



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 104th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 141

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 18, 1995

No. 161

Senate

The Senate met at 12 noon, and was called to order by the President pro tempore [Mr. THURMOND].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Today's prayer will be offered by the Reverend H. Kenneth Dutille, pastor of the First Baptist Church in Bath, ME.

PRAYER

The guest Chaplain, the Reverend H. Kenneth Dutille, offered the following prayer:

Today, Lord, we praise You that You hold our whole Earth in Your mighty hands. We thank You that the Sun, the Moon, and the stars are preserved by Your mighty power. We are so indebted to You because You have given Your prescription for perfect peace in providing help when we go through periods of problems, pain, and perplexities. Sometimes our country looks like a puzzle, and we do not know what path to pursue. One group promotes what they believe is truth, while another group believes they have the perfect plan. We pray that all people in our great diverse Nation will look to the Deity. Bind us together with a pattern of fibers that will make a complete puzzle with a greater potential.

Encourage each of us when we are discouraged, give us confidence when in doubt, boldness when we are fearful, and strength when we are spent.

I pray that we may have a clear and crisp vision of Your plans, and give us the honor, integrity, and uprightness to carry those plans forward. Let the mighty power of God become our power in all we do this day.

We entrust this day to our Lord who is the Light of the World. Amen.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The able majority leader, Senator DOLE, is recognized.

Mr. DOLE. I thank the Chair.

SCHEDULE

Mr. DOLE. Let me announce to my colleagues we have morning business until the hour of 2 p.m. today, and then at 2 p.m. there will be a cloture vote on the substitute amendment to H.R. 927, the Cuba sanctions bill. Yesterday's vote was 59 to 36. It is our hope that we can invoke cloture today. This will be the third effort. And if we do, we will continue consideration of the bill until disposed of. Second-degree amendments to the substitute amendment may be filed up until 1 p.m. today.

If cloture is not invoked, the Senate may turn to any of the following items: NASA authorization, which I understand is not controversial. We are close to having some consent agreement on that.

Amtrak authorization, which may be referred to the Finance Committee because it has some tax provisions. Hopefully, if it is referred, it can be done on a limited basis so it would come back here within 2 or 3 weeks.

Labor, HHS appropriations. We have been precluded from bringing that bill to the floor. It is my hope that Senators SPECTER and HARKIN, the managers of the bill, can get together to see if they cannot work out some agreement so we can pass Labor, HHS appropriations. Senator COCHRAN will be working on that as sort of the expediter of the appropriations bills. This is the last appropriations bill to leave the Senate, and we are locked up over a number of provisions dealing with abortion, others dealing with striker replacement. It is my hope we can resolve some of those issues, bring it to the floor, have the votes, and go to conference.

State Department reorganization. Hopefully, they are about to reach an agreement between Senator KERRY of

Massachusetts and Senator HELMS, the chairman of the committee. It was our hope that we could have disposed of this matter by now. And I know there was a meeting yesterday. I hope we can follow up and maybe dispose of that today, and any available conference reports.

I might ask the Senator from Mississippi, are there any additional conference reports that may be coming to the floor on appropriations bills?

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, if the distinguished Senator will yield, the Transportation appropriations conference is one that has been the subject of some hard work. Our chairman of the full committee, Senator HATFIELD, is chairman of that subcommittee here, and we are hopeful that that bill will come to the floor in the form of a conference report soon.

Energy and water is another where we are hopeful that differences can be resolved between the House and Senate at an early date and we can get that conference report before the body.

Mr. DOLE. And the Agriculture appropriations bill has gone to the President?

Mr. COCHRAN. It has gone to the President. We are happy that the Senate acted favorably on the report. So did the House. And that bill is now on its way to the President. We hope he will sign it. All indications are that he will. The Secretary of Agriculture indicated that was his strong recommendation. Others in the administration have likewise indicated they think the President will sign the bill.

Mr. DOLE. I thank the Senator, my colleague.

MEASURES PLACED ON CALENDAR—S. 1322 AND S. 1328

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I understand there are two bills at the desk that are due for their second reading.

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



Printed on recycled paper containing 100% post consumer waste

S 15261

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ASHCROFT). The clerk will read the two bills for the second time.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1322) to provide for the relocation of the U.S. Embassy in Israel to Jerusalem, and for other purposes.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I object to further proceedings on this matter at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill will be placed on the calendar.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1328) to amend the commencement dates of certain temporary Federal judgeships.

Mr. DOLE. I object to further proceedings on this bill at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill will be placed on the calendar.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, is the Senator from Wyoming seeking recognition?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be a period for the transaction of morning business not to extend beyond the hour of 2 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 5 minutes each.

Under the previous order, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. THOMAS] or his designee is recognized to speak for up to 60 minutes.

THE BUDGET

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, let me first allay any fears that I intend to speak for 60 minutes. But I do have some colleagues who will join in using this opportunity to talk about where we are going in the next several weeks. Of course, what we do in the next several weeks is relatively less important than the impact on where we are going in the next century. It is my belief and the belief of many of us that we have the opportunity during this time to make a great deal of difference, and much of it has to do with the budget. It has to do with our ability to be responsible in spending and what we do.

I would like, if the Senator from New Mexico is ready, to yield to have some basic comments with respect to the budget and where we are going with the budget. So if I might, Mr. President, I will yield to my colleague from New Mexico, the chairman of the Budget Committee.

Mr. DOMENICI. I thank the Senator very much.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

A BALANCED BUDGET

Mr. DOMENICI. First of all, let me in advance thank Senator COCHRAN for organizing this time. I am only going to use a few minutes because I get more

than enough time in expressing budget and fiscal problems for our country. But today I want to start by saying the long, long journey of getting to a balanced budget from the standpoint of the Senate and all of the committees of this Senate doing their work is completed as of now.

In fact, just about a half-hour ago, dated today, I received a letter from the Congressional Budget Office directed to me as chairman of the Budget Committee signed by Dr. June O'Neill, Director of the Congressional Budget Office, that says when we pass in the Senate and if the President will just sign what we have done, we have a balanced budget, literally. For the first time in more than 25 years we have put together a package of reforms and changes, restraints and modifications in the law such that the authenticator of our budgets, the institution created to tell us the truth, has said in this letter that we have a balanced budget.

Now, for many of us, this letter has been years, years, and years in the making, and for some who have joined us recently, like the occupant of the chair and my good friend from Wyoming, they came and they lent their support to this very, very important endeavor in their first year of what may be for them many years of being Senators when the United States spends only what it takes in and establishes a new premise that we will only fund what we can afford.

So it is with a great deal of pleasure that I kick off this 1 hour today, and many to follow, when we explain why we are doing what we are doing by saying to those who want future Americans to have a better standard of living, for those seniors, those parents across this land that are wondering why cannot our children have a better standard of living, why cannot they get better paychecks. This is the beginning of the reinstating across this land a U.S. economy that can grow and prosper with low inflation and provide an increasing standard of living.

Why? Because it is obvious when you borrow so much money to pay for Government that you probably could not afford, you siphon off the resources and the productivity of our people, young and old. Those around now and those who will be here in a couple years, you take their productivity and their wealth and you say the U.S. Government needs that. We need it, to borrow it, to pay our bills, which we should not have incurred in the first place. Mr. President, \$4.6 trillion of that kind of debt, which sooner or later will stop growing when all these bills we are going to send to the President gets real and says how we will do it with real numbers, not with phony economic numbers.

I repeat, it would not have been very difficult to get this letter from the Director of the Budget Office if we had the luxury that the President had. The President found \$475 billion without

cutting anything, without reforming anything. He just said, "We'll have better numbers than the Congressional Budget Office. Things are just going to be so much better, Medicaid is not going to cost so much. You don't have to change it. It is just going to stop costing so much."

"Medicare, you know, it is also going to stop costing so much," said the President. "We are going to save a bunch of money because the costs are going to start going down." He said, "We're going to pick up interest." He says we are going to pick up \$175 billion because he thinks we are going to grow more than the Congressional Budget Office says, again, the authenticator of truism and the opposite of smoke and mirrors that we so long looked for around here and now we have.

So when the President comes to the party, after we have done what this CBO Director says, after we pass what she says will get you the balance, the ball is going to be in the President's court. What does he want to do about it? We already had the Secretary of the Treasury, with weeping and gnashing of teeth about the debt limit, making changes in advance of what he assumes might happen around here.

Mr. Secretary of the Treasury, while we recognize and respect your past business performance, we insist that you understand that we want, too, a balanced budget. We do not want America to default on its debt. But, Mr. Secretary, we want a balanced budget. And we believe that the CBO Director told us today how you do it. You do not dream up better numbers so you do not have to do so much, you do what must be done. No smoke and mirrors. Reform the entitlement programs. You will get there. America will have a much better place for its youngsters to grow up in and have the opportunity to prosper and grow in.

So, I will ask unanimous consent that the letter, and for those interested, the attached charts be printed in the RECORD. The charts are now attached. And believe it or not, in 2002, the Congressional Budget Office, without a rosy scenario, with conservative economics, real estimates, says we will have a \$10 billion surplus.

Now, I know for many that is one of these "believe it or not," is it not? It has been so long since we ever thought about this seriously. You never thought we could get there. And I might conclude after all my years of trying to get there, I never thought we would be here today, and next week and the week after when we vote to do this. And I would hope some of those on the other side of the aisle will help us do it. I am not sure they will. But I hope they do not rely on the President's budget as a means of getting there.

I have heard some very, very expert members of the Democratic Party on that side of the aisle talk about the need to reform entitlement programs.

Well, reform did not mean that you wish away the costs by just sitting down and saying it just is not going to cost that much, you do not have to change anything.

Let me tell everyone, I have been down that route. The one summit that failed, when we got the Executive and the Congress together, failed because we refused to reform entitlement programs. We estimated their costs. And much like the President, we estimated them very low. The OMB Director thought they would not cost so much. We saw the result. They cost a lot more than we predicted, and we never came close to the goals we had set.

We are not doing that. We are not doing that. We are taking on some very tough issues. There is some pain. We think it is fair pain. And so today I am very, very proud to say that the journey toward a balanced budget is perhaps drawing to an end.

Mr. President, pursuant to section 205(a)(4) of the fiscal year 1996 concurrent resolution on the budget (H. Con. Res. 67), I am submitting to the Senate the Congressional Budget Office certification of the reconciliation recommendations.

In accordance with the procedures set forth in the budget resolution, the Budget Committee transmitted the recommendations received pursuant to section 105(a) of that resolution to the Congressional Budget Office [CBO]. CBO completed the required estimate and transmitted it to the Senate Budget Committee today. The estimate

projects that enactment of the legislation will result in a balanced total budget in 2002—indeed there will be a \$10 billion surplus in that year. This estimate does not include projections of the fiscal dividend.

This certification triggers the revenue reconciliation instructions to the Senate Finance Committee contained in section 105(b) of the budget resolution. Pursuant to that section, the Finance Committee must submit its revenue reduction recommendations to the Budget Committee within 5 days.

I submit officially for the RECORD the CBO's letter saying when we pass the Senate proposals we will have a balanced budget in the year 2002.

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

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, October 18, 1995.

Hon. PETE V. DOMENICI,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Congressional Budget Office has reviewed the legislation submitted to the Senate Committee on the Budget by eleven Senate committees pursuant to the reconciliation directives included in the budget resolution for fiscal year 1996 (H. Con. Res. 67). CBO's estimates of the budgetary effects of each of those submissions have been provided to the relevant committees and to the Budget Committee. Based on those estimates, using the economic and technical assumptions underlying the budget resolution, and assuming the level of discretionary spending specified in that resolution, CBO projects that enact-

ment of the reconciliation legislation submitted to the Budget Committee would produce a small budget surplus in 2002. The effects of the proposed package of savings on the projected deficit are summarized in Table 1, which includes the adjustments to CBO's April 1995 baseline assumed by the budget resolution. The estimated savings that would result from enactment of each committee's reconciliation proposal is shown in Table 2.

