pleasure to see Major General Killey and General * * *

Allow me to also say how much of a pleasure it is to see a very special friend of mine and of the National Guard—The Honorable Deborah Lee, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Reserve Affairs. Debbie is doing a very good job in the Pentagon and to make the total force better than ever. Her efforts are already beginning to bear fruit as the agreement announced this past Friday on restructuring the Army Guard and Reserve. I have not seen the details yet, so I will reserve judgment on the agreement. But anytime you can get the active Army, the National Guard and the Army Reserve singing from the same sheet of music that has to be counted as positive.

My favorite Assistant Secretary earlier this year gave a speech in which she said "The total force is no longer a concept but a reality." I believe she is right. I hope last week's agreement means we will no longer have an us vs. them attitude between active and reserve component forces. Active, Guard, and Reserve partisans must work together to

help put a brake to the free fall in defense spending. That will be a very difficult task in today's budget climate. Past differences cannot be allowed to continue among the various components. All of us who want a strong national defense, a capable military—active and reserve—need to work together. I hope last week's agreement will help us toward that goal.

Debbie, keep up the good work.

II. ANNIVERSARIES

357th Birthday of National Guard

Today, we celebrate the 357th birthday of the National Guard. By my arithmetic that means that the year of the birth of the National Guard was 1636, more than a century before this Nation declared its independence from Great Britain.

Despite the break that eventually took place between the American colonies and Great Britain, the Guard still retains a number of the customs that came from both the English and the colonial American militia traditions.

England's geographic position as an island separated from the European continent guaranteed its security from invasion. The need that other continental countries felt to maintain large standing armies was largely absent in England. It was able to man its armies with contingents raised locally and commanded by the local nobility. Equally important, such units were called to service on a temporary basis to respond to an immediate crisis. For example, at Tilbury in 1585, Elizabeth I reviewed such a militia brought together to resist an invasion of England threatened by the approach of the Spanish armada.

Those hardy souls who made the voyage across the Atlantic in the early seventeenth century took with them the traditions of the mother country including the militia system. The first colonists were few in number, ignorant of the new land to which they had come, and highly vulnerable to attack from native inhabitants. The militia concept, actively implemented and rigidly enforced in the first decades of colonization after 1607, helped ensure the survival of the tiny English communities from some of the most savage Indian wars in American history. The American colonial militias relied on local recruiting, short period of active duty in response to immediate threats, and territorial restrictions on service. The essential features of that early period are still part of the Guard today.

75th Anniversary of World War I

This year is also the 75th anniversary of the end of World War I, long known as the Great War. Last month I gave a speech in Missouri in which I recalled the great contributions of Missourians who distinguished themselves throughout our Nation's history. One of those Missourians was Harry S. Truman. As those in this audience know, Harry Truman served in the National Guard in that conflict.

As a boy he had decided that he wanted to be a military man, although he was afraid of a gun and would rather run than fight. He had originally enlisted in the Guard on June 14, 1905, Flag Day, at the age of 21. Twelve years later, he was still in the Guard. Though he was beyond the draft age, was operating a 600 acre farm, and had an oil lease on 320 acres of land, he left all this to join the artillery. He was motivated by a spirit of deep patriotism.

He sailed to France aboard the USS *George Washington*, on Good Friday 1918. After a voyage of 12 to 13 days, he arrived in Brest.

Soon after his arrival, his regiment, the 129th Field Artillery embarked upon a 6 week training course. Promoted to Captain, he commanded Battery D, and took it into action in August, participating in the Meuse-Argonne offensive until October 3. He saw further action in the Verdun sector from October 16 to November 7 and yet again in the Meuse-Argonne from November 7 until November 11 when the Armistice went into effect.

He returned from France in April 1919 and left service in May. Yet the following year, he accepted appointment as a Major of Field Artillery in the Officer's Reserve Corps. He attained the rank of Colonel, commanding a field artillery regiment in July 1932. He attended summer military camp every year but one from 1923 to 1933.

Years later he said "I've always been sorry I did not get a university education in the regular way. But I got it in the army the hard way—and it stuck."

III. FUTURE OF NATO

As we celebrate the birthday of the National Guard and recall Harry Truman's role as a member of the Guard in World War I, it is also appropriate to take some of those lessons of history and apply them today.

After Harry Truman and his fellow veterans came home after World War I, the United States entered a period of isolationism. We resisted involvement in the affairs of the world, and did so at our own expense.

After the defeat of the axis powers in 1945, the specter of Soviet communism threatened a prostrate Western Europe. At the time, the United States was the only Democratic country with the military and economic resources able to thwart the aims of the Soviet Union in Western Europe. Through the policy of containment the United States vigorously resisted this new threat. The Truman doctrine, which provided military and economic aid to Greece and Turkey in 1947, was soon followed by the Marshall Plan, which provided economic relief to the rest of Europe. The signing of the NATO agreement in 1949 committed the military power of the United States to the defense of Western Europe.

The generation that had come to power in the 1940s was determined not to repeat the mistakes of the 1920s and 1930s: Isolationism did not guarantee peace; appeasement only encouraged dictators. As the Soviets sought to gain elsewhere what they were unable to achieve in Western Europe, this high stakes contest between the two superpowers spread to virtually every region of the world—from Europe to Asia, the Middle East, Africa, and Latin America.

The cost was considerable, close to 100,000 American lives in two Asian wars. However, I believe that we can take a certain measure of pride in our accomplishments. Like Atlas, we shouldered our burdens well. Areas of the world that were completely devastated were soon on the way to economic recovery due to a combination of American generosity and self-interest. Western Europe is strong, vigorous, and prosperous, as is that island nation on the other side of the globe, Japan. Europe and Japan prospered as a result of the far-reaching economic, diplomatic, and military policies adopted by the Truman administration and supported by every American administration thereafter.

Elsewhere in East Asia, a credible argument can be made that the sacrifices made by the United States in Vietnam were not in vain. True, despite our considerable efforts, Indochina fell—Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos. And yet, I believe that the period of

our involvement in Vietnam bought time for the other countries of southeast Asia. If some of the dominoes fell, not all of them did. Thailand, Malaysia, Singapore, and Indonesia had time to develop and strengthen themselves politically and economically. As members of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations [ASEAN] their average economic rate of growth in the decade after 1975 was 7 percent in real terms, twice the global average. Today East Asia has replaced Western Europe as America's leading overseas trading partner. Very few would have predicted such a development in 1965.

Today, there is a great debate concerning the future of NATO. It succeeded in its original purpose—defending Western Europe against the Soviet threat. That threat disappeared 2 years ago.

This coming January President Clinton and the political leaders of other NATO countries will meet in Brussels to decide the future of history's most successful alliance.

A key issue that will be discussed is NATO's enlargement. Poland, Hungary, the Czech Republic, and Slovakia are actively seeking membership in NATO. They are properly concerned about developments in Russia, especially the Russian military's new doctrine that seeks to re-establish Russian control over the former Soviet Union.

The recent meetings over the past 2 weeks by NATO foreign and defense officials have led to the endorsement of the policy known as Partnership for Peace. It is an effort to give hope to those Central European countries wanting to become NATO members without offending Russian leaders, especially in the military establishment, who are suspicious of an expansionist western military alliance. No countries are named no time-tables offered for those wanting to join NATO. But the door is left open.

Having studied the matter at some length, I believe that the Partnership for Peace Program is a good start but it must be part of a broader effort.

First, explicit criteria for membership should be listed: a stable functioning democracy, protection of minority rights, civilian control of the military, open and detailed defense budgets.

Second, I believe the inclusion of Hungary, Poland, the Czech Republic, and Slovakia in NATO would actually increase stability in Eastern Europe. Much the way the Soviet Union acceded to unified Germany becoming part of NATO, I believe Russia could be convinced that the inclusion of the four Central European countries in NATO would be in its interest also.

Third, various NATO committees should be employed to increase contacts among the countries now in NATO, those in Central Europe wanting to join, and those in the Soviet successor states, namely committees dealing with economics, scientific affairs, environmental issues, airspace coordination, and civil emergency planning.

IV. CONCLUSION

Some may wonder how we convince an American public that NATO remains important even after the cold war has ended. Twice this century we became involved in European wars despite our intentions to stay out. During the period of time that we have been a European power, with troops stationed in Europe, Europe has experienced its longest period of peace since Roman times. I believe Americans can be convinced that it is in our strategic interest to remain in Europe, to remain in NATO.

The American National Guard, being part of the total force, should be just as inter-

ested in the NATO process as its active duty counterparts. Peace—just as conflict—affects all who wear the uniform. So let's follow the work and developments in progress. If it is successful, and peace in Europe continues, the Harry Trumans of Tomorrow will not have to bear the burden of freedom and security in another European conflict.

Again, congratulations on the anniversary of America's National Guard. It has been and will long remain a steady rock of our Nation's freedom.

REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE TOGO D. WEST, JR.—WELCOMING CEREMONY

Thank you, General Sullivan, for those extremely gracious comments and for your warm introduction. A special thanks as well to the members of the Old Guard and the Army Band who have participated here. The men and women of America's Army around the world are certainly well represented by you here today, and we in the West family are especially appreciative of your efforts, as well as the efforts of the entire Army community in making us feel welcome and at home. We are proud to return to the Army and to join its leadership team, and we look forward to our association with you.

Deputy Secretary Perry, General Shalikashvili, General Sullivan, Admiral Kelso, General Colin Powell, Senator Thurmond, distinguished Members of the House of Representatives, Mayor Kelly, distinguished guests, members and friends of the United States Army, ladies and gentlemen all, I am pleased to join you on this day and at this time. A number of people have had a hand in making this day possible and I owe thanks to them all.

First, of course, I deeply appreciate the President's nomination and, upon confirmation, appointment of me to lead our Army. I am gratified by the recommendation in my behalf by the Secretary of Defense and his Deputy, Bill Perry, to the President and by their continued support and encouragement of me during the period of nomination, confirmation and transition.

I appreciate as well the support and advice of the Members of the Senate and of the House of Representatives during this period. I especially appreciate the time and thoughtfulness of the Members of the Senate Armed Services Committee and their staffs as they went about their constitutional duties, and the wisdom imparted to me by other Members of the Senate as well. I am indebted to those Members of the House of Representatives, including the Delegate from the District of Columbia, the Honorable Eleanor Holmes Norton, for their counsel and support. We in the Army and in the Department of Defense understand the constitutional role of the United States Congress in raising and equipping the nation's Army, and we value the cooperative relationship that exists between the Department of Defense and the legislative branch of government.

I am grateful to the members of my family who, for a family as small as ours, are here in unusual number—my law school classmate, life's partner, severest critic, most dependable friend, my wife Gail; our daughters Tiffany and Hilary, who continue to grow in grace and beauty and wisdom, and who are a constant source of joy and pride to their parents; their uncle, Theodore Newton Berry, whom I have known since he was eleven, then a fine boy, later a fine young man and, now, somewhat older, but still a fine person; and his parents, my mother-in-law, Johnnie Mae Berry, a warm and wonderful human being, and my father-in-law, Theodore

Moody Berry, a true American hero who rose from selling newspapers on the street corners of Cincinnati as a child to become the Mayor of that city.

My mother and father are here today; she, in person, he, now dead some twenty years, in spirit. It is their discipline—the discipline of two dedicated teachers in the Winston-Salem public school system—and their high expectations that have shaped me and that influence me still to this day. They and their entire generation represent the people on whose shoulders I and my generation have stood to reach this point.

You can see that this is, in many ways, for me, a family day. And members of other families of which I am or have felt a part, my church, my community, the National Cathedral, and the Kennedy Center are also here. Those families, too, have made this occasion possible. They include former teachers, fellow students and friends from my hometown of Winston-Salem, North Carolina; colleagues and professors from our days at Howard University; fellow lawyers and workers from the Army Judge Advocate General's Corps, my former law firms, the Navy General Counsel's Office, the Department of Defense General Counsel's Office; and former colleagues from other Army and Navy offices, from the Office of the Secretary of Defense, and from my former corporation—all have helped to bring me to this point. And for that, I am truly grateful.

I have been called to lead the finest land force in the world. Your United States Army is a force without equal anywhere on the globe. Discharging the responsibilities of this office will require my best efforts in caring for the men and women who are America's Army. I will give that effort. And I am encouraged by the realization that I will not be required to do it alone.

I could not ask for a better team than the one assembled here. General Gordon Sullivan, our Chief of Staff, from whom you have just heard, has been the key architect of the Army's response to a constantly and swiftly changing world. His service, especially over the past year, has been as an exemplar of selfless, dedicated leadership. As Chief of Staff and Acting Secretary over the past several months, he has given the best of himself, and he has done it time and time again. General Sullivan, there are not words to express nor accolades sufficient to acknowledge your contributions to this Army you so clearly love and this country you so ably serve.

Joe Reeder, the newly appointed Under Secretary of the Army, brings an enthusiasm and high regard for America's soldiers formed during his own time of active service, as West Point cadet, commissioned officer, Ranger, Army lawyer and staunch supporter of Army concerns. Together, with General Sullivan, we are determined to deliver for our soldiers just as they are delivering for us.

Determination and pride, however, will not do the job alone. For that reason, I have a specific message for the Army's leadership, military and civilian, assembled here today. These are my expectations, and they frame the requirements I will impose. My goal for the Army is a simple one, and I have already stated it: to make our Army better tomorrow than it was yesterday, and to transmit that Army to my successor better trained, better equipped and better supported than the already high state in which it was transmitted to me. To fulfill this goal, I will require your personal support and your enthusiasm. But there is more: I require that you

adopt as a personal mandate that you will fulfill your fullest potential in every action you take, every responsibility you assume, every endeavor you attempt. I direct this challenge to you not as a means of your personal development, but rather because, as you already know, the soldiers you serve and lead deserve your best effort and, as I and this Administration know, the American people demand it.

Finally, this closing thought. This is a wonderful day. It fills me with pride and joy, and I hope it is a source of some fulfillment for my family and friends as well. But this day is not about me. It is about America's Army.

It is about that Army as it faces new challenges this year and enters a new chapter in its history today. It is about that Army as it faces a world grown newly—and gravely—complex, even as some old threats die. And it is about the men and women who face the new complexity.

They are the active duty members, reservists, National Guardsmen and Guardswomen, and Department of the Army civilians. And they are our family members.

They are not strangers. They are the sons and daughters of our neighborhoods, from next door, or the next block, or the farm a few miles down. In the words of that traditional Christmas carol, "They are our neighbors' children, whom we have seen before." They differ from us only in that they have chosen to do our nation's business, and to do it in uniform, thereby committing themselves to the timeless traditions of duty and service and sacrifice.

To them, I say, we are counting on you, just as we always have. We know you will not let us down because, in the history of this nation, you never have.

And, just as you—America's sons and daughters—have stood and are standing up for America; this President, this Secretary of Defense, this Deputy Secretary of Defense, this Under Secretary of the Army, this Chief of Staff, this Secretary of the Army and this Nation will continue to stand up for you. We can do no less.

Bless you all; thanks for making this day possible and for sharing it with me.

REMARKS BY GENERAL GORDON R. SULLIVAN AT THE WELCOME CEREMONY IN HONOR OF THE HONORABLE TOGO D. WEST JR., SECRETARY OF THE ARMY

Members of Congress, Mayor Kelly (District of Columbia), Mr. Perry (Deputy Secretary of Defense), Mr. Days (U.S. Solicitor General), former Secretaries of the Army Mr. Alexander, Mr. Ailes, and Mr. Stahr, General and Mrs. Shalikhvili (Chairman of the JCS), General and Mrs. Powell (former Chairman of the JCS), Admiral Kelso (Chief of Naval Operations), distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, it is a real pleasure to see all of you here today for this important ceremony. The Army today welcomes the Honorable Mr. Togo West as the sixteenth Secretary of the Army, and I thank all of you for being here in support of the Army.

Let me also take a moment to thank the soldiers here today—members of the Old Guard and the United States Army band, "Pershing's Own." As usual they are delivering a superb performance—truly representing the spirit, pride, and professionalism of all the soldiers, all the fine young men and women, serving their nation today.

This is a great day for the Army and a great day for the Nation. It's a real pleasure to welcome a new leader to the United States Army. But while he is new to the job

of Secretary of the Army, he is by no means new to leadership, service with the military, or service to his fellow citizens.

Mr. West has been associated with the Army, the armed forces and public service since his graduation from law school. A captain in the Army Judge Advocate General Corps, early in his career he came to know soldiers and to value the importance of the American soldier to a strong national defense.

Both his professional ability and his dedication to public service are evident from his service across three presidential administrations. Service in the Department of Justice under President Ford; appointed General Counsel of the Navy, and then General Counsel for the Department of Defense by President Carter; and in 1982, service on a special panel for the Secretary of State.

A respected and accomplished attorney, he is also a leader in the community as well. He is currently the Chairman of the Kennedy Center Friends and Community Board, has previously served as the Chairman of the Trustees Council of the YMCA, and serves on the Standing Committee of the Episcopal Diocese of Washington—to name only a few of his numerous community activities.

An accomplished professional, an experienced public servant, and a selfless contributor to the community—Mr. West is a leader. The Army could not be more fortunate than to be able to welcome Mr. West as the new Secretary at this critical juncture in our history.

The Army today stands at the threshold of the 21st Century, and has in many ways already entered a new era. We are an Army that has experienced significant change in the past 4 years—we are in many ways a changed Army.

But we are by no means finished. There are challenges still to be met. The future will not be placid—it never is. These are very demanding times—tough missions—missions which require strategic agility in thought and deed. We are transforming ourselves and serving our Nation. We are doing it. We are employing our forces and training our forces.

Mr. West, the soldiers of America's Army—active, National Guard, and Army Reserve—are fortunate to have a leader who has a clear vision of the challenges we will face in the 21st Century. We are fortunate to have in Mr. West a leader who knows that Nation's defense depends on an Army that is trained and ready, an Army with the absolute best equipment, and an Army that is made up of top quality young men and women, the top athletes, scholars and citizens, from every one of our fifty states and territories.

We are proud and honored to have Secretary West as our leader. Today America's Army—over 1 million men and women and their families; from every corner of our country; from camps, posts and stations around the globe—America's Army welcomes a new leader, our new Secretary.

Mr. West, America's Army today stands trained and ready; we are meeting the challenges of today; you will lead us in to the 21st Century; we are ready. Count on us!

SENATE QUARTERLY MAIL COSTS

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, in accordance with section 318 of Public Law 101-520, I am submitting the summary tabulations of Senate mass mail costs for the fourth quarter of fiscal year 1993, that is the period of July 1, 1993, through September 30, 1993, to be print-

ed in the RECORD, along with the quarterly statement from the U.S. Postal Service setting forth the Senate's total postage costs for the quarter.

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

SENATE QUARTERLY MASS MAIL VOLUMES AND COSTS FOR THE QUARTER ENDING SEPTEMBER 30, 1993

	Original total pieces	Pieces per capita	Original total cost	Cost per capita
Senators:				
Akaka	0	0.00000	\$0.00	\$0.00000
Baucus	68,666	0.8333	12,660.57	0.1536
Bennett	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000
Biden	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000
Bingaman	19,875	0.1257	4,183.86	0.0265
Bond	21,850	0.0421	4,562.46	0.0088
Boren	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000
Boxer	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000
Bradley	8,850	0.0114	1,344.01	0.0017
Breaux	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000
Brown	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000
Bryan	97,920	0.07379	14,900.32	0.1123
Bumpers	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000
Burns	61,067	0.7411	12,084.11	0.1467
Byrd	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000
Campbell	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000
Chafee	32,050	0.3189	5,395.19	0.0537
Coast	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000
Cochran	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000
Cohen	16,350	0.1324	3,097.15	0.0251
Conrad	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000
Coverdell	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000
Craig	9,200	0.0862	1,891.29	0.0178
D'Amato	260,300	0.1437	44,901.48	0.0248
Danforth	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000
Daschle	4,950	0.0696	75.40	0.0106
DeConcini	6,045	0.0158	4,781.05	0.0125
Dodd	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000
Dole	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000
Domenici	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000
Dorgan	33,175	0.5216	5,081.80	0.0800
Durenberger	80,440	0.1796	11,431.41	0.0255
Evan	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000
Faircloth	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000
Feingold	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000
Feinstein	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000
Ford	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000
Glenn	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000
Gorton	192,665	0.3751	37,660.30	0.0733
Graham	8,165	0.0061	6,530.54	0.0048
Gramm	83,010	0.0470	16,829.88	0.0095
Grassley	403,300	1.4342	61,457.39	0.2186
Gregg	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000
Harkin	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000
Hatch	7,000	0.0386	1,045.86	0.0058
Hatfield	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000
Heflin	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000
Helms	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000
Hollings	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000
Hutchinson	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000
Inouye	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000
Jeffords	13,450	0.2360	3,501.04	0.0614
Johnston	11,610	0.0271	5,056.38	0.0118
Kassebaum	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000
Kempthorne	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000
Kennedy	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000
Kerry	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000
Kohl	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000
Lautenberg	4,387	0.0056	1,714.37	0.0022
Leahy	20,500	0.0396	4,018.18	0.0705
Levin	11,563	0.0123	2,372.72	0.0025
Lieberman	13,650	0.0416	2,268.19	0.0069
Lott	4,000	0.0153	604.07	0.0023
Lugar	5,500	0.0097	1,060.45	0.0019
Mack	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000
Mathews	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000
McCain	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000
McConnell	318,350	0.8478	56,060.17	0.1493
Metzenbaum	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000
Mikulski	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000
Mitchell	55,950	0.4530	8,520.32	0.0690
Moseley-Braun	647,738	0.5569	95,651.15	0.0822
Moyihan	1,627,000	0.8980	295,461.39	0.1631
Murkowski	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000
Murray	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000
Nickles	46,000	0.1432	7,910.08	0.0246
Nunn	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000
Packwood	32,275	0.1084	5,825.48	0.0196
Pell	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000
Pressler	149,498	2.1026	24,644.70	0.3466
Pryor	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000
Reid	29,479	0.2221	10,040.74	0.0757
Riegle	242,150	0.2566	37,141.45	0.0394
Robb	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000
Rockefeller	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000
Roth	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000
Sarbanes	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000
Sasser	129,900	0.2586	18,733.99	0.0373
Shelby	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000
Simon	518,625	0.4459	78,986.85	0.0679

SENATE QUARTERLY MASS MAIL VOLUMES AND COSTS FOR THE QUARTER ENDING SEPTEMBER 30, 1993—Continued

	Original total pieces	Pieces per capita	Original total cost	Cost per capita
Simpson	35,900	0.7704	5,166.97	0.1109
Smith	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000
Specter	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000
Stevens	22,750	0.3876	3,924.33	0.0669
Thurmond	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000
Wallop	11,625	0.2495	2,520.09	0.0541
Warner	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000
Wellstone	49,700	0.1109	8,151.19	0.0182
Wofford	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000
				Total
				Total cost
Other offices:				
The Vice President	0	0.00000	\$0.00	0.00000
The President Pro-Tempore	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000
The Majority Leader	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000
The Minority Leader	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000
The Assistant Majority Leader	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000
The Assistant Minority Leader	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000
Secretary of Majority Conference	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000
Secretary of Minority Conference	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000
Agriculture Committee	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000
Appropriations Committee	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000
Armed Services Committee	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000
Banking Committee	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000
Budget Committee	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000
Commerce Committee	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000
Energy Committee	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000
Environment Committee	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000
Finance Committee	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000
Foreign Relations Committee	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000
Governmental Affairs Committee	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000
Judiciary Committee	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000
Labor Committee	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000
Rules Committee	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000
Small Business Committee	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000
Veterans' Affairs Committee	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000
Ethics Committee	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000
Indian Affairs Committee	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000
Intelligence Committee	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000
Aging Committee	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000
Joint Economic Committee	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000
Joint Committee on Printing	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000
Democratic Policy Committee	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000
Democratic Conference	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000
Republican Policy Committee	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000
Republican Conference	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000
Legislative Counsel	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000
Legal Counsel	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000
Secretary of the Senate	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000
Sergeant at Arms	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000
Narcotics Caucus	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000
SCMTE POW/MIA	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000
				Total
				Total cost

UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE,
Washington DC, December 9, 1993.
Hon. WENDELL H. FORD,
Chairman, Committee on Rules and Administration,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Detailed data on franked mail usage by the U.S. Senate for the fourth quarter, Fiscal Year 1993, is enclosed. Total postage and fees for the quarter is \$3,254,024.

A summary of Senate franked mail usage based upon actual data for the four quarters of Fiscal Year 1993 is as follows: Volume—41,453,448; revenue per piece—\$2,553; revenue—\$10,581,895.00; provisional payments (March 1993)—\$10,000,000.00; deficiency in provisional payments—\$581,895.00.

A bill is enclosed for the difference between the actual charges and the provisional payments.

Also enclosed is a copy of the comparable report for the United States House of Representatives.

If you or your staff have any questions, please call Tom Galgano of my staff.

Sincerely,
THOMAS E. DALE, JR.,
For Alfred Carreon, Jr., Manager, Post Office Accounting Finance, room 8831, Washington, DC.

Enclosures.

SENATE—FRANKED MAIL
(Postal quarter IV, fiscal year 1993)

	Pieces	Rate in dollars	Amount in dollars
Subcategories:			
1. Letters: First class	2,787,354	2900	808,333
Total	2,787,354	2900	808,333
2. Flats: First class	139,719	1.1064	154,585
Total	139,719	1.1064	154,585
3. Parcels:			
Priority—Up to 11 oz	27,440	4.3469	119,279
Priority—Over 11 oz	40,651	3.9547	160,763
4th Class—Regular			
Total	68,091	4.1128	280,042
4. Orange bag pouches: First class	4,706	3608	1,698
Priority—Up to 11 oz	64	2,9063	186
Priority—Over 11 oz	263	5,1027	1,342
Total	5,033	6410	3,226
5. Agriculture bulletins: First class			
Priority—Up to 11 oz			
Priority—Over 11 oz			
3rd Class			
4th Class Special (BK)			
4th Class Regular	69	9,5217	657
Total	69	9,5217	657
6. Yearbooks: 4th Class Special (BK)	775	1,4800	1,147
Total	775	1,4800	1,147
7. Other (odd size parcels):			
Priority—Up to 11 oz			
Priority—Over 11 oz	598	36,2074	21,652
4th Class Special (BK)			
4th Class Regular	2,635	11,0653	29,157
Total	3,233	15,1757	50,809
Total outside DC (See attachment)	360,105	4831	173,954
Permit imprint mailings:			
1st class single piece rate	121,999	2465	30,075
3rd class bulk rate	8,800,385	1319	1,161,108
Parcel post—PI	30	6,8667	206
First class single piece—PI			
Address corrections (3547's)	12	3333	4
Address corrections (3rd CL)	15	2666	4
Mailing list corrections (10 names or less)			
Mailing list corrections (more than 10 names)			
Mailgrams			
IPA—International priority air-mail			
Mailing fees (registry, certified, etc.)			
Postage due/short paid mail			57
Permit fees			
Miscellaneous charges/ADJ			
Express mail service			418,872
Sub-total	12,286,820	2509	3,083,079
Adjustments (PFY to GFY)	390,508	4378	170,945
Grand total	12,677,328	2567	3,254,024

CHARLOTTE MAILLIARD SWIG

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. The rarest of all possible talents is the brilliance to make others radiate with joy. That is the very special quality of Charlotte Mailliard Swig of San Francisco.

Charlotte has the magical gift to transform shadow into sunlight by making even the most humdrum occasion festive and lively.

Today, she is being honored by Episcopal Charities in San Francisco, and I want to call attention of the U.S. Senate to her many accomplishments.

Fittingly, she is being given the Hand-to-Hand Award for her leadership in helping those who are ill and suffering and would be forgotten if it were not for her caring heart. As a past

award to Charlotte makes it all the more so.

In so many ways, she walks hand in hand with those striving to build a stronger, more caring community.

She presently is chair of the effort to raise private contributions to match public funds to build a modern Main Library in San Francisco that will meet the needs of our new technological and fast-moving society. It will employ the latest in computer wizardry to tap into fountains of knowledge in libraries and universities around the world. It will be the prototype for libraries of the 21st century.

The library will provide special collections to satisfy the diversity of a great city, and will offer entertainment and education to young and old alike in an atmosphere that will stimulate the mind and imagination.

The library will be a wonderful resource and splendid sanctuary for all those who treasure the written word, the seeds for which were planted when I was mayor of San Francisco and Charlotte walked with me hand in hand on so many worthy projects.

When I was mayor, I appointed Charlotte San Francisco's chief of protocol to turn visits by presidents and heads of state and all civic occasions into events in which the whole city could participate and take pride and would be truly memorable for everyone involved.

Each event was carried off with flare and imagination from fire works sparkling within the dome of city hall to red, white, and blue balloons sailing skyward to greet the men and women of our Navy as their ships steamed into San Francisco Bay for the annual Fleet Week.

Always, Charlotte gave an unforgettable touch to all she planned. So many events stand out—the Super Bowl-winning Forty Niners parading through downtown San Francisco aboard motorized cablecars, the tens of thousands who arrived at dawn at the Golden State Bridge to celebrate its 50th anniversary in 1987.

Even when President Clinton came to San Francisco late in 1993, Charlotte added her magic by arranging for "Hail to the Chief" to be played not by a full orchestra or a brass band but by a single saxophonist, the great Clarence Clemmons.

Even at times of great personal loss and sorrow, Charlotte's buoyancy never fades, her commitment to her community never lessens. She is truly remarkable.

The Hand-to-Hand Award pays deserving tribute to Charlotte Mailliard Swig for her many civic activities, but to me she is more than a superb leader and wonderfully creative impresario, but she is a close and dear friend, and I welcome this opportunity to personally pay tribute to her.

IRAN-CONTRA FINAL REPORT

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, with the public release of the Iran-Contra final report, the Lawrence Walsh witch-hunt is officially over. But it will never be over for the innocent people whose reputations were nonetheless recklessly, and irreparably, damaged by Mr. Walsh in his final report.

Apparently, Mr. Walsh spared no one, trashing Cabinet Secretaries and personal secretaries alike. As an article appearing in yesterday's Wall Street Journal explained: "Dozens of examples from the * * * final report show Mr. Walsh stomping on his victim's rights. Publishing the report itself is profoundly unfair * * * the final report contains hundreds, perhaps thousands, of * * * unproven allegations, even including excerpts of grand jury testimony."

And, Mr. President, that is the point: When the "Not Guilty" verdict is read or indictments are not brought, a prosecutor normally picks up his briefcase and moves on to the next case. Unlike Mr. Walsh, he does not spend 8 months, at taxpayer expense, memorializing his own efforts and smearing the very people he failed to convict or even indict.

Last year, during the Senate debate over the Reauthorization of the Independent Counsel Act, I offered an amendment restricting the scope of final reports issued by future independent counsels. This amendment, which was designed to ensure that future independent counsels will not resort to Walsh-style smear tactics in their final reports, was adopted by the Senate on a bipartisan basis. It is my hope that the House of Representatives will adopt a similar amendment when it considers the reauthorization measure, perhaps as early as next month.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Wall Street Journal article be inserted in the RECORD immediately after my remarks.

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

[From the Wall Street Journal, Jan. 24, 1994]

DAMNING NEWS IN WALSH REPORT

(By Michael Ledeen)

Most of the working press, hoping as they had for seven years that Iran-Contra special prosecutor Lawrence Walsh would somehow pull a fluffy crime out of his empty hat, treated Mr. Walsh's final report as old news, and in one sense they were right.

After Mr. Walsh's election-eve indictment of Caspar Weinberger (the statute of limitations having quite clearly expired), after his tendentious "interim reports" that slandered his targets without enabling them to reply, after his utterly unethical public statements about the "guilt" of one or another target, the special prosecutor expired with a long sigh. There was no evidence to justify any further prosecutions. He even had some kind words for Ronald Reagan: He meant well; he thought he was advancing the national interest.

Yet there is news in the final report. For starters, there is a drastically revised por-

trait of Secretary of State George Shultz, previously enthroned as the lone teller of truth of the Reagan cabinet.

A HERO DETHRONED

It appears that Mr. Shultz systematically misled Mr. Walsh and Congress about the extent of his knowledge throughout Iran-Contra. The final report contains dozens of excerpts from notes and memorandums prepared by Mr. Shultz's two top assistants that show that many State Department officials were very well informed, indeed, about matters that Mr. Shultz had sworn the department in general and he in particular had been kept in the dark about. "Shultz . . . ultimately acknowledged that his testimony had been incorrect," the report says, but Mr. Walsh decided not to prosecute the former secretary of state because he couldn't prove "beyond a reasonable doubt that his testimony was willfully false."

Yet he did prosecute Mr. Weinberger for allegedly doing precisely what Mr. Shultz had done, and the evidence presented against Mr. Shultz is, if anything, more copious than that against Mr. Weinberger. The choice was probably dictated by personal rapport and political calculation: Mr. Shultz was the darling of Capitol Hill, while Mr. Weinberger was a pricklier personality; Mr. Shultz was cooperative with Mr. Walsh and admitted false testimony, while Mr. Weinberger defiantly held his ground.

A second bit of news is a return to one of Mr. Walsh's original theories about Iran-Contra: that among Mr. Shultz, Mr. Weinberger, Donald Regan, John Poindexter, William Casey, Ed Meese and Robert McFarlane there was a great conspiracy to prevent the special prosecutor and the American people from learning what had really happened. It is a hilarious notion, evidently written by Mr. Walsh's left hand, for the right hand has given us copious evidence that the would-be conspirators—at the very moment Mr. Walsh says they were plotting—were actually making feverish efforts to get each other fired. It requires a hyperactive imagination to believe that such antagonisms could be sublimated in the creation of an Iran-Contra coverup, and then sustained for seven years.

The third headline concerns George Bush, or rather Mr. Walsh's newfound obsession with him. After years of shadowing Mr. Reagan, and hinting darkly that he'd eventually be harpooned, Mr. Walsh suddenly gave up the chase and shifted targets. Whatever the explanation, the shift bespeaks a certain capriciousness in Mr. Walsh's decision-making process, rather than the relentless investigatory rigor he would have us believe he employed.

But most of the news is about Mr. Walsh and his team. Appended to Mr. Walsh's account are more than 1,000 pages of responses from persons named in the report (or, given the nature of Washington, from their lawyers)—a victim's guide to how we subverted our own legal system.

Much of this is brand-new, for it comes from the Indians, not from the chiefs: from secretaries and assistants and other midlevel civil servants. No one is too small to become a target of Mr. Walsh's cruelty; he accuses them all of crime or sin. While stressing he does not have enough to warrant indictment or ensure conviction, he puts his black spot on them.

Their responses constitute a bloodcurdling catalog of Mr. Walsh's viciousness, unethical behavior and astounding incompetence. For example, both of Mr. Weinberger's secretaries, Pentagon professionals for more than 20 years, were accused of lying. Both denied it.

One of them, Thelma Stubbs Smith, was hauled in front of a grand jury, where one of Mr. Walsh's men accused her of lying. Shocked, she denied it, and her lawyer demanded a correction. None was made. Later, Mr. Walsh's lawyer asked to interview her without her lawyer being present; the request was categorically denied. Three days later, Mr. Walsh's lawyer showed up at her door at 8 asking to talk to her. Her husband sent the rogue away.

Meanwhile, the other secretary, Kay Leisz, was informed that she was now a "subject" of Mr. Walsh's investigation. The report accuses her of false testimony; her lawyer's response shows the opposite and says: "It appears that the only rationale that [Mr. Walsh's office] might have . . . is that she may not have said what they wanted to hear."

The same kinds of vengeful actions were taken against Samuel Watson, one of Mr. Bush's assistants. Mr. Watson was accused of pronouncing the magic words "Contra resupply" as a possible subject for discussion at a meeting in the vice president's office. He didn't remember it, and denied any knowledge of the supply of military equipment to the Contras. Mr. Walsh, somehow convinced that Mr. Watson was covering up for Mr. Bush, proclaims him a liar.

Mr. Watson's lawyer, former special prosecutor Jacob Stein, observed that "it was not for illegal acts themselves that the [special prosecutor] sought Mr. Watson but rather . . . [for] his inability years later to remember events as the [special prosecutor] wished him to," Mr. Stein delicately observes that such behavior "violates the fairness of our American sense of right and wrong."

The entire case against CIA station chief Joe Fernandez was a joke. Mr. Walsh bungled the handling of classified information so badly that not even an appeal from the Justice Department to the court could save him. Typically, Mr. Walsh thanked Justice by blaming them for the screwup. His key witness to the charge of false testimony against Mr. Fernandez had already told the Office of the Independent Counsel that his own memory was "tainted" by the public testimony of others, thereby making him a useless source. Mr. Walsh's lawyers attempted to browbeat him into testifying that there was no "taint." And lawyers' replies show that several of the statements Mr. Walsh characterized as false were in fact true.

Strikingly, given Mr. Walsh's propensity for accusing folks of withholding information from him, there are several cases where Mr. Walsh was chastised by federal judges for failing to provide the defense with exculpatory material. In the Weinberger and Fernandez cases, defense attorneys had to use pretty rough language to get Mr. Walsh's team to comply, and—in one of those odd moments that make Iran-Contra such an unlikely tale—it was only when Oliver North's lawyers insisted on it that Mr. Walsh realized he had dozens of cartons of Mr. North's files in his possession.

Such testimony—and there are dozens of examples—shows Mr. Walsh stomping on his victims' basic rights. Indeed, publishing the report is itself profoundly unfair if not illegal. From time immemorial it has been considered unethical for prosecutors to make allegations against persons they do not indict, yet the final report contains hundreds, perhaps thousands, of such unproven allegations, even including excerpts of grand-jury testimony.

Grand-jury proceedings have always been secret, in part to protect people the grand

jury decides not to indict. Mr. Walsh bizarrely proclaimed that such requirements do not apply to special prosecutors and stuck the testimony in his report. The special court that theoretically oversees the work of special prosecutors rejected his theory but permitted the report to appear anyway, on the feeble grounds that very little of the material was really secret anyway and a lot of people—especially journalists—would be angry if the court didn't publish it.

COWARDLY COURT

It was a cowardly thing for the court to do, and the three judges obviously knew it, for they took pains to indicate their sympathy for those unindicted people besmirched by the report. Had they been made of sterner stuff, the judges would have instructed Mr. Walsh to delete all accusations against unindicted people, and to remove all references to grand-jury testimony. Such a document would have fulfilled Mr. Walsh's obligation to submit a final report and also maintained the quaint notion that Americans are held innocent unless proved guilty. We learned some years ago that Mr. Walsh was contemptuous of such archaic legal notions; it was bad news that the special court wouldn't defend them either.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVALS DURING SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 5, 1993, the Secretary of the Senate, on January 10, 1994, during the sine die adjournment of the Senate, received a message from the President of the United States announcing that he had signed the following bills and joint resolutions:

September 21, 1993:

S.J. Res. 50. Joint resolution to designate the weeks of September 19, 1993, through September 25, 1993, and of September 18, 1994, through September 24, 1994, as "National Rehabilitation Week."

S.J. Res. 95. Joint resolution to designate October 1993 as "National Breast Cancer Awareness Month."

S.J. Res. 126. Joint resolution designating September 10, 1993, as "National POW/MIA Recognition Day" and authorizing the display of the National League of Families POW/MIA flag.

October 1, 1993:

S. 184. An act to provide for the exchange of certain lands within the State of Utah, and for other purposes.

October 6, 1993:

S. 464. An act to redesignate the Pulaski Post Office located at 111 West College Street in Pulaski, TN, as the "Ross Bass Post Office."

S. 779. An act to continue the authorization of appropriations for the East Court of the National Museum of Natural History, and for other purposes.

S.J. Res. 61. Joint resolution to designate the week of October 3, 1993, through October 9, 1993, as "Mental Illness Awareness Week."

S.J. Res. 121. Joint resolution to designate October 6, 1993 and 1994, as "German-American Day."

October 8, 1993:

S. 1130. An act to provide for continuing authorization of Federal employee leave transfer and leave bank programs, and for other purposes.

October 12, 1993:

S. 1381. An act to improve administrative services and support provided to the Na-

tional Forest Foundation, and for other purposes.

S.J. Res. 102. Joint resolution to designate the months of October 1993 and October 1994 as "Country Music Month."

October 26, 1993:

S. 1508. An act to amend the definition of a rural community for eligibility for economic recovery funds, and for other purposes.

October 27, 1993:

S.J. Res. 21. Joint resolution designating the week beginning September 18, 1994 as "National Historically Black Colleges and Universities Week."

S.J. Res. 92. Joint resolution designating the month of October 1993 as "National Down Syndrome Awareness Month."

October 28, 1993:

S. 1487. An act entitled the "Middle East Peace Facilitation Act of 1993".

November 1, 1993:

S. 1548. An act to amend the National Wool Act of 1954 to reduce the subsidies that wool and mohair producers receive for the 1994 and 1995 marketing years and to eliminate the wool and mohair programs for the 1996 and subsequent marketing years, and for other purposes.

S.J. Res. 78. Joint resolution designating the beach at 53 degrees 53'51"N, 166 degrees 34'15"W to 53 degrees 53'48"N, 166 degrees 34'21"W on Hog Island which lies in the Northeast Bay of Unalaska, Alaska as "Arkansas Beach" in commemoration of the 206th regiment of the National Guard, who served during the Japanese attack on Dutch Harbor, Unalaska on June 3 and 4, 1942.

November 8, 1993:

S.J. Res. 115. Joint resolution designating November 22, 1993, as "National Military Families Recognition Day."

November 11, 1993:

S. 616. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide a cost-of-living adjustment in the rates of disability compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for survivors of such veterans.

November 17, 1993:

S. 836. An act to amend the National Trails System Act to provide for a study of El Camino Real de Tierra Adentro (The Royal Road of the Interior Lands), and for other purposes.

S. 983. An act to amend the National Trails System Act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to study the El Camino Real Para Los Texas for potential addition to the National Trails System, and for other purposes.

S.J. Res. 131. Joint resolution designating the week beginning November 14, 1993, and the week beginning November 13, 1994, each as "Geography Awareness Week."

S.J. Res. 139. Joint resolution to designate the third Sunday in November of 1993 as "National Children's Day."

S.J. Res. 142. Joint resolution designating the week beginning November 7, 1993, and the week beginning November 6, 1994, each as "National Womens Veterans Recognition Week."

November 23, 1993:

S.J. Res. 19. Joint resolution to acknowledge the 100th anniversary of the January 17, 1893 overthrow of the Kingdom of Hawaii, and to offer an apology to Native Hawaiians on behalf of the United States for the overthrow of the Kingdom of Hawaii.

November 24, 1993:

S. 654. An act to amend the Indian Environmental General Assistance Program Act of 1992 to extend the authorization of appropriations.

S. 1490. An act to amend the United States Grain Standards Act to extend the authority of the Federal Grain Inspection Service to collect fees to cover administrative and supervisory costs, to extend the authorization of appropriations for such act, and to improve administration of such act, and for other purposes.

S.J. Res. 55. Joint resolution to designate the periods commencing on November 28, 1993, and ending on December 4, 1993, and commencing on November 27, 1994, and ending on December 3, 1994, as "National Home Care Week."

S.J. Res. 129. Joint resolution to authorize the placement of a memorial cairn in Arlington National Cemetery, Arlington, VA, to honor the 270 victims of the terrorist bombing of Pan Am Flight 103.

December 2, 1993:

S. 433. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands in Cameron Parish, LA, and for other purposes.

S. 1667. An act to extend authorities under the Middle East Peace Facilitation Act of 1993 by six months.

S.J. Res. 75. Joint resolution designating January 2, 1994, through January 8, 1994, as "National Law Enforcement Training Week."

S.J. Res. 122. Joint resolution designating December 1993 as "National Drunk and Drugged Driving Prevention Month."

December 3, 1993:

S. 412. An act to amend title 49, United States Code, relating to procedures for resolving claims involving unfiled, negotiated transportation rates, and for other purposes.

S. 1670. An act to improve hazard mitigation and relocation assistance in connection with flooding, and for other purposes.

December 14, 1993:

S. 717. An act to amend the Egg Research and Consumer Information Act to modify the provisions governing the rate of assessment, to expand the exemption of egg producers from such act, and for other purposes.

S. 778. An act to amend the Watermelon Research and Promotion Act to expand operation of the act to the entire United States, to authorize the revocation of the refund provision of the act, to modify the referendum procedures of the act, and for other purposes.

S. 994. An act to authorize the establishment of a fresh cut flowers and fresh cut greens promotion and consumer information program for the benefit of the floricultural industry and other persons, and for other purposes.

S. 1716. An act to amend the Thomas Jefferson Commemoration Commission Act to extend the deadlines for reports.

S. 1732. An act to extend arbitration under the provisions of chapter 44 of title 28, United States Code, and for other purposes.

S. 1764. An act to provide for the extension of certain authority for the Marshal of the Supreme Court and the Supreme Court Police.

S. 1766. An act to amend the Lime Research, Promotion, and Consumer Information Act of 1990 to cover seedless and not seedless limes, to increase the exemption level, to delay the initial referendum date, and to alter the composition of the Lime Board, and for other purposes.

S. 1769. An act to make a technical amendment, and for other purposes.

S.J. Res. 154. Joint resolution designating January 16, 1994, as "Religious Freedom Day."

December 17, 1993:

S. 422. An act to extend and revise rule-making authority with respect to govern-

ment securities under the Federal securities laws, and for other purposes.

S. 664. An act making a technical amendment of the Clayton Act.

S. 714. An act to provide for the remaining funds needed to assure that the United States fulfills its obligation for the protection of depositors at savings and loan institutions, to improve to management of the Resolution Trust Corporation [RTC] in order to assure the taxpayers the fairest and most efficient disposition of savings and loan assets, to provide for a comprehensive transition plan to assure an orderly transfer of RTC resources to the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, to abolish the RTC, and for other purposes.

S. 1777. An act to extend the suspended implementation of certain requirements of the Food Stamp Program on Indian reservations, to suspend certain eligibility requirements for the participation of retail food stores in the Food Stamp Program, and for other purposes.

December 20, 1993:

S. 1507. An act to make certain technical and conforming amendments to the Higher Education Act of 1965.

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE RECEIVED DURING SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 5, 1993, the Secretary of the Senate, on November 30, 1993, during the sine die adjournment of the Senate, received a message from the House of Representatives announcing that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bill:

H.R. 1025. An act to provide for a waiting period before the purchase of a handgun, and for the establishment of a national instant criminal background check system to be contacted by firearms dealers before the transfer of any firearms.

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 5, 1993, the enrolled bill was signed on November 30, 1993, during the sine die adjournment of the Senate by the President of the Senate [Mr. GORE].

Under the authority of the order of the Senate on January 5, 1993, the Secretary of the Senate, on December 3, 1993, during the sine die adjournment of the Senate, received a message from the House of Representatives announcing that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bills:

S. 422. An act to extend and revise rule-making authority with respect to government securities under the Federal securities laws, and for other purposes.

S. 664. An act making a technical amendment of the Clayton Act.

S. 994. An act to authorize the establishment of a fresh cut flowers and fresh cut greens promotion and consumer information program for the benefit of the floricultural industry and other persons, and for other purposes.

S. 1507. An act to make certain technical and conforming amendments to the Higher Education Act of 1965.

S. 1732. An act to extend arbitration under the provisions of chapter 44 of title 28, United States Code, and for other purposes.

S. 1764. An act to provide for the extension of certain authority for the Marshal of the

Supreme Court and the Supreme Court Police.

S. 1769. An act to make a technical amendment, and for other purposes.

S. 1777. An act to extend the suspended implementation of certain requirements of the food stamp program on Indian reservations, to suspend certain eligibility requirements for the participation of retail food stores in the food stamp program, and for other purposes.

H.R. 486. An act to provide for the addition of the Truman Farm Home to the Harry S. Truman National Historic Site in the State of Missouri.

H.R. 1237. An act to establish procedures for national criminal background checks for child care providers.

H.R. 1944. An act to provide for additional development at War in the Pacific National Historical Park, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2150. An act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1994 for the United States Coast Guard, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2535. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide additional authority for the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide health care for veterans of the Persian Gulf War.

H.R. 2840. An act to amend title 17, United States Code, to establish copyright arbitration royalty panels to replace the Copyright Royalty Tribunal, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3000. An act for reform in emerging new democracies and support and help for improved partnership with Russia, Ukraine, and for other new independent states of the former Soviet Union.

H.R. 3216. An act to amend the Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act of 1970 to control the diversion of certain chemicals used in the illicit production of controlled substances such as methcathinone and methamphetamine, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3321. An act to provide increased flexibility to States in carrying out the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program.

H.R. 3450. An act to implement the North American Free Trade Agreement.

H.R. 3514. An act to clarify the regulatory oversight exercised by the Rural Electrification Administration with respect to certain electric borrowers.

H.R. 3616. An act to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the 250th anniversary of the birth of Thomas Jefferson, Americans who have been prisoners of war, the Vietnam Veterans Memorial on the occasion of the 10th anniversary of the Memorial, and the Women in Military Service for American Memorial, and for other purposes.

S.J. Res. 154. Joint resolution designating January 16, 1994, as "Religious Freedom Day."

H.J. Res. 272. Joint resolution designating December 15, 1993, as "National Firefighters Day."

H.J. Res. 300. Joint resolution providing for the convening of the Second Session of the One Hundred Third Congress.

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Under the authority of the order of January 5, 1993, the Secretary of the Senate, on November 26, 1993, during the sine die adjournment of the Senate, received a message from the House of Representatives announcing that the

Speaker has signed the following enrolled bills:

S. 714. An act to provide for the remaining funds needed to assure that the United States fulfills its obligations for the protection of depositors at savings and loan institutions, to improve the management of the Resolution Trust Corporation ("RTC") in order to assure the taxpayers the fairest and most efficient disposition of savings and loan assets, to provide for a comprehensive transition plan to assure an orderly transfer of RTC resources to the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, to abolish the RTC, and for other purposes.

S. 717. An act to amend the Egg Research and Consumer Information Act to modify the provisions governing the rate of assessment, to expand them from such Act, and for other purposes.

S. 778. An act to amend the Watermelon Research and Promotion Act to expand operation of the Act to the entire United States, to authorize the revocation of the refund provision of the Act, to modify the referendum procedures of the Act, and for other purposes.

S. 1716. An act to amend the Thomas Jefferson Commemorative Commission Act to extend the deadlines for reports.

S. 1766. An act to amend the Lime Research, Promotion, and Consumer Information Act of 1990 to cover seedless and not seedless limes, to increase the exemption level, to delay the initial referendum date, and to alter the composition of the Lime Board, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2202. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to revise and extend the program of grants relating to preventive health measures with respect to cervical cancer.

The message further announced that the House agrees to the amendment of the Senate to the following resolution:

H. Con. Res. 190. Concurrent resolution providing for the sine die adjournment of the First Session of the One Hundred Third Congress.

STATE OF THE UNION ADDRESS— MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—PM 77

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States; which was ordered to lie on the table.

To the Congress of the United States:

As we gather to review the State of the Union, I recall the memory of the giant who presided in this Chamber with such force and grace. Tip O'Neill liked to call himself "a man of the House." And he surely was that. But—even more—he was a man of the people, a bricklayer's son who helped build the American middle class. Tip O'Neill never forgot who he was, where he came from, or who sent him here.

We too must remember who we are, where we come from, and who sent us here.

We must return to the principle that if we give ordinary people equal opportunity, quality education, and a fair shot at the American dream, they will do extraordinary things.

We gather tonight in a world of changes so profound and rapid that all nations are tested.

Our American heritage has always been to master change, to expand opportunity at home, and provide leadership abroad.

But for too long, and in too many ways, that heritage was abandoned, and our country drifted.

For thirty years, family life in America has been breaking down. For twenty years, the wages of working families have been stagnant, or declining. For twelve years of trickle-down economics, we tried to build a false prosperity on a hollow base. Our national debt quadrupled. From 1989 to 1992, we experienced the slowest growth in a half century.

For too many families, even when both parents are working, the American dream has been slipping away.

In 1992, the American people demanded change. One year ago I asked you to join me and accept responsibility for the future of our country. Well, we did. We replaced drift and deadlock with renewal and reform.

I want to thank all of you who heard the American people, broke gridlock, and gave them the most successful teamwork between a President and a Congress for thirty years.

This Congress produced:

A budget that cut the deficit by half a trillion dollars, cut spending and raised income taxes only on the very wealthiest Americans.

Tax relief for millions of low income workers to reward work over welfare.

NAFTA.

The Brady bill—which is now the Brady law.

Tax cuts to help nine out of ten small businesses invest more and create jobs.

More research and treatment for AIDS.

More childhood immunizations.
More support for women's health research.

More affordable college loans for the middle class.

A new national service program for those who want to give something back to their community and earn money for higher education.

A dramatic increase in high tech investments to move us from a defense to a domestic economy.

A new law, the Motor Voter bill, to help millions of people register to vote.
Family and Medical Leave.

All passed. All signed into law with no vetoes. These accomplishments were all commitments I made when I sought this office, and they were all passed by this Congress. But the real credit belongs to the people who sent us here, pay our salaries, and hold our feet to the fire.

What we do here is really beginning to change lives. I will never forget what Family and Medical Leave meant to one father who brought his little girl to visit the White House last year.

After we talked and took a picture, he held on to my arm and said, "my little girl is really sick, and she's probably not going to make it. But because of the Family and Medical Leave law I can take time off without losing my job. I have had some precious time with my child, the most important time I have ever had, without hurting the rest of my family. Don't you ever think that what you do up here doesn't make a difference."

Though we are making a difference, our work has just begun. Many Americans still haven't felt the impact of what we have done. The recovery has still not touched every community or created enough jobs. Incomes are still stagnant. There is still too much violence and not enough hope. And abroad, the young democracies we support still face difficult times and look to us for leadership.

And so tonight, let us continue our journey of renewal: to create more and better jobs, guarantee health security for all, reward work over welfare, promote democracy abroad, and begin to reclaim our streets from violent crime and drugs, and renew our own American community.

Last year, we began to put our house in order by tackling the budget deficit that was driving us toward bankruptcy.

We cut \$255 billion dollars in spending, including entitlements, and over 340 budget items. We froze domestic spending, and used honest numbers.

Led by the Vice President, we launched a campaign to reinvent government. We cut staff, cut perks, and trimmed the fleet of federal limousines. After years of leaders whose rhetoric attacked bureaucracy, but whose actions expanded it, we will actually reduce it, by 252,000 over five years. By the time we have finished, the federal bureaucracy will be at its lowest level in thirty years.

Because the deficit was so large and because they had benefitted from tax cuts in the 1980s, we asked the wealthy to pay more to reduce the deficit. So April 15th, the American people will discover the truth about what we did last year on taxes. Only the top 1.2% of Americans will face higher income tax rates. Let me repeat: Only the wealthiest 1.2% of Americans will face higher income tax rates, and no one else will.

The naysayers said our plan wouldn't work. Well, they were wrong. When I became President, the experts predicted next year's deficit would be \$300 billion. But because we acted, the deficit is now going to be less than \$180 billion—forty percent lower than predicted.

Our economic program has helped to produce the lowest core inflation rate and the lowest interest rates in twenty years. And because those interest rates are down, business investment in equipment is growing at seven times the pace of the previous four years.

Auto sales are way up. Home sales are at a record high. Millions have refinanced their homes. And our economy has produced 1.6 million private sector jobs in 1993—more than were created in the previous four years combined. The people who supported this economic plan should be proud of its first results.

But there's much more to do.

Next month, I will send you one of the toughest budgets ever presented to Congress.

It will cut spending in more than 300 programs, eliminate 100 domestic programs, and reform the way government buys its goods and services. This year, we must make the hard choices again to live within the hard spending ceilings we have set.

We have proved we can bring down the deficit without choking off the recovery, without punishing seniors or the middle class, and without putting our national security at risk. If you will stick with our plan, we will post three consecutive years of declining deficits for the first time since Harry Truman lived in the White House. Once again, the buck stops here.

Our economic plan also bolsters America's strength and credibility around the world.

Once we reduced the deficit, and put the steel back in our competitive edge, the world echoed with the sound of falling trade barriers.

In one year, with NAFTA, GATT, our efforts in Asia, and the National Export strategy, we did more to open world markets to American products than at any time over the last two generations. That will mean more jobs and rising living standards for the American people.

Low deficits, low inflation, low interest rates, low trade barriers and high investment—these are the building blocks of our recovery. But if we want to take full advantage of the opportunities before us in the global economy, we must do more.

As we reduce defense spending, I ask Congress to invest more in the technologies of tomorrow. Defense conversion will keep us strong militarily and create jobs.

As we protect our environment, we must invest in the environmental technologies of the future which will create jobs. And this year we will fight for a revitalized Clean Water Act and Safe Drinking Water Act, and a reformed Superfund program.

And the Vice President is right: We must work with the private sector to connect every classroom, every clinic, every library, and every hospital in America to a national information superhighway by the year 2000. Instant access to information will increase productivity, help educate our children, and provide better medical care and create jobs, I call on Congress this year to pass legislation to establish the information superhighway.

As we expand opportunity and create jobs, no one can be left out. We will continue to enforce fair lending and fair housing and all civil rights laws, because America will never complete its renewal unless everyone shares in its bounty.

We can do all these things, put our economic house in order, expand world trade, and target the jobs of the future. And we will. But let's be honest: this strategy cannot work unless we also give our people the education, training and skills they need to seize the opportunities of tomorrow.

We must set tough, world-class academic and occupational standards for all of our children—and give our teachers and students the tools to meet them. Our Goals 2000 proposal will empower individual school districts to experiment with ideas like chartering their schools to be run by private corporations, public school choice—so long as we measure every school by one high standard: Are our children learning what they need to know to compete and win in this new economy. Goals 2000 links world class standards to grass roots reforms. Congress should pass it without delay.

Our school-to-work initiative will for the first time link schools to the world of work, and will provide at least one year of apprenticeship beyond high school. After all, most of the people we're counting on to build our economic future do not graduate from college. It's time to stop ignoring them and start empowering them.

We must transform America's outdated unemployment system into a re-employment system. The old system just kept you going while you waited for your old job to come back; but we have to have a new system to move people into new and better jobs, because most people don't get their old jobs back.

The only way to get a real job with a growing income is to have real skills and the ability to learn new ones. We simply must streamline today's patchwork of training programs and make them a source of new skills for people who lose their jobs. Reemployment, not unemployment, will be the centerpiece of our program for economic renewal, and I urge you to pass it this year.

Just as we must transform our unemployment system, we must also revolutionize our welfare system. It doesn't work. It defies our values as a nation.

If we value work, we cannot justify a system that makes welfare more attractive than work.

If we value personal responsibility, we cannot ignore the \$34 billion in child support that absent parents ought to be paying to millions of mothers and children.

If we value strong families, we cannot perpetuate a system that penalizes those who stay together. Can you be-

lieve that a child who has a child gets more money from the government for leaving home than for staying with a parent or a grandparent?

That's not just bad policy; it is wrong. And we must change it.

I worked for years on this welfare problem, and I can tell you: the people who most want to change welfare are the very people on it. They want to get off welfare, and get back to work, and support their children.

Last year, we began. We gave the states more power to innovate—because we know that great ideas can come from outside Washington—and many states are using it.

Then, we took a dramatic step. Instead of taxing people with modest incomes who are working their way out of poverty, we dramatically increased the Earned Income Tax Credit to lift them out of poverty, to reward work over welfare, to make it possible for people to be successful workers and successful parents.

But there is much more to be done.

This spring, I will send you comprehensive welfare reform legislation that builds on the Family Support Act and restores the basic values of work and responsibility.

We will say to teenagers, "If you have a child out of wedlock, we will no longer give you a check to set up a separate household. We want families to stay together."

To absent parents who aren't paying child support, we'll say: "If you're not providing for your children, we'll garnish your wages, we'll suspend your license, we'll track you across state lines, and if necessary, we'll make some of you work off what you owe. People who bring children into this world can't just walk away."

And to all those who depend on welfare, we offer this simple compact: We will provide the support, the job training, the child care you need for up to two years. But after that, anyone who can work must work—in the private sector if possible, in community service if necessary. We will make welfare what it ought to be: A second chance, not a way of life.

We must tackle welfare reform in 1994, yes, as we tackle health care. A million people are on welfare today are there because it's the only way they can get health care coverage. Those who choose leave welfare for jobs without health benefits find themselves in the incredible position of paying taxes that help pay for health coverage for those who choose to stay on welfare. No wonder many people leave work and go back on welfare to get health care coverage. We must solve the health care problem to solve the welfare problem.

This year, we will make history by reforming our health care system. This is another issue where the people are way ahead of the politicians.

The First Lady has received almost a million letters from people all across America and all walks of life. Let me share one of them with you.

Richard Anderson of Reno, Nevada lost his job and, with it, his health insurance. Two weeks later, his wife Judy suffered a cerebral aneurysm. He rushed her to the hospital, where she stayed in intensive care for twenty-one days.

The Anderson's bills exceeded \$120,000. Although Judy recovered and Richard went back to work, at eight dollars an hour, the bills were too much for them. They were forced into bankruptcy by high medical costs.

"Mrs. Clinton," he wrote to Hillary, "no one in the United States of America should have to lose everything they have worked for all their lives because they were unfortunate enough to become ill."

It was to help the Richard and Judy Andersons of America that the First Lady and so many others have worked so hard on the health care issue, and we owe them our thanks.

There are others in Washington who say there is no health care crisis. Tell that to Richard and Judy Anderson. Tell it to the 58 million Americans who have no coverage at all for some time each year that there is no health care crisis. Tell it to the 81 million Americans with "pre-existing" conditions who are paying more, can't get insurance, or can't change jobs. Tell it to the small businesses burdened by the skyrocketing cost of insurance. Tell it to the 76 percent of insured Americans whose policies have lifetime limits—and who can find themselves without any coverage just when they need it most—tell them there is no health care crisis. You tell them—because I can't.

The naysayers don't understand the impact of this problem on people's lives. They just don't get it. We must act now to show that we do.

From the day we began, our health care initiative has been designed to strengthen all that is good about our health care system. The world's best health professionals. Cutting-edge research and research institutions. Medicare for older Americans. None of this should be put at risk.

We're paying more and more money for less and less care. Every year fewer and fewer Americans even get to choose their doctors. Every year doctors and nurses spend more time on paperwork and less on patients because of the bureaucratic nightmare the present system has become. The system is riddled with inefficiency, abuse and fraud.

In today's health care system, insurance companies call all the shots. They pick and choose whom they cover. They can cut off your benefits when you need your coverage most. They are in charge.

And so every night, millions of well-insured Americans go to bed just an ill-

ness, an accident, or a pink slip away from financial ruin. Every morning millions more go to work without health insurance for their families. And every year, hard-working people are told to pick a new doctor because their boss picked a new plan, and countless others turn down better jobs because they fear losing their insurance.

If we let the health care system continue to drift, Americans will have less care, fewer choices, and higher bills. Our approach protects the quality of care and people's choices.

It builds on what works today in the private sector. To expand the employer-based system and guarantee private insurance for every American—something proposed by President Richard Nixon more than 20 years ago. That's what we want—guaranteed private insurance.

Right now, 9 out of 10 people who have private insurance get it through employers—and that must continue. And if your employer is providing good benefits at reasonable prices—that must continue, too.

Our goal is health insurance you can depend on: comprehensive benefits that cover preventive care and prescription drugs; health premiums that don't jump when you get sick or get older; the power, no matter how small your business is, to choose dependable insurance at the same rates government and big companies get; one simple form for people who are sick; and, most of all, the freedom to choose a health plan and the right to choose your own doctor.

Our approach protects older Americans. Every plan before Congress proposes to slow the growth of Medicare. The difference is this: We believe those savings should be used to improve health care for senior citizens. Medicare must be protected, and it should cover prescription drugs. And we should take the first steps toward covering long-term care. To those who would cut Medicare without protecting seniors, I say: the solution to today's squeeze on middle-class working people is not to put the squeeze on middle class retired people.

When it's all said and done, insurance must mean what it used to mean. You pay a fair price for security and, when you get sick, health care is always there. No matter what.

Along with the guarantee of health security, there must be more responsibility: parents must take their kids to be immunized; we all should take advantage of preventive care; and we all must work together to stop the violence that crowds its victims into our emergency rooms. People who don't have insurance will get coverage—but they'll have to pay something. The minority of business that provide no insurance and shift the costs to others, will have to contribute something.

People who smoke will pay more for a pack of cigarettes. If we want to solve the health care crisis in this country, there can be no more something for nothing.

In the coming months, I want to work with Democrats and Republicans to reform our health care system by using the market to bring down costs and to achieve lasting health security.

For 60 years, this country has tried to reform health care. President Roosevelt tried. President Truman tried. President Nixon tried. President Carter tried. Every time, the powerful special interests defeated them. But not this time.

Facing up to special interests will require courage. It will raise critical questions about the way we finance our campaigns and how lobbyists peddle their influence. The work of change will never get easier until we limit the influence of well financed interests who profit from the current system. So I call on you now to finish the job you began last year by passing tough, meaningful campaign finance reform and lobbying reform this year.

This is a test for all of us. The American people provide those of us in government service with great benefits—health care that's always there. We need to give every hard-working, tax-paying American the same health care security they give us.

Hear me clearly. If the legislation you send me does not guarantee every American private health insurance that can never be taken away, I will take this pen, veto that legislation, and we'll come right back here and start over again.

But I believe we're ready to do it right now. If you're ready to guarantee to every American health care that can never be taken away, now is the time to stand with the people who sent you here.

As we take these steps together to renew America's strength at home, we must also continue our work to renew America's leadership abroad.

This is a promising moment. Because of the agreements we have reached, Russia's strategic nuclear missiles soon will no longer be pointed at the United States, nor will we point ours at them. Instead of building weapons in space, Russian scientists will help us build the international space station.

There are still dangers in the world: Arms proliferation; bitter regional conflicts; ethnic and nationalist tensions in many new democracies; severe environmental degradation; and fanatics who seek to cripple the world's cities with terror.

As the world's greatest power, we must maintain our defenses and our responsibilities. This year we secured indictments against terrorists and sanctions against those who harbor them. We worked to promote environmentally sustainable economic growth.

We achieved agreements with Ukraine, Belarus and Kazakhstan to eliminate their nuclear arsenals.

We are working to achieve a Korean peninsula free of nuclear weapons. We will seek early ratification of a treaty to ban chemical weapons world-wide. And earlier today we joined with over 30 nations to begin negotiations on a comprehensive ban to stop all nuclear testing.

But nothing is more important to our security than our Nation's armed forces. We honor their contributions, including those who are carrying out the longest humanitarian airlift in history in Bosnia, those who will complete their mission in Somalia this year, and their brave comrades who gave their lives there.

Our forces are the finest military our Nation has ever had, and I have pledged that as long as I am President, they will remain the best trained, the best equipped and the best prepared fighting force on the face of this earth.

Last year I proposed a defense plan that maintains our post cold war security at lower cost. This year, many people urged me to cut our defense spending again to pay for other government programs. I said no. The budget I send to this Congress draws the line against further defense cuts and fully protects the readiness and quality of our forces.

Ultimately, the best strategy to ensure our security and build a durable peace is to support the advance of democracy. Democracies do not attack each other; they make better partners in trade and diplomacy.

That is why we have supported the democratic reformers in Russia and in the other states of the former Soviet bloc. I applaud the bi-partisan support this Congress provided last year for our initiatives to help Russia, Ukraine, and other states through the epic transformations.

Our support of reform must combine patience and vigilance. We will urge Russia and the other states to continue with their economic reforms. And we will seek to cooperate with Russia to solve regional problems, while insisting that if Russian troops operate in neighboring states, they do so only when those states agree to their presence, and in strict accord with international standards. But, as these new nations chart their own futures, we must not forget how much more secure and more prosperous our Nation will be if democratic and market reforms succeed across the former communist bloc.

That is why I went to Europe earlier this month: to work with our European partners to help integrate the former communist countries into a Europe unified for the first time in history, based on shared commitments to democracy, free market economies and respect for existing borders. With our

allies, we created a Partnership for Peace that invites states from the former Soviet bloc and other non-NATO members to work with NATO in military cooperation. When I met with Central Europe's leaders—including Lech Walesa and Vaclav Havel, who put their lives on the line for freedom—I told them that the security of their region is important to America's security.

This year we will provide support for democratic renewal, human rights and sustainable development around the world. We will ask Congress to ratify the new GATT accord. We will continue standing by South Africa as it makes its bold and hopeful transition. We will convene a summit of the western hemisphere's democratic leaders—from Canada to the tip of South America—and we will continue to press for the restoration of democracy in Haiti. And as we build a more constructive relationship with China, we will insist on clear signs of improvement in that nation's human rights record.

We will also work for new progress toward peace in the Middle East. Last year, the world watched Yitzhak Rabin and Yassir Arafat at the White House in their historic handshake of reconciliation. On the long, hard road ahead, I am determined to do all I can to help achieve a comprehensive and lasting peace for all the peoples of the region.

There are some in our country who argue that with the cold war over, America should turn its back on the rest of the world. Many around the world were afraid we would do just that. But I took this office on a pledge to keep our Nation secure by remaining engaged in the world. And this year, because of our work together—enacting NAFTA; keeping our military strong and prepared; supporting democracy abroad—we reaffirmed America's leadership and increased the security of the American people.

While Americans are more secure from threats abroad, we are less secure from threats here at home.

Every day, the national peace is shattered by crime. In Petaluma, CA, an innocent slumber party gives way to agonizing tragedy for the family of Polly Klass. An ordinary train ride on Long Island ends in a hail of 9-millimeter rounds. A tourist in Florida is nearly burned alive by bigots simply because he is black. Right here in our Nation's Capital, a brave young man named Jason White—a policeman, the son and grandson of policemen—is ruthlessly gunned down.

Violent crime and the fear it provokes are crippling our society, limiting personal freedom, and fraying the ties that bind us. The crime bill before Congress gives you a chance to do something about it—to be tough and smart.

First, we must recognize that most violent crimes are committed by a

small percentage of criminals, who too often break the laws even on parole. Those who commit crimes must be punished, and those who commit repeated violent crimes must be told: Commit a third violent crime and you'll be put away, and put away for good. Three strikes and you're out.

Second, we must take steps to reduce violence and prevent crimes, beginning with more police officers and more community policing. We know that police who work the streets, know the folks, have the respect of the kids, and focus on high crime areas, are more likely to prevent crime as well as catch criminals.

Here tonight is one of those policemen: a brave, young detective, Kevin Jett, whose beat is eight square blocks in one of the toughest blocks in New York City. Every day he restores some sanity and safety and a sense of values to the people whose lives he protects.

That's why we must hire 100,000 new community police officers, well trained and patrolling beats all over America; a police corps; and move retiring military personnel into police forces across America. We must also invest in safe schools, so that our children can learn to count and read and write without also learning how to duck bullets.

Third, we must build on the Brady bill, and take further steps to keep guns out of the hands of criminals. When it comes to guns, let me be clear: Hunters must always be free to hunt, and law abiding adults should be free to own guns and protect their homes. I respect that part of American culture. I grew up in it.

But I want to ask sportsmen and others who lawfully own guns to join us in a common campaign to reduce gun violence. You didn't create this problem, but we need your help to solve it. There is no sporting purpose on earth that should stop us from banishing the assault weapons that outgun our police and cut down our children. So, I urge you to pass an assault weapons ban.

Fourth, we must remember that drugs are a factor in an enormous percentage of crimes. Recent studies indicate that drug use is on the rise again among young people. The crime bill contains more money for drug treatment for criminal addicts and boot camps for youthful offenders.

The administration budget contains a large increase in funding for drug treatment and drug education. I hope you will pass them both.

The problem of violence is an American problem. It has no partisan or philosophical element. Therefore, I urge you to set aside your partisan differences and pass a strong, smart, tough crime bill now.