As you noted in your letter of October 6, CBO published in August an estimate of the fiscal dividend that could result from balancing the budget in 2002. CBO estimated that instituting credible budget policies to eliminate the deficit by 2002 could reduce interest rates by 150 basis points over six years (based on a weighted average of long-term and short-term interest rates) and increase the real rate of economic growth by 0.1 percentage point a year on average, compared with CBO's economic projections under current policies. CBO projected that the resulting reductions in federal interest payments and increases in federal revenues would total \$50 billion in 2002 and \$170 billion over the 1996-2002 period. Those projections were based on a hypothetical deficit reduction path developed by CBO. The deficit reductions estimated to result from the reconciliation legislation submitted to the Budget Committee, together with the constraints on discretionary spending proposed in the budget resolution, would likely yield a fiscal dividend similar to that discussed in the August report.

If you wish further details on this projection, we will be pleased to provide them.

Sincerely,

JUNE E. O'NEILL,
Director.

Enclosure.

TABLE 1.—PROPOSED SENATE BUDGETARY CHANGES FROM CBO'S APRIL BASELINE
[By fiscal year, in billions of dollars]

	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	Total 1996-2002
CBO April baseline deficit ¹	210	230	232	266	299	316	349	*
Baseline adjustments ²								
CPI rebenchmarking ³	0	0	0	-1	-3	-6	-9	-18
Other adjustments ⁴	1	1	1	2	2	1	1	10
Subtotal	1	1	1	1	-1	-5	-8	-8
Policy changes:								
Outlays:								
Discretionary: ⁵								
Freeze ⁶	-8	-9	-12	-35	-55	-75	-96	-289
Additional savings	-10	-21	-27	-24	-20	-24	-25	-151
Subtotal	-18	-29	-39	-59	-75	-99	-121	-440
Mandatory:								
Medicare	-8	-17	-25	-36	-48	-60	-75	-270
Medicaid	-5	-9	-16	-25	-33	-42	-52	-182
Other	-12	-21	-24	-27	-29	-30	-32	-175
Subtotal	-26	-48	-65	-87	-110	-133	-159	-627
Net interest	-2	-6	-12	-21	-33	-48	-67	-189
Total outlays	-45	-83	-116	-168	-217	-280	-347	-1,256
Revenues ⁷	-1	-3	-3	-4	-4	-4	-4	-24
Total policy changes	-46	-86	-120	-171	-221	-284	-351	-1,280
Total adjustments and policy changes	-45	-85	-118	-171	-222	-288	-359	-1,288
Senate policy deficit	165	146	113	96	77	28	-10	*

¹ Projections assume that discretionary spending is equal to the spending limits that are in effect through 1998 and will increase with inflation after 1998.

² The budget resolution was based on CBO's April 1995 baseline projections of mandatory spending and revenues, except for a limited number of adjustments.

³ The budget resolution baseline assumed that the 1998 rebenchmarking of the CPI by the Bureau of Labor Statistics will result in a 0.2 percentage point reduction in the CPI compared with CBO's December 1994 economic projections.

⁴ The budget resolution baseline made adjustments related to revised accounting of direct student loan costs, assuming expiration of excise taxes dedicated to the Superfund trust fund as provided under current law, the effects of enacted legislation, and technical corrections.

⁵ Discretionary spending specified in the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 1996 (H. Con. Res. 67).

⁶ Savings from freezing 1996-2002 appropriations at the nominal level appropriated for 1995.

⁷ Revenue increases are shown with a negative sign because they reduce the deficit.

Source.—Congressional Budget Office.

Note: * = not applicable; CPI = consumer price index.

TABLE 2.—SENATE RECONCILIATION SAVINGS BY COMMITTEE

[By fiscal year, in billions of dollars]

	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	1996–2002
Agriculture, Nutrition and Forestry:								
Outlays:								
Farm and export programs	–0.9	–1.6	–2.1	–2.0	–2.0	–2.0	–2.0	–12.7
Nutrition programs	–2.4	–4.0	–4.7	–5.3	–5.9	–6.4	–7.0	–35.7
Subtotal	–3.3	–5.6	–6.8	–7.3	–7.8	–8.4	–9.0	–48.4
Armed Services: Outlays	–0.1	–1.2	0.4	0.4	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Outlays	–5.1	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	–3.3
Commerce, Science and Transportation: Outlays	–0.1	–1.8	–2.6	–3.5	–3.1	–2.6	–1.4	–15.1
Energy and Natural Resources:								
Outlays	–0.6	–1.4	–1.1	–0.3	–0.9	–0.3	–0.1	–4.7
Revenues ¹	0.0	(?)	(?)	(?)	(?)	(?)	(?)	(?)
Deficit	–0.6	–1.4	–1.1	–0.3	–0.9	–0.3	–0.1	–4.7
Environment and Public Works: Outlays	–0.1	–0.3	–0.2	–0.5	–0.4	–0.4	–0.4	–2.3
Finance:								
Outlays:								
Medicare	–8.4	–17.1	–25.3	–36.1	–47.8	–60.3	–75.2	–270.2
Medicaid	–5.1	–9.0	–16.4	–24.5	–32.9	–42.2	–51.9	–182.0
Welfare reform	–0.8	–9.0	–10.9	–12.1	–13.6	–15.0	–16.9	–78.3
Subtotal	–14.3	–35.1	–52.6	–72.7	–94.3	–117.5	–144.0	–530.5
Revenues ¹ :								
Earned Income Tax Credit	–0.1	–1.2	–1.4	–1.6	–1.8	–2.1	–2.5	–10.7
Hospital Insurance Tax	–1.1	–1.6	–1.5	–1.5	–1.4	–1.4	–1.3	–9.8
Subtotal	–1.2	–2.8	–2.9	–3.1	–3.2	–3.5	–3.8	–20.5
Deficit	–15.5	–37.9	–55.5	–75.8	–97.5	–121.0	–147.7	–550.9
Governmental Affairs:								
Outlays	–0.5	–1.0	–1.0	–1.0	–0.9	–0.9	–0.9	–6.2
Revenues ¹	–0.2	–0.4	–0.6	–0.6	–0.6	–0.6	–0.7	–3.7
Deficit	–0.7	–1.4	–1.5	–1.6	–1.5	–1.6	–1.6	–9.9
Judiciary: Outlays	0.0	0.0	0.0	–0.1	–0.1	–0.1	–0.1	–0.5
Labor and Human Resources: Outlays	–1.3	–1.1	–1.4	–1.6	–1.7	–1.8	–1.9	–10.9
Veterans' Affairs: Outlays	–0.2	–0.3	–0.5	–1.3	–1.5	–1.4	–1.5	–6.7
Interactive Effects: Outlays	(?)	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.3	1.1
Total:								
Outlays	–25.5	–47.6	–65.4	–87.4	–110.0	–132.7	–158.6	–627.1
Revenues ¹	–1.4	–3.2	–3.4	–3.7	–3.9	–4.1	–4.4	–24.1
Deficit	–26.9	–50.8	–68.9	–91.1	–113.8	–136.8	–163.0	–651.3

¹ Revenue increases are shown with a negative sign because they reduce the deficit.² Less than \$50 million.

Sources.—Congressional Budget Office; Joint Committee on Taxation.

Mr. DOMENICI. I yield the floor.

Mr. THOMAS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, let me first congratulate the Senator from New Mexico. This is a tough job. This is the toughest job in the Congress. Everyone likes the programs that we have. Everyone is involved in the programs. So you have to make some really tough decisions. It has not been done for 25 years. So I certainly congratulate the Senator, the Budget Committee, and the Finance Committee. They are doing tough work.

So we say, why are we doing this? It is very tough. What is the benefit? Let me tell you that I think there are substantial benefits. As a matter of fact, I do not think there is any question whether we have to do it.

One, if we are to be responsible, fiscally, morally, in terms of paying for what we ask for, you have to balance the budget. We have gone for a very long time, and we have known it, all of us, as citizens but we have not cared too much. But now we are at a time when, for example, interest on the national debt soon will become the largest single line item in the budget: \$260 billion interest; not debt service, not a reduction, interest. That is one reason we do it.

If you have a philosophy about government, should Government continue

to grow and become larger, better Government, it has to do with balancing the budget. If we do not ask ourselves, are we willing to pay for the services that we ask for or are we going to put them on the credit card, as we have done for a very long time, then we will continue to have larger and larger Government.

One of the benefits, I think, is to leave more money in the pockets of American families to spend as they chose to invest and create jobs.

Of course, I mentioned the interest. We will, next month, I suspect, be asked to vote on raising the debt limit to \$5 trillion—whatever that is—\$5 trillion because that is where we have gotten ourselves over a period of time. These young people, like these pages here, have, I think, \$180,000 debt each they will inherit because we have not balanced the budget.

So that is what it is all about. It is not really a question of whether we do it, we must do it to be morally, fiscally responsible.

So we are doing the business this week. This is a defining moment, I believe, in a very long time. This is my first year in the Senate that I have been here. But I have been here for several years, 5 years, in the House. We have not had a moment of that kind since I have been here. But more importantly, we have not had a moment of that kind for many years, a defining

moment when we decide to make some fundamental changes in Government.

It is not just the budget. The budget is reflective of it. The budget is the key to doing it. But much more will be changed besides simply balancing the budget.

I do not think there is any question but what voters asked for change. I do not think there is any question, as you go out to your constituency and talk in town meetings, about where we are going. Everyone knows we have to do something different. Almost everyone knows that you cannot keep doing the same thing and expect different results.

So we have before us this week and next week and will have before us next month the defining moment. We will have before us a budget that will bring us into balance in 7 years, the first time for a very long time.

So I would like to talk a little bit about the process we go through to do that, as opposed to the detail, and it will be difficult. I would like to talk a little bit about philosophy, because it is quite obvious that there are two points of view. There is nothing wrong with that. There are, clearly, at least two points of views. There are many views, of course, and they center on the role of the Federal Government in America today. That is the reason we

have debate, that is the reason we have two parties, that is the reason we vote, to get a sense of direction as to how we want to go.

Some, including the President, and many of the more liberal Members on the other side, support more spending. That is a legitimate point of view, to spend more in the Federal Government, have more programs, have larger Government. I do not happen to agree with that.

My view is that we strengthen this country by having more personal responsibility, by having fewer programs that work better, that are efficient, that, in the case of welfare, are designed to help people who need help, but to help them back into a position to help themselves, not as a permanent establishment.

We have had 40 years where we just generally added to the social programs. If they did not work quite right, we put some more money in them. Now we have an opportunity to examine some of these programs, to see, indeed, that they are accomplishing the purposes for which they were established; to see, indeed, if they are efficient in terms of delivering the services that we pay for; to consider if there is a better way to do it.

This is, after all, a Union of States, and the basic governing unit are the States. They come together in the federation, and the more things, in my view, that the States can do, being closer to the people, the more likely they are to be effective.

So there is a different point of view about that. The President promised a 5-year balanced budget as a candidate 3 years ago. Of course, that has not happened. What did happen, however, was the largest tax increase in the history of this country that still left us with a deficit.

Voters rejected the proposal last year, of course, for the Government takeover of health care.