But, further, I urge you: As we demand tougher penalties for those who choose violence, let us also remember how we came to this sad point. In America's toughest neighborhoods,

meanest streets, and poorest rural areas, we have seen a stunning breakdown of community, family and work—the heart and soul of civilized society. This has created a vast vacuum into which violence, drugs and gangs have moved. So, even as we say no to crime, we must give people—especially our young people—something to say yes to.

Many of our initiatives—from job training to welfare reform to health care to national service—will help rebuild distressed communities, strengthen families, and provide work. But more needs to be done. That is what our community empowerment agenda is all about: Challenging businesses to provide more investment through Empowerment Zones; insuring that banks make loans in the same communities their deposits come from; and passing legislation to unleash the power of capital through Community Development Banks to create jobs, opportunity and hope where they are needed most.

Let's be honest. Our problems go way beyond the reach of any government program. They are rooted in the loss of values, the disappearance of work, and the breakdown of our families and our communities. My fellow Americans, we can cut the deficit, create jobs, promote democracy around the globe, pass welfare reform, and health care reform, and the toughest crime bill in history, and still leave too many of our people behind. The American people must want to change within, if we are to bring back work, family and community.

We cannot renew our country when within a decade more than half of our children will be born into families where there is no marriage.

We cannot renew our country when 13-year-old boys get semi-automatic weapons and gun down 9-year-old boys—just for the kick of it.

We cannot renew our country when children are having children and the fathers of those children are walking away from them as if they don't amount to anything.

We cannot renew our country when our businesses eagerly look for new investments and new customers abroad, but ignore those who would give anything to have their jobs and would gladly buy their products if they had the money to do it right here at home.

We cannot renew our country unless more of us are willing to join the churches and other good citizens who are saving kids, adopting schools, making streets safer.

We cannot renew our country until we all realize that governments don't raise children, parents do—parents who know their children's teachers, turn off the TV, help with the homework, and teach right from wrong—can make all the difference.

Let us give our children a future.

Let us take away their guns and give them books. Let us overcome their de-

spair and replace it with hope. Let us, by our example, teach them to obey the law, respect our neighbors, and cherish our values. Let us weave these sturdy threads into a new American community that can once more stand strong against the forces of despair and evil, and lead us to a better tomorrow.

The naysayers fear we will not be equal to the challenges of our time, but they misread our history, our heritage, and even today's headlines. They all tell us we can and we will overcome any challenge.

When the earth shook and fires raged in California, when the Mississippi deluged the farmlands of the Midwest, when a century's bitterest cold swept from North Dakota to Newport News, it seemed as though the world itself was coming apart at the seams. But the American people came together—they rose to the occasion, neighbor helping neighbor, strangers risking life and limb to save strangers, showing the better angels of our nature.

Let us not reserve those better angels only for natural disasters, leaving our deepest problems to petty political fights. Let us instead be true to our spirit—facing facts, coming together, bringing hope, moving forward.

Tonight, we are summoned to answer a question as old as the Republic itself. My fellow Americans, what is the State of the Union? It is growing stronger. But it must be stronger still. With your help and with God's, it will be.

Thank you. And may God bless America.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 25, 1994.

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 4:00 p.m. a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Hays, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has agreed to the following resolutions, in which it request the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 197. Concurrent resolution providing for a joint session of the Congress to receive a message from the President on the State of the Union.

H. Con. Res. 198. Concurrent resolution providing for an adjournment of the House from Wednesday, January 26, 1994 to Tuesday, February 1, 1994.

H. Res. 326. *Resolved*, That the Clerk of the House inform the Senate that a quorum of the House is present and that the House is ready to proceed with business.

H. Res. 328. *Resolved*, That the House has learned with profound sorrow of the death of the Honorable Thomas P. "Tip" O'Neill, Jr., former Member of the House for 17 terms and Speaker of the House of Representatives for the Ninety-fifth, Ninety-sixth, Ninety-seventh, Ninety-eighth and Ninety-ninth Congresses.

Resolved, That in the death of the Honorable Thomas P. "Tip" O'Neill, Jr. the United States and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts have lost a valued and eminent public servant and citizen.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That when the House adjourns today, it adjourn as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased.

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-1776. A communication from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of deferral of budget authority; referred jointly, pursuant to the order of January 30, 1975, as modified by the order of April 11, 1986, to the Committee on Appropriations, to the Committee on the Budget, to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition and Forestry, to the Committee on Environment and Public Works, to the Committee on Finance, and to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-1777. A communication from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on interest rates as determined by the Governor of the Rural Telephone Bank for fiscal year 1993; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-1778. A communication from the Chairman of the Farm Credit Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report for calendar 1992; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-1779. A communication from the Comptroller of the Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of a violation of administrative control of appropriation regulations; to the Committee on Appropriations.

EC-1780. A communication from the Comptroller of the Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of a violation of administrative control of appropriation regulations; to the Committee on Appropriations.

EC-1781. A communication from the Architect of the Capitol, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of all expenditures during the period April 1, 1993 through September 30, 1993; to the Committee on Appropriations.

EC-1782. A communication from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, notice relative to the Hanford Site; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1783. A communication from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the comparison of fiscal year 1994 five-year plan and the President's budget request; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1784. A communication from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report on the Department's fiscal year 1991 and 1992 expenditures for the Environmental Restoration and Waste Management program; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1785. A communication from the President and Chairman of the Export-Import Bank, transmitting, pursuant to law, notice of a transaction involving U.S. exports to Australia; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1786. A communication from the President and Chairman of the Export-Import Bank, transmitting, pursuant to law, notice of a transaction involving U.S. exports to the Federative Republic of Brazil; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1787. A communication from the President and Chairman of the Export-Import Bank, transmitting, pursuant to law, notice of a transaction involving U.S. exports to the People's Republic of China; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1788. A communication from the President and Chairman of the Export-Import Bank, transmitting, pursuant to law, notice of a transaction involving U.S. exports to the People's Republic of China; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1789. A communication from the President and Chairman of the Export-Import Bank, transmitting, pursuant to law, notice of a transaction involving U.S. exports to the Republic of Korea; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1790. A communication from the President and Chairman of the Export-Import Bank, transmitting, pursuant to law, notice of a transaction involving U.S. exports to various countries; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1791. A communication from the President and Chairman of the Export-Import Bank, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report on tied-aid credits; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1792. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, notice of continuation of Libyan Emergency; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1793. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, notice relative to the Governments of Serbia and Montenegro; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1794. A communication from the Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report on credit availability for small businesses and small farms in 1993; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1795. A communication from the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a supplement to the annual report relative to the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1796. A communication from the Executive Director of the Thrift Depositor Protection Oversight Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to savings associations; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1797. A communication from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Bureau of Export Administration for fiscal year 1993; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1798. A communication from the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report to Congress on appropriations legislation within five days of enactment; to the Committee on Budget.

EC-1799. A communication from the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report to Congress on appropriations legislation within five days of enactment; to the Committee on Budget.

EC-1800. A communication from the Director of the Office of Management and Budget,

Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report to Congress on appropriations legislation within five days of enactment; to the Committee on Budget.

EC-1801. A communication from the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report to Congress on appropriations legislation within five days of enactment; to the Committee on Budget.

EC-1802. A communication from the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report to Congress on appropriations legislation within five days of enactment; to the Committee on Budget.

EC-1803. A communication from the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report to Congress on appropriations legislation within five days of enactment; to the Committee on Budget.

EC-1804. A communication from the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report to Congress on appropriations legislation within five days of enactment; to the Committee on Budget.

EC-1805. A communication from the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report to Congress on appropriations legislation within five days of enactment; to the Committee on Budget.

EC-1806. A communication from the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report to Congress on appropriations legislation within five days of enactment; to the Committee on Budget.

EC-1807. A communication from the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report to Congress on appropriations legislation within five days of enactment; to the Committee on Budget.

EC-1808. A communication from the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report to Congress on appropriations legislation within five days of enactment; to the Committee on Budget.

EC-1809. A communication from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to high speed ground transportation research and development; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1810. A communication from the Chairman of the National Transportation Safety Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, notice of an appeal of the Board's fiscal year 1995 allowance; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1811. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Communications and Information, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the role of telecommunications in crimes of hate and violent acts against ethnic, religious, and racial minorities; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1812. A communication from the Deputy Associate Director for Compliance of the Minerals Management Service, Department

of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the refund of offshore lease revenues; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-1813. A communication from the Deputy Associate Director for Compliance of the Minerals Management Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the refund of offshore lease revenues; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-1814. A communication from the Deputy Associate Director for Compliance of the Minerals Management Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the refund of offshore lease revenues; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-1815. A communication from the Deputy Associate Director for Compliance of the Minerals Management Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the refund of offshore lease revenues; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-1816. A communication from the Deputy Associate Director for Compliance of the Minerals Management Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the refund of offshore lease revenues; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-1817. A communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report on Federal coal management for fiscal year 1992; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-1818. A communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the interim report on the High Plains States Groundwater Demonstration Program; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-1819. A communication from the Chairman of the Mississippi River Corridor Study Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the interim report on the corridor study; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-1820. A communication from the Acting Chief of the Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, notice of the Wild And Scenic River Boundary Description for Little Missouri River, Arkansas; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-1821. A communication from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the evaluation of the effects of exempting alternative-fuel vehicles from transportation control measures; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-1822. A communication from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report on the Strategic Petroleum Reserve for the third quarter of calendar year 1993; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-1823. A communication from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report on uranium revitalization; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-1824. A communication from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report on the study of the tax and rate treatment of renewable energy projects; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-1825. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, notice relative to the Dugway Proving Ground; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1826. A communication from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, notice relative to the Tooele Army Depot; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1827. A communication from the Administrators of the Federal Aviation Administration and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Subsonic Noise Reduction Technology Program; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1828. A communication from the Acting Chief Financial Officer, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, notice relative to a report on mixed waste streams; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1829. A communication from the Administrator of the General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, notice of a determination relative to competitive procedures to award contracts; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1830. A communication from the Deputy Administrator of the General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports of building project surveys for Greeneville, Tennessee, Jacksonville, Florida, and Brownsville, Texas; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1831. A communication from the Deputy Administrator of the General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of a building project survey for Burlington, Iowa; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1832. A communication from the Counselor to the Secretary, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report on environmental remedial action; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1833. A communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, a draft of proposed legislation entitled "John F. Kennedy Center Act Amendments of 1993"; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1834. A communication from the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Hydrogen Fluoride Study"; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1835. A communication from the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Opportunities to Reduce Methane Emissions in the United States"; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1836. A communication from the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Opportunities to Reduce Methane Emissions Internationally, Volume II: International Opportunities for Reducing Methane Emissions"; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1837. A communication from the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on cement kiln dust; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1838. A communication from the President of the United States, received in the Senate on December 15, 1993; transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the results of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade Uruguay Round of multilateral trade negotiations; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-1839. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pur-

suant to law, notice of an intention relative to Kyrgyzstan and the Generalized System of Preferences; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-1840. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Medicaid Drug Rebate Program; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-1841. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report from the Office of Child Support Enforcement for calendar year 1993; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-1842. A communication from the Administrator of the Health Care Financing Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Rural Health Care Transition Grant Program; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-1843. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the U.S. Government for fiscal year 1993; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-1844. A communication from the Assistant Legal Adviser (Treaty Affairs), Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the texts of international agreements and background statements, other than treaties; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-1845. A communication from the Assistant Legal Adviser (Treaty Affairs), Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the texts of international agreements and background statements, other than treaties; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-1846. A communication from the Assistant Legal Adviser (Treaty Affairs), Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the texts of international agreements and background statements, other than treaties; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-1847. A communication from the Assistant Secretary (Legislative Affairs) Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on U.S. contribution to international organizations for fiscal year 1992; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-1848. A communication from the Assistant Secretary (Legislative Affairs) Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on progress in dismantling apartheid; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-1849. A communication from the Assistant Secretary (Legislative Affairs) Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semi-annual reports for the period October 31, 1992 through March 31, 1993; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-1850. A communication from the Assistant Secretary (Legislative Affairs), Department of State, transmitting, a draft of proposed legislation entitled "The Antarctic Environmental Protection Act of 1993"; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-1851. A communication from the Assistant Secretary (Legislative Affairs), Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, notice of a Presidential determination relative to an assistance program for Independent States of the Former Soviet Union; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-1852. A communication from the Assistant Secretary (Legislative Affairs), Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, report of the fiscal year 1994 security assistance allocation; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-1853. A communication from the Assistant Secretary (Legislative Affairs), Depart-

ment of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, notice of a Presidential determination relative to Africa; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-1854. A communication from the Acting Administrator (Bureau for Legislative and Public Affairs), U.S. Agency for International Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report on the International Fund for Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-1855. A communication from the Administrator, U.S. Agency for International Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report on development assistance program allocations for fiscal year 1994; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-1856. A communication from the Administrator, U.S. Agency for International Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report on development assistance program allocations for fiscal year 1993; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-1857. A communication from the Director of the United States Information Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Diplomacy in the Information Age"; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-1858. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the loan guarantees to Israel program; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-1859. A communication from the Assistant Secretary (Legislative Affairs), Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, notice of a Presidential determination relative to the International Fund for Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-1860. A communication from the Assistant Secretary (Indian Affairs), Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the implementation of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act for fiscal year 1992; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-1861. A communication from the President of the National Safety Council, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report for fiscal year 1993; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-1862. A communication from the Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report under the Freedom of Information Act for calendar year 1992; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-1863. A communication from the Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, a draft of proposed legislation entitled "Office of National Drug Control Policy Reauthorization Act"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-1864. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on national strategic research plan for hearing and hearing impairment and voice; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

EC-1865. A communication from the Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "1992 Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Annual Report"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-1866. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the National Institutes of Health AIDS Research Loan Repayment Program; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

EC-1867. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on alcohol and other drug abuse prevention for calendar year 1993; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

EC-1868. A communication from the Secretary of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, a draft of proposed legislation entitled "The Howard University Endowment Amendments of 1993"; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

EC-1869. A communication from the Secretary of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, notice of final regulations—graduate assistance in areas of national needs; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

EC-1870. A communication from the Assistant Secretary (Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services), Department of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, notice of final funding priorities—research in education of individuals with disabilities; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

EC-1871. A communication from the Assistant Secretary (Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services) Department of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, notice of final funding priorities—knowledge dissemination and utilization program; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

EC-1872. A communication from the Assistant Secretary (Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services) Department of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, notice of final funding priorities—research and demonstration program; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

EC-1873. A communication from the Assistant Secretary (Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services) Department of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, notice of final funding priorities—rehabilitation research and training centers; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

EC-1874. A communication from the Acting Commissioner (Rehabilitation Services Administration), Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Department of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report for fiscal year 1992; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

EC-1875. A communication from the Chairman of the Barry M. Goldwater Scholarship and Excellence in Education Foundation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of activities for fiscal year 1993; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

EC-1876. A communication from the Chairman of the Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report for fiscal year 1992; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

EC-1877. A communication from the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the Chief Minority Affairs Officer for 1991 through 1993; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC-1878. A communication from the Commissioner (National Center for Education Statistics), Office of Educational Research and Improvement, Department of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Education in States and Nations: Indicators Comparing U.S. States with the OECD Countries in 1988"; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

EC-1879. A communication from the Chairman of the Federal Election Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, report of a revision of the budget request for fiscal year 1994; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

EC-1880. A communication from the Chairman of the Federal Election Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, notice of a form relative to contributions/loans received; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

EC-1881. A communication from the Office of the Public Printer, Government Printing Office, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Office's semiannual management report and the report of the Inspector General for the six months ending September 30, 1993; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1882. A communication from the Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Inspector General's Semiannual Report for fiscal year 1993; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1883. A communication from the Director of the Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Office's health promotion and disease prevention activities; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1884. A communication from the Director of the Peace Corps, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report of the Inspector General for the six month period ending September 30, 1993; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1885. A communication from the Director of the Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report of the Inspector General for the period ending September 30, 1993; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1886. A communication from the Inspector General of the Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report of the Inspector General for the six month period ending September 30, 1993; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1887. A communication from the Office of Special Counsel, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Office for fiscal year 1993; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1888. A communication from the Federal Co-Chairman of the Appalachian Regional Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report of the Inspector General for the six month period ending September 30, 1993; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1889. A communication from the Administrator of the General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the disposal of surplus Federal real property; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1890. A communication from the Secretary of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to audit follow-up for the six month period ending September 30, 1993; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1891. A communication from the Chairman of the Federal Labor Relations Authority, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1993; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1892. A communication from the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report of the Inspector General for the six month period ending September 30, 1993; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1893. A communication from the Chairman of the National Credit Union Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a re-

port relative to the Administration's compliance with the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1993; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1894. A communication from the Director of the Armed Forces Retirement Home, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Home's compliance with the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1993; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1895. A communication from the Acting Director of the Corporation for National and Community Service, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Agency's management control and financial systems; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1896. A communication from the Director of the United States Information Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Agency's management control program; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1897. A communication from the National Labor Relations Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report of the Inspector General for the six month period ending September 30, 1993; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1898. A communication from the Secretary of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1993; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1899. A communication from the Chairman of the Federal Maritime Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Financial Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1993; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1900. A communication from the Chairman of the National Endowment for the Arts, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for calendar year 1993; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1901. A communication from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report of the Inspector General and the report of the Secretary relative to Inspector General audits; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1902. A communication from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to audit, inspection and investigative activities for the six month period ending September 30, 1993; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1903. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report of the Inspector General for the six month period ending September 30, 1993; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1904. A communication from the Administrator of the Small Business Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report of the Inspector General for the six month period ending September 30, 1993; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1905. A communication from the Secretary of the Commission on Fine Arts, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1993; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1906. A communication from the Chairman of the Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1907. A communication from the Chairman of the Thrift Depositor Protection Oversight Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report of the Inspector General of the Resolution Trust Corporation for the six month period ending September 30, 1993; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1908. A communication from the Chairman of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report of the Inspector General for the six month period ending September 30, 1993; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1909. A communication from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a management report for the six month period ending September 30, 1993; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1910. A communication from the Acting Director of the Corporation for National and Community Service, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report of the Inspector General and reports of actions relative to the Inspector General's audits for the six month period ending September 30, 1993; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1911. A communication from the Chairman of the Federal Housing Finance Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report of the Inspector General for the six month period ending September 30, 1993; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1912. A communication from the Director of the United States Information Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report of the Inspector General and the management report on audit closure activity for the six month period ending September 30, 1993; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1913. A communication from the Attorney General of the United States transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report of the Inspector General for the six month period ending September 30, 1993; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1914. A communication from the Executive Director of the Committee for Purchase from People Who Are Blind or Severely Disabled, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the Inspector General for fiscal year 1993; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1915. A communication from the Executive Director of the Commission for the Preservation of America's Heritage Abroad, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1916. A communication from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Financial Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1993; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1917. A communication from the Chairman as Chief Executive Officer of the Farm Credit Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1993; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1918. A communication from the Chairman of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1993; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1919. A communication from the Federal Co-Chairman of the Appalachian Re-

gional Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1993; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1920. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report of the Inspector General for six month period ending September 30, 1993; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1921. A communication from the Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report of the Inspector General for the six month period ending September 30, 1993; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1922. A communication from the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report of the Inspector General for the six month period ending September 30, 1993; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1923. A communication from the Director of the United States Soldiers' and Airmen's Home, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1993; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1924. A communication from the Chairman of the board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report of the Inspector General for the six month period ending September 30, 1993; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1925. A communication from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report of the Inspector General for the six month period ending September 30, 1993; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1926. A communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report of the Inspector General and the Secretary's report on audit followup for the six month period ending September 30, 1993; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1927. A communication from the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report of the Inspector General and the report on audit management and resolution for the six month period ending September 30, 1993; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1928. A communication from the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report of the Inspector General and the management report on audit followup for the six month period ending September 30, 1993; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1929. A communication from the Manager, Compensation and Benefits, National Bank for Cooperatives, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the CoBank Retirement Trust Fund for calendar year 1992; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1930. A communication from the Vice Chairman of the Postal Rate Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1931. A communication from the Chairman of the United States Merit Systems Protection Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year

1993; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1932. A communication from the Chairman of the United States Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Commission's administration of the Government in the Sunshine Act for calendar year 1992; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1933. A communication from the Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report of the Inspector General for the six month period ending September 30, 1993; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1934. A communication from the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report of the Inspector General and the Department's management report in response to the Inspector's audit for the six month period ending September 30, 1993; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1935. A communication from the Chairman of the National Science Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report of the Inspector General for the six month period ending September 30, 1993; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1936. A communication from the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1993; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1937. A communication from the Chairman of the National Endowment for the Arts, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report of the Inspector General and the semiannual report on followup audits for the six month period ending September 30, 1993; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1938. A communication from the Chairman of the National Credit Union Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report of the Inspector General and the management report for the six month period ending September 30, 1993; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1939. A communication from the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1993; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1940. A communication from the Chairman of the National Mediation Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1993; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1941. A communication from the Chairman of the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1993; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1942. A communication from the Chairman of the Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1993; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1943. A communication from the Chairman of the Farm Credit System Insurance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1993; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1944. A communication from the Board of Directors of the Railroad Retirement

Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1993; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1945. A communication from the Director of Selective Service, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1993; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1946. A communication from the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report of the Inspector General and the semiannual report of the Secretary for the six month period ending September 30, 1993; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1947. A communication from the Chairman of the United States Merit Systems Protection Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to workforce demographics; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1948. A communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1993; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1949. A communication from the Deputy Director for Administration and Support, Department of the Navy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the retirement plan for civilian employees of the United States Marine Corps Morale, Welfare and Recreation Activities, the Morale, Welfare and Recreation Support Activity, and Miscellaneous Nonappropriated Fund Instrumentalities; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1950. A communication from the Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1993; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1951. A communication from the Administrator of the General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report of the Inspector General and a management perspective of the Inspector's audits for the six month period ending September 30, 1993; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1952. A communication from the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Judicial Officers' Retirement Fund; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1953. A communication from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report of the Inspector General for the six month period ending September 30, 1993; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1954. A communication from the Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Panama Canal Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report of the Inspector General for the six month period ending September 30, 1993; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1955. A communication from the Chairman of the Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report of the Inspector General for the six month period ending September 30, 1993; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1956. A communication from the Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, a re-

port relative to the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for calendar year 1993; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1957. A communication from the Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1958. A communication from the Director of Human Resources, Department of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the U.S. Army Nonappropriated Fund Employee Retirement Plan for fiscal year 1992; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1959. A communication from the Director of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report of the Inspector General and the Agency's report on audit resolution for the six month period ending September 30, 1993; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1960. A communication from the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1993, to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1961. A communication from the President's Pay Agent, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to comparability payments applicable to General Schedule employees; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1962. A communication from the Chairman of the Board for International Broadcasting, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report of the Inspector General for the six month period ending September 30, 1993; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1963. A communication from the Chairman of the Federal Mine Safety and Health Review Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1993; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1964. A communication from the Chairman of the United States International Trade Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1993; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1965. A communication from the Negotiator of the Office of the United States Nuclear Waste Negotiator, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1993; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1966. A communication from the Director of the National Gallery of Art, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1993; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1967. A communication from the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report of the Inspector General and the Commission's report on final actions for the six month period ending September 30, 1993; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1968. A communication from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1993; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1969. A communication from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report of the Inspector General and the Commission's report on final actions for the six month period ending September 30, 1993; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1970. A communication from the Special Assistant to the President and Director of the Office of Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to personnel; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1971. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to locality-based comparability payments for General Schedule employees for calendar year 1994; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1972. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1973. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to surplus real property transferred for public health purposes; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1974. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report of the Inspector General and the Department's management report on final actions for the six month period ending September 30, 1993; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1975. A communication from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report of the Inspector General and the semiannual management report on final actions for the six month period ending September 30, 1993; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1976. A communication from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1977. A communication from the Secretary of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report on audit follow-up for the six month period ending September 30, 1993; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1978. A communication from the Secretary of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the disposition of surplus Federal real property to educational institutions; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1979. A communication from the Secretary of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report of the Inspector General for the six month period ending September 30, 1993; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1980. A communication from the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to accounts containing unvouchered expenditures potentially subject to audit by the Comptroller General; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1981. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of D.C. Act 10-148 adopted by the Council on November 7, 1993; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1982. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Colum-

bia, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of D.C. Act 10-149 adopted by the Council on November 7, 1993; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1983. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of D.C. Act 10-151 adopted by the Council on November 17, 1993; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1984. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of D.C. Act 10-153 adopted by the Council on December 7, 1993; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1985. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of D.C. Act 10-154 adopted by the Council on December 16, 1993; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1986. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of D.C. Act 10-155 adopted by the Council on December 16, 1993; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1987. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of D.C. Act 10-156 adopted by the Council on December 16, 1993; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1988. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of D.C. Act 10-157 adopted by the Council on December 16, 1993; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1989. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of D.C. Act 10-158 adopted by the Council on December 16, 1993; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1990. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of D.C. Act 10-160 adopted by the Council on December 16, 1993; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1991. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of D.C. Act 10-159 adopted by the Council on December 16, 1993; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1992. A communication from the Administrator of the Panama Canal Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Commission's systems of internal accounting in accordance with the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1993; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1993. A communication from the Attorney General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1993; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1994. A communication from the Chairman of the Board of Governors of the United States Postal Service, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Service's compliance with the Government in the Sunshine Act; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1995. A communication from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1993; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1996. A communication from the Acting Chairman of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1993; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1997. A communication from the Acting Secretary of the Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for 1993; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1998. A communication from the President of the James Madison Memorial Fellowship Foundation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Foundation for fiscal year 1993; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1999. A communication from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report of the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation's Executive Director and the Inspector General for the six month period ending September 30, 1993; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-2000. A communication from the Chairman of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1993; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-2001. A communication from the Deputy Executive Director of the Office of Navajo and Hopi Indian Relocation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to contract arrangements for audit services and the results of those audits; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-2002. A communication from the Acting Secretary of the American Battle Monuments Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1993; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-2003. A communication from the Director of the Office of Government Ethics, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-2004. A communication from the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a special project to compile data related to the audit of financial statements dated August 1993; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-2005. A communication from the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to actions taken under the Program Fraud Civil Remedies Act for fiscal year 1993; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-2006. A communication from the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act and the Agency's management control and financial systems; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-2007. A communication from the Director of the Office of Personnel Management, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Office on drug and alcohol abuse and treatment for fiscal year 1992; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-2008. A communication from the Inspector General of the Office of Personnel Management, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, the

semiannual report of the Inspector General for the six month period ending September 30, 1993; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-2009. A communication from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, accounting reports from the month of November 1993; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-2010. A communication from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, accounting reports for the month of October 1993; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-2011. A communication from the Director of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Service's internal control and financial systems with respect to the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-2012. A communication from the Director of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the fulfillment of the audit and investigative provisions of the Inspector General Act Amendments; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-2013. A communication from the Chairman of the National Endowment for the Humanities, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report of the Inspector General for the six month period ending September 30, 1993; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-2014. A communication from the Inspector General of the National Endowment for the Humanities, transmitting, pursuant to law, a correction to the semiannual report of the Inspector General for the six month period ending September 30, 1993; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-2015. A communication from the Executive Director of the Committee for Purchase from People Who are Blind or Severely Disabled, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Committee's financial management system components with respect to the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES SUBMITTED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Pursuant to the order of the Senate of November 17, 1993, the following reports were submitted on December 9, 1993, during the adjournment of the Senate:

By Mr. JOHNSTON, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources:

Report to accompany the bill (S. 297) to authorize the Air Force Memorial Foundation to establish a memorial in the District of Columbia or its environs (Rept. No. 103-210).

Report to accompany the bill (S. 986) to provide for an interpretive center at the Civil War Battlefield of Corinth, Mississippi, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 103-211).

Report to accompany the bill (S. 1574) to authorize appropriations for the Coastal Heritage Trail Route in the State of New Jersey, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 103-212).

Report to accompany the bill (H.R. 698) to protect Lechuguilla Cave and other resources and values in and adjacent to Carlsbad Caverns National Park (Rept. No. 103-213).

Report to accompany the bill (H.R. 2650) to designate portions of the Maurice River and its tributaries in the State of New Jersey as

components of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System (Rept. No. 103-214).

By Mr. BOREN, from the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress:

Special Report pursuant to H. Con. Res. 192 (102d Congress) concurrent resolution to establish a Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of November 17, 1993, the following reports of committees were submitted on December 9, 1993:

By Mr. RIEGLE, from the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 783: A bill to amend the Fair Credit Reporting Act, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 103-209).

By Mr. HOLLINGS, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, with an amendment:

S. 329: A bill to amend section 315 of the Communications Act of 1934 with respect to the purchase and use of broadcasting time by candidates for public office, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 103-216).

By Mr. HOLLINGS, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, with amendments:

S. 1640: A bill to amend the Hazardous Materials Transportation Act to authorize appropriations to carry out that Act, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 103-217).

By Mr. HOLLINGS, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, without amendment:

S. 1515: A bill to amend the Central Bering Sea Fisheries Enforcement Act of 1992 (Rept. No. 103-218).

By Mr. HOLLINGS, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 1517: A bill to establish a marine biotechnology program within the National Sea Grant College Program, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 103-219).

S. 335: A bill to require the Secretary of Commerce to make additional frequencies available for commercial assignment in order to promote the development and use of new telecommunications technologies, and for other purposes.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. HOLLINGS, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, with amendments:

S. 1636: A bill to authorize appropriations for the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 and to improve the program to reduce the incidental taking of marine mammals during the course of commercial fishing operations, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 103-220).

By Mr. MOYNIHAN, from the Committee on Finance:

Report to accompany the bill (S. 1560) to establish the Social Security Administration as an independent agency, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 103-221).

By Mr. HOLLINGS, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 1427: A bill to provide the necessary authority to manage the activities in Antarctica of United States scientific research expeditions and United States tourists, and to regulate the taking of Antarctic marine living resources, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 103-222).

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. DASCHLE (for himself and Mr. PRESSLER):

S. 1786: A bill to increase the authorization of appropriations for the Belle Fourche Irrigation Project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. MCCONNELL:

S. 1787: A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the tax-free treatment of education savings accounts established through certain State programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. GRAMM:

S. 1788: A bill to authorize negotiation of free trade agreements with the countries of the Americas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. BOXER (for herself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Mr. HATFIELD):

S. 1789: A bill to amend title 23 United States Code, to permit the use of funds under the highway bridge replacement and rehabilitation program for seismic retrofit of bridges, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. BUMPERS:

S. 1790: A bill entitled "the National Peace Garden Reauthorization Act"; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. KEMPTHORNE:

S. 1791: A bill to provide for mandatory life imprisonment of a person convicted of a second offense of kidnapping a minor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1792: A bill to amend the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1973, to permit a Senator to direct that excess funds allocated to the Senator's personal office for a fiscal year be returned to the U.S. Treasury to reduce the public debt; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

S. 1793: A bill to provide an exemption from citation by the Secretary of Labor under the Occupational Safety Act to employers of individuals who perform rescues of individuals in imminent danger as a result of a life-threatening accident, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

By Mr. BAUCUS:

S. 1794: A bill to designate the Federal building located at the corner of North 29th Street and Fourth Avenue North in Billings, Montana, as the "William J. Jameson Federal Building", and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. BROWN (for himself, Mr. DOLE, Mr. PACKWOOD, Mr. D'AMATO, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. WARNER, Mr. GRAMM, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. GORTON, Mr. BURNS, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. MURKOWSKI, Mr. NICKLES, Mrs. HUTCHISON, and Mr. PRESSLER):

S. 1795: A bill to amend title IV of the Social Security Act and other provisions to

provide reforms to the welfare system in effect in the United States; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. GRAMM (for himself, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. COATS, Mr. COVERDELL, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. HELMS, Mr. LOTT, Mr. FAIRCLOTH, Mr. WALLOP, Mr. BENNETT, and Mr. BROWN):

S. 1796: A bill to ensure that health coverage is portable and renewable, to enhance the ability of small businesses to purchase health care, to enhance efficiency through paperwork reduction, to provide antitrust reforms, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

By Mr. KOHL (for himself and Mr. FEINGOLD):

S. 1797: A bill to require the Secretary of Transportation to amend the existing regulations applicable to charter flights to the Super Bowl to apply the requirements of such regulations to charter flights to intercollegiate football games designated as bowl games and to the basketball games among the last 4 teams in the National Collegiate Athletic Association's division I championship basketball tournaments; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. BRADLEY:

S. 1798: A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the tax on handguns and assault weapons and to impose a tax on the transfer of handguns and assault weapons, to increase the license application fee for gun dealers, and to use the proceeds from those increases to pay for medical care for gunshot victims; to the Committee on Finance.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. MITCHELL (for himself and Mr. DOLE):

S. Res. 177: A resolution informing the President of the United States that a quorum of each House is assembled; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. MITCHELL (for himself and Mr. DOLE):

S. Res. 178: A resolution informing the House of Representatives that a quorum of the Senate is assembled; considered and agreed to.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. MCCONNELL:

S. 1787: A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the tax-free treatment of education savings accounts established through certain State programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

THE EDUCATION TRUST FUND SAVINGS ACT

• Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Higher Education Trust Fund Savings Act, a bill that will help American families defray the rapidly increasing costs of higher education. I find it alarming that education costs have become the greatest barrier for students who want to attend college.

Mr. President, there isn't a corporate or civic leader in this country who will

dispute the fact that this Nation's future success is dependent on the education of our children today. Not only do we need to train our future scientists and business leaders, but we need to provide service personnel and traditional blue collar occupations with skill development. Vocational training is critical to our ability to rapidly adapt to technological developments which directly affect the competitiveness of U.S. businesses.

I am disappointed to report, however, that for many families an affordable education is unrealistic. Students are forced to burden themselves with tens of thousands of dollars in loans or aid. In fact, in 1990, 56 percent of all students accepted financial assistance and the average was higher for minority students.

As a parent of two college students, I know only too well the costs associated with higher education. I was forced to take out a second mortgage on my home in order to help meet the costs of their education.

Mr. President, I know that I am lucky compared to some. It is not uncommon for parents to take a second job in order to help meet the tuition and financial obligations. Many times, students are restricted to attending part time or are forced to put off their education altogether due to financial difficulty.

Since 1992, Kentucky students have faced two tuition hikes. The two largest public universities have been forced by budgetary pressures to increase tuition by 11 percent; and community college students were asked to pay a 14-percent increase. Lance Dowdy, the student government president at the University of Kentucky, hit the nail on the head when he said, "Public education is starting to look like a privilege." We cannot afford to let this happen.

This bill will amend the Tax Code to maximize investment in State-sponsored education savings plans. It will permit an individual's investment in a State-sponsored savings program to be exempt from Federal taxation when the earnings are used to meet educational costs.

The contributions would be after-tax dollars, and any earnings that are not used for educational purposes would be subject to taxation at the individual's current tax rate.

In an effort to encourage States to create their own savings plan, this bill also would exempt the State organizations that administer such programs from Federal taxation. This would reduce administrative expenses, thus increasing investment in education. Thirty-four States have already established some form of education savings plan for their residents.

This legislation will not force States to establish their own education trust fund or saddle a State with additional

costs involuntarily. It merely provides States with an opportunity to invest in the future. I am confident that upon passage of this bill, more States will seek to establish a savings vehicle for their residents.

Lastly, this legislation would exempt from Federal taxation, corporate and individual endowments to the trust fund. This provision is unique because it also provides an incentive for corporations to help finance the education of the next leaders of this country. The added investment will boost the return to the students, thus further reducing the cost of education.

In Kentucky, there is already a State-sponsored savings plan in effect and working quite well. However, there are several Federal tax concerns that have impeded the growth and full utilization of this program. I have worked one-on-one with the Kentucky Higher Education Assistance Authority in drafting this legislation, and I believe we have a winning package that will benefit education and students alike. I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting this legislation. ●

By Mr. GRAMM:

S. 1788. A bill to authorize negotiation of free trade agreements with the countries of the Americas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

THE AMERICAN FREE-TRADE ACT

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, today I am introducing the American Free-Trade Act. This legislation builds on our success with the North American Free-Trade Agreement. It sets up a procedure whereby the President would begin negotiations with any or all of the countries of the Western Hemisphere with a goal of achieving a free-trade area from the Arctic to the Antarctic.

The bill has special procedures to deal with Cuba. It says that once Cuba is liberated from Castro, once there is a constitutionally guaranteed democratic government, once private property rights have been restored and protected, once Cuba has a convertible currency, once free speech and free press are protected, and all the political prisoners are released, then we could begin at that point to negotiate with Cuba. Indeed, priority would be given to our negotiations with a free Cuba.

I believe that we are going to create jobs, growth, and opportunity in North America with NAFTA. I think these are benefits that can and should be extended to all the Americas, so that any person working in any hut in any village in the Americas could produce any good or service and sell it anywhere else.

This would be a great act that would promote freedom and democracy in the Americas, that would promote prosperity. It is a very important goal, and I am happy to introduce this bill today.

This may sound visionary to some people. Five years ago, when I was talking about a free-trade agreement with Mexico and with Canada, many thought that I sounded too visionary. Today that vision is the law of the land.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a summary of the American Free-Trade Act be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE AMERICAN FREE-TRADE ACT SUMMARY

I. The President is directed to undertake negotiations to establish free trade agreements between the United States and countries of the Western Hemisphere. Agreements may be bilateral or multilateral.

II. The President, before seeking a free trade agreement with Cuba under the Act, would have to certify (1) that freedom has been restored in Cuba, and (2) that the claims of U.S. citizens for compensation for expropriated property have been appropriately addressed. The President could make the certification that freedom has been restored in Cuba only if he determines that—

A. constitutionally guaranteed democratic government has been established in Cuba, with leaders freely and fairly elected;

B. private property rights have been restored and are effectively protected and broadly exercised;

C. Cuba has a convertible currency;

D. all political prisoners have been released; and

E. free speech and freedom of the press are effectively guaranteed.

If the President certifies that freedom has been restored to Cuba, priority will be given to the negotiation of a free trade agreement with Cuba.

III. Congressional fast track procedures for consideration of any such agreement (i.e. expedited consideration, no amendments), are extended permanently.

By Mr. BUMPERS:

S. 1790. A bill entitled "the National Peace Reauthorization Act"; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

NATIONAL PEACE REAUTHORIZATION ACT

● Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, in 1987 Congress authorized and the President signed into law legislation to authorize the creation of a National Peace Garden in Washington, DC. The purpose of the Peace Garden is to honor the commitment of the people in the United States to world peace. This unique monument will not only honor past achievements but help inspire future efforts for peace—both in this country and throughout the world.

Unfortunately, construction of this memorial was held up for several years because of disagreements over its proposed design. As many of my colleagues know, getting a design concept approved for a memorial is often a long and difficult process and requires the approval of both the Commission of Fine Arts and the National Capital

Planning Commission. Fortunately, final approval for the design concept was received last July and a national fundraising campaign has been launched for the project. Because of the delay in securing design approval, the National Peace Garden now needs to extend its construction authority for an additional 3 years. Today, I am introducing legislation to give them this extension.

Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation and allow work on this memorial to move forward. Similar legislation has already been passed by the House and I hope will be favorably considered by the Senate.

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. 1790

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

SECTION 1. EXTENSION OF AUTHORIZATION FOR PEACE GARDEN.

(a) Notwithstanding section 10 (b) of Public Law 99-652, as amended (40 U.S.C. 1010 (b)), the authority of the National Peace Garden to establish the garden known as the "Peace Garden" in accordance with Public Law 100-63 (40 U.S.C. 1003 note) shall expire on June 30, 1997.

(b)(1) The Congress finds that the Peace Garden Project, Incorporated, has changed its name to the National Peace Garden.

(2) Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the Peace Garden Project, Incorporated shall be deemed to be a reference to the National Peace Garden."•

By Mr. BAUCUS:

S. 1794. A bill to designate the Federal building located at the corner of North 29th Street and Fourth Avenue North in Billings, Montana, as the "William J. Jameson Federal Building", and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

WILLIAM J. JAMESON FEDERAL BUILDING ACT OF 1994

• Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I introduce legislation to name the new Federal building in Billings, MT after the late Judge William J. Jameson. Judge Jameson was an renowned Montana jurist, respected for his integrity, dedication, wisdom, and contribution to the law.

Born August 8, 1898, in Butte, MT, Jameson also lived in Roundup as a youngster. During his early years, teachers and family knew Bill was someone special. He exhibited an uncommon devotion to learning, and from an early age knew he wanted to be a lawyer.

At the age of 17, he entered the University of Montana, matriculating to the university's law school once his undergraduate work was complete. One

year after graduating from law school, he married Mildred Lore of Billings. Mildred was a source of inspiration and support to Bill throughout his career.

Jameson was active in the Montana Republican party. In 1926, while an attorney with the Billings law firm Johnston, Coleman & Johnston, he ran a successful campaign for the Montana legislature. According to *Journey With the Law*, a book about Judge Jameson by Lawrence F. Small, his entire election campaign cost \$35.00.

Jameson served two terms in Helena, and became known for his strong support for the State's higher education system. This support was critical to bringing higher education to Billings, with Eastern Montana College opening in 1927.

After his years in the legislature, Jameson returned to his Billings firm and continued his work as a trial attorney. He received high marks from judges and fellow attorneys for his exceptional abilities.

Jameson joined the Montana Bar Association soon after graduating from law school, and was elected to serve as the M.B.A. president from 1936 to 1937. He also contributed to the community. He gave generously of his time to numerous educational and community organizations in Montana.

In 1953, a prestigious honor came Jameson's way. He was elected president of the American Bar Association during a tumultuous time in American history, the era of McCarthyism and of Brown versus Board of Education of Topeka. During his year-long term, Jameson helped to eliminate racial restrictions for membership in the American Bar Association.

Jameson also served as a member of the Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws; president of the American Judicature Society and the American Law Institute; chairman of the American Bar Endowment board of directors, of the Committee on Standards for the Administration of Criminal Justice, and of the American Bar Association section of judicial administration.

Soon after his term as A.B.A. president, President Eisenhower nominated Jameson to be a U.S. District Judge for Montana. Like the trial attorneys Jameson had faced in court, judges thought highly of Judge Jameson. His reasoned decisions were much respected by members of the bench.

Judge Jameson's love for the law triggered his decision to continue his judicial career as a senior judge after being eligible for full retirement in 1969. In this capacity, he was widely sought after for the next 20 years to sit on Courts of appeals for various Federal circuits.

In 1973, Jameson was awarded the A.B.A. medal, the association's highest accolade, given for "conspicuous service in the cause of American jurispru-

dence." Jameson joined Oliver Wendell Holmes and Felix Frankfurter, among others, in receiving this award.

Judge Jameson was so economical in his stewardship of Federal funds and so diligent in his work habits that it was said at his funeral that if all Federal employees worked as hard and were as frugal as he, there would be no Federal deficit.

Judge Jameson, Mr. President, contributed much to our system of jurisprudence. His passion for the law, and his balanced approach to the law, have served us all.

Montanans are proud to call Judge Jameson one of their own. For this reason, I am particularly honored to introduce legislation to name the new Federal building in Billings after the judge. It is a well-deserved tribute.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the measure be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 1794

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

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION OF WILLIAM J. JAMESON FEDERAL BUILDING.

The Federal building located at the corner of North 29th Street and Fourth Avenue North in Billings, Montana, shall be known and designated as the "William J. Jameson Federal Building".

SEC. 2. REFERENCES.

Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the Federal building referred to in section 1 shall be deemed to be a reference to the "William J. Jameson Federal Building".•

By Mr. BROWN (for himself, Mr. DOLE, Mr. PACKWOOD, Mr. D'AMATO, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. WARNER, Mr. GRAMM, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. GORTON, Mr. BURNS, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. MURKOWSKI, Mr. NICKLES, Mrs. HUTCHISON and Mr. PRESSLER):

S. 1795. A bill to amend title IV of the Social Security Act and other provisions to provide reforms to the welfare system in effect in the United States; to the Committee on Finance.

WELFARE REFORM ACT OF 1994

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, in November, Senate Republicans promised to introduce a welfare reform bill on the first day of this session. Today, with Senator DOLE and 14 other Senators as cosponsors, I'm here to keep that promise and to introduce a Senate Republican welfare reform bill.

Americans believe in work. Work is the key to success, opportunity, fulfillment, and growth. Work encourages accomplishment and self-respect. To reform welfare, we must encourage work.

The welfare reform we Senate Republicans propose focuses on opportunity

to move out of poverty. The Brown/Dole bill requires job search by adults applying for Aid for Families with Dependent Children. It requires able-bodied job-ready adults to work for their welfare benefits. For those who don't have the skills or education to hold a job, we require them to get the remedial education and job skills training necessary for one. The Brown/Dole bill gives States the option of "two years and off" for adult AFDC recipients.

For the welfare recipient, the bill allows them to exchange welfare benefits for a job. AFDC and food stamp benefits can literally be taken in voucher form and exchanged for a job with a private employer. Under this program, the welfare recipient receives a job that pays at least double the welfare benefits. The employer receives the voucher which they can redeem to help pay for the cost of training the employee. The Government saves money by receiving taxes on the income of the new employee.

In 1988, when I was in the House, we made a step toward changing our welfare system to encourage work in the Family Support Act. When the Senate passed a work requirement in its 1988 welfare reform package, the groundwork was set to get it through the House and enacted into law. It was the Republicans in both the House and Senate who thought of it and accomplished it.

This bill takes the work requirements we started in 1988 in the Family Support Act and builds on them. The Brown/Dole bill requires at least one parent in two-parent AFDC families to work for the benefits. It requires non-custodial parents whose children are on welfare to pay court-ordered child support or to participate in welfare work programs.

With work, the Senate Republican welfare reforms also focus on parental responsibility. The Brown/Dole bill requires teenage mothers to live at home, or in a supervised group home, to be eligible for AFDC benefits. It also gives States the option to deny cash welfare benefits to teen mothers or for children conceived while the mother is on AFDC. The Senate Republican welfare reform proposal changes the law so a mother does not get her portion of cash AFDC benefits until she has fully cooperated in getting her children's paternity legally established. It encourages States to establish uniform forms and systems for wage withholding of child support and to honor other States' child support orders.

In developing this legislation, we've talked to several Governors and State legislators about flexibility for States in designing welfare programs. The Senate Republican welfare reform bill allows States to impose several welfare requirements without getting a waiver from the Federal Government. Under this bill, States can impose childhood

immunization and school attendance requirements, limit benefits to new State residents to the same level as they received in the previous State for 1 year, encourage educational savings accounts for children and eliminate the welfare penalty if a mother marries a man not the father of her children. The bill also would standardize and streamline the process for States to get exemptions from Federal welfare requirements.

Lastly, the Senate Republican welfare reform bill would put limits on who can get welfare, but do so recognizing the various needs of our citizens and our communities. In the Brown/Dole bill, we have included a provision specifically stating that illegal aliens are not eligible for welfare benefits, except emergency medical. For legal aliens, their sponsor's income is deemed available to them until they become naturalized U.S. citizens and legal aliens who receive 12 months of welfare benefits are required to be reported to the Immigration and Naturalization Service for possible deportation as a public charge.

Welfare recipients addicted to drugs or alcohol, under this bill, are required to participate in a rehabilitation program and undergo random drug tests to remain eligible. Persons found innocent by reason of insanity would not be eligible for disability benefits based on their mental condition.

This bill is just a beginning of our work on welfare reform. There are other welfare programs, outside the scope of this bill, that desperately need changing. Food stamps, job training, and day care are just a few of the programs we need to work on to give people the help they need to get into a real job and off welfare. I pledge to work with my colleagues, on both sides of the aisle, to further strengthen the Brown/Dole bill and to work on other bills reforming other parts of our welfare system.

Finally, we must address the overall cost of all the welfare programs. Our country cannot continue to spend and increase the deficit in programs that don't help people become productive members of society. The vehicle for addressing these overall cost concerns will soon be before us in the budget resolution. With Senators FAIRCLOTH, GRASSLEY, and GORTON, I will be working toward reasonable caps on welfare spending.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I am pleased to join with my distinguished colleague, Senator BROWN, in introducing a real welfare reform bill.

As part of his campaign, President Clinton promised to "End welfare as we know it," yet a year has gone by and Americans are still waiting for his proposal.

Right now—too many Americans who receive welfare assistance need to be set free from the chains that bind them

to a dependency on government handouts. Handouts that often destroy their self-sufficiency.

Republicans have responded to this welfare crisis with leadership—action has been taken by our Republican Governors, by Republican Members of the House of Representatives and right here in the U.S. Senate. Our emphasis has been on ending welfare as a way of life—by strengthening real work requirements for able-bodied adults who receive government assistance and by encouraging parental responsibility.

The Republican proposals recognize the human despair of those in need, while at the same time, taking a real look at who needs welfare and what should be the responsibilities of those who receive cash assistance. This country was built on the American dream—not the assurance of a free ride.

Mr. President, the legislation that Senator BROWN has introduced today asks welfare recipients to commit to what made this country great—the American work ethic. And it builds upon the landmark progress that was made when President Ronald Reagan signed into law the 1988 Family Support Act—a hard fought bipartisan agreement. The Senate contributed to this effort by passing a visionary work requirement which also was approved in the House.

More specifically, this legislation takes another step toward encouraging those on welfare to work. It gives the States the authority to end welfare after 2 years for all able-bodied recipients. That's right. Two years and off. No more temptation to rely on lifelong government benefit programs that have become a permanent crutch for many Americans when these people can become self-sufficient. Too many times these benefits have become the crutch that contributes to broken families, the loss of personal dignity and at the same time costing taxpayers billions of dollars a year.

Moreover, the bill emphasizes parental responsibility and allows increased State flexibility to address these local problems and respond to the rapid increase in illegitimacy.

The Federal Government has a role to play in setting tough rules that establish priorities. For example, the Federal Government will require unmarried minor mothers on aid to families with dependent children [AFDC], a major welfare program, to live with their parents, guardians, or in a group home. We believe this will help establish a family environment—clearly an important benefit over the long term.

States have a lot to contribute in the design of new ways to address existing problems—so new flexibility will be given. For example, States will have the option to deny AFDC cash benefits to unmarried minor mothers or to deny additional cash benefits for children conceived while the mother is on welfare.

Right now—we must seize the opportunity to fix this broken system. A system that exists where 1 out of 7 American children are on welfare.

Republicans want able-bodied Americans to have a temporary safety net and then earn a fair shot at joining the mainstream of society. We want to provide the children of America the future they deserve.

By Mr. KOHL (for himself and Mr. FEINGOLD):

S. 1797. A bill to require the Secretary of Transportation to amend the existing regulations applicable to charter flights to the Super Bowl to apply the requirements of such regulations to charter flights to inter-collegiate football games designated as bowl games and to the basketball games among the last 4 teams in the National Collegiate Athletic Association's division I championship basketball tournaments; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

AMENDING CHARTER FLIGHT REGULATIONS

• Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, this year, when thousands of eager University of Wisconsin Badgers fans bought plane tickets to go to the Rose Bowl to cheer their hometown team to victory, they had no reason to believe that they'd have to watch the event on TV. Or did they?

It has been estimated that as many as 2,000 Wisconsin residents who purchased Rose Bowl "packages" from charter services arrived in California only to learn that the game tickets they had been promised did not exist. While some of these people were able to secure last minute tickets at exorbitant prices, hundreds of those had to watch the event on TV in a room near-by the stadium.

While U.S. Department of Transportation regulations exist to prevent this from happening at the Super Bowl, these regulations do not apply to other events. The DOT regulations (14 CFR 380.18a) require that an operator marketing a Super Bowl air package that includes game tickets must have the tickets in hand or have a written contract for the tickets before the operator does any advertising.

The legislation that I am introducing today would require the Secretary of Transportation to apply these Super Bowl regulations to Rose Bowl games and to NCAA "Final Four" tournaments. It is my hope that this legislation will result in the regulatory changes necessary to protect the consumer.

I welcome Senator FEINGOLD as an original cosponsor of this legislation, and note that Congressman KLUG is introducing the same legislation in the House.

I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the bill be included in the RECORD.

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

S. 1797

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

SECTION 1. REGULATION OF CHARTERS.

The Secretary of Transportation shall amend part 380.18a of title 14 of the Code of Federal Regulations to apply the requirements contained in such regulation to charter flights going to—

(1) inter-collegiate football games designated as bowl games; and

(2) basketball games among the last 4 teams in the National Collegiate Athletic Association's division I championship basketball tournaments.●

• Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I rise today to join my colleague, Senator KOHL in introducing a bill to require the Secretary of Transportation to amend the existing regulations applicable to charter flights, to extend those rules to collegiate bowl games and NCAA final four basketball games.

As you know, the University of Wisconsin football team appeared in the 1994 Rose Bowl for the first time in over 30 years; and I am proud to add they were victorious.

As Rose Bowl fever swept the State following the regular season, tens of thousands of Badger fans sought out ways to get to Pasadena. Indeed, tens of thousands of Badger fans did actually get to Pasadena and attend the game.

Many of those loyal fans made their travel and game plans through agents and companies selling charter flight and Rose Bowl ticket packages. Upon their arrival in California they found that the tickets that they paid for were unavailable, or were priced significantly higher than they believed to be the case when they booked and paid for the charter package.

So while over 60,000 Badger fans were inside the Rose Bowl on New Year's Day, thousands were relegated to viewing the game on television at hastily erected tents outside the stadium or in hotels and bars—great economic development for Pasadena, but no consolation for paying Wisconsin Badger fans.

Charter and ticket scams have occurred before, and especially in relation to major sporting events. It's happened at the Super Bowl and at other bowl games in the past. Some States protect citizens against scalping and other forms of ticket fraud, while others don't. Where such consumer protection laws do exist, detection and enforcement vary widely.

We already have a no-cost solution to the problem, and that is part 380.18A of title 14 of the Code of Federal Regulations, which requires charter operators to prove that they have possession of the appropriate number of game tickets before they advertise. Currently, however, the rule only applies to Super Bowl games.

This bill amends the rule, and extends its requirements to charter flights going to intercollegiate bowl

games and the games of the last 4 teams of the NCAA's division I basketball tournament.

It's simple, it's effective, it's fair, it's time.●

By Mr. BRADLEY:

S. 1798. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the tax on handguns and assault weapons and to impose a tax on the transfer of handguns and assault weapons, to increase the license application fee for gun dealers, and to use the proceeds from those increases to pay for medical care for gunshot victims; to the Committee on Finance.

GUN VIOLENCE HEALTH CARE COST PREVENTION ACT

• Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Gun Violence Health Care Costs Prevention Act, a bill to reduce the public's share of the health care costs associated with gunshot injuries by significantly increasing the taxes and licensing fees associated with the sale and purchase of handguns, assault weapons, and the ammunition for these firearms.

The high rate of gun-related violence is wreaking havoc with our health care system. Every 14 minutes someone in the United States dies from a gunshot. The total lifetime costs associated with firearm deaths and injuries were over \$20 billion in 1990. We spend an estimated \$3 billion a year treating firearm injuries, and 80 percent of the cost of hospitalization for these injuries is paid by public funds. Although handguns and assault weapons cost the Government millions of dollars in health care each year, the dealers and consumers of these firearms do not pay their fair share. Instead, the American public must foot the bill.

The bill I introduce today increases the fees for most 3-year Federal firearms dealer licenses to \$3,000. It also increases the manufacturer's excise tax on handguns, assault weapons, and the ammunition for these firearms to 30 percent. In addition, it establishes a new 30-percent Federal sales and transfer tax to cover sales of these instruments by gun dealers to retail customers. Finally, this bill puts the proceeds from these tax and licensing fee increases into a trust fund for the support of trauma centers and hospitals that have incurred substantial uncompensated costs while treating gunshot victims. If enacted, this bill will shift some of the health care cost of firearms-related injuries away from the American public to the dealers and consumers of guns.

There are currently over 209 million firearms in the United States, 71 million of which are handguns. Although handguns make up less than one-third of all firearms, they are involved in two-thirds of the gun murders that occur each year. Assault weapons account for a much smaller percentage of

total firearms, but they have become weapons of choice for some criminals, giving them the ability to pump bullets into people at devastatingly fast and intense levels.

There are currently 280,000 federally licensed dealers in the United States, as compared to 155,000 grocery stores and 210,000 gas stations. According to the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, 90,000 new or renewed dealers licenses are issued each year. The current cost of a new 3-year Federal firearms dealer license is \$30, a cost which has not changed since 1968. When the Brady bill goes into effect next month, the cost will still only be \$200 for a new license and \$90 for subsequent licenses. Significant increases in the gun dealer licensing fee would dramatically reduce the number of Federal firearms dealers, raise the amount of public funds available to treat firearms-related injuries, and bring the cost of handguns, assault weapons, and the ammunition for these firearms more in line with their cost to our society.

It is not my intention to restrict the use of the firearms which are appropriate for legitimate recreational purposes. It is my goal, however, to acknowledge the important link between certain firearms and the high health care costs associated with gun violence. I urge my colleagues to cosponsor it. I ask unanimous consent to include the text of this legislation and a bill summary in the RECORD. I yield the floor.

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

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 "Gun Violence Health Care Costs Prevention Act".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds that—

(1) there are currently over 209,000,000 firearms in the United States, 71,000,000 of which are handguns and 1,000,000 of which are semiautomatic assault weapons;

(2) there are now over 280,000 federally licensed gun dealers in the United States, as compared to 155,000 grocery stores and 210,000 gas stations;

(3) a Federal firearms dealer's license allows the licensee to purchase firearms wholesale across State lines;

(4) according to the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, American taxpayers annually pay more than \$28,000,000 in subsidies to operate the Federal firearms dealer licensing system;

(5) each year more than 24,000 Americans (65 Americans a day) are killed with handguns, either in homicides, by committing suicide, or by unintentional injuries;

(6) handguns account for only one-third of all firearms in the United States, but account for two-thirds of all firearm-related deaths;

(7) in 1991, the United States led the developed world with 14,373 gun murders, as compared to 186 gun murders in Canada, 76 gun murders in Australia, 60 gun murders in England, and 74 gun murders in Japan;

(8) in 1991, there were 11,497 murders committed with handguns, as compared to 745 murders committed with rifles, 1,124 murders committed with shotguns, and 3,430 murders committed with knives;

(9) every 14 minutes someone in the United States dies from a gunshot;

(10) in 1989, there were over 240,000 nonfatal firearms injuries;

(11) 95 percent of the persons injured each year by a handgun require emergency care or hospitalization;

(12) firearms injuries, fatal and nonfatal, are the third most costly type of injury overall;

(13) the total lifetime costs associated with firearm deaths and injuries were \$14,400,000,000 in 1985, increased to at least \$16,200,000,000 by 1988, and increased to \$20,400,000,000 by 1990;

(14) the health care cost of firearm-related injuries is approximately \$3,000,000,000 a year;

(15) public funds pay for over 80 percent of the cost of hospitalization for firearms injuries, excluding professional fees and the cost of ambulance, physical therapy, and other rehabilitative services;

(16) youngsters carry an estimated 270,000 guns to school every day;

(17) gun violence is a major public health problem and handguns, assault weapons, and the ammunition for these firearms are major health hazards;

(18) the cost of firearms and firearms dealers licenses should reflect the health costs of firearms to our society;

(19) the Federal taxes on handguns, assault weapons, and the ammunition for these firearms should be significantly increased to partially offset the health care costs of gun violence;

(20) the fees required for Federal firearms dealer's licenses should be significantly increased to partially offset the health care costs of gun violence; and

(21) the increased Federal taxes should not be imposed on firearms and ammunition which are recognized as particularly suitable for, or readily adaptable to, sporting purposes.

SEC. 3. LICENSE APPLICATION FEES FOR DEALERS IN FIREARMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 923(a) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking subparagraph (B) of paragraph (3) and inserting:

"(B) who is not a dealer in destructive devices, a fee of \$3,000 for 3 years (including renewals)."; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new flush sentence:

"There are hereby appropriated to the Gun Violence Trauma Care Trust Fund established under section 9512 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (26 U.S.C. 9512) 93 percent of the revenues from fees collected under paragraph (3)(B) for original licenses and 97 percent of the revenues from such fees for renewal licenses."

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to license applications (including renewals) filed after the 180th day after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 4. INCREASE IN TAX ON HANDGUNS AND ASSAULT WEAPONS.

(a) INCREASE IN MANUFACTURER'S TAX.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Part III of subchapter D of chapter 32 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to tax on firearms) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"SEC. 4183. IMPOSITION OF ADDITIONAL TAX ON HANDGUNS AND ASSAULT WEAPONS.

"(a) IMPOSITION OF TAX.—In addition to any tax imposed by section 4181, there is hereby imposed upon the sale by the manufacturer, producer, or importer of any of the following articles a tax equivalent to the specified percentage of the price for which so sold:

"ARTICLES TAXABLE AT 20 PERCENT.—
"Handguns.

"ARTICLES TAXABLE AT 19 PERCENT.—
"Semiautomatic assault weapons.

"Shells and cartridges used in handguns and semiautomatic assault weapons.

"(b) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of subsection (a)—

"(1) HANDGUN.—The term 'handgun' means any pistol or revolver.

"(2) SEMIAUTOMATIC ASSAULT WEAPON.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'semiautomatic assault weapon' means—

"(i) any of the semiautomatic firearms known as—

"(I) A.A. Arms AP-9;

"(II) Auto-Ordnance Thompson;

"(III) Barrett Light-Fifty;

"(IV) Beretta AR-70;

"(V) Bushmaster Auto Rifle;

"(VI) Calico M-900 and M-950;

"(VII) Cobray, Ingram and RPB MAC-10 and MAC-11;

"(VIII) Colt AR-15 and Sporter;

"(IX) Encom MP-9 and MP-45;

"(X) Fabrique Nationale FN/FAL, FN/LAR, and FNC;

"(XI) Feather AT-9;

"(XII) Federal XP900 and XP450;

"(XIII) Franchi SPAS-12;

"(XIV) Intratec TEC-9 and TEC-22;

"(XV) Israeli Military Industries UZI and Galil;

"(XVI) Iver Johnson Enforcer 3000;

"(XVII) Norinco, Mitchell and Poly Technologies Avtomat Kalashnikovs;

"(XVIII) Steyr AUG; or

"(XIX) USAS-12;

"(i) a revolving-cylinder shotgun such as or similar to the Street Sweeper or Striker 12; and

"(ii) a semiautomatic firearm designated by the Secretary as a semiautomatic assault weapon under subsection (c).

"(B) EXCEPTIONS.—The term 'semiautomatic assault weapon' does not include (among other firearms)—

"(i) any of the firearms known as—

"(I) Remington Model 1100 shotgun;

"(II) Remington Model 7400 rifle;

"(III) Mossberg Model 5500 shotgun;

"(IV) HK Model 300 rifle;

"(V) Marlin Model 9 camp carbine;

"(VI) Browning High-Power rifle; or

"(VII) Remington Nylon 66 auto loading rifle;

"(ii) a firearm that is a manually operated bolt action firearm;

"(iii) a lever action firearm;

"(iv) a slide action firearm; or

"(v) a firearm that has been rendered permanently inoperable.

"(3) SHELLS AND CARTRIDGES.—

"(A) HANDGUNS.—The term 'cartridges used in handguns' includes—

"(i) any centerfire cartridge which has a cartridge case less than 1.3 inches in length,

"(ii) any cartridge case which is less than 1.3 inches in length, or

"(iii) any other ammunition listed under subsection (c)(1)(B) as likely to be used in a handgun.

"(B) SEMIAUTOMATIC ASSAULT WEAPONS.—The term 'shells or cartridges used in semiautomatic assault weapons' means any shells, cartridges, magazines, or other am-

munition which is listed under subsection (c)(1)(B) as likely to be used in a semiautomatic assault weapon.

"(c) DESIGNATION OF SEMIAUTOMATIC ASSAULT WEAPONS AND TAXABLE AMMUNITION.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this section, and annually thereafter, the Secretary, in consultation with the Attorney General, shall—

"(A) determine whether any other semiautomatic firearm (other than a firearm described in subsection (b)(2)(B)) should be designated as a semiautomatic assault weapon in addition to those previously designated by subsection (b)(2)(A) or by the Secretary under this subsection, and

"(B) publish a list of shells and cartridges which are likely to be used in handguns and semiautomatic assault weapons.

"(2) CRITERIA.—For purposes of paragraph (1)(A), the Secretary shall by regulation designate as a semiautomatic assault weapon a rifle, pistol, or shotgun that is a semiautomatic firearm and that is described in paragraph (3), (4), (5), or (6).

"(3) REPLICAS OR DUPLICATES.—A replica or duplicate in any caliber of a semiautomatic firearm described in subsection (b)(2)(A)(i) is a semiautomatic assault weapon.

"(4) CERTAIN NONSPORTING FIREARMS.—A rifle that is a semiautomatic firearm is a semiautomatic assault weapon if it—

"(A) is not generally recognized as being particularly suitable for or readily adaptable to sporting purposes,

"(B) has an ability to accept a detachable magazine, and

"(C) has at least 2 of the following characteristics:

"(i) A folding or telescoping stock.

"(ii) A pistol grip that protrudes conspicuously beneath the action of the weapon.

"(iii) A bayonet mount.

"(iv) A flash suppressor or threaded barrel designed to accommodate a flash suppressor.

"(v) A grenade launcher.

"(5) CERTAIN PISTOLS.—A pistol that is a semiautomatic firearm is a semiautomatic assault weapon if it—

"(A) is not generally recognized as being particularly suitable for or adaptable to sporting purposes,

"(B) has an ability to accept a detachable magazine, and

"(C) has at least 2 of the following characteristics:

"(i) An ammunition magazine that attaches to the pistol outside of the pistol grip.

"(ii) A threaded barrel capable of accepting a barrel extender, flash suppressor, forward hand grip, or silencer.

"(iii) A shroud that is attached to or partially or completely encircles the barrel and that permits the shooter to hold the firearm with the second hand without being burned.

"(iv) A manufactured weight of 50 ounces or more when the pistol is unloaded.

"(v) A semiautomatic version of an automatic firearm.

"(6) CERTAIN SHOTGUNS.—A shotgun that is a semiautomatic firearm is a semiautomatic assault weapon if it—

"(A) is not generally recognized as being particularly suitable for or adaptable to sporting purposes, and

"(B) has at least 2 of the following characteristics:

"(i) A folding or telescoping stock.

"(ii) A pistol grip that protrudes conspicuously beneath the action of the weapon.

"(iii) A fixed magazine capacity in excess of 6 rounds.

"(iv) An ability to accept a detachable magazine."

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) Section 4182(a) of such Code is amended by inserting "or 4183" after "section 4181".

(B) Paragraph (6) of section 6091(b) of such Code is amended by striking "section 4181" and inserting "section 4181 or 4183".

(C) The table of sections for part III of subchapter D of chapter 32 of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

"Sec. 4183. Imposition of additional tax on handguns and assault weapons."

(b) TAX ON SUBSEQUENT SALES OR TRANSFERS INVOLVING ASSAULT WEAPONS AND HANDGUNS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 31 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subchapter:

"Subchapter D—Handguns and Semiautomatic Assault Weapons

"Sec. 4056. Handguns and semiautomatic assault weapons.

"SEC. 4056. HANDGUNS AND SEMIAUTOMATIC ASSAULT WEAPONS.

"(a) IMPOSITION OF TAX.—There is hereby imposed on any sale, transfer, or other disposition by any person of a handgun, semiautomatic assault weapon, or shells and cartridges used in handguns and semiautomatic assault weapons a tax equal to 30 percent of the price for which sold, transferred, or disposed of.

"(b) CREDIT FOR TAX PREVIOUSLY IMPOSED.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of the 1st retail sale of any article, and any sale, transfer, or disposition preceding the 1st retail sale, the amount of tax imposed by subsection (a) shall be reduced by the amount of tax imposed by this section, section 4181, or section 4183 on any preceding sale, transfer, or disposition of the article.

"(2) REFUNDS.—If a taxpayer establishes to the satisfaction of the Secretary that tax was imposed in excess of the amount due, the Secretary shall pay (without interest) to the taxpayer the amount of such excess.

"(3) REQUIREMENTS.—No reduction or refund shall be made under this subsection unless the taxpayer meets such requirements as the Secretary may prescribe with respect to proof of payment of tax for any prior sale, transfer, or disposition.

"(c) EXCEPTIONS.—

"(1) COORDINATION WITH MANUFACTURER'S TAX.—No tax shall be imposed under subsection (a) on a sale, transfer, or disposition of an article if tax is imposed under section 4181 or 4183 with respect to such sale, transfer, or disposition.

"(2) DEFENSE DEPARTMENT.—No tax shall be imposed by subsection (a) on any sale described in section 4182(b).

"(d) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section, the terms 'handgun', 'semiautomatic assault weapon', and 'shells and cartridges used in handguns and semiautomatic assault weapons' have the meanings given such terms by section 4183(b)."

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of subchapters for chapter 31 of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

"Subchapter D—Handguns and Semiautomatic Assault Weapons."

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to sales, transfers, and other dispositions after the 180th day after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 5. GUN VIOLENCE TRAUMA CARE TRUST FUND.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter A of chapter 98 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to trust fund code) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"SEC. 9512. GUN VIOLENCE TRAUMA CARE TRUST FUND.

"(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF THE TRUST FUND.—There is established in the Treasury of the United States a trust fund to be known as the 'Gun Violence Trauma Care Trust Fund', consisting of such amounts as may be appropriated or credited to such Trust Fund as provided in this section or section 9602(b).

"(b) TRANSFERS TO THE TRUST FUND.—There are hereby appropriated to the Gun Violence Trauma Care Trust Fund amounts equivalent to—

"(1) the taxes received in the Treasury under section 4056,

"(2) the taxes received in the Treasury under section 4183, and

"(3) the amounts described in the last sentence of section 923(a) of title 18, United States Code.

"(c) EXPENDITURES FROM THE TRUST FUND.—Funds in the Gun Violence Trauma Care Trust Fund shall be available, as provided in appropriations Acts, only—

"(1) for the purpose of making grants to assist hospitals, trauma centers, or other health care providers that have incurred substantial uncompensated costs in providing medical care to gunshot victims, or

"(2) in the event a national health program is established which compensates for those costs, for the purpose of reimbursing that program for its costs in providing the compensation.

"(d) ELIGIBILITY FOR TRUST FUND MONIES.—A hospital, trauma center, or other health care provider is eligible to apply for grants from the Trust Fund for any calendar year if the hospital, trauma center, or health care provider—

"(1) is in compliance with Federal and State certification and licensing requirements;

"(2) is a not-for-profit entity; and

"(3) has incurred substantial uncompensated costs during the previous calendar year in providing medical care to gunshot victims.

"(e) REGULATIONS FOR TRUST FUND.—The Secretary shall, not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this section and in consultation with the Secretary of Health and Human Services, issue such regulations as are necessary to implement the provisions of this section."

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for subchapter A of chapter 98 of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

"Sec. 9512. Gun Violence Trauma Care Trust Fund."

GUN VIOLENCE HEALTH CARE COSTS PREVENTION ACT SUMMARY

First, increases the 3-year Federal firearms dealer licensing fee to \$3,000. The current fees are \$200 for the initial dealer's license and \$90 for subsequent licenses. Before passage of the Brady bill, which goes into effect on February 28, 1994, the cost of a 3-year firearms dealer license was \$30, a cost which had not increased since 1968. Increasing the Federal firearms dealer licensing fee to \$3,000 would raise an additional \$40-60 million and reduce the number of fed-

erally licensed firearms dealers from the current figure of 280,000 to between 40,000 and 60,000.

Second, increases the Federal manufacturer-producer-importer excise tax to 30 percent for handguns—pistols and revolvers—assault weapons, handgun ammunition, and ammunition used in semiautomatic assault weapons. The current excise tax is 10 percent for handguns and 11 percent for shotguns and rifles.

Third, imposes a new 30-percent Federal tax upon all transfers or sales of handguns—pistols and revolvers—assault weapons, handgun ammunition, and ammunition used in semiautomatic assault weapons. The Joint Tax Committee estimates that the tax increases would raise \$1.1 billion in additional revenue over 5 years to offset the health care costs of gun-related violence.