So where are we now? We have to have a budget that really means something. The President's first budget this year was rejected 99 to zip in this place. The budget that followed was touted as a balanced budget, but CBO indicated that it will be \$200 billion over at the end of the 10-year period and would never balance.

There has to be a little pain in balancing, and it has to be real cuts. It is tough. It is where we are. We have to really come to the snubbing post and say are we going to commit ourselves to doing it and the time is now.

I hope that we get some support and cooperation from the White House and the other side of the aisle. I do not suggest everyone is going to agree. There are, obviously, lots of points of disagreement in how you do this, but the point is that we have to do it.

We have to save Medicare. If you like Medicare, if you want to have a health care program for the elderly, you have to change it. You cannot let it continue to grow at 10 percent a year, un-

less you want to double the contribution that is made to Social Security for part A. That is a fact.

I am a little concerned that as we move toward these decisions in the public arena, making public policy, that we are moving more and more toward sort of merchandising, towards the idea of using fright tactics instead of facts.

I picked up something in the Denver paper the other day on my way back. The Denver paper is not exactly a conservative bulletin, but it asserted the allegation under the Clean Water Act that we are going to dump arsenic in the water supply. Of course we are not going to dump arsenic in the water supply. Those are the kind of things that are being talked about as distortions, and they do not really come to the question of what we do to have a responsible Government, to be able to finance the kinds of programs that really are meaningful over time.

So, Mr. President, I say, again, that we are approaching and involved in, and it is a treat for you and me and my associate from Minnesota in our first year here to be a part of the first time to have a real opportunity to balance the budget, and we have that. I certainly hope our associates in the Senate will cause that to happen.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. INHOFE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

A MESSAGE OF HOPE

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I have been told, and we hear over and over again that we have lost the war on words on the Republican side and that this, what has now become known as the "big lie" around the country, is selling; that people are buying the idea that the Republicans are cutting Medicare and giving tax credits and tax relief for the very wealthy.

Of course, this just is not true. I come here with a message of hope this morning, because I really believe that the American people will catch on. We are going to go through the same thing we went through a couple years ago when they were talking about socializing medicine. I am not nearly as distressed as other people are because we have time, time works in our favor, we have logic on our side, and we are seeing some things happening right now that I get really quite excited about.

The other day, I picked up an editorial that was in the Washington Post. Mr. President, we are talking about the Washington Post now. This is not the Limbaugh Letter and this is not the Human Events, this is the Washington Post. Generally, the Washington Post is more liberal on their editorial outlook. If anything, they are more on the Democratic side than the Republican side.

The editorial is called "Medagogues." This is really a kind of neat article. The first paragraph says. I will paraphrase it:

Newt Gingrich and Bob Dole accused the Democrats and their allies yesterday of conducting a campaign based on distortion and fear . . . They're right; that's precisely what the Democrats are doing—it's pretty much all they're doing—and it's—

A crummy idea.

I ask unanimous consent to have this editorial, entitled "Medagogues," printed in the RECORD.

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

MEDAGOGUES

Newt Gingrich and Bob Dole accused the Democrats and their allies yesterday of conducting a campaign based on distortion and fear to block the cuts in projected Medicare spending that are the core of the Republican effort to balance the budget in the next seven years. They're right; that's precisely what the Democrats are doing—it's pretty much all they're doing—and it's crummy stuff.

There's plenty to be said about the proposals the Republicans are making; there's a legitimate debate to be had about what ought to be the future of Medicare and federal aid to the elderly generally. But that's not what the Democrats are engaged in. They're engaged in demagoguery, big time. And it's wrong—as wrong on their part now as it was a year ago when other people did it to them on some of the same health care issues. Then, they were the ones who indignantly complained.

Medicare and Medicaid costs have got to be controlled, as do health care costs in the economy generally. The federal programs represent a double whammy, because they, more than any other factor, account for the budget deficits projected for the years ahead. They are therefore driving up interest costs even as they continue to rise powerfully themselves. But figuring out how to contain them is enormously difficult. More than a fourth of the population depends on the programs for health care; hospitals and other health care institutions depend on them for income; and you cut their costs with care. Politically, Medicare is especially hard to deal with because the elderly—and their children who must help care for them to the extent the government doesn't—are so potent a voting bloc.

The congressional Republicans have founded the skeptics who said they would never attack a program benefiting the broad middle class. They have come up with a plan to cut projected Medicare costs by (depending on whose estimates you believe) anywhere from \$190 billion to \$270 billion over the seven-year period. It's true that they're also proposing a large and indiscriminate tax cut that is a bad idea and that the Medicare cuts would indirectly help to finance. And it's true that their cost-cutting plan would do—in our judgment—some harm as well as good.

But they have a plan. Enough is known about it to say it's credible; it's gutsy and in some respects inventive—and it addresses a genuine problem that is only going to get worse. What the Democrats have instead is a lot of expostulation, TV ads and scare talk. The fight is about "what's going to happen to the senior citizens in this country," Dick Gephardt said yesterday. "The rural hospitals. The community health centers. The teaching hospitals . . ." The Republicans "are going to decimate [Medicare] for a tax break for the wealthiest people, take it right out of the pockets of senior citizens. . . ." The American people "don't want to lose their Medicare. They don't want Medicare costs to be increased by \$1,000 a person. They

don't want to lose the choice of their doctor."

But there isn't any evidence that they would "lose their Medicare" or lose their choice of doctor under the Republican plan. If the program isn't to become less generous over time, how do the Democrats propose to finance it and continue as well to finance the rest of the federal activities they espouse? That's the question. You listen in vain for a real response. It's irresponsible.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, this is what is going on around the country. I just feel very strongly that the people are not willing to buy this.

I wish I had a blowup of it, but there is a cartoon that has been sent out, I guess, into all the districts by the Democrat senatorial committee that depicts us as individuals who are trying to cut taxes for the superrich and we are going to be cutting Medicare. The things are just outrageous. It says: "Inhofe feasts on tax cuts for the privileged while children go to bed hungry."

This is something that is, in my opinion, so extreme that the American people are not going to buy it.

It was not long ago, just a little over a year ago, that the Democrats were trying at that time to sell to the American people a program where the Government would run the health care system and discard a health delivery system that has been the most successful system in the history of all nations, of all mankind, and it was one to adopt a program that was similar to what they have in Canada, or the age-old failure in Great Britain or the Scandinavian countries; and that is, all presume that the Government can run things better than the private sector.

We were all so distressed at that time. Keep in mind this is just a year and a half ago. Even the American Medical Association bought a full-page ad in the Wall Street Journal and said they were throwing in the towel, raising the white flag, "We surrender." For a few crumbs, they were willing to give up this system and take Hillary's health care system, and that was only a year and a half ago.

I had an experience a couple weeks ago that drove home to me what a great system we have now. I have a close friend, Mr. President. He is an ear, nose, and throat surgeon in Tulsa, OK, one that has a very, very fine reputation among his peers and nationwide. I was talking to him and shared with him in casual conversation, about 20 years ago, that I lost my sense of smell. He said, "Come around sometime and I will examine you."

I went in and he said, "You need to have surgery." It is called endoscopic nasal surgery. It is a really yucky thing to talk about. But nonetheless, this is 2 weeks ago. Today, I am walking around and I have characterized this, Mr. President, as the most significant non-Christian experience that I have had or change in my life. I now have had this restored, and I have a sense of smell. This could not have happened in any other country, where you have a choice of practitioners to go

to, you have the state of the art and a degree of professionalism that none of the other countries have. It happened to me.

Now, a year and a half ago, we were willing to give that up. And now, if you surveyed the American people, they know that we are making changes, that we need to do something about medical malpractice. They know we are going to come up with medical savings accounts and improve the system we have now. But the Government is not going to take it over.

Well, this is what we are going through right now. By the way, this is, I think, unprecedented for the Washington Post to do. They came out with another editorial, and this was on September 25, called "Medagogues, Cont'd." I will read the last two sentences:

The Democrats have fabricated the Medicare-tax cut connection because it is useful politically. It allows them to attack and to duck responsibility, both at the same time. We think it's wrong.

Again, that is what the Washington Post said.

I ask unanimous consent that at this point this editorial be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 25, 1995]
MEDAGOGUES, CONT'D

We print today a letter from House minority leader Richard Gephardt, taking exception to an editorial that accused the Democrats of demagoguing on Medicare. The letter itself seems to us to be more of the same. It tells you just about everything the Democrats think about Medicare except how to cut the cost. That aspect of the subject it puts largely out of bounds, on grounds that Medicare is "an insurance program, not a welfare program," and "to slash the program to balance the budget" or presumably for any purpose other than to shore up the trust fund is "not just a threat to . . . seniors, families, hospitals" etc. but "a violation of a sacred trust."

That's the bullfeathers, and Mr. Gephardt knows it. Congress has been sticking the budget knife to Medicare on a regular basis for years. Billions of dollars have been cut from the program; both parties have voted for the cutting. Most years the cuts have had nothing to do with the trust funds, which, despite all the rhetoric, both parties understand to be little more than accounting devices and possible warning lights as to program costs. Rather, the goal has been to reduce the deficit. It made sense to turn to Medicare because Medicare is a major part of the problem. It and Medicaid together are now a sixth of the budget and a fourth of all spending for other than interest and defense. If nothing is done those shares are going to rise, particularly as the baby-boomers begin to retire early in the next century.

There are only four choices, none of them pleasant. Congress can let the health care programs continue to drive up the deficit, or it can let them continue to crowd out other programs or it can pay for them with higher taxes. Or it can cut them back.

The Republicans want to cut Medicare. It is a gutsy step. This is not just a middle-class entitlement; the entire society looks to the program, and earlier in the year a lot of the smart money said the Republicans would

never take it on. They have. Mr. Gephardt is right that a lot of their plan is still gauzy. It is not yet clear how tough it will finally be; on alternate days you hear it criticized on grounds that it seeks to cut too much from the program and on grounds that it won't cut all it seeks. Maybe both will turn out to be true; we have no doubt the plan will turn out to have other flaws as well.

They have nonetheless—in our judgment—stepped up to the issue. They have taken a huge political risk just in calling for the cuts they have. What the Democrats have done in turn is confirm the risk. The Republicans are going to take away your Medicare. That's their only message. They have no plan. Mr. Gephardt says they can't offer one because the Republicans would simply pocket the money to finance their tax cut. It's the perfect defense; the Democrats can't do the right thing because the Republicans would then do the wrong one. It's absolutely the case that there ought not be a tax cut, and certainly not the indiscriminate cut the Republicans propose. But that has nothing to do with Medicare. The Democrats have fabricated the Medicare-tax cut connection because it is useful politically. It allows them to attack and to duck responsibility, both at the same time. We think it's wrong.

Mr. INHOFE. Finally, Mr. President, I feel confident that the American people are not going to buy into this lie. I know it is a very short message. I know the Democrats are rejoicing. They think they fooled the American people into thinking that the Republicans are going to cut Medicare in order to have tax cuts. There is no connection, as far as tax cuts are concerned.

I hope that anyone in America that is looking at that and saying "we do not want tax cuts" will stop and remember what happened in 1993. In 1993, President Clinton came out with the largest single tax increase in the history of public finance in America or anyplace in the world. These are not the words of conservative Republican JIM INHOFE. These are the words of a Democrat on the floor of the U.S. Senate.

I suggest to you that anybody who was opposed to that major tax increase that we did not need in 1993 ought to be supporting a tax cut. All we are trying to do is repeal a lot of the damage that was done to the American people in 1993. We may not be able to get by with this, until we change the personality in the White House. Nonetheless, we should not connect what we are trying to do to save Medicare with the fact that we would like to have tax relief for the American people—not the superrich, we are talking about the American people and child deductions and that sort of thing.

I feel confident that we are going to be able to sell that message because it is right and honest. We are getting more and more support around the country from liberal editorial boards who are saying: "That is enough; we are not going to perpetrate a lie on the American people such as the Democrat leadership is trying to perform."

You know, it was Winston Churchill who said, "Truth is incontrovertible. Panic may rescind it, ignorance may deride it, malice may destroy it, but there it is."

I think we will find truth and truth will prevail.

I yield the floor.

Mr. GRAMS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized.

SECURITY—AT ANY COST?

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, I want to talk a little this afternoon not so much about taxes but taxpayers' money and about security.

Mr. President, 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue is certainly the most famous residential street address in America. It is, of course, the address of the White House—the crown jewel in a city that attracts 15 million visitors every year.

Part of the excitement for White House guests is discovering that their President lives right alongside a busy street, just like many of them do, that his house has an address, just like theirs does. The mail carrier really does deliver letters each day to 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, just exactly as it happens at every other home, in every other town in America.

The White House is called the People's House because of its close relationship with the American people. It is a familiar place where visitors instantly feel at home.

The city has certainly grown around them, but Pennsylvania Avenue and the White House have actually changed little since 1791, when George Washington gave his approval to Pierre L'Enfant's magnificent city plan. The bold stretch of Pennsylvania Avenue that shoots from the Capitol to the White House links the executive branch to the Legislative, physically and metaphorically.

By the early 1800's, Pennsylvania Avenue had become a busy thoroughfare, bringing people closer to the White House, and closer to their Government.

Pennsylvania Avenue in front of the White House was a natural place to hold the official ceremonies of a young nation. From there, President Lincoln reviewed troops heading off to battle in 1861. Later, dignitaries would gather on the avenue for inaugural parades.

People who were lost and looking for directions used to pull their carriages up to the front door of the White House to ask for help. By the middle of this century, it was station wagons and tour buses that made their way past the Executive Mansion. Families on vacation, eager for a close-up look at the home of the President, would travel the same route their ancestors might have traveled.

When ordinary citizens could drive past the White House or walk past its gate, well, that said something special about the unique openness that exists between the people and their President.

By 1995, Pennsylvania Avenue—the Main Street of America—had grown up. Over 80 feet wide, the modern, seven-lane thoroughfare was being used by more than 26,000 vehicles every day in the three-block stretch fronting the

White House. That is, until May 20 of this year, when all traffic on Pennsylvania Avenue in front of the White House came to a halt. In the wake of the tragic bombing in Oklahoma City, and citing a security risk for the President, the Treasury Department shut down three blocks of Pennsylvania Avenue. For the first time in the 195-year history of the Executive Mansion, the people are no longer allowed to drive past the people's house.

The Secret Service says the street is not actually closed in front of the White House. In the Washington-speak that infects so many here, the roadway is merely restricted to vehicular traffic. Even the President, when he gave the order to close Pennsylvania Avenue, said the decision would not change very much except the traffic patterns in Washington. But a great deal more than that has changed. If you want to experience intense security, try driving to the White House—even as an invited guest, with permission to park on the grounds. A bunker mentality has taken hold.

Massive concrete barriers block Pennsylvania Avenue, keeping out unwanted traffic. The fortress-like effect is compounded by dozens of concrete posts inset into the White House sidewalk.

Police cruisers patrol every intersection.

Vans—engines running, manned by officers with dogs—wait in the parking areas.

Uniformed Secret Service officers guard their new security stations, circulate among the tourists and patrol the White House lawn.

Motorcycle officers and even officers on bicycles are there, too.

If you look carefully, you will see figures on the White House roof itself, binoculars in hand.

Drive into a parking area and you are stopped by armed officers who ask if anyone has given you explosives to carry.

You are told to pull forward, where you are met by another officer, who asks to check your trunk as he puts his bomb-sniffing dog through its paces.

Mr. President, I think it is safe to say that very few visitors feel at home these days at the White House. The openness is gone. The closeness is gone. It has all been replaced with intimidation and fear. The place is secure now—secure as a fortress—but what have we sacrificed for that security?

The cost of trading security for freedom cannot be calculated mathematically, but the cost can indeed be measured in three ways.

First, the knee-jerk closing of a major artery such as Pennsylvania Avenue has had a devastating financial cost for the District of Columbia and its businesses, its commuters, its tourists, its residents. With the avenue closed for three blocks, and several surrounding streets blocked off as well, the people who live, work, and visit here and give life to this city are begin-

ning to feel choked off from it. Nearby businesses and offices are no longer as accessible to employees and clients. Traffic hassles compound the problem. A great deal of parking space has been eliminated. And most troubling is the fact that the President ordered the closing of Pennsylvania Avenue, and the Treasury Department carried it out, without any consultation with the District, without any direct public input from the people this action would most disrupt. Add up the lost parking revenue, the cost of changing street signs and signals, higher Metrobus subsidies, and police overtime, and as of June 30 of this year, the District estimated that closing Pennsylvania Avenue in front of the White House had cost nearly \$750,000. No one is willing to guess how high that figure might be today.

And that does not begin to take into account the other indirect costs of the closing. How has this affected tour bus operators? They can no longer drive their customers—many of whom are strapped for time, or unable to walk the extra three or four blocks—to drive past the White House.

How has this affected the public bus system? In order to provide the same services it offered before the Pennsylvania Avenue shutdown, transit officials estimate they will have to spend up to \$200,000 more every year by adding new buses and new drivers.

How has this affected local businesses and the customers who park nearby? That impact has yet to be calculated.

Mr. President, the people who depend on open access to Pennsylvania Avenue for their livelihoods say they have accepted the present closure, but they are not going along with the idea that the avenue must be blockaded forever. That case has simply not been made, they say. I agree.

The second measure of the cost of this closing is the direct hit it means for the taxpayers. The Federal Government has since repaid the District for some of the \$750,000 in costs but, of course, that means the taxpayers have once again been handed the bill. And there are more bills to come.

At an open house today at the White House Visitor Center, the National Park Service is soliciting public input into the future of this vital stretch of Pennsylvania Avenue. They have devised what they call an "interim beautification plan" for the 1,600-foot strip of the avenue between Lafayette Park and the White House. It involves replacing large sections of the asphalt with grass, replacing the police cruisers at each end of the avenue with guard booths equipped with steel barricades, and replacing the old concrete barriers with new concrete barriers disguised as planters.

"Beautification," if that is what you want to call it, does not come cheaply. Implementing this plan will cost the taxpayers an additional \$1.3 million, and it is only temporary. The proposed

permanent, and certainly more expensive, plan for the site will be put in place just a couple of years from now.

Most Americans will not have the opportunity to visit the White House Visitor Center today to offer their comments. Most will not even know that the future of Pennsylvania Avenue is under discussion. But if they were here, I know they would have strong feelings they would want to share about the Government's plans to limit public access to the White House.

And that is the third way to measure the price we pay when we trade security for freedom: by calculating the high cost of Washington's paranoia on the national psyche.

Mr. President, all Americans are deeply concerned about the safety of their President. The security measures used to protect him must be well thought out, appropriate, and thorough. I do not question the desire to afford him every ounce of security we can muster, but I do question whether we can satisfy that desire without sacrificing the people's freedoms. The balance between security and freedom has been tipped too far in favor of security.

Mr. Mark McCurry, the President's spokesman, says the American people "will have greater access to the front of the White House as a result of some of the changes they want to make." But that just is not so. How can we cut off traffic from a historic stretch of Pennsylvania Avenue and claim we are improving access?

Once the ball starts rolling, where does it stop? Already, the drastic security measures undertaken on Pennsylvania Avenue have set a precedent and are being mirrored here on Capitol Hill. Access to two streets on the Senate side of the Capitol have been shut off. Parking has been eliminated or restricted in many places. Security at the Capitol itself has been tightened dramatically. Officials in other Federal buildings are asking that parking meters be removed from their sidewalks, too.

Where does it end? How much of Washington, DC, are we going to have to rope off before the public figures out we simply do not want them here? As tragic as it sounds, that is the message we are sending to America.

Mr. President, on behalf of the American people who are not here to stand up for themselves, I ask my colleagues to join me in denouncing the assault on our freedoms being undertaken on Pennsylvania Avenue. President Clinton has gone too far, but it is not too late to halt his efforts to close off the people's house on America's Main Street from the people themselves.

I urge that we take action now, before a single spadeful of earth is turned.

In Le Roy, MN, population 900, the town's weekly newspaper reflected recently on Washington's current obsession with security. I would like to read some of it:

"We also wonder about the cost of the security around the Nation's capitol and if this much security is truly needed," wrote Al Evans in the *Le Roy Independent*.

"We are sure any midwesterner visiting there would question this. Perhaps we in this area of the country are too trusting, but there are limits to security measures.

The folks in Le Roy, MN, understand that closed streets do not equate with an open democracy. Why do not the Washington bureaucrats and politicians get it?

For 195 years, the address 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue has been a symbol of a government accessible to the people. Yet our government of the people, by the people, and for the people is slowly becoming a government just a little farther away from the people, too.

It is time we stood up and said "that is enough."

I yield the floor.

THE BUDGET

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, I will just take a few minutes of the Senate's time to comment on the set of issues that we will be spending much time on over the weeks ahead, those specifically related to our budget, the reconciliation legislation, which will also include legislation to reduce the tax burden on Americans, and the whole issue that surrounds that concerning the economy of our country.

As I traveled throughout my State during last year's campaign and as I have traveled since that campaign, I have heard Americans and Michiganders in particular tell me two things. Both of the things they have told me I believe are included in and really are the centerpieces of the budget that we are working to achieve here in the U.S. Senate.

The first thing they tell us is that they want a budget that is in balance. Americans and people in my State are frustrated by the fact that the U.S. Congress has gone a quarter of a century without bringing the budget into balance. They have to do that in their families. Most of our States and our local communities have to balance their budgets. The American people are frustrated when Washington cannot do the same thing, when we cannot bring ourselves to establish priorities, to set an agenda that allows us to spend no more than we take in.

People in my State also want a budget that is balanced and that is balanced legitimately. They are tired of fancy bookkeeping in Washington, bookkeeping which allows us to think we are doing better than we really are. That is why, I think, many people in my State applauded the President of the United States when he came to Congress not too long ago and, with bipartisan encouragement, said that we should use the statistics and the revenue estimates and the budget figures of the Congressional Budget Office at

both ends of Pennsylvania Avenue to make determinations as to where our Federal Government's deficit was.

Interestingly, of course, we now have a slight change in direction here in Washington. Here in the Congress, we have stuck to the ideal of balancing the budget and we have used legitimate statistics compiled by the Congressional Budget Office in calculating our budget to make sure it would be in balance based on the accurate readings of the CBO.

Unfortunately, now, as the actual rubber hits the road, at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue, we have a detour. There what we see is a diversion away from the use of CBO statistics, a diversion away from the idea of using the same budgeting calculations that are used on Capitol Hill, and instead a throwback to days gone by when statistics that are used in rosy scenarios, to balance the budget not with tough choices and setting priorities, but rather making unrealistic estimates as to the economy's growth and unrealistic estimates as to the needs for various promises and a variety of things allowing to balance the budget through fancy bookkeeping.

I have to ask today, Mr. President, why has this occurred? Why have we moved backward, and why has the White House chosen this course of action? Most people know the answer is simple. Without making those kinds of calculations that only can be made inside the Office of Management and Budget, tough choices would have to be made. Politically unpopular choices would have to be made.

I ask another question today as well: Where was the balanced budget fervor in the White House earlier this year? Why has it come about so late in the game? Again, I suggest that it is more politics than it is public policy objectives.