Fourth, establishes a gun violence trauma care trust fund and places all revenue generated—over and above that generated by current taxes benefiting the Federal Aid to Wildlife Fund—into the fund for the benefit of hospital trauma centers that treat gunshot victims.●

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 27

At the request of Mr. SARBANES, the names of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HARKIN], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. LAUTENBERG], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SPECTER] were added as cosponsors of S. 27, a bill to authorize the Alpha Phi Alpha fraternity to establish a memorial to Martin Luther King, Jr., in the District of Columbia.

S. 155

At the request of Mr. DASCHLE, the names of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. KOHL] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. FORD] were added as cosponsors of S. 155, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 with respect to the treatment of certain amounts received by a cooperative telephone company.

S. 359

At the request of Mr. DECONCINI, the names of the Senator from Texas [Mrs. HUTCHISON] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN] were added as cosponsors of S. 359, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial, and for other purposes.

S. 618

At the request of Mr. RIEGLE, the name of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. LIEBERMAN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 618, a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to permit the admission to the United States of nonimmigrant students and visitors who are the spouses and chil-

dren of U.S. permanent resident aliens, and for other purposes.

S. 687

At the request of Mr. ROCKEFELLER, the names of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. PRYOR] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. GRAMM] were added as cosponsors of S. 687, a bill to regulate interstate commerce by providing for a uniform product liability law, and for other purposes.

S. 774

At the request of Mr. WOFFORD, the name of the Senator from New York [Mr. MOYNIHAN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 774, a bill to authorize appropriations for the Martin Luther King, Jr., Federal Holiday Commission, extend such Commission, establish a national service day to promote community service, and for other purposes.

S. 783

At the request of Mr. RIEGLE, the names of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SIMON] and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SARBANES] were withdrawn as cosponsors of S. 783, a bill to amend the Fair Credit Reporting Act, and for other purposes.

S. 839

At the request of Mr. HOLLINGS, the name of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 839, a bill to establish a program to facilitate development of high-speed rail transportation in the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 921

At the request of Mr. BAUCUS, the names of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. RIEGLE], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. JEFFORDS], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MURRAY] were added as cosponsors of S. 921, a bill to reauthorize and amend the Endangered Species Act for the conservation of threatened and endangered species, and for other purposes.

S. 1083

At the request of Mr. ROCKEFELLER, the name of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. LEAHY] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1083, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that veterans' allowances and benefits administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs are not included in gross income.

S. 1125

At the request of Mr. DODD, the name of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. WELLSTONE] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1125, a bill to help local school systems achieve Goal Six of the National Education Goals, which provides that by the year 2000, every school in America will be free of drugs and violence and will offer a disciplined environment conducive to learning, by ensuring that all schools are safe and free of violence.

S. 1288

At the request of Mr. AKAKA, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island

[Mr. CHAFEE] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1288, a bill to provide for the coordination and implementation of a national aquaculture policy for the private sector by the Secretary of Agriculture, to establish an aquaculture commercialization research program, and for other purposes.

S. 1329

At the request of Mr. D'AMATO, the names of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. DASCHLE] and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. ROTH] were added as cosponsors of S. 1329, a bill to provide for an investigation of the whereabouts of the United States citizens and others who have been missing from Cyprus since 1974.

S. 1406

At the request of Mr. KERREY, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. NICKLES] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1406, a bill to amend the Plant Variety Protection Act to make such act consistent with the International Convention for the Protection of New Varieties of Plants of March 19, 1991, to which the United States is a signatory, and for other purposes.

S. 1458

At the request of Mrs. KASSEBAUM, the names of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CRAIG], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. KEMPTHORNE], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. GRAMM] were added as cosponsors of S. 1458, a bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to establish time limitations on certain civil actions against aircraft manufacturers, and for other purposes.

S. 1521

At the request of Mr. SHELBY, the name of the Senator from Texas [Mrs. HUTCHISON] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1521, a bill to reauthorize and amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to improve and protect the integrity of the programs of such act for the conservation of threatened and endangered species, to ensure balanced consideration of all impacts of decisions implementing such act, to provide for equitable treatment of non-Federal persons and Federal agencies under such act, to encourage non-Federal persons to contribute voluntarily to species conservation, and for other purposes.

S. 1650

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the name of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBB] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1650, a bill to designate the United States Courthouse for the Eastern District of Virginia in Alexandria, Virginia, as the Albert V. Bryan United States Courthouse.

S. 1676

At the request of Mr. MACK, the names of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. COATS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HELMS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. LOTT], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. NICKLES] were added as cosponsors of S. 1676, a

bill to provide a fair, nonpolitical process that will achieve \$65,000,000,000 in budget outlay reductions each fiscal year until a balanced budget is reached.

S. 1693

At the request of Mr. REID, the name of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. PRESSLER] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1693, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to delay the effective date for the change in the point of imposition of the tax on diesel fuel, to provide that vendors of diesel fuel used for any nontaxable use may claim refunds on behalf of the ultimate users, and to provide a similar rule for vendors of gasoline used by State and local governments.

S. 1698

At the request of Mr. WALLOP, the names of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. COCHRAN] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] were added as cosponsors of S. 1698, a bill to reduce the paperwork burden on certain rural regulated financial institutions, and for other purposes.

S. 1772

At the request of Mr. GRAMM, the name of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. LOTT] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1772, a bill to reduce Federal employment to the levels proposed in the Vice President's report of the national performance review.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 90

At the request of Mr. ROBB, the names of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCCAIN] and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. DASCHLE] were added as cosponsors of S.J. Res. 90, a joint resolution to recognize the achievements of radio amateurs, and to establish support for such amateurs as national policy.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 155

At the request of Mr. LEVIN, his name was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 155, a joint resolution to designate the week beginning March 13, 1994, as "National Manufacturing Week".

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 160

At the request of Mr. RIEGLE, the names of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. LAUTENBERG], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BREAUX], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BRYAN], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCCAIN], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. MURKOWSKI], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SPECTER], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUE], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. GLENN], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. CHAFEE], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. AKAKA], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. DURENBERGER], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. BOND], the Senator from New York [Mr. D'AMATO], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. WOFFORD], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS], and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr.

LIEBERMAN] were added as cosponsors of S.J. Res. 160, a joint resolution to designate the month of April 1994 as "National Sudden Infant Death Syndrome Awareness Month", and for other purposes.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 45

At the request of Mr. D'AMATO, the name of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HELMS] was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 45, a concurrent resolution relating to the Republic of China on Taiwan's participation in the United Nations.

SENATE RESOLUTION

At the request of Mr. LUGAR, the name of the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 64, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that increasing the effective rate of taxation by lowering the estate tax exemption would devastate homeowners, farmers, and small business owners, further hindering the creation of jobs and economic growth.

SENATE RESOLUTION 177—INFORMING THE PRESIDENT THAT A QUORUM OF EACH HOUSE IS ASSEMBLED

Mr. MITCHELL (for himself and Mr. DOLE) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 177

Resolved, That a committee consisting of two Senators be appointed to join such committee as may be appointed by the House of Representatives to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that a quorum of each House is assembled and that the Congress is ready to receive any communication he may be pleased to make.

SENATE RESOLUTION 178—INFORMING THE HOUSE THAT A QUORUM OF THE SENATE IS ASSEMBLED

Mr. MITCHELL (for himself and Mr. DOLE) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 178

Resolved, That the Secretary inform the House of Representatives that a quorum of the Senate is assembled and that the Senate is ready to proceed to business.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED

FOREIGN RELATIONS
AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1994BIDEN (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT
NO. 1246

Mr. BIDEN (for himself, Mr. FEINGOLD, Mr. PELL, Mr. WOFFORD, Mr. KERRY, and Mr. HELMS) proposed an amendment to the bill (S. 1281) to authorize appropriations for the fiscal

year 1994 and 1995 for the Department of State, the United States Information Agency, and related agencies, to provide for the consolidation of international broadcasting activities, and for other purposes; as follows:

Beginning on page 133, strike out line 1 and all that follows through line 24 on page 149, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

TITLE III—UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL BROADCASTING ACT OF 1994

SEC. 301. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the "United States International Broadcasting Act of 1994".

SEC. 302. CONGRESSIONAL FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF PURPOSES.

The Congress hereby finds and declares that—

(1) it is the policy of the United States to promote the right of opinion and expression, including the freedom "to seek, receive, and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers," in accordance with Article 19 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights;

(2) open communication of information and ideas among the peoples of the world contributes to international peace and stability, and that the promotion of such communication is in the interests of the United States;

(3) prominent in the implementation of this policy has been United States support for the Voice of America, Radio Free Europe, Radio Liberty, and Broadcasting to Cuba, which have demonstrated their effectiveness in providing accurate and timely information to the people of the world;

(4) the continuation of these broadcasting entities, and the creation of a new broadcasting service to the people of the People's Republic of China and the other communist countries of Asia, would continue the promotion of information and ideas, while advancing the goals of United States foreign policy; and

(5) the reorganization and consolidation of these services will achieve important economies and strengthen the capability of the United States to utilize these instrumentalities to support freedom and democracy in a rapidly changing international environment.

SEC. 303. ESTABLISHMENT OF BROADCASTING BOARD OF GOVERNORS.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is hereby established within the United States Information Agency a Broadcasting Board of Governors (hereafter in this title referred to as the "Board").

(b) COMPOSITION OF THE BOARD.—(1) The Board shall consist of 8 members, as follows:

(A) Six voting members who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

(B) The Director of the United States Information Agency who shall also be a voting member.

(C) The Director of the International Broadcasting Bureau, who shall be an ex officio member of the Board and may not vote in the determinations of the Board.

(2) The President shall designate one member (other than the Director of the United States Information Agency) as Chairman of the Board.

(3) Exclusive of the Director of the United States Information Agency, not more than three of the members of the Board appointed by the President shall be of the same political party.

(c) TERM OF OFFICE.—The term of office of each member of the Board shall be three years, except that the Director of the United

States Information Agency and the Director of the International Broadcasting Bureau of the United States Information Agency shall remain members of the Board during their respective terms of service. Of the other six voting members, the initial terms of office of two members shall be one year, and the initial terms of office of two other members shall be two years, so that the terms of one-third of these voting members of the Board expire each year. The President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, Board members to fill vacancies occurring prior to the expiration of a term, in which case the members so appointed shall serve for the remainder of such term. Any member whose term has expired may serve until his or her successor has been appointed and qualified.

(d) **SELECTION OF BOARD.**—Members of the Board appointed by the President shall be citizens of the United States who are not currently regular full-time employees of the United States Government, except the Director of the United States Information Agency. Such members shall be selected by the President from among Americans distinguished in the fields of mass communications, print, broadcast media or foreign affairs.

(e) **COMPENSATION.**—Members of the Board, while attending meetings of the Board or while engaged in duties relating to such meetings or in other activities of the Board pursuant to this section, including travel time, shall be entitled to receive compensation equal to the daily equivalent of the compensation prescribed for level IV of the Executive Schedule under section 5315 of title 5, United States Code. While away from their homes or regular places of business they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5703) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently. The Director of the United States Information Agency and the Director, International Broadcasting Bureau, United States Information Agency, shall not be entitled to any compensation under this title, but may be allowed travel expenses as provided in the preceding sentence.

SEC. 304. FUNCTIONS OF THE BOARD.

(a) **AUTHORITIES.**—The Board is authorized—

(1) to provide guidance and oversight to the International Broadcasting Bureau;

(2) to review and evaluate the mission and operation of the International Broadcasting Bureau and to assess the quality, effectiveness, and professional integrity of its programming within the context of the broad foreign policy objectives of the United States;

(3) to review and evaluate, at least annually, the mix of traditional Voice of America programming and surrogate programming and make recommendations to the President, through the Director of the United States Information Agency, regarding the addition or deletion of language services;

(4) to make grants to RFE/RL, Incorporated, or to an alternative entity in accordance with section 307(e);

(5) to review engineering activities to ensure that all broadcasting elements receive the highest quality and cost-effective delivery services;

(6) to undertake such studies as may be necessary to identify areas in which the operations of the International Broadcasting Bureau could be made more efficient and economical;

(7) to submit to the President, through the Director of the United States Information

Agency, an annual report which summarizes the activities of the Board and evaluates the operations of the International Broadcasting Bureau;

(8) to the extent it deems necessary to carry out the functions under this title, procure supplies, services, and other personal property;

(9) to appoint such staff personnel for the Board as may be necessary, subject to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, and to fix their compensation in accordance with the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates; and

(10) to make available for its own use, for official reception and representation expenses, such amount as provided for in an annual appropriations which shall not exceed the amount appropriated to the Board for International Broadcasting for such purposes in fiscal year 1993.

(b) **IMPLEMENTATION.**—The Director and the Board, in carrying out the functions of subsection (a), shall respect the professional independence and integrity of the International Broadcasting Bureau and its broadcasting services.

SEC. 305. FOREIGN POLICY GUIDANCE.

To assist the Board in carrying out its functions, the Secretary of State, acting through the Director of the United States Information Agency, shall provide information and guidance on foreign policy issues to the Board.

SEC. 306. INTERNATIONAL BROADCASTING BUREAU.

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—There is hereby established an International Broadcasting Bureau within the United States Information Agency (hereafter in this title referred to as the "Bureau").

(b) **ORGANIZATION OF THE BUREAU.**—The Bureau, in recognition of and to implement the purposes of this title, shall consist of the following separate elements:

(1) The Voice of America.

(2) The Office of Surrogate Broadcasting.

(3) Such services of the WORLDNET Television and Film Service as determined by the Board with the concurrence of the Director of the United States Information Agency.

(4) Engineering and Technical Operations.

(5) Such other elements as the Director of the International Broadcasting Bureau may from time to time establish with the concurrence of the Director of the United States Information Agency and the Board.

(c) **ORGANIZATION OF THE OFFICE OF SURROGATE BROADCASTING.**—The Office of Surrogate Broadcasting shall administer the grants for Radio Free Europe, Radio Liberty, and Radio Free Asia and shall administer the Office of Cuba Broadcasting (including Radio Marti and TV Marti), and such other surrogate services as may from time to time be established.

(d) **SELECTION OF THE DIRECTOR OF THE BUREAU.**—(1) The Director of the Bureau shall be appointed by the Chairman of the Board, in consultation with the Director of the United States Information Agency and with the concurrence of a majority of the Board. The Director of the Bureau shall be entitled to receive compensation at the rate now or hereafter prescribed by law for level IV of the Executive Schedule.

(2) Section 5315 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"Director of the International Broadcasting Bureau, the United States Information Agency."

(e) **SEPARATELY IDENTIFIED APPROPRIATION ACCOUNT.**—(1) In any fiscal year, funding for the Board and the Bureau shall be made out of a single appropriations account designated "International Broadcasting Activities" or "International Broadcasting Operations", as the case may be.

(2) The Director of the Bureau shall submit proposals on appropriation of broadcasting funds to the Board. The Board shall forward its recommendations concerning the proposed budget for the Board and the Bureau to the Director of the United States Information Agency for his consideration as a part of the Agency's budget submission to the Office of Management and Budget.

(3) The Director of the United States Information Agency shall include in the Agency's submission to the Office of Management and Budget the comments and recommendations of the Board concerning the proposed broadcasting budget.

(4) The Board shall allocate funds appropriated pursuant to paragraph (1) among the separate elements of the International Broadcasting Bureau, subject to the limitations contained in section 307(d).

SEC. 307. GRANTS FOR RADIO FREE EUROPE, RADIO LIBERTY, AND RADIO FREE ASIA.

(a) **AUTHORITY.**—The Board is authorized to make annual grants to RFE/RL, Incorporated, for the purpose of operating Radio Free Europe, Radio Liberty, and Radio Free Asia as provided for in sections 308 and 309.

(b) **BOARD STRUCTURE.**—No grant may be made to RFE/RL, Incorporated, unless the certificate of incorporation of RFE/RL, Incorporated, has been amended to provide that—

(1) the Board of Directors of RFE/RL, Incorporated, shall consist of the members of the Broadcasting Board of Governors established under section 303 and of no other members;

(2) such Board of Directors shall make all major policy determinations governing the operation of RFE/RL, Incorporated, and shall appoint and fix the compensation of such managerial officers and employees of RFE/RL, Incorporated, as it deems necessary to carry out the purposes of the grant provided under this title; and

(3) the name of the corporation shall be amended to include reference to Radio Free Asia, and the corporation shall be authorized to carry out the functions described in section 308 with respect to Radio Free Asia.

(c) **LOCATION OF PRINCIPAL PLACE OF BUSINESS.**—(1) No grant may be made under this section unless RFE/RL, Incorporated, agrees to locate the headquarters of the corporation and its senior administrative and managerial staff within the metropolitan area of Washington, D.C.

(2) Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Board shall provide a report to Congress on the number of administrative, managerial, and technical staff who will be located within the metropolitan area of Washington, D.C., and the number of employees whose principal place of business will be located outside the metropolitan area of Washington, D.C.

(d) **LIMITATION ON GRANT AMOUNTS.**—(1) Grants made after September 30, 1995, for the operating costs of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty may not exceed \$75,000,000 in any fiscal year.

(2) Grants made for the operating costs of Radio Free Asia may not exceed \$22,000,000 in any fiscal year.

(3) The total amount of grant funds made available for one-time capital costs of Radio Free Asia may not exceed \$8,000,000.

(4) Notwithstanding the provisions of paragraphs (1) and (2), if RFE/RL, Incorporated, determines that there is a need to reallocate resources between funds made available for Radio Free Europe, Radio Liberty, and Radio Free Asia, RFE/RL, Incorporated, may submit a request for the reallocation of such resources to the Board, which may authorize such reallocation after notifying the appropriate congressional committees.

(e) **ALTERNATIVE GRANTEE.**—If the Board determines at any time that RFE/RL, Incorporated, is not carrying out the functions described in section 308 or 309 in an effective and economical manner, the Board may award the grant to carry out these functions to another entity after soliciting and considering applications from eligible entities in such manner and accompanied by such information as the Board may reasonably require.

(f) **NOT A FEDERAL AGENCY OR INSTRUMENTALITY.**—Compliance with the requirements of subsection (b) shall not be construed to make such entity a Federal agency or instrumentality.

SEC. 308. RADIO FREE ASIA.

(a) **AUTHORITY.**—(1) Grants authorized under section 307(a) shall be available to make annual grants for the purpose of carrying out radio broadcasting to the People's Republic of China, Burma, Cambodia, Laos, North Korea, Tibet, or Vietnam.

(2) Such surrogate broadcasting service shall be referred to as "Radio Free Asia".

(b) **FUNCTIONS.**—Radio Free Asia shall—

(1) provide accurate and timely information, news, and commentary about events in the respective countries of Asia and elsewhere; and

(2) be a forum for a variety of opinions and voices from within Asian nations whose people do not fully enjoy freedom of expression.

(c) **SUBMISSION OF DETAILED PLAN FOR RADIO FREE ASIA.**—(1) No grant may be awarded to carry out this section unless the Board, through the Director of the United States Information Agency, has submitted to Congress and the Comptroller General of the United States a detailed plan for the establishment and operation of Radio Free Asia, including—

(A) a description of the manner in which RFE/RL, Incorporated, would meet the funding limitations provided in section 307(d)(2);

(B) a statement that the authority to utilize existing transmitters has been obtained for the broadcasting of Radio Free Asia to countries or regions proposed in the plan, and that existing transmitters meet the technical needs of the new service; and

(C) a detailed justification for the number of employees RFE/RL, Incorporated, proposes to hire, the extent to which RFE/RL, Incorporated, intends to utilize technical or other resources of other broadcasting entities, and the manner in which RFE/RL, Incorporated, intends to reimburse such other entities for such utilization of resources.

(2) The plan required by paragraph (1) shall be submitted not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(3) No grant may be awarded to carry out the provisions of this section unless the plan submitted by the Board includes a certification by the Board that Radio Free Asia can be established and operated within the funding limitations provided for in section 307(d)(2).

(4) The Comptroller General of the United States shall review the plan submitted by the Board and shall, not later than 30 days after receipt of the plan, report to the Director of the United States Information Agency, the Board, and the appropriate congressional

committees on whether the Comptroller General determines that the fiscal assumptions contained in the plan are adequate and that the plan can be implemented within the funding limitations provided for in this section.

(5) If the Board determines that a Radio Free Asia cannot be established or operated effectively within the funding limitations provided for in this section, the Board may submit, through the Director of United States Information Agency, an alternative plan and such proposed changes in legislation as may be necessary to the appropriate congressional committees.

(d) **GRANT AGREEMENT.**—(1) Grants awarded under this section shall be subject to the same terms and conditions as are provided in subsections (b), (c), (d), and (e) of section 309 with respect to the functions of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty.

(2) Any grant agreement under this section shall require that any contract entered into by RFE/RL, Incorporated, with respect to Radio Free Asia shall specify that all obligations are assumed by RFE/RL, Incorporated, and not by the United States Government, and shall further specify that funds to carry out the activities of RFE/RL, Incorporated, may not be available after September 30, 1999.

(3) Any such grant agreement shall require that any lease agreements entered into by RFE/RL, Incorporated, with respect to Radio Free Asia shall be, to the maximum extent possible, assignable to the United States Government.

(e) **LIMITATIONS ON ADMINISTRATIVE AND MANAGERIAL COSTS.**—(1) It is the sense of the Congress that administrative and managerial costs for operation of Radio Free Asia should be kept to a minimum and, to the maximum extent feasible, should not exceed the costs that would have been incurred if Radio Free Asia had been operated as a Federal entity rather than as a grantee.

(2) The Board shall include in the annual report required by section 304(a)(7) information on the amount of funds expended on administrative and managerial services by each of the broadcasting services operated through the Bureau, directly or by grant, and the steps it has taken to reduce unnecessary overhead costs for each of the broadcasting services.

(f) **ASSESSMENT OF THE EFFECTIVENESS OF RADIO FREE ASIA.**—Not later than 3 years after the date funds have been provided to RFE/RL, Incorporated, for the purpose of operating Radio Free Asia, the Board, through the Director of the United States Information Agency, shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on—

(1) whether Radio Free Asia is technically sound and cost-effective,

(2) whether Radio Free Asia consistently meets the standards for quality and objectivity established by law by the United States Information Agency or the Board,

(3) whether Radio Free Asia is received by a sufficient audience to warrant its continuation,

(4) the extent to which such broadcasting is already being received by the target audience from other credible sources; and

(5) the extent to which the interest of the United States is being served by maintaining broadcasting of Radio Free Asia.

(g) **SUNSET PROVISION.**—The Board may not make any grant for the purpose of operating Radio Free Asia after September 30, 1998, unless the President of the United States determines in his fiscal year 1999 budget submission that continuation of funding for Radio

Free Asia for 1 additional year is in the interest of the United States.

(h) **NOTIFICATION AND CONSULTATION REGARDING DISPLACEMENT OF VOICE OF AMERICA BROADCASTING.**—The Board shall notify the appropriate congressional committees before entering into any agreements for the utilization of Voice of America transmitters, equipment, or other resources that will significantly reduce the broadcasting activities of the Voice of America in Asia or any other region in order to accommodate the broadcasting activities of Radio Free Asia. The Chairman of the Board shall consult with such committees on the impact of any such reduction in Voice of America broadcasting activities.

(i) **PRINCIPAL PLACE OF BUSINESS.**—Grants may only be made to RFE/RL, Incorporated, if the principal place of business of Radio Free Asia is within the Washington, D.C., metropolitan area, unless the Board determines that another location within the United States is necessary to carry out the functions of Radio Free Asia effectively and in a cost-effective manner.

SEC. 309. RADIO FREE EUROPE AND RADIO LIBERTY.

(a) **AUTHORITY.**—Grants authorized under section 307(a) shall be available to make annual grants for the purpose of carrying out the same functions as were carried out by RFE/RL, Incorporated, before the date of enactment of this Act with respect to Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty, consistent with section 2 of the Board for International Broadcasting Act of 1973, as in effect on such date.

(b) **GRANT AGREEMENT.**—(1) Such grants shall be made pursuant to a grant agreement between the Board and RFE/RL, Incorporated, which requires that grant funds shall only be used for activities which the Board determines are consistent with the purposes of subsection (a) and that RFE/RL, Incorporated, shall otherwise comply with the requirements of this section. Failure to comply with such requirements shall permit the grant to be terminated without fiscal obligation to the United States.

(2) The grant agreement shall impose such conditions as the Board determines may be appropriate pursuant to section 304(a)(3) to reduce overlapping language services and broadcasting service with other broadcasting services operated within the International Broadcasting Bureau.

(3) The grant agreement shall require RFE/RL, Incorporated, to justify in detail each proposed expenditure of grant funds, and such funds may not be used for any other purpose unless the Board gives its prior written approval.

(c) **PROHIBITED USES OF GRANT FUNDS.**—No grant funds provided under this section may be used—

(1) to pay any salary or other compensation, or enter into any contract providing for the payment thereof in excess of the rates established for comparable positions under title 5 of the United States Code or the foreign relations laws of the United States, except that no employee may be paid a salary or other compensation in an amount in excess of the rate of pay payable for level IV of the Executive Schedule under section 5315 of title 5, United States Code and that the salary or other compensation limitations provided for in this paragraph shall not be imposed prior to January 1, 1995, with respect to any employee covered by a union agreement requiring a different salary or;

(2) to pay for any activity for the purpose of influencing the passage or defeat of legislation being considered by Congress;

(3) to enter into a contract or obligation to pay severance payments beyond those required by United States law or the laws of the country where the employee is stationed;

(4) to pay for first class travel for any employee of RFE/RL, Incorporated, or the employee's relative; or

(5) to compensate freelance contractors without the written approval of the Director.

(d) **REPORT ON MANAGEMENT PRACTICES.**—Not later than March 31 and September 30 of each calendar year, the Inspector General of the United States Information Agency shall submit to the Board, the Director of the United States Information Agency, and the Congress a report on management practices of RFE/RL, Incorporated, under this section during the preceding 6-month period. The Inspector General of the United States Information Agency shall establish a special unit within the Inspector General's office to monitor and audit the activities of RFE/RL, Incorporated, and shall provide for on-site monitoring of such activities.

(e) **AUDIT AUTHORITY.**—(1) Such financial transactions of RFE/RL, Incorporated, as relate to functions carried out under this section may be audited by the General Accounting Office in accordance with such principles and procedures and under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Comptroller General of the United States. Any such audit shall be conducted at the place or places where accounts of RFE/RL, Incorporated, are normally kept.

(2) The representatives of the General Accounting Office shall have access to all books, accounts, records, reports, files, and all other papers, things or property belonging to or in use by the private entity pertaining to such financial transactions and necessary to facilitate the audit. Such representatives shall be afforded full facilities for verifying transactions with any assets held by depositories, fiscal agents, and custodians. All such books, accounts, records, reports files, papers, and property of RFE/RL, Incorporated, shall remain in the possession and custody of RFE/RL, Incorporated.

(3) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Inspector General of the United States Information Agency is authorized to exercise the authorities of the Inspector General Act of 1978 with respect to RFE/RL, Incorporated.

(g) **PLAN FOR RELOCATION.**—Before relocating the activities of RFE/RL, Incorporated, in the Federal Republic of Germany to another site, the Board for International Broadcasting or the Board, if established, shall submit to the Comptroller General of the United States and the appropriate congressional committees a detailed plan for such relocation, including cost estimates. No funds made available under law may be used for such relocation unless explicitly provided in an appropriation Act or pursuant to a reprogramming notification. Any plan developed pursuant to this subsection shall include provisions for relocating the senior administrative and management personnel of RFE/RL, Incorporated, to the geographic area of Washington, D.C., as provided for in section 307(c).

(h) **REPORTS ON PERSONNEL CLASSIFICATION.**—(1) Not later than 3 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Board for International Broadcasting shall submit a report to the Office of Personnel Management containing a justification, in terms of the types of duties performed at specific rates of salary and other compensation, of the classification of personnel employed by RFE/RL, Incorporated.

(2) Not later than 9 months after submission of the report referred to in paragraph (1), the Office of Personnel Management shall submit to Congress a report containing an evaluation of the system of personnel classification used by RFE/RL, Incorporated, with respect to its employees.

(3) The report submitted by the Office of Personnel Management shall include a comparison of the rates of salary or other compensation and classifications provided to employees of RFE/RL, Incorporated, with the rates of salary or other compensation and classifications of employees of the Voice of America stationed overseas in comparable positions and shall identify any disparities and steps which should be taken to eliminate such disparities.

SEC. 310. TRANSITION.

(a) **AUTHORIZATION.**—(1) The President is authorized to direct the transfer of all functions and authorities from the Board for International Broadcasting to the United States Information Agency, the Board, or the Bureau as may be necessary to implement this title.

(2)(A) Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the United States Information Agency and the Chairman of the Board for International Broadcasting shall jointly prepare and submit to the President for approval and implementation a plan to implement the provisions of this title. Such report shall include at a minimum a detailed cost analysis to implement fully the recommendations of such plan. Additionally, such plan shall identify all costs in excess of those authorized for such purposes and shall provide that any excess cost to implement such plan shall be derived only from funds authorized in title II, Part A, section 201(a)(1) of this Act.

(B) The President shall transmit copies of the approved plan, together with any recommendations for legislative changes that may be necessary, to the appropriate congressional committees.

(b) **NEW APPOINTEES.**—The Director of the United States Information Agency may assign employees of the Agency for service with RFE/RL, Incorporated, with the concurrence of the president of RFE/RL, Incorporated.

Such assignment shall not affect the rights and benefits of such personnel as employees of the United States Information Agency.

(c) **BOARD FOR INTERNATIONAL BROADCASTING PERSONNEL.**—All Board for International Broadcasting full-time United States Government personnel (except special Government employees) and part-time United States Government personnel holding permanent positions shall be transferred to the United States Information Agency, the Board, or the Bureau. Such transfer shall not cause any such employee to be separated or reduced in grade or compensation.

(d) **OTHER AUTHORITIES.**—The Director of the United States Information Agency is authorized to utilize the provisions of titles VIII and IX of the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, and any other authority available to the Director on the date of enactment of this Act, to the extent that the Director deems necessary in carrying out the provisions and purposes of this title.

(e) **REPEAL.**—The Board for International Broadcasting Act of 1973 (22 U.S.C. 2871, et seq.) is repealed effective September 30, 1995, or the earliest date by which all members of the Board are appointed, whichever is later.

(f) **SAVINGS PROVISIONS.**—

(1) **CONTINUING EFFECT OF LEGAL DOCUMENTS.**—All orders, determinations, rules,

regulations, permits, agreements, grants, contracts, certificates, licenses, registrations, privileges, and other administrative actions—

(A) which have been issued, made, granted, or allowed to become effective by the President, any Federal agency or official thereof, or by a court of competent jurisdiction, in the performance of functions which are transferred under this title; and

(B) which are in effect at the time this title takes effect, or were final before the effective date of this title and are to become effective on or after the effective date of this title,

shall continue in effect according to their terms until modified, terminated, superseded, set aside, or revoked in accordance with law by the President, the Director of the United States Information Agency or other authorized official, a court of competent jurisdiction, or by operation of law.

(2) **PROCEEDINGS NOT AFFECTED.**—The provisions of this title shall not affect any proceedings pending before the Board for International Broadcasting at the time this title takes effect, with respect to functions transferred by this title, but such proceedings shall be continued. Orders shall be issued in such proceedings, appeals shall be taken therefrom, and payments shall be made pursuant to such orders, as if this title had not been enacted, and orders issued in any such proceedings shall continue in effect until modified, terminated, superseded, or revoked by a duly authorized official, by a court of competent jurisdiction, or by operation of law. Nothing in this subsection shall be deemed to prohibit the discontinuance or modification of any such proceeding under the same terms and conditions and to the same extent that such proceeding could have been discontinued or modified if this title had not been enacted.

(3) **SUITS NOT AFFECTED.**—The provisions of this title shall not affect suits commenced before the effective date of this title, and in all such suits, proceedings shall be had, appeals taken, and judgments rendered in the same manner and with the same effect as if this title had not been enacted.

(4) **NONABATEMENT OF ACTIONS.**—No suit, action, or other proceeding commenced by or against the Board for International Broadcasting or by or against any individual in the official capacity of such individual as an officer of the Board for International Broadcasting shall abate by reason of the enactment of this title.

(5) **ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS RELATING TO PROMULGATION OF REGULATIONS.**—Any administrative action relating to the preparation or promulgation of a regulation by the Board for International Broadcasting relating to a function transferred under this title may be continued by the United States Information Agency with the same effect as if this title had not been enacted.

(6) **REFERENCES.**—A reference in any provision of law, reorganization plan, or other authority to the Associate Director for Broadcasting of the United States Information Agency shall be considered to be a reference to the Director of the International Broadcasting Bureau of the United States Information Agency.

(7) **EFFECT ON OTHER LAWS.**—The provisions of, and authorities contained in or transferred pursuant to, this title are not intended to repeal, limit, or otherwise derogate from the authorities or functions of or available to the Director of the United States Information Agency or the Secretary

of State under law, reorganization plan, or otherwise, unless such provision hereof—

(A) specifically refers to the provision of law or authority existing on the effective date of this title, so affected; or

(B) is in direct conflict with such law or authority existing on the effective date of this title.

SEC. 311. PRESERVATION OF AMERICAN JOBS.

It is the sense of the Congress that the Director of the United States Information Agency and the Chairman of the Board for International Broadcasting should, in developing the plan for consolidation and reorganization of overseas international broadcasting services, limit, to the maximum extent feasible, consistent with the purposes of the consolidation, elimination of any United States-based positions and should affirmatively seek to transfer as many positions as possible to the United States.

SEC. 312. PRIVATIZATION OF RADIO FREE EUROPE AND RADIO LIBERTY.

(a) **DECLARATION OF POLICY.**—It is the sense of the Congress that, in furtherance of the objectives of section 302 of this Act, the funding of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty should be assumed by the private sector not later than December 31, 1999, and that the funding of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty Research Institute should be assumed by the private sector at the earliest possible time.

(b) **PRESIDENTIAL SUBMISSION.**—The President shall submit with his annual budget submission for the International Broadcasting Bureau established by section 306 of this Act an analysis and recommendations for achieving the objectives of subsection (a).

(c) **REPORTS ON TRANSFER OF RFE/RL RESEARCH INSTITUTE.**—No later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Board for International Broadcasting, or the Board, if established, shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the steps being taken to transfer RFE/RL Research Institute pursuant to subsection (a) and shall provide periodic progress reports on such efforts until such transfer has been achieved.

SEC. 313. DEFINITIONS.

For the purposes of this title—

(1) the term "appropriate congressional committees" means the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives;

(2) the term "Director" means the Director of the International Broadcasting Bureau, acting through the Office of Surrogate Broadcasting;

(3) the term "RFE/RL, Incorporated" includes—

(A) the corporation having the corporate title described in section 307(b)(3); and

(B) any alternative grantee described in section 307(e).

(4) the term "salary or other compensation" includes any deferred compensation or pension payments, any payments for expenses for which the recipient is not obligated to itemize, and any payments for personnel services provided to an employee of RFE/RL, Incorporated.

HELMS (AND MATHEWS) AMENDMENT NO. 1247

Mr. HELMS (for himself and Mr. MATHEWS) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1281, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title II, part B, add the following:

SECTION 1. REDUCTION IN FORCE AUTHORITY WITH REGARD TO THE FOREIGN SERVICE.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—(1) Title VI of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (22 U.S.C. 4001 et seq.) is amended—

(A) by redesignating sections 611, 612, and 613 as sections 612, 613, and 614 respectively; and

(B) by inserting after section 610 the following new section:

"SEC. 611. REDUCTIONS IN FORCE.—(a) The Secretary may conduct reductions in force and may prescribe regulations for the separation of members of the Service under such reductions in force which give due effect to—

"(1) organizational needs;

"(2) documented employee qualifications, knowledge, skills, or competencies;

"(3) documented employee performance;

"(4) tenure of employment; and

"(5) military preference.

"(b) For purposes of this section the term 'members of the Service' means the individuals described under section 103."

(2) The table of contents for the Foreign Service Act of 1980 is amended by striking out the items related to section 611, 612, 613 and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"Sec. 611. Reductions in force.

"Sec. 612. Termination of limited appointments.

"Sec. 613. Termination of appointments of consular agents and foreign national employees

"Sec. 614. Foreign Service awards."