Indeed, I sit on the Budget Committee, and earlier this year, in the spring, we had several representatives of the administration come before us to discuss the President's budget. When they did, of course, that original budget was not in balance. It did not project a balance in years 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, or 7.

I asked, did you ever go through the exercise within the administration of coming up with a balanced budget or a budget that would reach balance in 7 years, recognizing that you might have done it, and concluded, for whatever reason, not to offer it because you did not want to establish the priorities that would be required to balance the budget? To my surprise, I was told that no one had ever gone through the exercise. This is as recently as the spring and, indeed, the budget we had been offered by the White House, by the administration, was the only budget that had been put together.

It makes me very suspicious, now, as we come to the end of this process, that suddenly we are told there is a budget, suddenly we are told there is a commitment to a balanced budget, and

suddenly we are told the CBO numbers are no longer the ones that will be used to attain that budget. It leads me to believe that we are basically being told these things as we come upon an election year in which a central part of the debate in America will be whether or not the American Government should spend no more money than it takes in.

Balance the budget and do it in a way that is credible and legitimate, is one thing I hear in Michigan. The other thing I hear in my State is that people want to be able to keep more of what they earn and that, in particular, the middle-class families of my State want to be able to keep more of what they earn. Here, in Washington, inside the beltway, in many of our committees and on the floor of the Senate itself as well as on the House side of the Capitol Building, we are told by people who purport to represent constituencies back in their States that there is no demand for reductions in taxes in America, that this desire to reduce taxes is somehow a myth created by people on our side of the political aisle for whatever purpose, I guess, happens to be convenient at the time.

I just want to know what constituencies those who claim Americans do not want a tax cut represent, because I cannot go to any part of my State without being told by people how hard it is to make ends meet in America, and in Michigan today. What people tell me is not that they wish somehow Government would intrude on their job site or their business or their community and start dictating what salaries they should earn. They do not tell me that. They do not tell me they want to see Washington begin to create some kind of central economy management system here inside the beltway. What they tell me is, if you will just let me keep a few more dollars that I earn in my paycheck, I would feel a lot better.

It is interesting to me to hear people tell us they do not hear any cries back in their State for tax relief when, at the same time, many of the very same Members of Congress come to the floor, bringing charts with them, to talk about the so-called middle-class squeeze that middle-class, hard-working, average American families are feeling today. Why is that middle-class squeeze being felt? The answer is quite simple. It is because American families—hard-working families, where people go out to work every day, and in some cases where more than one person is in the work force, and they work very hard—find at the end of the week or the end of the quarter or the end of the month they do not have as much money left after withholding and the payment of taxes as they need to make ends meet.

So, I think it is very disingenuous to, on the one hand, decry the fate of the middle class because of the difficult time middle-class Americans are having making ends meet and at the same time claim middle-class families do not want a tax cut. The fact is, if we reduce

the taxes on families in this country there will be less of a squeeze, in particular less of a squeeze on the middle class. In my judgment, those are simply mutually exclusive positions. I have a very hard time believing that in the constituencies of other Members of this body or in the House there is not the same yearning for an opportunity to attain the American dream, more chance of people keeping what they earn, that I hear from the constituents that I represent.

Here in the Senate we are trying. We tried during the budget resolution debates and we will try again in the next few weeks to deliver on commitments we made to our constituents from one end of this country to the other, our commitments to bring the budget into balance and to do so with a legitimate, credible budget and at the same time allow hard-working, middle-class families to keep more of what they earn.

The alternative to that is business as usual. The alternative to that is more fancy, funny bookkeeping. The alternative to that is big Government in Washington calling more shots, making more decisions that affect the lives of our families.

So, as the debate proceeds, I hope, as people hear these arguments that we cannot move to a balanced budget or that we cannot do it in 7 years or we cannot have a tax cut, they will reflect on the fact that the people making those arguments are the same people who have tended to be in charge for the last 40 years here in Washington as the budget deficits have increased, as the Federal debt has increased, as taxes have increased, and as the middle class has felt the corresponding squeeze that comes about when too many of the dollars of hard-working Americans are sent to Washington to fulfill the priorities of somebody else.

I think if one reflects on that debate, they will conclude that that budget which we passed here in the Senate earlier this year and that budget we are going to try to now bring to conclusion in the weeks ahead, puts us on the right path to achieving not only our objective of making sure our economy is strong, but achieving the other goals of balancing the budget credibly and reducing the tax burden on hard-working families.

I yield the floor.

Mr. COVERDELL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

A BALANCED BUDGET

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I rise in support of the long, arduous march, 32 years long, to balance the budget of the United States.

This is a most historic period in American history. On or about October 24, this Congress, the House and the Senate, will come head to head with the decision to join with America in its call for properly managing our financial affairs.

What we have here is a classical contest between those who come from the country arguing that Washington should stop doing business the way it has been and those who believe that Washington should continue just as it has been. Look at the essential questions that will be settled. In the case of the budget, the new Congress, the majority, is arguing that the budget should be balanced and it should be balanced within 7 years.

I read from Newsweek magazine by author Joe Klein, who talks about the chief spokesperson for the status quo, in name, the President of the United States. He says:

The sloppy, hyperactive wonkiness that defined Clinton's first 2 years in office has been supplanted by a sleek, tactical cunning. He has traded activism for passivism. He gives the appearance of taking stands—for some sort of tax cut, some sort of welfare reform, some sort of balanced budget—but these are ploys, mirages; they exist only to undermine positions taken by the Republicans.

A fundamental goal of this vote on October 24 will be to balance the budget. The President promised a balanced budget in 5 years when he ran for President. He forgot the promise. He then said he would not offer a budget, leave it to the Republicans. He then offered a budget that was unbalanced and received no votes when it was put before the Senate. It was 99 to zero. He then said he would give us a balanced budget within 10 years. But the Congressional Budget Office and all economists know that is not so; it does not balance in 5 years, 7 years, 10 years, or any years. The status quo or change; balance the budgets or leave them spending new debt and deficits.

Second, tax relief. I read, Mr. President, from today's Washington Times. And I am quoting the President:

It might surprise you to know that I think I raised [taxes] too much, too.

President Clinton said last night he thinks he raised taxes too much in his first year in office. Fine. We are trying to refund that tax increase. His tax increase, the largest in American history, was about \$250 billion—status quo—tax more and spend more. We are proposing to lower taxes \$245 billion—change, lower taxes on the working family, lower taxes on American business. Change or status quo.

We say in response to the Medicare trustees that Medicare must be saved or it will go bankrupt in 6 years. We have offered a good plan. It saves Medicare for current beneficiaries and those yet to come. It is reasonable and does what the country needs to have done.

What does the Democrat plan do? First of all, it is 21 pages. It is not a plan. The Congressional Budget Office cannot score it because it does not have enough detail. At best, if it were so and it were a plan, which it is not, it would push the solvency out 24 months. Is that what the beneficiaries are looking for, 24 months of a reprieve, or are they looking for us to take this program and make it solid

and solvent and something forever American family?

Status quo—just tinker with it, or change it and make it work?

Fourth, welfare reform: On October 24, if those votes prevail, welfare as we know it today will never be the same. We are saying that was a failed program. All America knows this. So we are changing it.

Who are the adversaries? Who wanted it left the same? Who has told the country we ought not to change it? It is the other side of the aisle.

So on these four great issues:

Balancing the budget: We stand with America, who says, "Balance it." The President says, "Stay with the status quo."

Medicare: We say, "Save it, change it, make it plausible, and reach solvency for 10 to 20 years." What do they say? "Keep it the way it is, tinker with it 24 months."

Tax relief: "Well, I raised taxes too much." We are saying, "Fine. Reduce them. Lower the burden on the working families so that the family can care for itself."

And welfare: "Change it." "No, leave it the same."

Mr. President, this is probably one of the most historical votes in the history of the Congress. That question is, are we going to take the changes that America is asking for and respond to them and do it, or are we going to defend Washington and three decades of bureaucracy, tax America, spend America, and leave it the same? That is the fulcrum. That is the question.

I hope every American is riveted on the votes that are cast and what they stand for. Change it. A new way—go into the new century ready to do it, an American century. Or the status quo that has brought us almost to our knees.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. COCHRAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FAIRCLOTH). The Senator from Mississippi is recognized.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I understand that the time under our special order has expired.

I want to thank the distinguished Senator from Georgia for his remarks and also those other Senators who have spoken so eloquently and convincingly this afternoon on the subject of the importance of our reconciliation process, balancing the budget, and ushering in a new era of fiscal responsibility. That is what we are determined to achieve, and with the support of Senators we will achieve that and make this a truly new day for America.

Mr. DORGAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota is recognized.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, am I correct that the previously agreed upon agenda gives us 1 hour?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has all the time he needs between now and 2 o'clock.

Mr. DORGAN. I thank the President for that advice.

MEDICARE AND TAX CUTS

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, we have heard a generous bit of discussion the last couple of days on the floor of the Senate about Medicare by people on the other side of the aisle. I must say the consistency with which the assertions are made on the floor of the Senate about Medicare reminds me of the consistency yesterday by the folks who came into this Chamber and cast votes on term limits. It was very interesting to see people who have served here 30 years cast their votes calling for term limits; people here 20 years say, "Well, we are in favor of term limits." I saw one fellow who has been here 12 years vote for term limits and walk out of the Chamber. And, of course, I know he just filed for reelection for the next term.

This is the group that says, "Stop me before I run again." It is the same consistency of thought that allows them to make these kind of representations on Medicare and taxes and their budget, or lack of consistency, I might say.

They say, "We are not cutting Medicare." What are people saying? Why would they say we are cutting Medicare? The fact is, we know what it is going to cost to provide a Medicare Program for the next 7 years. Those costs are estimated.

The majority party is saying we want to provide \$270 billion less than it is going to cost. That is a cut. The senior citizens are going to pay more and get less. That is a cut. Oh, you can proclaim all you want that it is not a cut. But the folks who pay more for less health care is going to know it is a cut.

I thought, rather than have a Democrat who will be viewed as someone covered by partisanship making the point, I would have a Republican make the point so that we are not going to argue about whether or not this is a cut or whether it is fair. Let me have Kevin Phillips, a Republican political analyst, make the point. He made this not too long ago, about a week or 2 ago on public radio.

He said:

Remember, at the same time as the Republicans proposed to reduce Medicare spending by \$270 billion over 7 years, they want to cut taxes for corporations, investors and affluent families by \$245 billion over the same period. This is no coincidence.

That is a Republican who says that.

Kevin Phillips, a Republican analyst, responds to these folks who have treated us to 2 hours now in 2 days of protest that they are not doing what they are really doing, says:

Today's Republicans see Federal Medicare outlays to old people as a treasure chest of gold for partial redirection in their favorite directions; towards tax cuts for deserving corporations, families, and individuals.

Kevin Phillips, a Republican, says:

The revolutionary ideology driving the new Republican Medicare proposal is also simple. Cut middle-class programs as much as possible and give the money back to the private sector business, finance and high-income taxpayers.

Finally, not a Democrat, Kevin Phillips, a Republican, responds to the 2 hours in 2 days of protests from people who say they are not doing what they are doing, says:

Let's be blunt. If the Republican Medicare reform proposal was a movie, its most appropriate title would be "Health Fraud II."

This debate is about choices, and do not lament the fact that we do not agree. The debate is healthy. It is what the democratic system is about—different ideas, and seeking from those different sets of ideas the best of those ideas, but which have the worst of the priorities in this Chamber these days. Those priorities say let us kick 55,000 kids off the Head Start Program, and every single one of those kids has a name and some place in their chest they are hoping they get a start, hoping they get a decent chance. But there is not enough money for 55,000 Head Start kids. There is not enough money to send kids to college, which is going to make it tough for families to send their kids to college because we do not have enough money. There is just not enough money for education and not enough money for health care. We cannot afford health care for the sick and the old. So we have to make some adjustments there.

But there is enough money for—what? B-2 bombers, nobody ordered, 20 of them, \$30 billion. Nobody wanted them. Nobody ordered them. The Defense Department did not ask for them. But they say we want to buy 20 anyway.

There is enough for a star wars program that nobody asked for. Enough for F-16's nobody ordered; F-15's nobody asked for; two amphibious ships for \$2 billion this country does not need; and, yes, even \$60 million for blimps that was written into the Defense budget. Who wrote it in? I could not find out. There were no hearings, no thought, and no discussion. Just buy some blimps. We cannot afford Head Start for kids. But we can buy blimps, the *Hindenburg* strategy of American defense, I guess.

New ideas? No, no. Herbert Hoover with the shoeshine and a haircut; nothing new about this. This is not a new set of ideas, or a new direction, or a new policy. It is, let us decide that the rich have too little and the poor have too much.

Kevin Phillips, a Republican, says this: Cut middle-class programs as much as possible and give the money back to private sector business, finance, and high-income taxpayers. There is nothing new about that. But it is not the right priority for this country. We ought to tighten our belt, and we ought to do it soon.

All of us believe that we ought to balance the budget, and we ought to do it the right way. All of us believe that you ought to invest for the future in this country. All of us believe the right investment will produce results for America.

I do not believe any of us really think that this set of priorities makes sense for this country's future—B-2 bombers, star wars, blimps, ships, submarines, and airplanes that nobody ordered, nobody asked for, and nobody wanted; \$7 billion more pumped into the Defense appropriations bill that nobody asked for. And then we say we are sorry, Timmy, or Tommy or Ruth or Mary; you are 4 years old and poor and want a head start, you want an opportunity. We are sorry; America cannot afford you.

I wish to make one final point, and then I wish to yield to my friend from New Mexico. I was at an airport on Saturday, and a woman asked if she could visit with me as I walked through the airport. I said sure. She was a woman in her late seventies, and she began very quietly because she did not want anybody to hear. And as she began to speak, her chin began to quiver and she, I could tell, was going to have trouble holding back tears. And tears filled her eyes, and here is what she said to me. She said: My husband's in a nursing home, been there 3 years. We have a very small farm. I have now sold most of it to pay for his nursing home care. She said the problem is, I do not have any more money except we have got the home place, the house, and I wish to stay in my house. I do not want to have to sell my house. Her eyes were filled with tears. She says: I am not asking for favors. We have never asked anybody for anything. We have never been on the end of a hand-out. We have always made our own way. But this woman, in her late seventies, with tears in her eyes and her chin quivering, says: All I wish to do is be able to live in my house.

The fact is all of these people are victims of policies that say we ought to buy B-2 bombers and star wars instead of helping a 78-year-old woman stay in her home, instead of deciding we should not drive that woman into the poorhouse so that her husband can stay in a nursing home. All of these people, that woman, a young 4-year old kid, all of them have names. Senior citizens, Head Start kids, family farmers who are going to lose the farm, all of them have names. Those are the victims of bad choices in budget priorities. It is why, as we debate this, we have to think through what is good for our country, what advances America's economic interests. Is it just making sure those who have a lot get more? Or is it deciding, yes, the investors are important; yes, people who have done well and are successful are important to this country.

There is nothing wrong with that, no dispute about that. But there are others with needs in America that are important as well. Addressing those needs sometimes represents an enormous investment. It breeds enormous returns for our future. That is what this debate is about. And the outcome of this debate will determine what life is going to be like for that older woman, who

cries because she wants to keep her home, or for some young child who deserves a start in the Head Start Program.

Mr. President, I yield 8 minutes to the Senator from New Mexico, Mr. BINGAMAN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FAIRCLOTH). The Chair recognizes the Senator from New Mexico.

MEDICARE AND MEDICAID

Mr. BINGAMAN. I thank the Chair. I appreciate that time to speak about some of what is going on in Congress. There is a lot going on, but I wish to speak particularly about the Medicare and Medicaid proposals that we are going to have to vote on in the near future.

Mr. President, 30 years ago, when President Johnson signed into law the Medicare legislation, which really did establish a contract with the people of this country, New Mexico was very proud at that time because one of our great statesmen, Senator Clinton Anderson, was standing with President Johnson there in Missouri at the time that legislation was signed.

As many who have studied American history may recall, the legislation that enacted Medicare was called the King-Anderson bill, and Anderson, of course, was the Senate sponsor of that legislation, and very proudly so.

Since that historic day in the summer of 1965, the Medicare Program has made health care a reality for thousands of people throughout this country and, of course, thousands in New Mexico. It has been the lifeblood of many of my State's rural hospitals and rural health care providers. Today, the program is at a serious risk, and I am not at all confident that the contract that President Johnson and Senator Anderson then had worked out and fought for will survive in the same form that they enacted it.

The Republican majority here in Congress is proposing to reduce Federal resources for health care in this year's budget by \$450 billion from Medicare and Medicaid. That will occur, of course, over the next 7 years. In New Mexico, the result clearly will be less health care for poor children and a greater financial burden on seniors and families who attempt to care for seniors.

Today, there are some 300,000 New Mexicans who depend upon Medicaid for health care, and 60 percent of those 300,000—180,000, roughly—are poor children. I think that is a fact on which many have not focused in this debate, particularly on Medicaid. A significant majority of the people who are beneficiaries of Medicaid are poor children. That is certainly true in my State.

Under legislation that has been proposed by the Republican majority in the House and the Senate, many of these children are bound to go with less health care available to them. Both the House and Senate bills call

for major reductions in Medicaid funds to my State, New Mexico. In the House bill, the reductions in funding for New Mexico will exceed \$900 million over the next 7 years, almost \$1 billion. In the Senate bill, the reductions will exceed \$600 million. The Federal Department of Health and Human Services predicts that the loss in funding will cause our State, New Mexico, to reduce the number of people being served by Medicaid by 19 percent.

Now, if 19 percent of the 180,000 children presently served are dropped from the program, then more than 34,000 poor New Mexico children who today are covered by Medicaid will not be covered by Medicaid in the future.

Some may argue that this will never happen; that the State will make up the difference; that any shortfall in funds will be made up by our State legislature and/or Governor. If that is true, I guess my question is, why is my State joining with 23 other States in sending a letter protesting the overly prescriptive and onerous provisions that are contained in the Senate bill, specifically the requirements that States provide health care for below-poverty-line pregnant women and children up to age 12.

Mr. President, under the current Medicaid Program, our State is required to provide service to these vulnerable individuals, and my question is, why do we not just continue with that requirement? According to the Governors' letter, which I referred to earlier, continuing with that requirement could potentially lead to a huge cost shift to the States and the States want the flexibility to avoid that cost shift and thereby reduce the benefits to that vulnerable group.

In New Mexico, more than 212,000 seniors and children and adults with disabilities currently depend upon Medicare in addition to those who depend upon Medicaid, and by the year 2002 more than 257,000 New Mexicans are anticipated to be eligible for the program. More than 210,000 of those will be seniors.

What do these program cuts that are contained in the legislation we are going to vote on this next week mean to seniors? According to the American Association of Retired Persons study of this issue, the average Medicare beneficiary in my State will pay a minimum of \$2,000 more in higher deductibles, higher copays, and there are many services that will not be covered. It also means a raising of the eligibility age from 65 to 67 beginning in the year 2003.

Mr. President, a cost shift of this type and this size is especially tough on New Mexico seniors and their families because so many of those in my State who are seniors live at or near poverty. One in every five New Mexicans, including about 26,000 seniors, lives in poverty in my State. Many of the State's seniors are barely making ends meet today.

The question is, how can poor, elderly New Mexicans possibly come up with the additional resources, this additional \$2,000 that it is anticipated they will have to come up with? Medicaid currently pays for \$188 million of nursing home care in New Mexico annually. I heard the Senator from North Dakota speak about the woman who had a husband in a nursing home.

We have many people in nursing homes in my State, and they benefit substantially from the payments that Medicaid makes. Through the Medicaid Program the State typically picks up the extra cost where Medicaid falls off. But to do so, under the cuts that are proposed, the State must raise additional revenue. And it would be substantial additional revenue, this \$188 million that I referred to earlier. That would be in addition to the \$600 to \$900 million shortfall which also would have to be made up if services were to continue as they presently are.

If New Mexico will not or cannot raise the revenue needed to keep the safety net in place without Federal assistance for these 300,000 current beneficiaries, the results are very clear, Mr. President. Thousands of seniors and children in my State will be denied adequate health care in the future.

The arguments for these cuts are well known by all of us. Proponents say the cuts are necessary to get us to a balanced budget. But if a balanced budget is the goal, then my question is, why here today at this very moment do we have a committee marking up a bill to cut taxes in this country by \$245 billion over this same period? If a balanced budget is the goal, and poor children and seniors have to do without health care in order to meet that goal, then why cannot the Congress also limit spending for the Pentagon to the amount that the Pentagon requested?

All of New Mexico's shortfall, every single dollar of New Mexico's shortfall in Federal funds for health care could be offset by foregoing one of the additional B-2 bombers that the Republican Congress insists on ordering.

So this debate, in my view, is not about whether we should reduce expenditures on health care. Clearly, we need to make some reductions. And we will do that. The debate is how deep those cuts will be, where the greatest burden of this deficit reduction will fall, what the priorities of this Nation are. These priorities should include maintaining decent health care for the most vulnerable in our society. The proposal that is being presented to us this next week does not provide for that.

Mr. President, I appreciate the opportunity to speak. And I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. DORGAN. I yield 7 minutes to the Senator from West Virginia.

OBJECTION TO FINANCE COMMITTEE MEETING

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. I thank the distinguished presiding officer and the distinguished Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. President, crowds are gathering to watch a train wreck. It is going to be a budget wreck. And it is going to be a horrible, horrible pileup. Maybe that ghoulis fascination about what is ahead is, in fact, distracting us, diverting us from the daily bashing that vulnerable Americans are taking every single day in the actions of this Congress.

But today, weeks before that big crash, I have seen enough. Speaking for this Senator, the junior Senator from West Virginia, I have seen enough. I have been fighting, offering amendments, voting no, but today I object. I object to all of it, to taking one more step, to letting the latest injury go unanswered.

I have put in an objection to the Senate Finance Committee's meeting. And as a result of my objection, they cannot meet after the hour of 2. And I will do that every day, and I will do that all the way through the reconciliation process until a particular part involving old coal miners is removed from the bill the Senate Finance Committee is now working on.

This new Republican leadership will go to any length to seize the crown jewel of their contract. And that is to ring out \$245 billion in new tax breaks for a privileged few. But at what cost? At whose expense? Every day their answer becomes more savage. Pilfering school lunch moneys, turning 4-year-olds away from Head Start classes, eliminating standards for screening and testing for childhood diseases.

Where does it end? Not there. Brick by brick, they are tearing down the Medicare Program, the efficient, effective, popular insurance program that protects senior citizens from poverty, which they once knew, and pain, turning their backs on the elderly and in nursing homes, allowing again, as we cut out almost 10 years ago, patients in nursing homes who were considered to be disruptive to be tethered down, tied down, or drugged into passivity. That will now be legal. And it will be done. Doubling the cost of health insurance for the most fragile amongst us. Had enough?