(b) **MANAGEMENT RIGHTS.**—Section 1005(a) of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (22 U.S.C. 4105(a)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (3) through (6) as paragraphs (4) through (7), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following new paragraph:

"(3) to conduct reductions in force, and to prescribe regulations for the separation of employees under such reductions in force conducted under section 611."

(c) **CONSULTATION.**—The Secretary of State shall consult with the Director of the Office of Personnel Management before prescribing regulations for reductions in force under section 611 of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (as added by subsection (a) of this section).

HELMS AMENDMENTS NOS. 1248– 1249

Mr. HELMS proposed two amendments to the bill S. 1281, supra; as follows:

AMENDMENT No. 1248

On page 9, line 16, after "purposes" insert the following new subsection (b) and renumber the rest of the section accordingly:

(b) **WITHHOLDING OF FUNDS.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the funds authorized to be appropriated for "Contributions for International Organizations" shall be reduced in the amount of \$118,875,000 for each fiscal years 1994 and 1995, and for each year thereafter, unless the President has certified to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to the President of the Senate that no United Nations Agency or United Nations-affiliated agency grants any official status, accreditation, or recognition to any organization which promotes, condones, or seeks the legalization of pedophilia, or which includes as a subsidiary or member any such organization.

AMENDMENT No. 1249

On page 179, line 6, after the word "agreement" add the following: "or a bilateral U.S. nuclear cooperation agreement."

PELL (AND SIMON) AMENDMENT NO. 1250

Mr. PELL (for himself and Mr. SIMON) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1281, supra; as follows:

On page 179, after line 6, add the following new title:

TITLE VIII—ARMS CONTROL AND NONPROLIFERATION ACT OF 1994

SEC. 801. SHORT TITLE; REFERENCES IN ACT; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This title may be cited as the "Arms Control and Nonproliferation Act of 1994".

(b) **REFERENCES IN TITLE.**—Except as specifically provided in this title, whenever in this title an amendment or repeal is expressed as an amendment to or repeal of a provision, the reference shall be deemed to be made to the Arms Control and Disarmament Act.

SEC. 802. CONGRESSIONAL DECLARATIONS; PURPOSE.

(a) **CONGRESSIONAL DECLARATIONS.**—The Congress declares that—

(1) a fundamental goal of the United States, particularly in the wake of the highly turbulent and uncertain international situation fostered by the end of the Cold War, the disintegration of the Soviet Union and the resulting emergence of fifteen new independent states, and the revolutionary changes in Eastern Europe, is to eliminate chemical and biological weapons and to reduce and limit the large numbers of nuclear weapons in the former Soviet Union and, more generally, to prevent the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and their means of delivery, and of high-technology conventional armaments as well as to prevent regional conflicts and conventional arms races; and

(2) an ultimate goal of the United States continues to be a world in which the use of force is subordinated to the rule of law and international change is achieved peacefully without the danger and burden of destabilizing and costly armaments.

(b) **PURPOSE.**—The purpose of this title is—

(1) to strengthen the United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency; and

(2) to improve congressional oversight of the arms control, nonproliferation, and disarmament activities of the United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

SEC. 803. PURPOSES.

Section 2 (22 U.S.C. 2551) is amended in the text following the third undesignated paragraph by striking paragraphs (a), (b), (c), and (d) and by inserting the following new paragraphs:

"(1) The preparation for and management of United States participation in international negotiations and implementation fora in the arms control and disarmament field.

"(2) When directed by the President, the preparation for, and management of, United States participation in international negotiations and implementation fora in the nonproliferation field.

"(3) The conduct, support, and coordination of research for arms control, nonproliferation, and disarmament policy formulation.

"(4) The preparation for, operation of, or, as appropriate, direction of, United States participation in such control systems as may become part of United States arms control, nonproliferation, and disarmament activities.

"(5) The dissemination and coordination of public information concerning arms control, nonproliferation, and disarmament."

SEC. 804. REPEALS.

The following provisions of law are hereby repealed:

(1) Section 26 (22 U.S.C. 2566), relating to the General Advisory Committee.

(2) Section 36 (22 U.S.C. 2578), relating to arms control impact information and analysis.

(3) Section 38 (22 U.S.C. 2578), relating to reports on Standing Consultative Commission activities.

(4) Section 1002 of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1986 (22 U.S.C. 2592a), relating to an annual report on Soviet compliance with arms control commitments.

SEC. 805. DIRECTOR.

Section 22 (22 U.S.C. 2562) is amended to read as follows:

"DIRECTOR

"SEC. 22. (a) APPOINTMENT.—The Agency shall be headed by a Director appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. No person serving on active duty as a commissioned officer of the Armed Forces of the United States may be appointed Director.

"(b) DUTIES.—(1) The Director shall serve as the principal adviser to the Secretary of State, the National Security Council, and the President and other executive branch Government officials on matters relating to arms control, nonproliferation, and disarmament matters. In carrying out his duties under this Act, the Director, under the direction of the President and the Secretary of State, shall have primary responsibility within the Government for matters relating to arms control and disarmament, and, whenever directed by the President, primary responsibility within the Government for matters relating to nonproliferation.

"(2) The Director shall attend all meetings of the National Security Council involving weapons procurement, arms sales, consideration of the defense budget, and all arms control, nonproliferation, and disarmament matters."

SEC. 806. BUREAUS, OFFICES, AND DIVISIONS.

Section 25 (22 U.S.C. 2565) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 25. BUREAUS, OFFICES, AND DIVISIONS.

"The Director, under the direction of the Secretary of State, may establish within the Agency such bureaus, offices, and divisions as he may determine to be necessary to discharge his responsibilities pursuant to this Act, including a bureau of intelligence and information support and an office to perform legal services for the Agency."

SEC. 807. PRESIDENTIAL SPECIAL REPRESENTATIVES.

(a) Sections 27 and 28 (22 U.S.C. 2567, 2568) are redesignated as sections 26 and 27, respectively.

(b) Section 26 (as redesignated by subsection (a)) is amended to read as follows:

"PRESIDENTIAL SPECIAL REPRESENTATIVES

"SEC. 26. The President may appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, Special Representatives of the President for Arms Control, Nonproliferation, and Disarmament. Each Presidential Special Representative shall hold the personal rank of ambassador. Presidential Special Representatives appointed under this section shall perform their duties and exercise their powers under direction of the President and the Secretary of State, acting through the Director. The Agency shall be the Government Agency responsible for providing administrative support, including funding, staff, and office space, to all Presidential Special Representatives."

SEC. 808. POLICY FORMULATION.

Section 33 (22 U.S.C. 2573) is amended to read as follows:

"POLICY FORMULATION

"SEC. 33. (a) FORMULATION.—The Director shall prepare for the President, the Secretary of State, and the heads of such other Government agencies as the President may determine, recommendations and advice concerning United States arms control, nonproliferation, and disarmament policy.

"(b) PROHIBITION.—No action shall be taken pursuant to this or any other Act that would obligate the United States to reduce or limit the Armed Forces or armaments of the United States in a militarily significant manner, except pursuant to the treaty-making power of the President set forth in Article II, Section 2, Clause 2 of the Constitution or unless authorized by the enactment of further affirmative legislation by the Congress of the United States."

SEC. 809. NEGOTIATION MANAGEMENT.

Section 34 (22 U.S.C. 2574) is amended to read as follows:

"NEGOTIATION MANAGEMENT

"SEC. 34. (a) RESPONSIBILITIES.—The Director, under the direction of the President and the Secretary of State, shall have primary responsibility for the preparation, conduct, and management of United States participation in all international negotiations and implementation fora in the field of arms control and disarmament and shall have primary responsibility, whenever directed by the President, for the preparation, conduct, and management of United States participation in international negotiations and implementation fora in the field of nonproliferation. In furtherance of these responsibilities Special Representatives of the President for Nonproliferation, established pursuant to section 26, shall, as directed by the President, serve as the United States Government representatives to international organizations, conferences, and activities relating to the field of nonproliferation, such as the preparations for and conduct of the review relating to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.

"(b) FUNCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO THE UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY.—The Director shall perform functions pursuant to section 2(c) of the Reorganization Plan 8 of 1953 with respect to providing to the United States Information Agency official United States positions and policy on arms control, nonproliferation, and disarmament matters for dissemination abroad.

"(c) AUTHORITY.—The Director is authorized—

"(1) to formulate plans and make preparations for the establishment, operation, and funding of inspections and control systems which may become part of the United States arms control, nonproliferation, and disarmament activities; and

"(2) as authorized by law, to put into effect, direct, or otherwise assume United States responsibility for such systems."

SEC. 810. REPORT ON MEASURES TO COORDINATE RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.

Not later than March 31, 1995, the President shall submit to the Congress a report prepared by the Director of the United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, in coordination with the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Energy, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the Director of Central Intelligence, with respect to the procedures established pursuant to section 35 of the

Arms Control and Disarmament Act (22 U.S.C. 2575) for the effective coordination of research and development on arms control, nonproliferation, and disarmament among all departments and agencies of the executive branch of Government.

SEC. 811. NEGOTIATING RECORDS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Arms Control and Disarmament Act is amended by inserting after section 35 the following:

"NEGOTIATING RECORDS

"SEC. 36. (a) PREPARATION OF RECORDS.—The Director shall establish and maintain records for each arms control, nonproliferation, and disarmament agreement to which the United States is a party and which was under negotiation or in force on or after January 1, 1990, which shall include classified and unclassified materials such as instructions and guidance, position papers, reporting cables and memoranda of conversation, working papers, draft texts of the agreement, diplomatic notes, notes verbal, and other internal and external correspondence.

"(b) NEGOTIATING AND IMPLEMENTATION RECORDS.—In particular, the Director shall establish and maintain a negotiating and implementation record for each such agreement, which shall be comprehensive and detailed, and shall document all communications between the parties with respect to such agreement. Such records shall be maintained both in hard copy and magnetic media.

"(c) PARTICIPATION OF AGENCY PERSONNEL.—In order to implement effectively this section, the Director shall ensure that Agency personnel participate throughout the negotiation and implementation phases of all arms control, nonproliferation, and disarmament agreements."

(b) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than January 31, 1995, the Director of the United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency shall submit to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate a detailed report describing the actions he has undertaken to implement section 36 of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act.

SEC. 812. VERIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE.

Section 37 (22 U.S.C. 2577) is amended to read as follows:

"VERIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE

"SEC. 37. (a) IN GENERAL.—In order to ensure that arms control, nonproliferation, and disarmament agreements can be adequately verified, the Director shall report to Congress, on a timely basis, or upon request by an appropriate committee of the Congress—

"(1) in the case of any arms control, nonproliferation, or disarmament agreement that has been concluded by the United States, the determination of the Director as to the degree to which the components of such agreement can be verified;

"(2) in the case of any arms control, nonproliferation, or disarmament agreement that has entered into force, any significant degradation or alteration in the capacity of the United States to verify compliance of the components of such agreement; and

"(3) the amount and percentage of research funds expended by the Agency for the purpose of analyzing issues relating to arms control, nonproliferation, and disarmament verification.

"(b) STANDARD FOR VERIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE.—In making determinations under paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a), the Director shall assume all measures of concealment not expressly prohibited could be

employed and that standard practices could be altered so as to impede verification.

"(c) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Except as otherwise provided for by law, nothing in this section may be construed as requiring the disclosure of sensitive information relating to intelligence sources or methods or persons employed in the verification of compliance with arms control, nonproliferation, and disarmament agreements.

"(d) **PARTICIPATION OF THE AGENCY.**—In order to ensure adherence of the United States to obligations or commitments undertaken in arms control, nonproliferation, and disarmament agreements, and in order for the Director to make the assessment required by section 51(a)(5), the Director, or the Director's designee, shall participate in all interagency groups or organizations within the executive branch of Government that assess, analyze, or review United States planned or ongoing policies, programs, or actions that have a direct bearing on United States adherence to obligations undertaken in arms control, nonproliferation, or disarmament agreements."

SEC. 813. AUTHORITIES WITH RESPECT TO NON-PROLIFERATION MATTERS.

(a) **AMENDMENTS TO THE ARMS EXPORT CONTROL ACT.**—(1) Section 38(a)(2) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2778(a)(2)) is amended to read as follows:

"(2) Decisions on issuing export licenses under this section shall be made in coordination with the Director of the United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, taking into account the Director's assessment as to whether the export of an article would contribute to an arms race, support international terrorism, increase the possibility of outbreak or escalation of conflict, or prejudice the development of bilateral or multilateral arms control or nonproliferation agreements or other arrangements. The Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency is authorized, whenever the Director determines that the issuance of an export license under this section would be detrimental to the national security of the United States, to recommend to the President that such export license be disapproved."

(2) Section 42(a) of such Act (22 U.S.C. 2791(a)) is amended—

(A) by redesignating clauses (1), (2), and (3) as clauses (A), (B), and (C), respectively;

(B) by inserting "(1)" immediately after "(a)";

(C) by amending clause (C) (as redesignated) to read as follows:

"(C) the assessment of the Director of the United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency as to whether, and the extent to which, such sale might contribute to an arms race, support international terrorism, increase the possibility of outbreak or escalation of conflict, or prejudice the development of bilateral or multilateral arms control or nonproliferation agreements or other arrangements;" and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

"(2) Any proposed sale made pursuant to this Act shall be approved only after consultation with the Director of the United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. The Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency is authorized, whenever the Director determines that a sale under this section would be detrimental to the national security of the United States, to recommend to the President that such sale be disapproved."

(3) Section 71(a) of such Act (22 U.S.C. 2797(a)) is amended by inserting "and the Di-

rector of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency" after "The Secretary of Defense".

(4) Section 71(b)(1) of such Act (22 U.S.C. 2797(b)(1)) is amended by inserting "and the Director of the United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency" after "Secretary of Defense".

(5) Section 71(b)(2) of such Act (22 U.S.C. 2797(b)(2)) is amended by inserting "and the Director of the United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency" after "The Secretary of Commerce".

(6) Section 71(c) of such Act (22 U.S.C. 2797(c)) is amended by inserting "to include the Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency" after "other appropriate Government agencies".

(7) Section 73(d) of such Act (22 U.S.C. 2797(d)) is amended by inserting "and the Director of the United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency" after "The Secretary of Commerce".

(b) **AMENDMENT TO THE NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION ACT.**—Section 309(c) of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Act of 1978 (42 U.S.C. 2139(a)) is amended in the second sentence by striking out ", as required."

SEC. 814. APPOINTMENT AND COMPENSATION OF PERSONNEL.

Section 41(b) (22 U.S.C. 2581(b)) is amended by striking all that follows "General Schedule pay rates," and inserting in lieu thereof "except that—

"(1) the Director may, to the extent the Director determines necessary, appoint in the excepted service, and fix the compensation of, employees possessing specialized technical expertise without regard to provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointment or compensation of employees of the United States,

"(2) an employee who is appointed under this provision may not be paid a salary in excess of the rate payable for positions of equivalent difficulty or responsibility, and in no event, may be paid at a rate exceeding the maximum rate in effect for level 15 of the General Schedule, and

"(3) the number of employees appointed under this paragraph shall not exceed ten percent of the number of positions allowed under the Agency's full-time equivalent limitation."

SEC. 815. SECURITY REQUIREMENTS.

Section 45(a) (22 U.S.C. 2585) is amended in the third sentence—

(1) by inserting "or employed directly from other Government agencies" after "persons detailed from other Government agencies"; and

(2) by striking "by the Department of Defense or the Department of State" and inserting "by such agencies".

SEC. 816. ANNUAL REPORT TO CONGRESS; AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Title IV of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act is amended—

(1) by striking sections 49 and 50;

(2) by redesignating sections 51 and 53 as sections 49 and 50, respectively; and

(3) by inserting after section 50 (as redesignated by paragraph (2)) the following new sections:

"ANNUAL REPORT TO CONGRESS

"SEC. 51. (a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than January 31 of each year, the President shall submit to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate a report prepared by the Director, in consultation with the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Energy, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of

Staff, and Director of Central Intelligence, on the status of United States policy and actions with respect to arms control, nonproliferation, and disarmament. Such report shall include—

"(1) a detailed statement concerning the arms control and disarmament objectives of the executive branch of Government for the forthcoming year;

"(2) a detailed statement concerning the nonproliferation objectives of the executive branch of Government for the forthcoming year;

"(3) a detailed assessment of the status of any ongoing arms control or disarmament negotiations, including a comprehensive description of negotiations or other activities during the preceding year and an appraisal of the status and prospects for the forthcoming year;

"(4) a detailed assessment of the status of any ongoing nonproliferation negotiations or other activities, including a comprehensive description of the negotiations or other activities during the preceding year and an appraisal of the status and prospects for the forthcoming year;

"(5) a detailed assessment of adherence of the United States to obligations undertaken in arms control, nonproliferation, and disarmament agreements, including information on the policies and organization of each relevant agency or department of the United States to ensure adherence to such obligations, a description of national security programs with a direct bearing on questions of adherence to such obligations and of steps being taken to ensure adherence, and a compilation of any substantive questions raised during the preceding year and any corrective action taken; and

"(6) a detailed assessment of the adherence of other nations to obligations undertaken in all arms control, nonproliferation, and disarmament agreements to which the United States is a participating state, including information on actions taken by each nation with regard to the size, structure, and disposition of its military forces in order to comply with arms control, nonproliferation, or disarmament agreements, and shall include, in the case of each agreement about which compliance questions exist—

"(A) a description of each significant issue raised and efforts made and contemplated with the other participating state to seek resolution of the difficulty;

"(B) an assessment of damage, if any, to the United States security and other interests; and

"(C) recommendations as to any steps that should be considered to redress any damage to United States national security and to reduce compliance problems.

"(b) **CLASSIFICATION OF THE REPORT.**—The report required by this section shall be submitted in unclassified form, with classified annexes, as appropriate.

"AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

"SEC. 52. (a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—To carry out the purposes of this Act, there are authorized to be appropriated—

"(1) \$57,500,000 for fiscal year 1994 and \$59,375,000 for fiscal year 1995; and

"(2) such additional amounts as may be necessary for each fiscal year for which an authorization of appropriations is provided for in paragraph (1) of this subsection for increases in salary, pay, retirement, other employee benefits authorized by law, and other nondiscretionary costs, and to offset adverse fluctuations in foreign currency exchange rates.

"(b) TRANSFER OF FUNDS.—Funds appropriated pursuant to this section may be allocated or transferred to any agency for carrying out the purposes of this Act. Such funds shall be available for obligation and expenditure in accordance with the authorities of this Act or in accordance with the authorities governing the activities of the agencies to which such funds are allocated or transferred.

"(c) LIMITATION.—Not more than 12 percent of any appropriation made pursuant to this Act shall be obligated or reserved during the last month of the fiscal year."

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—So much of the amendment made by subsection (a) as inserts section 52 of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act shall be deemed to have become effective as of October 1, 1993.

SEC. 817. CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.

(a) Section 2 (22 U.S.C. 2551) is amended—
(1) in the second undesignated paragraph, by inserting ", nonproliferation," after "Arms control"; and

(2) in the second and third undesignated paragraphs, by inserting ", nonproliferation," after "arms control" each place it appears.

(b) Section 28 (22 U.S.C. 2568) is amended—
(1) in the first sentence, by striking "field of arms control and disarmament" and inserting "fields of arms control, nonproliferation, and disarmament"; and
(2) in the second sentence, by inserting ", nonproliferation," after "arms control".

(c) Section 31 (22 U.S.C. 2571) is amended—
(1) in the text above paragraph (a), by striking "field of arms control and disarmament" each of the three places it appears and inserting "fields of arms control, nonproliferation, and disarmament";

(2) in the first sentence, by inserting "and nonproliferation" after disarmament; and
(3) in the fourth sentence, by inserting ", nonproliferation," after arms control each of the eight places it appears.

(d) Section 35 (22 U.S.C. 2575) is amended by inserting ", nonproliferation," after "arms control".

(e) Section 39 (22 U.S.C. 2579) is amended by inserting ", nonproliferation," after "arms control" each of the two places it appears.
At the bottom of page 5, add the following:

TITLE VIII—ARMS CONTROL AND NONPROLIFERATION ACT OF 1994

- Sec. 801. Short title; references in title; table of contents.
- Sec. 802. Congressional declarations; purpose.
- Sec. 803. Purposes.
- Sec. 804. Repeals.
- Sec. 805. Director.
- Sec. 806. Bureaus, offices, and divisions.
- Sec. 807. Presidential special representatives.
- Sec. 808. Policy formulation.
- Sec. 809. Negotiation management.
- Sec. 810. Report on measures to coordinate research and development.
- Sec. 811. Negotiating records.
- Sec. 812. Verification of compliance.
- Sec. 813. Authorities with respect to nonproliferation matters.
- Sec. 814. Appointment and compensation of personnel.
- Sec. 815. Security requirements.
- Sec. 816. Annual report to Congress; authorization of appropriations.
- Sec. 817. Conforming amendments.

GLENN AMENDMENTS NOS. 1251-1252

Mr. KERRY (for Mr. GLENN) proposed two amendments to the bill S. 1281, supra; as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 1251

On pages 2 and 3 strike out the items relating to sections 136 through 140 and insert in lieu thereof the following:
Sec. 136. Refugee affairs.
Sec. 137. Office of foreign missions.
Sec. 138. Women's human rights protection.
Sec. 139. Repeals.

On page 41, beginning on line 5, strike out all through line 3 on page 42.

On page 42, line 4, strike out "SEC. 137." insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 136.".

On page 43, line 22, strike out "SEC. 138." insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 137.".

On page 46, line 7, strike out "SEC. 139." insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 138.".

On page 46, line 20, strike out "SEC. 140.00" insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 139.".

AMENDMENT NO. 1252

At the appropriate place in the bill, add the following new section:

SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the Sense of the Senate that—

(a) There is a growing concern among some of the Members of this body that the unlimited terms of Office of Inspectors General in federal agencies may be undesirable, therefore,

(b) The issue of amending the Inspector General Act to establish term limits for Inspectors General should be examined and considered as soon as possible by the appropriate committees of jurisdiction.

NOTICES OF HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the public that a hearing has been scheduled before the full Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

The hearing will take place Tuesday, February 1, 1994, at 9:30 a.m. in room 366 of the Senate Dirksen Office Building in Washington, DC.

The purpose of the hearing is to receive testimony from Charles Curtis, nominee to be Under Secretary of Energy, and Robert Uram, nominee to be Director, Office of Surface Mining for the Department of the Interior.

For further information, please contact Rebecca Murphy at (202) 224-7562.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the public that a hearing has been scheduled before the full Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

The hearing will take place Tuesday, February 8, 1994, at 9:30 a.m. in room 366 of the Senate Dirksen Office Building in Washington, DC.

The purpose of the hearing is to receive testimony from Greta Joy Dicas, Margaret Hornbeck Greene, William J. Rainer, Kneeland C. Young, and Frank G. Zarb, nominees to be members of the Board of Directors of the United States Enrichment Corporation.

For further information, please contact Rebecca Murphy at (202) 224-7562.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. JOHNSTON. The Committee on Veterans' Affairs would like to announce that a hearing on the nomination of R. John Vogel to be Under Secretary for Benefits at the Department

of Veterans Affairs will be held in room 418 of the Russell Senate Office Building at 10:00 a.m. on Wednesday, January 26, 1994.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent on behalf of the Governmental Affairs Committee for authority to meet on Tuesday, January 25, at 9:45 a.m., for a hearing on the subject: human radiation and other scientific experiments: The Federal Government's role.

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

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Selection Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, January 25, 1994 at 2:30 p.m. to hold an open hearing on intelligence matters.

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

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

MARTHA GRIFFITHS

● Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, 30 years ago, the Civil Rights Act of 1964 became law. Most of us in this body remember the events that led to the passage of that landmark legislation, and some of us may remember the debate that preceded its passage. But there was a very specific part of that debate that has special significance today.

On February 8, 1964, former Congresswoman Martha Griffiths, of Michigan, gave an eloquent speech on the floor of the House of Representatives, urging her colleagues to add gender to the Civil Rights Act. She pointed out that the act would right some of the wrongs based on race, but she vehemently argued that wrongs based on gender were not addressed. Consequently, protection for women was included in the act.

Martha Griffiths never abandoned her mission to promote the equality of women in our society, and later she successfully led the campaign for the equal rights amendment in the House.

After completing 20 productive and notable years in Washington, Martha Griffiths retired from Congress and a few years later started a new career as Lieutenant Governor of Michigan, where she served 8 years. And just recently, she was inducted into the National Women's Hall of Fame in Seneca Falls, NY, only the 82d woman to achieve this honor.

On February 6, the American Association of University Women, along

with the Michigan Women's Commission and the Michigan Women's Historical Center/Michigan Women's Hall of Fame, is honoring Martha Griffiths and celebrating the 30th anniversary of her landmark speech in Congress. I want to add my congratulations to her, and her husband Hicks Griffiths, and wish them both many more years of good health and much happiness.●

A TRIBUTE TO LUISA DELAURO

● Mr. DODD. Mr. President, on December 24 a very special member of the Connecticut community, Luisa DeLauro of New Haven, celebrated her 80th birthday.

Luisa DeLauro has served her neighbors on New Haven's Board of Aldermen for 27 years, the longest tenure in the board's two century history. Through four decades and five different mayors—soon to be six, Luisa has been a tireless advocate for the people in her Wooster Square ward, the heart of the large Italian-American community in the New Haven area. She has fought consistently for more jobs and better housing, clean parks, and sidewalks, and lower taxes. After 14 terms as an alderwoman, her neighbors lovingly refer to her as "The Mayor of Wooster Square," although most of them view her more as a friend than as a political representative.

As a young woman, Luisa worked in the heat and din of a New Haven dress factory, struggling with other Italian immigrants to secure a better life for herself and her daughter in a land of opportunity. At night and on weekends, she worked in a bakery to supplement her meager income. Somehow, Luisa found the time to enter politics. In 1933, she wrote in the newsletter of the 10th Ward Democratic Club,

We are not living in the Middle Ages when a woman's part in life was merely to serve her master in the home, but we have gradually taken our place in every phase of human endeavor, and even in the heretofore stronghold of the male sex: politics.

As an alderwoman, Luisa has garnered praise for her tremendous energy, her unswerving loyalty to Wooster Square, and her Italian pastries, which she distributes at board meetings and on election day. She has also been a consistent champion of seniors and minority communities in her own ward and throughout the city.

But she will always be remembered, together with her late husband Ted, for preserving the architectural beauty of downtown New Haven. In the 1940's, the couple fought hard against a plan to demolish many of the old buildings in Wooster Square and central New Haven and redevelop the area. Thanks to their efforts, the classic structures—many of which were over a century old even then—were renovated instead of destroyed. Today, Wooster Square is the most beautiful part of New Haven.

Luisa DeLauro's life symbolizes what is best about America: family and hard work and public service. And she is showing no signs of slowing down. On her 80th birthday, I salute her.●

150TH ANNIVERSARY OF B'NAI B'RITH

● Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, on October 13, 1843, a small group of immigrants in New York City founded B'nai B'rith, the first international service organization founded in the United States. At that time, a few people of the Jewish faith dreamed of uniting Jews in work that would promote not only their interests, but the interests of all humankind.

Today, a half million members and affiliates in 52 countries carry on this dream. In October of 1843, 12 members contributed \$60 each to a fund for widows and orphans. This year, B'nai B'rith will spend more than \$25 million on education, social service, youth activities, and many other community programs and activities.

B'nai B'rith fought anti-Semitism as early as 1851 when it persuaded the U.S. Senate, which was considering a pending treaty with Switzerland, to insist on the removal of anti-Jewish restrictions in several Swiss cantons. In 1913 it formally established the Anti-Defamation League to coordinate the fight against anti-Semitism. Today, ADL is one of the world's foremost advocates of human rights, fighting for Jews and non-Jews alike.

B'nai B'rith organized the National Jewish Hospital in Denver, a non-sectarian, non-fee hospital which was a pioneer institution for treatment and research in tuberculosis.

During the Civil War, members of a B'nai B'rith lodge in Chicago recruited and equipped a company of Jewish soldiers in response to President Lincoln's call for volunteers.

Thirteen years before the founding of the American Red Cross, B'nai B'rith organized the first disaster relief campaign in the United States for victims of a Baltimore flood. This kind of work continues to this day.

B'nai B'rith challenged the forced evacuation of Japanese-Americans from the west coast during World War II. At the same time, it sold millions of dollars worth of U.S. war bonds, contributed recreational facilities at military camps and hospitals, entertained service personnel and distributed game books and magazines. It was the first civilian organization to receive citations from the Army and the Navy.

This is just a short summary of achievement of this fine organization. B'nai B'rith continues to step up to the challenges of guiding our youth, helping our seniors and serving our country. I am proud to bring the achievements of B'nai B'rith to the attention of my colleagues and I wish its leaders

and members another 150 productive years—and more.●

ANNOUNCEMENT OF THE 1994 CONGRESS-BUNDESTAG STAFF EXCHANGE

● Mr. DECONCINI. Since 1983, the U.S. Congress and the German parliament, the Bundestag, have conducted an annual exchange program in which staff members from both countries observe and learn about the workings of each other's political institutions and convey the views of members from both sides on issues of mutual concern.

This exchange program has been one of several sponsored by both public and private institutions in the United States and Germany to foster better understanding of the institutions and policies of both countries.

This year will mark the fourth exchange with a reunified Germany and a parliament consisting of members from both the West and the East. Ten staff members from the U.S. Congress will be chosen to visit Germany from April 23 to May 7. They will spend most of the time attending meetings conducted by members of the Bundestag, Bundestag party staffers, and representatives of political, business, academic, and media institutions. They also will spend a weekend in the district of a Bundestag member.

A comparable delegation of German staff members will come to the United States in late June for a 3-week period. They will attend similar meetings here in Washington and will visit the districts of Members of Congress over the Fourth of July recess.

The Congress-Bundestag exchange is highly regarded in Germany. Accordingly, U.S. participants should be experienced and accomplished Hill staffers so that they can contribute to the success of the exchange on both sides of the Atlantic. The Bundestag sends senior staffers to the United States and a number of high-ranking members of the Bundestag take time to meet with the U.S. delegation. The United States endeavors to reciprocate.

Applicants should have a demonstrable interest in events in Europe. Applicants need not be working in the field of foreign affairs, although such a background can be helpful. The composite United States delegation should exhibit a range of expertise in issues of mutual concern in Germany and the United States, such as, but not limited to, trade, security, the environment, immigration, economic development, health care, and other social policy issues.

In addition, U.S. participants are expected to help plan and implement the program for the Bundestag staffers when they visit the United States. Among the contributions participants should expect to make is the planning of topical meetings in Washington.

Moreover, participants are expected to host one or two staff people in their Member's district over the Fourth of July, or to arrange for such a visit to another Member's district.

Participants will be selected by a committee composed of U.S. Information Agency personnel and past participants of the exchange.

Senators and Representatives who would like a member of their staff to apply for participation in this year's program should direct them to submit a resume and cover letter only in which they state why they believe they are qualified, and some assurances of their ability to participate during the time stated. Applications may be sent to Bob Maynes or Ginger Harper, Office of Senator DENNIS DECONCINI, 328 Hart Building, by Tuesday, February 15.●

ANNOUNCEMENT OF POSITION ON VOTE—BRADY HANDGUN VIOLENCE PREVENTION ACT

● Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I wish the RECORD to reflect that, had there been a vote on the Brady bill, I would have voted in favor of it.●

● Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, if a rollcall vote would have been called for on the conference report of the Brady Handgun Violence Prevention Act, my vote would have been "yea."●

● Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I wish to inform the Senate that had there been a recorded vote on final passage of the Brady bill, I would have voted in the affirmative.●

● Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, if there had been a recorded vote on the conference report on the Brady bill I would have voted in the affirmative.●

● Mr. ROBB. Mr. President, as a supporter of the Brady bill, I wish to note for the RECORD that if there had been a recorded vote on passage, I would have voted "aye." I think it is important to illustrate the broad range of support for this bill.●

● Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, had there been a recorded vote on passage of the Brady bill, H.R. 1025, I would have voted "nay."●

● Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, on November 24 the Senate passed the Brady bill conference report. Had there been a recorded vote I would have voted "yea."●

● Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. Mr. President, I wish to announce, for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, that, had there been a rollcall vote on the "Brady" bill, I would have voted in favor of the bill.●

● Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I wish the RECORD to reflect had the conference report on the Brady bill (H.R. 1025), been subject to a rollcall vote, I would have voted "aye" on passage of this conference report.●

● Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, as a cosponsor of the Brady bill, I wish to note for the RECORD that, had there

been a recorded vote on passage, I would have voted in favor of the Brady bill.●

● Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I wish to note for the RECORD that, if there had been a rollcall vote on adoption of the Brady bill conference report, I would have voted "yea."●

CONGRESS CAN HELP END STALEMATE

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, when he served as Governor of Puerto Rico, I had the opportunity to get acquainted with CARLOS ROMERO-BARCELÓ.

Now he is the Resident Commissioner in Congress, better known as a nonvoting Member of Congress from Puerto Rico.

He continues to be loaded with good sense and good leadership skills.

Recently he had an article in Roll Call commenting on the Puerto Rican plebiscite and what we ought to do.

In his article, he mentions a bill introduced by Congressman DON YOUNG, which I have not had a chance to look at yet.

But, we ought to be listening to CARLOS ROMERO-BARCELÓ, as well as the able, new Governor of Puerto Rico, Pedro Rossello.

I ask that CARLOS ROMERO-BARCELÓ's article from Roll Call be placed in the RECORD at this point, and I urge my colleagues who have not read it to do so.

[From Roll Call, Jan. 6, 1994]

CONGRESS CAN HELP END PUERTO RICO'S STATUS STALEMATE

(By Carlos Romero-Bareló)

For the first time in 26 years, the US citizens of Puerto Rico have voted in a political status plebiscite to express a preference for commonwealth, statehood, or independence.

In a vote that surprised many, none of the three options emerged from the Nov. 14 plebiscite with a majority. "Commonwealth" garnered 48.6 percent, "statehood" 43.6 percent, and "independence" 4.4 percent.

The plebiscite was held to fulfill a 1992 campaign promise made by those of us in the pro-statehood New Progressive Party who wanted to offer the people of Puerto Rico a way out of our colonial status: a colonial relationship in which 3.6 million US citizens do not have the right to vote in a presidential election and are denied voting representation in Congress as well as full benefits in some of the most important federal programs.

Commonwealth supporters campaigned on the theme that Puerto Rico's residents currently enjoy "the best of both worlds." With this spin, they sought to remind voters that they do not pay federal income taxes and in many cases are employed by corporations that until this year were exempt from federal corporate taxation.

As Puerto Rico's sole representative in Congress, every day when I walk into the House chamber I live the frustration of disenfranchisement. The stalemate produced by the lack of majority support for any one particular status option seems to have heightened the interest of a number of Members in finding out just what happened. Many have

asked me what can be done in order to help Puerto Rico make a final decision on its political status and to end the present colonial relationship.

With commonwealth's plurality margin and the fact that statehood was a very close second, it's clear that no one is being fooled into thinking that commonwealth won another mandate. While in most jurisdictions of the US general elections can be won by a plurality of votes, when it comes to effecting a change of status, everyone understands that winning by a majority is essential.

For the first time since the Commonwealth's inception in 1952, the people of Puerto Rico are subject to the sovereignty of Congress without the expressed consent of the majority of Puerto Ricans. For both the people of Puerto Rico and the United States, which exercises sovereignty over Puerto Rico, such a situation is untenable. As sovereign, the United States has an obligation to make sure that Puerto Rico achieves a political status that has the consent of the majority.

There's more than one way to resolve the current stalemate. Perhaps the best way to begin would be making a careful examination of the definition of commonwealth that was presented on the plebiscite ballot.

The Constitution and history indicate that such a commonwealth is neither compatible with the US constitutional system nor financially viable. And if that is indeed the case, Congress has an obligation to speak out clearly so that a future plebiscite will not be vitiated, as the latest one was, by false and impossible promises by commonwealth leaders.