Sticking students with higher loan fees, squeezing out job training opportunities, cutting the number of college loans, opening a loophole to drop the disabled from health coverage. Senator CHAFEE and I did that. It passed the Senate Finance Committee 17 to 3. Pregnant women, children 12 years and younger, and the disabled. And unilaterally it was dropped. And then at the last moment, because some of us came to the floor of the U.S. Senate to expose that ruse, it was put back in, sort of, by saying, "Let the States set the standards."

Charging families more to care for their mentally ill or retarded children. Closing the doors on more than half of our special ed classrooms. How much more could they want? Mugging the working poor with a \$43 billion tax hike.

What do I mean by that? The earned-income tax credit being cut by \$43 billion. Those are people who are living out America's dream, working without health insurance, all of them virtually, but working, refusing to go on welfare, many of them making less money than if they were on welfare, and their kids not getting Medicaid, health care coverage to boot. But they are doing it because they want to work.

So we talk about honoring work in America. And then we turn around and cut those who are at the very bottom edge of the working poor, a \$43 billion tax increase for them, money which they earned which they will now not get to keep because we are changing the rules on them.

We are turning off the heat, Mr. President. We are turning off the heat, quite literally, taking away money from remedial reading and writing for poor children. Are they done yet? No. Not quite.

Today a new provision to unravel the health benefits for retired coal miners and their widows has been added to this long list of atrocities. It is a small group, Mr. President, only 92,000 individuals in all 50 States. A small group, I admit that; the average age, 76 years old. Most worked in the mines for decades back in the 1940's, 1950's, and 1960's.

They had to work in 3-foot crawl spaces in ice water. They did the hard work, pick and shovel. And now we want to take away their health insurance. It is being done in the Senate Finance Committee. These were the people that fueled the economic growth and the prosperity of our country. These days I meet these miners that I am talking about in their homes in West Virginia. Many struggle to walk.

Mr. President, if I could only describe to you what it is for an older miner, attached to oxygen, with black lung, with all kinds of problems of breathing, taking a fistful of pills a day. Just a simple act, to watch that miner try to get up out of his chair and then to walk very, very slowly across the room to the television set to change the channel or to turn the set on or off, and then very slowly come back, fall back into that chair—almost a day's journey is the physical impact of that.

These are the people we are talking about. Old people, ravaged by the only work that they possibly could have done, because of where they grew up and what work was available. Pills for blood pressure, for constant joint pain. They do not have much. They never earned a lot. There are no big pensions.

But these miners, Mr. President, traded wages every year. They traded wages that they got for digging coal to get health insurance security, because

to the miner, health insurance is more significant in the long term than the wages of the pension. But they wanted the health insurance in their old age, to earn coverage for their wives, too often widowed too early. They sacrificed for the guarantee of coverage, a guarantee that was sealed by this Government in law and which was promised to them by President Harry S. Truman, the U.S. Government, and which we, in a bipartisan way, passed into law in something called the Coal Act back in 1952, which is in the process of being repealed by the Republican majority.

These benefits, Mr. President, were guaranteed by a promise made by that President 50 years ago. So what is a contract worth? They ask; I ask. These coal miners escaped floods, they escaped roof falls, they escaped explosions, they escaped the ravages of black lung. They still survive, a few of them, across this country, 92,000. But they may not survive this Republican Congress, and I am sad to say there is probably more to come.

But for me, I have seen enough. I have seen enough. Every person has a line, a line in the sand. Every one of my colleagues has a line. For me, the line is these old miners. I cannot, I will not, go back to West Virginia without knowing that I did everything—everything—to stop this cruelty.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. I ask unanimous consent for 1 more minute.

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

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, no amount of procedural pain or legislative suffering that I, as a Senator, rightfully can impose—and will—could possibly offset the pain and the suffering being imposed on so many fragile people by the measures being rammed through the Senate Finance Committee and this Congress.

I recognize that the powerful interests who will benefit from these harsh measures will probably win and these coal miners will probably be cut off. But I want to make it hard, and I have the right to make it hard, and I have the moral obligation to make it hard for anybody to do that. I only wish I could make it as hard for them as they intend to make it—we in the Congress, that is—for the children and the seniors and the students and the disabled and the poor working families and those old coal miners. That is my line in the sand. I fully object to what this Congress is doing.

I thank the Chair. I thank the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Illinois, Senator SIMON.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Illinois.

BALANCING THE BUDGET

Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from North Dakota for yielding to me.

Senator BOXER, whose work I have come to appreciate more and more in this body, and I had a press conference in which we had some senior citizens and some students, senior citizens talking about the need for student aid, students talking about how we have to protect our grandparents. The reality is this should not be a partisan fight.

I am sure the Presiding Officer has heard me mention before we have become excessively partisan. It is one of the changes that has happened in my years in Congress, and it is not a good change. I think, frankly, the Republican Party is going to get hurt somewhat in the course of all this. But there is too much partisanship in all of this. I do not believe it makes sense when we have huge deficits—and the Washington Post had an editorial about this this morning—to be saying we are going to have a tax cut.

It is like saying you are having a New Year's resolution of going on a diet, and you are going to start it off by having a great big dessert. That is what we are doing now. We are going to balance the budget, but we are going to have a \$245 billion tax cut.

If we want to use that \$245 billion for reducing the deficit, I would understand that. But that is not what is happening, and I do not think there is any question about what we are going to impose on seniors. Also—and it has not received as much attention as Medicare has—Medicaid is also going to really be hurt. Who receives Medicaid? The majority of those who receive it are children, poor children—24 percent of our young people live in poverty—and senior citizens, those who are in nursing homes. They are basically the primary recipients.

But it is part of a pattern of not being as responsive as we should be. Let me just tie in with what those grandparents said out in front of the Capitol just a few minutes ago at the press conference on student aid.

The Presiding Officer will forgive me to say he is old enough, along with me, to remember the GI bill. It is interesting how the GI bill emerged. The GI bill, which we look back to with great pride and say what a great thing it was for our country, was a matter of controversy. There were those who said we ought to give a cash bonus to veterans, and the American Legion, to their great credit, said we ought to have the GI bill which will provide education to veterans. That was the fight.

Today we have almost a similar fight. Cash bonus—we do not call it a cash bonus, we call it a tax cut. Like the cash bonus, it will be frittered away and will not do much for our country. But if we put money into student aid, we are going to do something for our country.

Direct lending is under attack, and this is not a Democratic program. TOM

PETRI, a Republican from Wisconsin, was the first one to suggest it. My colleague, Senator Dave Durenberger, was a cosponsor with me of direct lending when it was introduced. Senator David Durenberger has properly said, in regard to the role of banks and the guarantee agencies, "This is not free enterprise, it is a free lunch." That is why the banks and the guarantee agencies are fighting for this.

The commission that looked into how we ought to have student aid, headed by our former Republican colleague Senator Paula Hawkins, recommended direct lending. Larry Lindsey, a Bush appointee to the Federal Reserve Board, has said we should have direct lending, it makes more sense, in a letter to our colleague, Senator SPENCER ABRAHAM.

We have to be looking out for the interest of the young and the old, for everyone in our society. We have to reach out. And I hope we use some common sense. We are going to be in this battle the middle of next week. And to say we are going to have tax cuts for people at the same time we deprive elderly and students of the help that they need, I do not think is in the national interest.

I simply ask the Presiding Officer—and I know he cannot answer this from the chair—I have not yet had one person with an income over \$100,000 come up to me and say, "I ought to have a tax cut." I have had a lot of people come to me and say, "We should not be cutting back on Medicare, we should not be cutting back on Medicaid, we should not be cutting back to assistance to students." Those are the choices that we have, and I hope we do the responsible thing here.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Washington, Senator MURRAY.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from the State of Washington.

CUTS IN MEDICARE AND MEDICAID

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to join my colleagues in exposing to the light of day the real lasting affects of the deep, reckless cuts in Medicare and Medicaid that are being rushed through this Congress. I want to focus specifically on the massive proposed scaling back of Medicaid and how it completely ignores the values of average, middle-income families today.

Let me focus for a minute on one of the hidden surprises in the Medicaid block grant proposal—one that is going to devastate the so-called sandwich generation—my generation. The sandwich generation is those of us who are raising our kids at home, and who are also responsible for the health and safety of our aging parents.

Today, under current Medicaid laws that have been in effect since 1965, adult children are not held legally or financially liable for their parents'

health care. If the parents' health deteriorates and they enter a nursing home, Medicaid helps with the costs if they personally meet financial requirements.

Republicans, however, today are proposing to repeal this protection, which will allow States to go after the life savings of adult children before Medicaid kicks in for their parents. In fact, if this law is repealed, working families in 29 States will immediately be subject to State laws requiring them to bear astronomical long-term care costs now covered by Medicaid.

What does this mean in pocketbook terms? Caring for an elder in a nursing home costs an average of \$36,000 to \$40,000 a year. By the way, the cost of caring for a medically fragile child on a ventilator can easily cost as much as \$86,000 a year, or more.

This could be catastrophic to the average family budget. It is prejudicial, and it is unfair. Let us not forget, these are families already under stress trying to put food on the table, paying for their children's education, and trying to save for their own retirement.

Some of these 29 States whose laws will go into effect if Medicaid is rolled back have general duty-to-support laws. These laws assume that since parents take care of children, children must later take care of the costs of their parents. Other States require reimbursement of nursing home and goods and services, similar to child support laws. Some States will actually impose criminal penalties for adults who do not contribute to the cost of their parent or family member in a nursing home.

This means that working families will have to make new choices. They will have to choose between allowing their mom to be cared for in a facility where she will have access to medical attention and assistance, or quitting a job to take care of her at home.

They will have to choose between paying for one family member's medical costs, or for the cost of another family member's education. Or paying for groceries. Or saving for retirement.

Working families should not be forced to make such untenable choices. No one wants to make choices between the future of their own children, and the health of their parents. They should not have to.

So why are these cuts being suggested? We have no crisis, financial or otherwise, that could merit these draconian measures. Any money that may be needed to continue our commitment to Medicare is not an issue with Medicaid. Under the guise of saving money, this cut will actually pit our citizens against one another.

There are 36 million financially strapped Americans on Medicaid: 4 million elderly Americans, 6 million disabled Americans, 8 million American women, and most important, 18 million American children.

Under the Republican proposal, over the next 7 years nearly one in every

four Medicaid recipients will lose their coverage. Who will suffer when our State governments run out of money?

Who will be turned down for benefits? An elderly woman waiting for vital nursing assistance? A disabled adult needing new sterile suction tubes for a ventilator? A medically fragile child whose body needs an essential mineral or amino acid to process food?

I can tell you this; I would not want to be the one making that choice.

This is real. It is going to be felt by real families, with real problems in my State and across this Nation.

I got a letter recently from a mother who is scared about how this assault on Medicaid might affect her son Patrick, who is a 45-year-old man with infantile autism, which among other things, means that he has no verbal language. During Patrick's early life, no insurance company would cover the costs of his treatment or therapy, so it was no surprise that by age 16 he had deteriorated to the point where he was also afflicted with epileptic seizures.

When Patrick's parents finally learned, on their own, that their son qualified for Medicaid coupons when he was 22, Patrick's life changed. He could receive treatment at any doctor, dentist, or pharmacy he needed to see, even though his parents sometimes had to remind people who tried to refuse the coupons that the medical schools they had attended had received Medicaid funding.

Today, Patrick lives freely in the community, in his mother's words "only because of the federally mandated program, Medicaid." Republicans in Congress would make Patrick and his family compete at the State level against pregnant mothers, severely mentally ill teenagers, elderly stroke victims in nursing homes, and medically fragile infants. All to be able to provide a tax break no one wants, to people who do not need it.