In the coming months, Congress will have an opportunity to review the plebiscite's results, beginning with an upcoming hearing by the House Natural Resources insular and international affairs subcommittee to examine the viability of implementing the status called for in the commonwealth definition.

But there is another effort that is also aimed at breaking the status gridlock: a bill offered by Rep. Don Young (R-Alaska) that provides a mechanism for the unincorporated territories of the United States to achieve incorporation.

As the ranking member of the Natural Resources panel, Young has set forth a plan that formalizes a serious intention to assure the US puts an end to colonial relationships with the remaining territories (Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, Guam, the Northern Mariana Islands) before the United Nations "Decade of Decolonization" comes to an end.

The Young bill addresses the 95 percent of the Puerto Rican electorate that supports the achievement of three major goals for Puerto Rico: irrevocable, permanent union with the US, irrevocable and guaranteed US citizenship; and equal treatment with the states in all federal programs. But the achievement of each of these guarantees has a price: the payment of federal income taxes.

Statehood advocates, like myself, sought to explain during the plebiscite campaign that the responsibility to pay federal income taxes will be a benefit, and not a burden, for many low-income residents of Puerto Rico. This is because many of our taxpayers would qualify for the Earned Income credit for low-income wage earners.

Given the filing in the House of the Young bill, along with the initiation of a Congressional examination of Commonwealth status, we anticipate that the stalemate will not continue indefinitely.

I am convinced that once the people of Puerto Rico clearly understand the options,

they will vote decisively for equality, that is, to be come the 51st state.●

HARVEST OF TEARS

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, I got on a United Airlines plane recently, and when I finished doing the work I brought along, I reached for the publication of the airline. In it was a statement by Stephen M. Wolf, the United Airlines chief executive officer. It was not about airlines or transportation but about the problem of crime, and what we're doing in our country.

Instead of the usual nonsense, Steve Wolf has a statement that really makes sense; urging us to take the long, hard, difficult road to solving crime that means paying attention to people from the earliest years on.

I ask to insert Steve Wolf's message into the RECORD at this point.

The article follows:

[From Hemispheres, January 1994]

HARVEST OF TEARS

(By Stephen M. Wolf)

Even in the land of freedom, there are communities virtually taken hostage by murders, thieves, and drug traffickers. The evening news could not paint a more lurid picture of a nation where many citizens are afraid to leave their homes and where youths use guns to establish authority.

Is spending more money to build prisons and increase the police ranks the answer? Yes, but only partly. These approaches focus solely on crime after the fact—after the crime is committed and after innocent victims have suffered. I believe we will never reduce crime unless we direct more money and energy toward early intervention, rehabilitation, and drug programs.

I certainly support the views that dangerous criminals should be incarcerated and kept off the street for a long time and punishment for violent offenders must be harsh enough to send a strong message. But the nation's preoccupation with the quick fix of building more prisons and mandatory minimum sentences for drug offenders has put more people in jail, but not much else. According to USA Today, between 1981 and 1991, the U.S. prison population more than doubled, while violent crime rose more than 40 percent. America, in fact, has the most people in jail per capita in the world. Obviously, our current system is failing to deter crime and make our streets safe again.

We must find long-term answers. In the short term, we can build more prisons, but to make real inroads in reducing crime rates, we must assist at-risk children and young, first-time offenders before criminal behavior becomes a way of life.

A Colorado judge recently addressed this issue in his sentence of a juvenile offender. "I hope that these days when the juvenile justice system is under the microscope, there will be recognition that crime prevention begins at home," he said, "and that if we do not spend money helping parents and families, all the prisons in the world won't solve the juvenile crime problem."

We are losing our children, as they commit serious crimes at ever younger ages. U.S. Attorney General Janet Reno also advocates early intervention, believing the first three years are crucial. "We will never have enough dollars to save everybody if we wait until they are 16 or 17," she said.

Elected to five terms as state attorney for Dade County, Florida, Reno believes children must have support and a nurturing environment—ideally from their families—and has put her theories into action. She opened Florida's first domestic violence unit. She started a center to help with child abuse cases. She brought teachers, police, and health officials together to help families in one of the city's poorest public housing developments. And she helped create a Drug Court that emphasizes treatment instead of jail for young first offenders.

Because of her emphasis on children and crime prevention programs, some have accused Reno of being "soft" on crime. On the contrary, taking a long-term view of the problem is not a sign of being soft on crime, but demonstrates the wisdom in realizing that simply punishing those who commit crimes has not provided an effective deterrent.

We cannot continue to let crime grow unchecked. Unless we attack it at its roots, many of our children will be tangled in its branches and the only harvest our communities will reap will be one of tears.●

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

● Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, it is required by paragraph 4 of rule 35 that I place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD notices of Senate employees who participate in programs, the principal objective of which is educational, sponsored by a foreign government or a foreign educational or charitable organization involving travel to a foreign country paid for by that foreign government or organization.

The select committee received notification under rule 35 for Suzanne C. Hildick, a member of the staff of Senator HATFIELD, to participate in a program in Germany, sponsored by the Center for Civic Education of the United States and the Federal Center for Political Education of the Federal Republic of Germany, from October 2-9, 1993.

The committee determined that no Federal statute or Senate rule would prohibit participation by Ms. Hildick in this program.

The select committee received notification under rule 35 for Bruce Cordingly, a member of the staff of Senator GORTON, to participate in a program in Hong Kong and China, sponsored by the Hong Kong Chamber of Commerce, from August 30-September 6, 1993.

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

The select committee received notification under rule 35 for Angela Flood, a member of the staff of Senator COATS, to participate in a program in Germany, sponsored by the Friedrich Naumann Foundation, from September 4-10, 1993.

The committee determined that no Federal statute or Senate rule would prohibit participation by Ms. Flood in this program.

The select committee received notification under rule 35 for Ken Levinson, a member of the staff of Senator ROCKEFELLER, to participate in a program in Germany, sponsored by the Friedrich Naumann Foundation, from September 4-10, 1993.

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

The select committee received notification under rule 35 for John Person, a member of the staff of Senator SASSER, to participate in a program in Taiwan, sponsored by the Chung Yuan Christian University, from August 22-29, 1993.

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

The select committee received notification under rule 35 for Kevin Dempsey, a member of the staff of Senator DANFORTH, to participate in a program in Hong Kong, sponsored by the Hong Kong General Chamber of Commerce, from August 30-September 6, 1993.

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

The select committee received notification under rule 35 for Christopher Hull, a member of the staff of Senator BURNS, to participate in a program in Korea, sponsored by the Korean Ministry of Foreign Affairs, from August 28-September 6, 1993.

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

The select committee received notification under rule 35 for Senator COVERDELL, to participate in a program in Hong Kong, Taiwan and South China, sponsored by Vision 2047 Foundation of Hong Kong, a private foreign organization, and the Atlantic Council of the United States, a domestic organization from August 18-25, 1993.

The committee determined that no Federal statute or Senate rule would prohibit participation by Senator Coverdell in this program.

The select committee received notification under rule 35 for Marc E. Nicholson, a member of the staff of Senator JEFFORDS, to participate in a program in Korea, sponsored by the Korea Institute for International Economic Policy, from October 16-24, 1993.

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

The select committee received notification under rule 35 for Sean O'Neal, a member of the staff of Senator CAMP-

BELL, to participate in a program in Taiwan, sponsored by Soochow University, from December 8-14, 1993.

The committee determined that no Federal statute or Senate rule would prohibit participation by Mr. O'Neal in this program.

The select committee received notification under rule 35 for Pamela Sellars, a member of the staff of Senator COATS, to participate in a program in Taiwan, sponsored by the Chung Yuan Christian University, from December 12-19, 1993.

The committee determined that no Federal statute or Senate rule would prohibit participation by Ms. Sellars in this program.

The select committee received notification under rule 35 for Kathleen Casey, a member of the staff of Senator SHELBY, to participate in a program in Taiwan, sponsored by Chung Yuan Christian University, from December 12-19, 1993.

The committee determined that no Federal statute or Senate rule would prohibit participation by Ms. Casey in this program.

The select committee received notification under rule 35 for Claudia Davant, a member of the staff of Senator THURMOND, to participate in a program in Taiwan, sponsored by Soochow University, from December 8-14, 1993.

The committee determined that no Federal statute or Senate rule would prohibit participation by Ms. Davant in this program.

The select committee received notification under rule 35 for Edward M. Bolen, a member of the staff of Senator KASSEBAUM, to participate in a program in China, sponsored by the Chinese People's Institute of Foreign Affairs from December 6-17, 1993.

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

The select committee received notification under rule 35 for Gary Reese, a member of the staff of Senator DECONCINI, to participate in a program in China, sponsored by the Chinese People's Institute of Foreign Affairs from December 6-17, 1993.

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

The select committee received notification under rule 35 for Steven B. Harris, a member of the staff of Senator RIEGLE, to participate in a program in China, sponsored by the Chinese People's Institute of Foreign Affairs, from December 6-17, 1993.

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

The select committee received notification under rule 35 for Gene Wiley, a member of the staff of Senator PRES-

SLEER, to participate in a program in China, sponsored by the Chinese People's Institute of Foreign Affairs, from December 6-17, 1993.

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

The select committee received notification under rule 35 for Susanne Martinez, a member of the staff of Senator FEINGOLD, to participate in a program in Singapore, sponsored by the U.S.-Asia Institute, from November 28-December 3, 1993.

The committee determined that no Federal statute or Senate rule would prohibit participation by Ms. Martinez in this program.

The select committee received notification under rule 35 for Patricia McDonald, a member of the staff of Senator WALLOP, to participate in a program in the Federal Republic of Germany, sponsored by the Konrad Adenauer Foundation, from November 27-December 4, 1993.

The committee determined that no Federal statute or Senate rule would prohibit participation by Ms. McDonald in this program.

The select committee received notification under rule 35 for Chris McLean, a member of the staff of Senator EXON, to participate in a program in Singapore, sponsored by the Republic of Singapore, from November 28-December 3, 1993.

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

The select committee received notification under rule 35 for Laura Hudson, a member of the staff of Senator JOHNSTON, to participate in a program in Singapore, sponsored by the Republic of Singapore, from November 28-December 3, 1993.

The committee determined that no Federal statute or Senate rule would prohibit participation by Ms. Hudson in this program.

The select committee received notification under rule 35 for Sam Spina, a member of the staff of Senator GORTON, to participate in a program in Singapore, sponsored by the Republic of Singapore, from November 28-December 3, 1993.

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

The select committee received notification under rule 35 for Kris Kolesnik, a member of the staff of Senator GRASSLEY, to participate in a program in Germany, sponsored by the Konrad Adenauer Foundation, from November 27-December 4, 1993.

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

The select committee received notification under rule 35 for Patricia McDonald, a member of the staff of Senator WALLOP, to participate in a program in the Federal Republic of Germany, sponsored by the Konrad Adenauer Foundation, from November 27-December 4, 1993.

The committee determined that no Federal statute or Senate rule would prohibit participation by Ms. McDonald in this program.

The select committee received notification under rule 35 for a member of the staff of Senator ROTH to participate in a program in Taiwan sponsored by the Chinese Culture University from January 4-10, 1994.

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

The select committee received notification under rule 35 for Erik Smulson, a member of the staff of Senator JEFFORDS, to participate in a program in Taiwan, sponsored by the Chinese Culture University from January 4-10, 1994.

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

The select committee received notification under rule 35 for Senator and Mrs. Akaka to participate in a program in China, from January 7-13, 1994, sponsored by the Chinese People's Institute for Foreign Affairs, an agency of the Chinese Government.

The committee determined that no Federal statute or Senate rule would prohibit participation by Senator and Mrs. Akaka in this program.

The select committee received notification under rule 35 for Brian P. Moran, a member of the staff of Senator BUMPERS, to participate in a program in Taiwan, sponsored by Soochow University, from January 8-15, 1994.

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

The select committee received notification under rule 35 for Senator and Mrs. Bradley to participate in a program in Hamburg, Germany, sponsored by the Korber Foundation, from May 21-23, 1993.

The committee determined that no Federal statute or Senate rule would prohibit participation by Senator and Mrs. Bradley in this program.

The select committee received notification under rule 35 for Tom McMahon, a member of the staff of Senator HEFLIN, to participate in a program in Saudi Arabia, Syria, and the United Arab Emirates sponsored by the Abu Dhabi Chamber of Commerce and the Saudi Chamber of Commerce and Industry from November 25-December 5, 1993.

The committee determined that no Federal statute or Senate rule would

prohibit participation by Mr. McMahon in this program.

The select committee received notification under rule 35 for Martin J. Gruenberg, a member of the staff of Senator RIEGLE, to participate in a program in Germany and Belgium, sponsored by the European Community Commission, from December 4-14, 1993.

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

The select committee received notification under rule 35 for Stewart Hall, a member of the staff of Senator SHELBY, to participate in a program in China, sponsored by the Chinese People's Institute of Foreign Affairs, from December 4-19, 1993.

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

The select committee received notification under rule 35 for Thomas H. Moore, a member of the staff of Senator BREAUX, to participate in a program in the Republic of Singapore, sponsored by the Republic of Singapore, from November 24-December 6, 1993.

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

The select committee received notification under rule 35 for Edward L. King, a member of the staff of Senator MITCHELL, to participate in a program in Hong Kong and South China, sponsored by the Atlantic Council and Vision 2047 Foundation from December 11-20, 1993.

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

The select committee received notification under rule 35 for Daniel Sherman, a member of the staff of Senator BOREN, to participate in a program in China, sponsored by Chung Yuan Christian University, from December 12-19, 1993.

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

The select committee received notification under rule 35 for Robert S. Foust, a member of the staff of Senator CONRAD, to participate in a program in China, sponsored by the Chinese Culture University, from January 4-10, 1993.

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

THE WOLF AND THE LAMB

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, just before we quit for 1993 in our formal con-

gressional sessions, the New York Times published an article by Wei Jingsheng, China's most prominent political prisoner, who was recently released after 14 years in prison. He warns us not to be fooled and not to be talked too easily into making concessions to China.

My instinct is, that is precisely what is happening. We are selling the new, sophisticated computer to China, and I can see nothing concrete that we are getting in return.

Not only is China one of the worst abusers of human rights in the world today, if you look down the road 30 years from now, and ask what nation may be a significant military threat to its neighbors, one of those has to be China. I hope before we get to that period when a dictatorial China represents a threat, democracy can take hold, and China will live in peace with its neighbors.

But I believe it is unsound policy to assume that will happen.

I ask to insert the Wei Jingsheng article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point.

The article follows:

THE WOLF AND THE LAMB

(By Wei Jingsheng)

BEIJING.—Most Americans don't really understand China, just as most Chinese don't understand America. This leads the two Governments to make numerous miscalculations in their relations and leads the two peoples toward numerous misunderstandings of the opposing regime's conduct.

For example, the Chinese Government holds that America cares nothing for the fate or future of the Chinese people; this means that raising human rights issues becomes nothing but a political tactic used in laying siege to the Communist Party or merely an economic bargaining tool.

So China treats human rights as a problem of foreign relations. And the primary pretext for refusing to bend under international pressure on human rights is that China "will not allow interference in its internal affairs."

Furthermore, there is a tendency on the part of China to view the detention and release of dissidents as a hostage transaction, in which freedom for the prisoner is just a bargaining chip in an economic poker game.

The reason the Chinese Government is willing to make such unclean transactions is that it does not understand why the U.S. might be unwilling to continue lucrative trade relations if China's human rights environment does not improve. China doesn't understand, because it thinks this way: Is it really likely that Americans would befriend a people they are not at all familiar with?

Is it really likely that Americans would abandon an opportunity to make money just to protect the human rights of those they have befriended?

Is it really likely that the American people's determinations of right and wrong could ever influence the judgment of the U.S. Government?

It looks as if the Communist Party has answered these questions in the negative. So even though it may have realized that its own conduct might have been in error, it still firmly pursues a strategy of brinkmanship, giving ground only when absolutely

necessary and always in the last five minutes of negotiations. For example, Chinese officials last week agreed to give "positive consideration" to allowing the International Committee of the Red Cross to inspect prisons.

The party holds that in such ways it will save face, and in the end will debunk Yankee protestations of seriousness over human rights, which the party believes are just an affectation. Pursuing this strategy, Beijing believes, will free it to deprive the people of their freedom. It also seems that the U.S. Government has misunderstood the true mind-set of the Chinese Government. Washington evidently believes that the Communist Party resembles a bunch of slow-witted rulers of a backward culture and that China doesn't comprehend that violations of human rights are evil.

Therefore, the Clinton Administration now plans to abandon policies of pressure in favor of a policy of persuasion and "enhanced engagement"—a misguided shift to be symbolized in Seattle today by the handshake between Presidents Clinton and Jiang Zemin. Unfortunately, the reality is more like the Aesop's fable in which a lamb tries to reason with a wolf. After the wolf accuses the lamb of fouling his drinking water, the lamb protests: "I could not have fouled your water because I live downstream from you." The wolf eats the lamb anyway.

I fear that no matter how much the two countries debate, the old wolf in China will still complain about its drinking water. China not only doesn't understand reason but also does not intend to reason.

I'm unclear about the American people's understanding of changes in China-U.S. relations, but the Chinese people's understanding of their own Government is very precise. The present leaders were the most outspoken group of men, shouting their support of human rights and democracy before they ascended to power. But their subsequent dictatorship made clear that they have no intention of making good on the promises they once made to the masses.

The Chinese people's understanding of the new direction of U.S. policy toward China leads them to believe that the party was right all these years in saying that the American Government is controlled by rich capitalists. All you have to do is offer them a chance to make money and anything goes. Their consciences never stopped them from making money. I don't really believe in this kind of understanding—or rather I'm not willing to believe in it.●

HONORING LT. ADAM S. LEVITT

● Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to an extraordinary New Yorker, Lt. Adam S. Levitt. Lieutenant Levitt has the distinct honor of receiving a sea-going command while still a lieutenant when the fourth of thirteen Cyclone-class ships, the U.S.S. *Monsoon*, is christened this month. This is quite an honor and a great opportunity for early and major responsibility.

Lt. Adam S. Levitt, a native of Malverne, NY, graduated from the U.S. Naval Academy in 1984 with a bachelor of science degree in operations analysis. Upon commissioning he reported to U.S.S. *John Young* as damage control assistant, and later served as gunnery officer and main propulsion assistant

until his transfer to naval post-graduate school in 1988.

Lieutenant Levitt received his master of science degree in information systems management in 1989 and was awarded the Admiral Grace Hopper award. Following graduate school, he reported to surface warfare school in Newport, RI and then joined the U.S. *Merrill* which was deployed to the Persian Gulf in May 1991.

Lieutenant Levitt reported to new construction duty in July 1992 as prospective commanding officer of the fourth *Cyclone* Class Patrol Coastal (PC) Ship, U.S.S. *Monsoon*. Command of each of the 13 *Cyclone*-class ships is available to surface warfare-qualified lieutenants, like Adam Levitt, serving in their second department head tours. At-sea commands usually require their commanding officers to be at least a lieutenant commander who has already served two department head tours.

Navy officials discovered a need for a small, fast patrol boat that could pursue minelayers, patrol against terrorists in motor boats and launch special operations forces in small motor boats. The answer came in the form of a Vosper Thornycroft design which is being built by Bolinger Shipyard in Lockport, LA. The PC class ships are named after elements of weather.

PCO Lt. Adam S. Levitt will take command of the *Monsoon* in San Diego on January 22, 1994. I salute Lieutenant Levitt as he enters a new level in his career. I ask my colleagues to join me in thanking Lt. Adam Levitt for his dedication and commitment to the U.S. Navy and the United States of America.●

RADIO FREE ASIA

● Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I would like to commend Senators BIDEN and FEINGOLD on their amendment to create a cost-effective and potent Radio Free Asia. I understand that there have been a number of discussions about the amount of funding for this project as well as its status within the Department of State. The compromise represented in this amendment effectively resolves these issues, allowing us to proceed with a project that will become an important part of our Nation's policy toward the People's Republic of China, Cambodia, Laos, North Korea, Vietnam, and Burma.

I am particularly pleased that the Radio Free Asia created by this amendment will be given the same corporate "grantee" status that allowed Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty to broadcast independently of the Department of State. With this designation, Radio Free Asia will act much as a radio station in the target country would if its media were not suppressed. Broadcasts will include extensive, controversial information on events within the country, responses to the state-

controlled media, and information on dissident movements—all of which the Voice of America can include, but never to the extent that it might exacerbate diplomatic ties or jeopardize our leases on transmitters.

Radio Free Europe included the readings of Vaclav Havel at a time when his books were difficult to obtain. Stations aggressively researched stories, tracked political and artistic dissent, and successfully circumvented Soviet jamming. Broadcasts solidified underground movements, and told listeners of sentiments similar to their own. It fed the passions that overthrew communism, and when complete, was lauded and defended by Vaclav Havel, Boris Yeltsin, and Lech Walesa.

After the Tiananmen Square massacre, Chinese state-run television ran a Disney movie. In 1991, Liu Binyan, a Chinese dissident now living in the United States, told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that after Tiananmen Square there were 1,500 strikes, but that a vast majority of Chinese knew nothing of them. The media in Vietnam, Burma, Cambodia, North Korea and Laos are just as repressed, and more often than not used as instruments of their governments' policies.

With this legislation we are ensuring that the Radio Free Asia we pursue follows the model of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty. We are creating a station which can unite and inform the millions in repressed East Asian countries who want democracy, while enlightening those who have known only state-run media. It can deliver insightful investigative reporting, respond promptly to false governmental reports, travel on strong signals, and carry the necessary number of dialects. If it is successful, it will shorten the path for freedom in some of these countries, while merely keeping alive democratic movements in others.

Some have argued that the United States should not pursue the funding for a Radio Free Asia. Indeed, our State Department budget is shrinking, while our foreign aid budget is literally strapped. But the threat and possibilities posed by the repressed nations of East Asia made this project worth the effort. The People's Republic of China—the world's most populous nation, and most powerful nondemocratic state—is developing a mighty economy while its political reform lags. As turn-of-the-century Japan proved, political liberalization need not follow economic growth. For the United States, a wealthy but repressed China would be a bane at nearly every turn: it could learn to dominate East Asia, just as the United States seeks to lower its overseas presence; it would hinder our multilateral efforts; and it could exacerbate our already troubled trade relationship. For the countries of Southeast Asia, communism would retain a powerful patron to it north.

Conversely, on East Asia whose Communist countries embrace democracy presents staggering possibilities. Their neighbors—Japan, and the newly industrialized nations of East Asia—have enjoyed a miraculous economic growth that has literally changed the world. If freedom takes hold in Laos, Vietnam, South Korea, and Burma, the wealthy community of trading nations in Asia will almost certainly expand again. For China, its economic growth will gain security alongside a healthy, stable government that respects the freedom of its citizens.

A Radio Free Asia might not single-handedly change the face of Asia's repressive governments, but it will show our commitment to these countries' citizens, and, as in Eastern Europe, it will strengthen and preserve democratic movements. For governments that have stringently fought our policies, but whose people yearn for freedom, it's an effort we are obliged to make.●

POLITICS OF PRISONS IS A CRIME

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, over the holidays, my wife and I spent a week's vacation in Florida. It was the first time in many years we have had a week in Florida, and we enjoyed it.

While I was in Florida, I picked up the Tampa Tribune, and there was a column by Daniel Ruth in which he talks candidly about the easy politics of calling for more and more prisons and longer and longer sentences and, basically, not doing anything about the crime problem.

I cast one of four votes against the crime bill that passed the Senate a few weeks ago. I recognize that it was not a popular vote. I also cast one of four votes against the amendment to spend \$3 billion more on additional Federal prisons.

We are being "tough on crime," and we can make great speeches about it, but we are not being smart on crime, and it is about time we start getting smart on crime.

A few weeks ago, I inserted into the RECORD an op ed piece from the Los Angeles Times in which a Catholic priest, who is a prison chaplain, asked a group of prisoners in his class what they thought we should be doing to stop crime. It was interesting that very little of what we had in our crime bill coincided with what they recommended—these experts on crime.

I ask to insert the Daniel Ruth column into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the end of my remarks.

Let me just add that we now have 510 people per 100,000 in our prisons and jails, more than any other country, by far. South Africa is second with 311, and Canada trails at 109.

We ought to be doing some sensible things on crime and not things that get votes for us back home.

The article follows:

[From the Tampa Tribune]
POLITICS OF PRISONS IS A CRIME
 (By Daniel Ruth)

When the going gets tough, the tough run for governor

It's a good thing, too. Because if you're gonna be governor, you gotta be tough. That's because there are all sorts of tough issues, demanding tough decisions, requiring tough people to make those, well, tough decisions.

And what tougher problem do we have in this state than crime? Tough problem.

But we're blessed in this great state of Florida because all of the men running for governor and even those who aren't running for governor even though they really are running for governor are all tough on crime—every man jack of them.

It's a law or something that you can't run for public office, any public office, from student body president at the University of South Florida to governor, unless you've come out foursquare against crime.

There are a number of ways to make it clear to the electorate that you're so tough on crime that if Pablo Escobar were still alive, he'd wish he was dead rather than do criminal combat against you because of course you're so galldarned tough on crime.

Tougher sentencing is always a popular piece of political jabberwocky. Tougher sentences and longer sentences. Yep, that's the ticket. A tough ticket, too. People just love to hear about tougher and longer sentences. More importantly, they love to hear candidates talk tough about tougher and longer sentences.

PRISON CELLS LIKE MODEL T'S

More prisons. And tougher prisons. Even though this state has been churning out prisons like so many Model Ts, the people want more of them. We need more prisons because we have so much crime. And we have to get tough on crime. Because if we don't get tough on crime and stop mollycoddling all these criminals, well, we'll just have to build more prisons.

As any politician will tell you, the more attention you need in your bid for office is in direct proportion to how many more prisons beds we need. For example, Gov. Lawton Chiles wants 15,000 new beds. However, Republican hopeful Jeb Bush insists we need 50,000 new beds, which would accommodate a doubling of the existing prison population.

You have to talk tough on crime because the voter insists upon it. The voters are rightfully scared out of their wits that some piece of vermin will rob them, or rape them, or beat them or murder them, or perhaps all of that.

And what better way to soothe those voter fears than to work harder and tougher than all the other candidates to become the toughest hombre on the campaign trail when it comes to getting tough on crime?

Of course, it goes without saying that calling for tougher sentences and tougher prisons accomplishes very little when it comes to curbing crime. That's why you go without saying anything about it. That wouldn't be very tough.

A FAIR AMOUNT OF LIP-FLAPPING

Tough crime talk at least makes people feel momentarily secure. It makes them feel and somebody at least cares about them and wants to do something for them, which in the final analysis amounts to only a fair amount of lip-flapping.

No politician—at least no pol who wants to get elected—is going to ever level with the voter about crime.

That would require telling the public things the public doesn't want to hear. It would require some political courage.

The mythically honest candidate would say to the voter: "If we really want to do something about crime, we must attack a complex range of social issues—all at once. We have to find people jobs so that they don't need to turn to crime. But before they can get a job, they must be educated. And before they can be educated, they have to learn about personal responsibility and developing a work ethic.

"We have to reform a welfare system that tears families apart and creates generation after generation of institutionalized dependence.

"All that and much, much, much more is where crime comes from. And it will take generations to fix what took generations to create. Building more prisons doesn't solve the crime problem—it's like a huge truck that hauls away oranges from the grove. There's always plenty of more oranges left on the trees."

But you won't hear any of that from the men who would be Lawton. Which may explain, all too sadly, why we will always need more prisons. Tough luck.●

THE NAVAL MILITIA

● Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, New York is one of only two States that has successfully bolstered its National Guard forces with a naval militia. I ask that the first installment of a two-part series describing the history, function, and advantages of the Naval Militia recently published in the *Naval Review Association* magazine be included in the RECORD.

The article follows:

THE NAVAL MILITIA—PART I. HERITAGE OF THE NAVAL RESERVE

(By Comdr. Walter J. Johanson, USNR/NYNM and Comdr. William A. Murphy, USNR/NYNM)

Editor's Note: This is the first of two articles on the Naval Militia. The second article, entitled, "Mission For The Naval Reserve," will be published in the October edition of *NRA NEWS*.

The Naval Militia in states which have it on their statute books and functioning, consists of those members of the Naval and Marine Corps Reserve who live, work, or drill in the state and who opt to affiliate in its Organized Militia, in accordance with Title 10, US Code. At present, only Alaska and New York have functioning Naval Militia organizations which conform to Federal standards. In the past, many more states had a Naval Militia; in the future, perhaps many more will.

In 1991, RADM Joseph Peck, New York Naval Militia (NYNM), now President Emeritus of the Naval Militia Association, re-instituted the policy of promulgating the Naval Militia message to the several States. This effort has had several positive results. The Marine Corps Reserve Officers Association passed a resolution at its 1993 annual convention urging all States to establish a Naval Militia. A similar resolution was passed by the Militia Association of New York, which includes Army and Air National Guard as well as Naval and Marine Corps Reserve members.

GENESIS

The Naval Militia came into existence late in the Nineteenth Century because there was

awareness of a need for a federally-controlled naval reserve, but Congress did not pass the necessary legislation until 1915. For a quarter of a century the States attempted to fill the void in a manner which also augmented the Militia of the States.

The United States Navy, which had been the world's largest during the Civil War, reverted to peacetime insignificance after 1865. Starting in the early 1880's, Congress authorized a building program. It became apparent that appropriations for man-power, though, did not keep pace with the number of billets required afloat. The Navy believed a naval reserve could eliminate the shortfall.

In February 1887, Senator Washington C. Whitthorne (D-Tenn.), a former Confederate general, introduced legislation (S. 3320) to establish a United States Naval Reserve. Although a combination of active officers, the Secretary of the Navy, the Naval Institute, and concerned civilians supported legislation to establish a naval reserve, many more were not convinced of its necessity. The Congress was unable to take action, and this led the States to take the initiative.

James Russell Soley, a Massachusetts resident and a former Navy officer who had participated in a study of European reserve systems, discovered that the governor, in a continuation of colonial-era practice, was designated the "Captain-General, Commander-in-Chief, and Admiral of the land and sea forces of the State." He urged the state to use that power to establish a Naval Militia, and the legislature passed an act to that effect on 17 May 1888. Nearly a year later, on 29 April 1889, Rhode Island passed enabling legislation to establish a naval battalion of the State Militia; the same day, Pennsylvania did likewise. New York followed on 14 June 1889 by establishing three battalions of Naval Reserve Artillery and a Naval Reserve Torpedo Corps. California, North Carolina, Texas, and Maryland followed in 1891. South Carolina added a naval militia the next year.

The Naval Militia, in addition to developing as a reserve for the Navy, was an incipient reserve for the Marine Corps as well. Starting in 1893, the New York Naval Militia included the 1st Marine Corps Reserve Company. Massachusetts and Louisiana also included units of Marines in their Naval Militia organizations.

WAR IN 1898 AND AFTER

When, in April 1898, diplomatic relations with Spain were ruptured, there was no overall concept for the wartime employment of the Naval Militia, let alone a detailed mobilization plan. Furthermore, there was no formal contractual relationship between individual members of the Naval Militia and the Navy. Unit activation was impossible; each member had to be processed on his own, with the result that the unit cohesion which had developed for as much as ten years was threatened with being broken up.

USS YOSEMITE, all of whose 300 crew members came from the Michigan State Naval Brigade, fought off Spanish forces at the entrance to San Juan, Puerto Rico. The ship was assigned to a task force which at the time the war ended, was preparing for operations against the coast of Spain. The Navy began the Spanish-American War with 12,500 men and ended it with 24,123. Of the increase, 3,832 came from the Naval Militia. Results were uneven but, as demonstrated by YOSEMITE, there was considerable potential for a well-trained, well-organized, adequately-funded reserve force.

Almost immediately after the war, the Navy pointed to its wartime experience and requested establishment of a naval reserve

under its control to consist of personnel with prior service in the Navy or Marine Corps. Support in Congress was minimal, however, and after several attempts to enact a Naval Reserve failed, the Navy had to be content with improvements on the margins.

In 1911, the Naval Militia included about 7,400 officers and men in units in 20 States and the District of Columbia. That year, problems of manning the fleet became acute and the Navy developed plans to fully man its newer ships, while placing others in a reserve status. The latter ships were to be manned by members of the Naval Militia upon mobilization.

The Navy came to depend upon personnel of the Naval Militia for peacetime, or contributory, support activity in the years before World War I. Personnel shortages afloat forced the Navy to resort to relieving them by different expedients. In some instances, active duty personnel in shore stations were ordered to sea to man critical billets, and their positions ashore were manned temporarily by Naval Militia personnel. In 1912, in order to sufficiently man ships at a major naval review in New York, the Secretary of the Navy sanctioned an interesting process that was used to gain the services of some 1,000 Naval Militia personnel. They were enlisted on standard four-year contracts but were discharged at the conclusion of the events.

In February 1914, Congress passed the legislation to give the Secretary of the Navy authority over the Naval Militia. Before it could be put into practice, however, it was overtaken by events: the early events of the European War led Congress to overcome a quarter century of reluctance and establish the United States Naval Reserve.

NAVAL MILITIA AND NAVAL RESERVE

Establishment of the Naval Reserve in 1915 did not immediately render the Naval Militia obsolete nor cause it to be abandoned. Indeed, the Navy was never more dependent upon the Naval Militia just before this country became involved in World War I.

As the Naval Reserve was first established, it was little more than a data base of prior-service personnel who indicated their availability for reactivation in event of war. As of November, 1915, only 176 men had affiliated with the Naval Reserve.

The approach of war led Congress to strengthen the Naval Reserve. An Act of August 29, 1916 established National Naval Volunteer as a category of Naval Reserve membership. Intended for members of the Naval Militia, National Naval Volunteers were to consist of personnel whose naval skills were found by the Navy to meet its standards and who agreed to be available for mobilization.

BETWEEN THE WARS

Congress was unwilling to fund the infrastructure needs of the Naval Reserve, and the previous capital assets acquired by the Naval Militia over twenty-five years were critical: subsequent analysis indicated that, in the period between the wars, where the Naval Reserve was able to exist alongside the Naval Militia as a result of dual membership, it was far more effective than where there was no Naval Militia.

By 1936, however, the Naval Militia was declining. Although 19 states carried Naval Militia organizations on their statute books, only ten maintained them as functioning organizations: Connecticut, Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, New Jersey, New York, Ohio and Wisconsin. Nevertheless, for every four dollars that the Federal Government allocated to the Naval Reserve, the states spent one dollar on the Naval Militia.

AFTER WORLD WAR II

James Forrestal, Secretary of the Navy from 1944 until he became first Secretary of Defense in 1947, was a firm supporter of the Naval Reserve. Forrestal ensured that funding of the Naval Reserve was sufficient for its needs. This reduced the Navy's need for the Naval Militia. Of the original States with a Naval Militia, only New York has kept the Naval Militia as an operating organization (in accordance with Title 10, U.S. Code), but it was joined later by Alaska.

THE FUTURE

In view of severely declining budgets for the active component, the Navy has come to see the Naval Reserve as a potentially-valuable resource which can be put to use in its day-to-day activity. Overall "Naval Reserve Policy" is spelled out in SECNAV instruction 1000.37 of October 1992, where "Peacetime (Contributory) Support" allows the Navy to be able to access members of its reserve component whose skills—both military and civilian—can add value by supplementing the skills of active component personnel or where skills for a given task are nonexistent in the active component.

Naval Militia organizations, originating a century ago to defend the vulnerable coasts of seaboard states, have the potential to contribute to the defense of vulnerable budgets of state governments which must often respond to unanticipated demands. As the Naval Reserve originated as a data base of personnel who could be used by the Navy as needed but which could be maintained by the Navy at little cost in peacetime, so that Naval Militia could rise again in the form of a data base of personnel, maintained at little cost, but containing skilled personnel available when needed as part of the Organized Militia of the States as provided in Title 10, U.S. Code.

Both writers are Life Members of the Naval Reserve Association, and officers of the New York Naval Militia and of the Analysis and Strategy Department of NR Naval War College Support Unit 0119, which supports the Advanced Concepts Department of the Center for Naval Warfare Studies at the US Naval War College, Newport, Rhode Island. CDR Murphy is also President of the ENS James F. Burke, Jr. (Westchester County, New York) Chapter of the Naval Reserve Association. CDR Johnson is the Public Affairs Officer of the Naval War College Support Unit; he is the author of several articles on military and security issues and is researching a book on the reformation of the US military from Vietnam to the Gulf War.

Historical research data for this paper was originally prepared for Center for Naval Warfare Studies, US Naval War College, Naval Reserve Paper No. 1: U.S. Naval Reserve: The First 75 years. (Newport, RI: Naval War College, 1992). Marine Corps Reserve material is from Reserve Officers of Public Affairs Unit 4-1, The Marine Corps Reserve: A History. (Washington, DC: Division of Reserve, Headquarters, U.S. Marine Corps, 1966).

Chapter 659, Naval Militia, Sections 7851 through 7854.

State Naval Militia Organizations

Massachusetts	1891
California	1891
New York	1891
Rhode Island	1891
Texas	1891
South Carolina	1892
Maryland	1892
Illinois	1893
Pennsylvania	1893

Connecticut	1894
Michigan	1894
Georgia	1895
New Jersey	1895
Louisiana	1896
Ohio	1897
Virginia	1899
District of Columbia	1899
Oregon	1899
Florida	1900
Maine	1900
Minnesota	1904
Missouri	1912
Washington	1912
Wisconsin	1912
Alaska	1955

TRIBUTE TO STEWART E. CONNER, MANAGING PARTNER, WYATT, TARRANT & COMBS

● Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, it is my pleasure to rise today in order to pay tribute to Mr. Stewart Conner of Louisville, KY. Stewart is the managing partner of one of Louisville's premier law firms and just as important a good friend of mine as well as the Louisville community.

Mr. Conner grew up in Louisville, attending Atherton High School. After a year at Eastern Kentucky University, Conner received a scholarship from the University of Louisville. He graduated in 1963 as the valedictorian of his class, a feat he repeated 3 years later graduating from cum laude Louisville's law school.

Mr. Conner came by these achievements through hard work and discipline, attributes he garnered from his family. Mr. Conner says his father believed "that if you work hard enough you may not get everything you want, but you can get most anything." Mr. President, I don't believe any motto better sums up the pathway which leads to the American dream.

Following school he joined the prestigious law firm Wyatt, Tarrant & Combs. Unfortunately, 2 years after joining the firm his Army National Guard unit was activated for service in Vietnam. Mr. Conner served at Gia Le, South Vietnam, 60 miles northwest of Danang. While he was away his law firm continued to pay him one half of his salary and held his job for his return. Because of this generosity, Mr. Conner and his young family did not have to suffer undue hardships.

This loyalty was not forgotten by the young attorney. He quickly rose through the ranks and was elected partner in 1972, and served as chairman of the general corporate law section from 1980 to 1990. Additionally, Mr. Conner has served on the firm's executive committee since 1980 before beginning his current position in 1990.

He wins rave reviews from all who deal with him on a professional and personal basis. Despite his numerous responsibilities, Mr. Conner has the ability to make each person he deals with important and unique.

Mr. Conner also finds the time to serve on several boards, including the

Kentucky Council on Higher Education, Kentucky Chamber of Commerce, Old Kentucky Home Council, and the Boy Scouts of America. As you can imagine Mr. President, Stewart Conner is a driven and compassionate man.

I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring this outstanding Kentuckian. In addition, I ask that an article from Business First be included in the RECORD at this point:

[From Business First, Jan. 3, 1994]

REFOCUSING STEWART CONNER CHOSE LAW
OVER BURGERS
(By Ron Cooper)

Girls and other "distractions" caused Stewart E. Conner's grades to take a nose dive when he was a senior at Atherton High School in 1958-59.

"I was in the top half of the bottom fourth of my class," says Conner, "and I was convinced I'd end up being a hamburger flipper. Then my faculty adviser told me to start thinking about learning a trade."

That was a major turning point in life for the 51-year-old Conner, managing partner of Wyatt, Tarrant & Combs, Kentucky's largest law firm.

"I had decided tentatively to join the military and learn a trade," recalls Conner. "But my parents talked me into giving college a try. Then they put it all on the line for me. They gave me their (lifetime) savings of \$900 for tuition and room and board."

Conner enrolled at Eastern Kentucky State Teachers College at Richmond (now Eastern Kentucky University) following graduation from Atherton in 1959. He excelled academically, enough to secure a scholarship to the University of Louisville in his sophomore year.

Initially, he was uncertain which career to pursue. He was driven by a determination to remain in school and to make his parents' financial sacrifice stand for something.

In that he succeeded.

He was valedictorian twice at U of L. The first time was in 1963, when he earned a bachelor's degree in business management, then again in 1966, when he graduated from law school cum laude.

Conner says he was determined to make a mark at Eastern, and later U of L. One motivation was his recollection of how fellow students at Atherton had become National Merit scholars. He knew he was just as capable of achieving that status, he says.

Because he had done so poorly with grades in high school, he says, "I had a bit of an inferiority complex" to overcome.

After he earned his undergraduate degree at U of L, Conner says he had a chance to enter a sales career for any number of firms. That prospect did not intrigue him. A law career—with its emphasis on logic—did.

Conner was the youngest of three children of the late James P. and Lucille Conner, who raised their family in the Highlands area. His father was a construction foreman, and his mother was a long-distance telephone operator for South Central Bell.

The family lived modestly, and Stewart Conner had to work for everything he achieved. He had good role models.

"All Dad had was a seventh-grade education, but he also had a lot of street sense in how he dealt with people," Conner says. "And he had a strong work ethic. He believed that if you work hard enough you may not get everything you want, but you can get most anything."

Scholarships paid only a portion of his tuition during his university days. Among the positions that Conner held to pay the remaining portion were social worker, hod carrier and clerk for a real estate title company.

Conner says the work ethic is so ingrained in him as to be almost consuming.

Little spare time is available in his schedule of overseeing the 175-lawyer Wyatt, Tarrant firm, and of conducting a practice in which he serves several noteworthy clients.

His personal clients include PNC Bank, Kentucky, and Trans Financial Bancorp Inc. of Bowling Green, KY.

"A couple of years ago, my wife Jef told me I should have a hobby," he says. "So I took up trains."

Conner assembles Lionel train sets; he has three of them set up in the basement of his home in the Federal Hill neighborhood near Locust Grove.

Conner says he views Wyatt, Tarrant as a second family, and little wonder.

In 1968, two years after he joined the firm—then named Wyatt, Grafton & Sloss—his Army National Guard unit was activated for service in Vietnam.

"I was 27 years old and just earning my spurs at the firm, getting to work on some larger cases," he says.

At that time, he was a married man with a newborn daughter, and the ink barely dry on a first mortgage. A private's pay in the Army was only \$127 a month, \$6 less than the monthly mortgage payment.

But the Wyatt firm paid one-half of Conner's salary the entire year that he served at Gia Le, South Vietnam, about 60 miles northwest of Danang. That allowed Conner and his spouse, Nancy Flick Peterworth, to keep their home.

Conner, who rose in the ranks to staff sergeant, served as assistant to the chief of staff of his artillery unit.

The young attorney's job at Wyatt, Tarrant was kept open, awaiting him on his return from service in Vietnam in October 1969.

"Needless to say, that experience wed me to these people," he says of his fellow partners at Wyatt. "The firm has been a constant in my life."

The feeling is mutual.

"He's an absolutely superb lawyer, extremely thorough, with excellent and sound judgment along with common sense," says Wilson Wyatt Sr., senior partner at Wyatt, Tarrant.

Conner was hired fresh out of U of L in 1966, when Wyatt learned of the young attorney from the law school dean.

Gordon Davidson is Wyatt, Tarrant's executive-committee chairman. He served as the firm's managing partner from 1978 until Conner succeeded him in 1990.

He says: "Stewart is a loyal and dedicated friend, and my number-one, right-hand guy. And his devotion and loyalty to the firm is unbelievable."

Upon his return from the war, Conner rose quickly in the ranks at the law firm.

He was elected partner in 1972, and served as chairman of the general corporate law section from 1980-90. He has served as a member of the firm's executive committee since 1980.

Clients and professional associates speak highly of Conner.

J. David Grissom, former chairman of PNC Bank, Kentucky, described the attorney as "a very thoughtful, intelligent and capable individual."

"Although he has an extremely heavy workload and a large array of clients and is

managing partner of the firm, he makes you feel you are his only client," said Grissom, now a principal in Mayfair Capital in Louisville and formerly with the Wyatt firm.

Michael Harrel, president and chief executive officer of PNC Bank, Kentucky, says Conner has made a mark serving the financial-services industry in the state.

"He's smart, very good at explaining complex legal problems in lay terms," Harrel says. "He's a good communicator."

Conner represented Citizens Fidelity Bank & Trust Co. in its merger with PNC Financial Corp. in 1986. That year, he also worked with Wyatt, Tarrant partners in representing the Bingham family in their sale of The Courier-Journal, WHAS-TV and Standard Gravure Co.

Jefferson Circuit Court Judge William McAnulty Jr. met Conner when both were members of the Leadership Louisville Class of 1981. He was, and is, impressed.

"For one of the best lawyers in the state, he has to be one of the most even, down-to-earth people I've known," McAnulty says. "He's just a regular guy."

When he's not at work, Conner makes time for civic activities. Among the those is serving as a member of the executive committees of the Kentucky Council on Higher Education and the Kentucky Chamber of Commerce, and a board member of the Old Kentucky Home Council, Boy Scouts of America.

He has three daughters by two previous marriages.

His children are Shannon Smock, 25, a teacher at Miami University of Ohio; Erin Conner, 20, a sophomore at the University of Dayton; and Maggie Conner, 11, a sixth-grader at Louisville Collegiate School.

He is married to the former Jef Fish, who has three children by a previous marriage.

Conner says the blended families spend two weeks a year at a remote lake in Michigan.

His spouse is the former executive director of Leadership Kentucky. They've been married for five years.

Jef Conner says she and her husband are very compatible.

She is former president of the Ronald McDonald House board in Louisville, a charitable enterprise that has her husband's full support.

The couple spent part of their Christmas Eve decorating trees at the 20-bedroom facility at 550 S. First St., where parents of hospitalized children stay.

The couple attends Southeast Christian Church.

Jef Conner describes her husband as "very easy going and the most patient person I've ever known. He's also my best friend."

Speaking professionally, Stewart Conner says he expects Wyatt, Tarrant to remain a predominant force in the region's legal community. And he hopes that he can build on his leadership skills.

"There's a difference between a manager and a leader," he says. "A manager tells you how to go from point A to point B. A leader takes you."●

NUCLEAR TEST BAN TALKS

● Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, today the Conference on Disarmament opens in Geneva. The No. 1 item on its agenda is negotiation of a Comprehensive Test Ban [CTB] Treaty. This treaty banning all nuclear weapons tests has been the goal of U.S. Presidents back to Eisenhower. Achieving a CTB has been a standing treaty commitment for the

United States and Russia—then the Soviet Union—since the Limited Test Ban Treaty, which halted nuclear weapons explosions in the atmosphere, was signed in 1963. But underground explosions continued for the three following decades by the United States, Russia, Britain, France, China, and eventually India.

The nuclear powers again committed to conclude a CTB Treaty when the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty [NPT] was signed in 1968, and for 25 years the non-nuclear nations that signed the NPT have looked for progress on a CTB. That is what they explicitly expected in return for their compliance with the NPT. But although negotiations continued and even neared completion during the Carter administration, CTB talks were suspended with the invasion of Afghanistan.

Now, today, the Clinton administration is taking its effort to finally conclude a CTB to the international stage. I believe there are several reasons why the time is ripe for quick progress in these talks:

The NPT comes up for review and potential extension in the fall of 1995, and the non-nuclear signatories have made clear they expect a CTB be in hand or near-at-hand if they are to support extension of the NPT.

There is now in place a voluntary, mutual moratorium on tests by all the nuclear powers except China, which tested once last fall. As President Clinton correctly observed last July, "nuclear weapons in the United States arsenal are safe and reliable," and the U.S. does not need more testing at this juncture.

In yet another sign that the cold war is over, these CTB talks begin with the two superpowers essentially on the same side, both voluntarily halting their tests and seeking a permanent global halt to all tests. Not since the end of World War II has a major arms treaty negotiation begun with such common purpose and objectives.

Earlier today, John Holum, Director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, gave his opening address to the conference. I ask unanimous consent that it be included in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks, and I encourage my colleagues to read it.

Although there is no formal schedule or deadline for the CTB negotiations, President Clinton recognizes that it would be in the clear interest of the United States to conclude them as quickly as possible.

Mr. Holum has noted that it is the goal of the United States to reach multilateral agreement on a CTB Treaty well in advance of the 1995 Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty extension conference. And his address today restates U.S. policy to conclude the negotiation of a CTB Treaty "at the earliest possible time." Holum continues,

"obviously, no country can unilaterally set the pace. I assure you that as compared to some past deliberation on this issue, the United States will be out front pulling, rather than in the back dragging our heels."

That declaration demonstrates true leadership and rededication to the imperative of stemming proliferation of nuclear weapons as these talks begin.

Mr. President, I believe these statements by Mr. Holum today reflect substantial congressional sentiment, that the current multinational moratorium on nuclear tests be converted into a permanent CTB Treaty as soon as possible. We have demonstrated that intention through legislation passed in 1992, and the administration has recognized that with its statements today.

A strong CTB treaty, which will be a cornerstone of our nuclear non-proliferation efforts for many years to come.

The address follows:

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE JOHN D. HOLUM, DIRECTOR, U.S. ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY, GENEVA, JANUARY 25, 1994

Thank you, Mr. President.

On behalf of the United States, may I first wish you every success as you guide the work of this body to begin this important year. You will have the complete cooperation of the United States delegation. I thank your predecessor, Ambassador Zahran of Egypt, for his wise and skillful performance of the challenging duties of president. I would also like to congratulate the new personal representative of the Secretary General of the United Nations, Mr. Vladimir Petrovsky, and express our confidence that we will have with him the same close and productive relationship that we enjoyed with his predecessor.

Mr. President, ladies and gentleman.

This is my first opportunity to address a session of the Conference on Disarmament (CD) as the Director of the United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. This forum serves the cause of a safer and more stable world, and my presence here today reflects the commitment of the Clinton administration to the goals of arms control, disarmament and non-proliferation. Upon my confirmation, the President reiterated to me the high priority he personally gives to making concrete, rapid progress on strengthening international security through multilateral cooperation. The end of the cold war has created particular opportunities for the CD, and I am here today to pledge to you that the United States will do everything in its power to make the most of them. In this regard, I would like to read out to you a message to the Conference from President Clinton:

"I am grateful for the opportunity to address all those who are participating in the Conference on Disarmament. This Conference has several important items on its agenda as the 1994 session begins, including transparency in armaments, and it may assume others, such as a ban on fissile material production for nuclear explosive purposes. None is more important than the negotiations of a comprehensive and verifiable ban on nuclear explosions. This challenging, but crucial, objective is the conference's top priority. It reflects our common desire to take decisive action that will support and

supplement the global nuclear non-proliferation regime and will further constrain the acquisition and development of nuclear weapons.

"Regional instabilities, the end of the cold war, and the growing threat of proliferation of nuclear weapons have created new and compelling circumstances to encourage progress in disarmament. Accordingly, I decided last July to extend the moratorium on the United States nuclear weapons tests and committed the United States to achieving a comprehensive test ban treaty. At the same time, I called on the other nuclear weapon states to observe a testing moratorium, and I do so again today.

"I am confident that Ambassador Ledogar and the U.S. delegation will join with you in taking bold steps toward a world made safer through the negotiation at the earliest possible time of a comprehensive test ban treaty that will strengthen the security of all nations. You have my best wishes during this important conference." (End text of President's message.)

The CD is the only multilateral forum to address global arms control and disarmament issues on a continuing basis. Its membership covers every region of the globe and reflects a wide range of concerns and interests. We have all come to accept the CD as both a marketplace of ideas and a place where nations get down to practical business and conclude the agreements that enhance international security.

The United States recognizes the importance of the CD as a multilateral arms control body, and we have consistently supported appropriate membership expansion. We do, however, insist that it is inappropriate to elevate the status in the CD of a state whose behavior continues to be flagrantly opposed to the goals of the organization. It is our hope that CD members will continue working together to forge a consensus on an acceptable membership package.

The conclusion of the chemical weapons convention (CWC) vividly demonstrates how the constructive competition of ideas and the pursuit of diverse interests and concerns can produce achievements to benefit the entire international community. I congratulate you on that signal accomplishment.

However, this is not the time for us to rest. There is much work to be done; the demands are immediate; and we have a unique opportunity to help to shape the world constructively.

The end of the cold war actually has increased the need for arms control. There are new sources of proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and the missiles used to deliver them. Formerly contained ethnic tensions have emerged in areas where adversaries are all too ready to use violence as the instrument of first resort. Sadly, there is abundant evidence that we still live in a world where technology advances faster than human wisdom.

Arms control can help us meet the challenge of bringing peace and stability to a troubled new world order. We can limit and reduce destabilizing military forces. We can prevent the spread of weapons of mass destruction and the missiles used to deliver them. We can contribute to confidence and trust through greater transparency about our military activities. Doing these things is not a sign of weakness or of capitulation; it is a wise investment in the future and a sure way to underwrite all of our vital national interests.

Much is underway. Less than three weeks ago, the Presidents of Ukraine, the Russian

Federation, and the United States signed a statement that opens the way to the elimination of nuclear weapons in the Ukraine. It provides for the transfer of all nuclear weapons on Ukrainian territory to Russia for their dismantlement, while recording agreement on compensation for Ukraine, previewing the security assurances that the United States, Russia, and the United Kingdom will provide Kiev once it accedes to the NPT and Start I enters into force, and reiterating the U.S. commitment to assist in eliminating strategic systems on Ukrainian territory.

This trilateral statement advances the interests of all three countries and of the international community in general. It will accelerate the entry into force and implementation of the Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (Start), bolster the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), and lead to the dismantlement of thousands of nuclear weapons. Equally important, this agreement should help establish a pattern of stable political relationships. It can contribute to an environment in which democratic reform, economic vitality, and social harmony can be pursued without dangerous distraction.

Arms control and confidence-building efforts are being seriously pursued elsewhere at the regional level—including the arms control and regional security (ACRS) working group created as part of the Middle East peace process, the new regional forum created by the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), the historic progress on arms control and non-proliferation in Latin America, and the agreement in principle between India and Pakistan to establish a multilateral dialogue on regional security and nonproliferation. Similarly, we were encouraged when CSCE ministers decided last December in Rome to begin discussions in the forum for security cooperation of possible arms control contributions for settling the conflicts in the former Yugoslavia.

Manifestly, the arms control negotiating tables are now located not only in the conference rooms of Washington and Moscow and the committee rooms here in Geneva, but also in Buenos Aires; in New Delhi and Islamabad; in Cairo and Tel Aviv; and in many other places around the globe. While the venues are varied, the objectives are closely linked. The CD has been the proving ground of new ideas and has set in motion a new dynamic and a new spirit of international negotiations.

A CHALLENGING AGENDA

With this dynamic in mind, let me turn to some of the major items of business that will occupy you in the days ahead.

COMPREHENSIVE TEST BAN TREATY

In the short time I have been in Geneva, I have already sensed the great anticipation of our forthcoming negotiations of a comprehensive test ban treaty (CTBT). And we should be excited. A CTBT is long overdue. We are beginning the final steps in a journey of too many years.

Let me be clear at the outset: U.S. policy—announced by President Clinton on July 3—is one of strong support for concluding a CTBT at the earliest possible time. Now, in the aftermath of the cold war, a CTBT becomes even more important. A CTBT will be an important part of our efforts to prevent proliferation of nuclear weapons and will place a major restraint on the nuclear-weapon states.

The United States has been working hard—as have many of you—to ensure a smooth start to the negotiations. We were pleased to be able to cosponsor the United Nations reso-

lution supporting the objectives of a CTBT. Its acceptance by consensus provides a strong base from which to launch your negotiations.

The consensus at the U.N. shows there is now virtually universal support for a CTBT. While the issues are complex, they are not beyond our immediate reach; we should be able to work out the essential elements of a treaty expeditiously. "At the earliest possible time" means just that. Obviously, no country can unilaterally set the pace, and we should avoid arbitrary deadlines. But I assure you that, as compared to some past deliberation on this issue, the United States will be out front pulling, rather than in the back dragging our heels.

A CTBT will be fully successful only with the participation and support of the five nuclear-weapon states and with broad international adherence. The nuclear-weapon states bear a special responsibility to contribute to these negotiations, and you have our commitment that the United States will meet its responsibility. For the United States, a tangible demonstration of our commitment to the CTBT is our continuing moratorium on nuclear testing. In his message to you, which I read to you just a few moments ago, the President has again urged the other nuclear-weapon states to refrain from testing.

STRENGTHENING THE NPT REGIME

With the end of the cold war, we have moved from a bipolar world to a multipolar world. The threat of nuclear proliferation remains, and with it the need to preserve the Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty (NPT) as the primary bulwark against the further spread of nuclear weapons. The NPT reflects a broad consensus against nuclear proliferation. The treaty also establishes a framework for preventing the spread of nuclear weapons, and for facilitating and regulating cooperation among states in the peaceful uses of nuclear energy. And it has proved an important instrument for enhancing the social and economic development of its members.

The U.S. welcomes the substantial progress made at the second meeting of the preparatory committee for the 1995 NPT conference, including the decision to open its proceedings to observers from both non-party states and non-governmental organizations. The prepcom reaffirmed the importance of consensus as its method of decision-making, and it agreed on the background documentation the parties will need from the United Nations, the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), and other organizations to support their work. The prepcom also unanimously endorsed the candidacy of Ambassador Jayantha Dhanapala of Sri Lanka for the presidency of the 1995 conference. The work of the prepcom is all the more important because of the end to which it is directed. The United States is committed to make every effort to achieve the NPT's indefinite and unconditional extension in 1995. Without a stable and durable non-proliferation regime, which includes a strong NPT, further arms control methods will be jeopardized.

Indefinite extension of the NPT in 1995 will ensure that the many benefits the NPT provides to its parties will remain available. By indefinite extension, the international community will send to would-be proliferators the clearest possible signal that their activities are not acceptable.

The threat of nuclear proliferation has diminished in some regions, such as Latin America and Africa. We need to ensure that

for the future such regional security benefits provided by the NPT are not mortgaged by a decision to limit its extension. The full weight of the NPT membership behind a treaty of unlimited duration would be a formidable political force for non-proliferation. Moreover, it would provide an essential foundation for building further on the historic measures already taken to limit, reduce, and dismantle nuclear weapon systems.

FISSILE MATERIAL CUT-OFF

Our objective of reshaping the nuclear contours of the post-cold war security landscape does not end there. The successful implementation of the Treaty on Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces (INF), the implementation of unilateral initiatives, such as reduction and dismantling of tactical nuclear weapons, and strategic arms reduction agreements, including Start I and Start II, were significant contributions to the process of halting the spread of nuclear arms. Now we can add not just the CTBT negotiations and NPT extension, but also negotiations for a global agreement to prohibit further production of highly enriched uranium and plutonium for nuclear explosive purposes or outside of international safeguards, as President Clinton urged in his address to the United Nations last September.

Such an agreement should be formally negotiated here in the CD. We were greatly encouraged by the consensus support at the UN for such a convention. A non-discriminatory, multilateral, and effectively verifiable fissile material production ban could bring the unsafeguarded nuclear programs of certain non-NPT states under some measure of restraint for the first time. It would also halt the production of plutonium and highly enriched uranium for nuclear weapons in the five declared nuclear-weapon states.

NEGATIVE SECURITY ASSURANCES

Negative security assurances are also related to the cause of non-proliferation. We adhere to a policy that has been reiterated by several previous administrations, namely:

The United States will not use nuclear weapons against any non-nuclear-weapon state party to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) or any comparable internationally binding commitment not to acquire nuclear explosive devices, except in the case of an attack on the United States, its Territories or Armed Forces, or its allies, by such a state allied to a nuclear-weapon state or associated with a nuclear-weapon state in carrying out or sustaining this attack."

As we have stated repeatedly in this forum, the United States is open to discussions on this issue.

We cannot disinvest nuclear weapons; but we can control them. We can limit their impact and influence. Deep reductions in nuclear weapons inventories, strengthened and extended non-proliferation norms, conclusion of a CTBT, a global ban on fissile material production, and other measures will alter fundamentally the role of nuclear weapons in the world of the twenty-first century. All these steps will contribute to the important goal we all share—a safer and more stable world.

THE CHALLENGE OF CONVENTIONAL WEAPONS

The devastating destructive power of nuclear weapons and the dangers posed by other weapons of mass destruction demand that they remain high on our arms control agenda, but they cannot be the only items. Another crucial element of the arms control equation is conventional arms.

We are reminded daily that the end of the cold war has not by any means removed all

conflict and danger from the world. Regional arms races and destabilizing accumulations of arms well beyond those realistically needed for defense are all too common. Reversing these trends is a global responsibility. We can help reduce the sources of tension that generate such accumulations. We must continue working to discourage the use of arms in resolving disputes.

The Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe (CFE) is a landmark in the reduction of conventional weapons. It serves as the foundation for a post-cold-war security architecture in Europe based on cooperation rather than confrontation. We look forward to its full implementation in 1995, and note with satisfaction that tens of thousands of items of equipment have already been destroyed.

The immediate challenge to this forum is to promote greater transparency about security matters. Transparency in turn fosters the greater confidence and trust upon which stable political relationships can rest.

Last year the CD created the ad hoc Committee on Transparency in Armaments (TIA). As the first new committee established by the CD in a number of years, it demonstrated the CD's ability to adapt to the challenges of the post-cold-war era. It is important as well because it is the only item on your agenda that addresses the conventional arms challenge. I strongly encourage you to build on the very useful work begun in the TIA ad hoc committee last year. I also recommend the ideas put forward last year by the United States to promote transparency regarding conventional arms.

Some object that we should instead pay even more attention to weapons of mass destruction and the missiles used to deliver them. Let us discuss those concerns seriously, but let us not create yet another setting where we repeat ourselves endlessly to the point where other important business is neglected. If we slacken in our willingness to address the conventional weapons problems that first gave rise to the TIA initiative, we will not make much progress, and we will begin to slide away from our global conventional arms control objectives.

Just as in the nuclear area, the work done here in Geneva on conventional arms will have a significant impact on related efforts elsewhere. We share your pride in the successful initiation of the UN Register of Conventional Arms. The first year's experience with the register was good—but not good enough. Eighty-two responses represent answers from less than half the UN's membership. We must do better; our goal should be universal participation, which your work here at the CD can encourage.

The United States also looks forward to the experts' meeting on these issues in New York next month. We will play an active part in moving their efforts to a successful conclusion.

Another conventional arms issue on which we have taken a first step relates to land mines. These weapons continue to wreak havoc on civilian populations whether or not they are any longer in an active war zone. The UN has supported by consensus the U.S.-initiated resolution calling for a moratorium on the export of anti-personnel land mines. We must now take the next step and make the global moratorium a reality. In doing so, we not only protect the futures of many innocent civilians, but we also draw attention to a range of problems long thought too difficult for arms control to solve.

This process will also be fortified by this year's experts' deliberations leading to a re-

view conference on the convention on weapons that may be deemed to be excessively injurious or have indiscriminate effects. Although not presently a party to this convention, the United States will closely follow the progress of the conference as an observer, and the President intends to submit the convention to the United States Senate this year for advice and consent to ratification.

These positive developments can mutually reinforce one another, forming a tide that can break down resistance to progress on the conventional arms control agenda. The CD should help swell that tide.

AN EXTENSIVE AGENDA REMAINS

In my closing minutes, Mr. President, let me briefly touch on the other developments and other issues that are part of U.S. arms control, disarmament, and non-proliferation efforts.

Despite the fact that the chemical weapons convention has now passed beyond the CD's purview, I know that many of you remain keenly interested in its fate. In Washington this past November, President Clinton submitted the CWC to the United States Senate for advice and consent, and will push for ratification early this year. The United States urges every other signatory to do the same, so that the convention will enter into force for the critical parties at the earliest possible date.

The United States has also been pleased by the progress made by the preparatory commission in The Hague on elaborating the complex procedures that will guarantee the convention's smooth and effective functioning.

The biological and toxin weapons convention (BWC) has been strengthened since its entry into force by the increased membership and by the confidence-building measures developed by successive review conferences. We believe the world can go further. President Clinton has announced that the United States will promote new measures to increase transparency of activities and facilities that could have biological and toxin weapons applications. The United States also supports the work of the ad hoc group of government experts convened to identify and examine potential BWC verification measures from a scientific and technical standpoint. We support an early conference to consider the report and to discuss the next steps to strengthen the international norm against a scourge that could well become the next weapon of mass destruction of choice.

The Clinton administration's non-proliferation policy also attempts to find solutions where non-proliferation norms have not taken hold. The United States has taken a strong stand against any North Korean nuclear weapon ambitions. In coordination with many other countries, we have made it clear to North Korea that, to resolve the nuclear issue, it will have to provide the international community with assurance that it does not possess nuclear weapons and it will not build them in the future. This means that North Korea must remain a full party to the NPT, fully cooperate with the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), including accepting regular and special inspections, and fully implementing the denuclearization agreement reached by North and South Korea. Our position remains unchanged: North Korea will have to meet these obligations aimed at ensuring a nuclear weapon-free Korean peninsula and a strong international non-proliferation regime.

Proliferation threats are acute in South Asia and the Middle East. The United States

is encouraging India and Pakistan to join in a multilateral effort to examine regional security and arms control issues. We continue to support the activities of the Middle East arms control and regional security working group.

The diffusion of missile technology makes the world a more dangerous place for all of us. The United States wants to strengthen the missile technology control regime to ensure that it continues to be an effective vehicle to combat missile proliferation.

CONCLUSION

Mr. President, the Conference on Disarmament is strengthened by its success with the chemical weapons convention negotiations. It is energized by the prospect of the negotiations on a comprehensive test ban treaty. It is challenged by the demands of enhancing transparency in armaments. It is bolstered by important arms control developments beyond these halls.

Our responsibility now is to make the most of the opportunity before us. The task is immediate; but our results will be long-lasting. The challenges are enormous; but they are matched by the promise of profound results. The path will be difficult; but it will be worth every effort when we arrive at our destination. Let us get down to work.

Thank you.●

COSPONSORSHIP OF S. 1150—GOALS 2000 EDUCATE AMERICA ACT

● Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. President, I rise today to speak to the important issue of education and how our education system in the United States can be enhanced by the passage of S. 1150—Goals 2000: Educate America Act. Two recent studies highlight just how important education is to our country and to its citizens. Last fall Education Secretary Richard Riley released a study indicating that only 59 percent of our fourth graders could meet basic reading standards for their age, and that 75 percent of our high school seniors could meet their basic standards. These figures are even more alarming in light of the fact that many of the kids in dire need of improvement have already dropped out of school by grade 12.

While analysis of our education system usually centers on school children 18 and younger, a second study confirms that substandard education does indeed have an ongoing negative impact on our citizens and on the country as a whole. This survey, which has been described as the most comprehensive study of adult literacy in the United States in over two decades, provides evidence of how education, employment, citizenship and the well being of our Nation are intertwined.

According to this study, roughly half or 47 percent of adult Americans fell into the lowest two of five literacy levels. These adults can perform only the most simple reading and writing tasks; one-fifth of those surveyed ranked in the lowest literacy level. For these adults—an estimated 40 million Americans nationwide—it is impossible to determine the total cost of a purchase, to locate an intersection on a map, or

enter information on a simple form. Tragically these Americans fell through the cracks of our education system, and continue to fall through the cracks of our society—experiencing high unemployment, high poverty rates, and little hope of self-improvement.

We have an opportunity to do something about these troubling numbers and to ensure that today's young people will receive the basic skills they need. In 1989, a bipartisan group of State and national leaders gathered to form what we now refer to as Goals 2000. Over the past few years, the spirit in which these goals were drawn up has been enhanced by the bipartisanship and broad support these goals have received.

The Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources has strengthened these goals, making very clear that parental involvement and State and local control are critical elements in the education of our children. And while Washington cannot offer any magic solutions or silver bullet answers to our troubled education system, we can do what we must do—offer leadership and provide assistance.

This legislation has received broad national support that includes parent groups, business organizations, labor unions, school administrators, boards of education, and Governors. S. 1150 codifies the national education standards that were formed by that 1989 meeting between the Governors and the President. By enacting these standards we make clear that education is a top priority for our country, and I believe we enhance our chances of reaching these goals as we enter the 21st century.

It is important to highlight the words that are included in the purpose of this legislation: "Creating a vision of excellence and equity that will guide all Federal education and related programs." It is time that we stepped up to that responsibility and assisted our communities, school systems, and families in creating that vision. Some will argue that this is Government interference or another Federal mandate, but the reality is that this bill does not contain mandates and in fact gives the Secretary of Education the power to grant important waivers if Federal regulations are impeding critical reform efforts at the State and local level. Instead of mandates, this bill provides incentives and financial help to States that are striving to reform their education systems.

This legislation is also important because it recognizes the role of education in our work force and how that education directly affects our economy. Included in this bill are provisions to help States create their own improvement plans, assistance in professional development, and a number of provisions that tie our education sys-

tem to the economy including the establishment of a National Skills Standards Board. While continuing the theme of the voluntary nature of this legislation, we make a statement that we are willing to offer the leadership and direction that education has been lacking.

I endorse this bill because it is time for this Nation to move ahead, it is time for the country to look toward the year 2000 with a goal of greatness. I want to take this opportunity to express my gratitude to the senior Senator from Massachusetts, Senator EDWARD KENNEDY and the other Members of the Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources—both Democrats and Republicans—who worked very hard at crafting a bill that has such broad bipartisan and national support.●

JOINT SESSION OF THE CONGRESS

Mr. KERRY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 197, providing for a joint session of the Congress, just received from the House; that the concurrent resolution 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 concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 197) was agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. KERRY. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 198 relating to the adjournment of the House of Representatives just received from the House, that the concurrent resolution be agreed to, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

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

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 198) was agreed to.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. KERRY. Madam President, let me just say to colleagues that in a few moments we will be requesting by unanimous consent that there be a vote tomorrow morning, with the Senate coming in prior to that for morning business, and then there will be a recess period this evening between now and the time we assemble for the joint session of Congress for the State of the Union Message, and momentarily I will propound the appropriate unanimous-consent request. I believe Senator HELMS will proceed tomorrow morning after the first vote, and I believe that the vote will be at approximately 10:30, by 10:30, and subsequently Senator

HELMS will proceed with two amendments that he has, both of which will require votes, and after that the bill will be open for further amendment.

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. KERRY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

ORDERS FOR TOMORROW

Mr. KERRY. Madam President, on behalf of the majority leader, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess until 8:35 p.m., and that upon reconvening at 8:35 p.m. the Senate assemble as a body and proceed to the House of Representatives for the purpose of receiving such communication as the President of the United States wishes to make during the joint session; that at the close of the joint session, the Senate then stand in recess until 9 a.m. Wednesday, January 26; that on Wednesday, following the prayer, the Journal of proceedings be 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, with the time from 9 a.m. to 9:40 a.m. under the control of Senator SIMPSON or his designee, and with the time from 9:40 a.m. to 10:20 a.m. under the control of the majority leader or his designee, with Senator GORTON recognized for up to 10 minutes from 10:20 to 10:30 a.m.; that at 10:30 a.m., the Senate resume consideration of S. 1281, the State Department authorization, and that upon resuming the bill and without intervening action or debate the Senate proceed to vote on or in relation to the Helms amendment No. 1248.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

RECESS UNTIL 8:35 P.M.

Mr. KERRY. Madam President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate at this time, I ask unanimous consent we stand in recess as previously ordered.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:43 p.m., recessed until 8:35 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer [Mr. CAMPBELL].

JOINT SESSION OF THE TWO HOUSES—MESSAGE OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 177)

Mr. CAMPBELL. Under the previous order, the Senate will now proceed to