This is nothing more than the legislative pursuit of political dogma, without regard for the consequences to real people.

The core principals in these proposals are all wrong. This is not the America I grew up in, the country I believe cares about all of its citizens, no matter who they are or where they come from, or how much they are worth in financial terms.

Let us look at the real problem. If this Congress is serious, it will focus on the \$89 billion financial hole in Medicare, and will find a way to make these programs work better for families. We cannot just toss people on the street and hope things turn out OK.

We hear so much about family values today. Well, I agree: it is time to start valuing our families. It is time to recognize that many many families are struggling today. Their real needs are family wage jobs and economic security; a good education for their kids and health care that is affordable.

These draconian cuts, so hastily thrown together, will only increase

economic insecurity of American families. I hope this Congress will have the integrity and the intelligence to stop these unnecessary cuts now, before it is too late.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I appreciate the comments by Senator MURRAY from the State of Washington. She says it well and says it with feeling. I suppose some would say that we are hopelessly old-fashioned when we think that there are certain virtues in our country, the virtue of helping someone who needs help, extending a hand to those who are down and out, caring about kids. There are certain virtues that are important, that ought to be at the front of the agenda, at the top of the list.

I come from a town of about 300 people, and if you were to devise some sort of fiscal policy or budget for my hometown and say, look, I have an idea for this town, and here is my idea. Our town has 300 people in it. What I am going to do is I am going to make a stop at some of the poorest homes in our town, where people do not have much, and I am going to ask them to tighten their belts and take away a little of what they have. I am going to stop at the homes where people are trying to send their kids to college and say: You know what I want to do for you? I want to make it more expensive to send your kids to school.

I want to stop at the middle-income working families' homes, who have parents in nursing homes, whose assets are exhausted and gone and say: We are going to make a deal for you. You are going to have to pay more to have your parents in nursing homes.

I am going to stop at a home where a low-income single mother has a child in Head Start and say, "By the way, your little Timmy, age 4, his name comes up on our list of 55,000 kids that we cannot afford to have in the Head Start Program."

Then in our travels around this small town of 300 people, we will say, well, we have been to all the neighborhoods and told those folks what they have to sacrifice. We will stop by the wealthiest families in town and give them the good news.

Know what the good news is we will say to the wealthiest folks in town? "We will give you a big tax cut." Do you know why? "Because you are successful, you are investors and you deserve it."

Now, it is true we will not even bother to tell you we have been driving around town all day telling the poorer folks and the middle-income families how much they have to give, but we are delighted to stop at your house because we will give you a big tax cut. We think so much of you, we think so much of what you do we want you to have more.

I am saying that sense of priorities does not make sense to me. It is out of step. This is all about priorities and choices.

Frankly, I wish it were not partisan. For 10 months we have heard people

stand on the floor saying we are the ones that do not care about a balanced budget. Nonsense. We are the ones that do not care about putting this country's fiscal house in order. Rubbish. For 2 days, an hour a day we have heard people stand up and say we are the ones that could not have a plan. Baloney.

Of course, we have a plan. We do not have a plan like this. We have a plan that balanced the budget and does it the right way with the right priorities.

Here is a letter dated today by the head of the Congressional Budget Office, and it is "Chapter 2 in Budget Fraud": This says, from the head of the Budget Office, June O'Neill, Director, "The CBO projects that the enactment of the reconciliation legislation submitted to the Budget Committee would produce a small budget surplus in the year 2002."

Oh, really? A small budget surplus? Well, what it will produce is \$110 billion deficit. This is budget fraud. I have sent a letter to the Director of the CBO just now, and I am hoping to get an answer either today or in the morning that says, by the way, if you construct a letter like this following the law and not misusing Social Security funds, what is the deficit in 2002?

The answer, if the Director of the Congressional Budget Office gives me an honest answer, is that the deficit in the year 2002 with this set of plans or these priorities will be \$110 billion deficit in the year 2002.

Now, we want to see some honesty in budgeting. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota, the minority leader, who has come to the floor and wants to make a presentation on these priorities.

PRIORITIES

Mr. DASCHLE. I thank the Chair and the distinguished Senator from North Dakota for his eloquence and his leadership on this issue. He has spoken as passionately as I have seen him speak on an issue he cares deeply about, and I am very grateful to him for the many occasions where he has come to the floor to speak out as strongly as he has again this afternoon.

Mr. President, this is an unusual week. I hope that everyone can fully appreciate the magnitude of what will happen this week. As we speak, the Senate Finance Committee is meeting to discuss just how we will divide up the \$245 billion in tax cuts that we have been talking about now for several months.

They are expected to complete their work tomorrow. Ironically, tomorrow is the very day the House of Representatives will take up a proposal to cut \$270 billion from Medicare in an effort to pay for it.

So you have the interesting and very ironic juxtaposition of the Senate Finance Committee voting to cut \$245 billion today and tomorrow, and the House voting simultaneously to pay for

it by cutting \$270 billion in Medicare and ultimately \$187 billion in Medicaid, to ensure that we have enough left over.

We are deeply concerned, Mr. President, on the ramifications that all of this has; concern for a lot of reasons. Let me mention just four.

First, we are deeply concerned, and I could bring back all of the rhetoric we heard last year during the health care debate about closed-door decisionmaking, rhetoric we heard about the concerns raised by many that we did not have an opportunity to discuss in open and public debate all of the very significant and far-reaching ramifications of the decisions being made.

Lo and behold, over the last several days, that is exactly what has happened with regard to this tax package. Decisions were made, deals were cut, long-term ramifications considered and explained away without one opportunity for Democrats to be consulted or to participate. That is wrong. Closed-door decisionmaking, Mr. President, is wrong under any circumstances, and it is wrong in this case.

We just saw evidence in the last couple of weeks about what kind of deals can be cut behind closed doors, as doctors went in to speak to the Speaker and came out smiling because of the new opportunities they have to avoid responsibility in making the cuts on Medicare; avoid having to come under the scrutiny of those who would ferret out waste and abuse in the Medicare Program.

The Speaker made an announcement a couple of days later that he will go after murderers first and he will talk later about what problems there may be with fraud and abuse in the Medicare system, because we may not have enough prison cells.

Mr. President, that is wrong. If that is what results in closed door deals, it is doubly wrong.

We are equally concerned about the budgetary effect. Everybody has come to the floor, time and again, to talk about what it is we are trying to do with this reconciliation package, what we are trying to do, going all the way back to the budget debate last spring and how important it was we did everything possible to ensure that we reach that 2002 target day.

What do we find? Republicans have a choice between a tax cut which exacerbates the problem by \$93 billion according to CBO and not achieving all of the goals that we want, or having a tax cut and doing all that Republicans have proposed we do with regard to providing this largess to those who do not need it.

What do we find? Almost to a person, our Republican colleagues now suggest that it is important to pass this tax cut, regardless of the deficit ramifications. The \$93 billion somehow is explained away. The \$93 billion will not be explained away, Mr. President, and we have to address that issue before we resolve this reconciliation matter.

Third, as we have said time and again, it is the distribution of benefits that disturbs us a great deal. Providing huge tax cuts to millionaires and requiring working families with incomes of less than \$30,000 to pay more is just wrong. It is wrong, and that distribution is something that we will be dealing a lot more with in the coming days and weeks.

How is it we can possibly ask working families to pay more, and turning around and giving those who have so much yet another handout in the form of tax benefits?

Perhaps the most troubling of all the aspects, Mr. President, is the degree to which Medicare is being cut to accomplish this in the first place. A Medicare cut of \$270 billion, \$187 billion in Medicaid, all in this rush that somehow it is those resources that will be used only for deficit reduction, when we know full well that \$270 billion is going to be used for the tax cut that has nothing to do with taking further out whatever solvency we can in the trust fund.

Bruce Vladeck said in an October 11 letter to Congressman SAM GIBBONS:

The cumulative effect of the Medicare Part A HI reductions included in H.R. 2425 for FY 1996-FY 2002, offset by the cost of repealing the OBRA '93 provision, would reduce Part A expenditures by approximately \$93.4 billion. Based on estimates from the Health Care Financing Administration's actuaries, the resulting year-by-year "net" Medicare Part A savings would extend the life of the HI Trust Fund through the third quarter of calendar year 2006. This estimate is based on the intermediate set of assumptions in the 1995 Trustees Report.

Mr. President, that says it as clearly as anyone can say it. While the Republican proposal would cut \$270 billion, the effect that it will have on the trust fund is the same effect as the Democratic plan which cuts at 89.

I do not think anyone should be misled about the real motivations and the real desire on the part of Republicans, understandably, to find a way to pay for the tax cut in the first place.

The real impact to real people is what we ought to be concerned about. The distinguished Senator from North Dakota said it so well. They are the most vulnerable. They are the people whose faces we must remember as we make these very important decisions—disabled people, elderly people, children, people who will be left out simply because we failed to appreciate the magnitude of the personal impact that these decisions will have on them.

I do not think a soul in the country voted last year to cut Medicaid benefits to those who are disabled so we could give a tax cut to those who do not need it. That is wrong. That set of priorities must be turned around, and over the course of the next several days we will do our level best to ensure that people fully appreciate the repercussions and ramifications of what some on the other side are prepared to do.

With that, I yield the floor.

TRIBUTE TO JOE ALLEN AZBELL

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, Joe Allen Azbell—author, journalist, and adviser to Presidents and Governors—passed away on September 30 after a lengthy illness. He was city editor of the Montgomery Advertiser newspaper, a columnist for the Montgomery Independent, and the author of three books.

While his formal education ended with the fifth grade, Joe's accomplishments are truly historic. He is credited with helping make the Montgomery bus boycott possible. Joining the staff of the Advertiser in 1947, within 5 years he had become one of the youngest city editors in the South. In December 1955, he ran a front-page story on the impending bus boycott. The Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr., once remarked that the boycott might never have occurred without this pivotal article.

Born during the Great Depression in a small Texas dustbowl town, Joe Azbell ran away from home at the age of 12 because his parents did not allow him to read books, and his thirst for knowledge could not be quenched. He hid in small-town libraries, figuring that the truant police would not look for him there. During World War II, he joined the Army Air Corps and began his career in journalism.

Joe served as an advisor to every Alabama Governor going back to Gordon Persons. He was especially close to George Wallace, for whom he wrote speeches during his presidential campaign. He supposedly came up with the political slogan "Send them a message" for the campaign. John Chancellor of NBC called it the best political slogan of this century. He was also an advisor to every American President from Lyndon Johnson to George Bush.

Much of the success Joe Azbell enjoyed over the years was due to his colorful personality and gift for getting along with all types of people. He had a genuine interest in people and thoroughly enjoyed getting to know them and talking to them. Likewise, people responded to his charm, humor, and honesty.

Joe will be sorely missed by those who knew him both personally or only through his excellent reporting and commentary. I extend my sincerest condolences to his family in the wake of their tremendous loss.

TRIBUTE TO WILLIAM ORR GRAHAM

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, Mr. William Orr "Bill" Graham passed away on September 28 after an extended illness. The Morgan County, AL, native was founder and owner of Graham & Son Piano House and was active in his community and in State politics for many years.

Bill Graham attended Auburn University. He once received the Florence Civitan Club's Book of Golden Deeds

Award for outstanding community service. He was a charter member of the Florence Chamber of Commerce, president of the North Tennessee Valley Council of the Boy Scouts of America and was an organizer of the Camp Westmoreland Boy Scout Camp and the Kiwanis high school Key Clubs.

Bill was elected by the people of the Eighth Congressional District to serve on the State Democratic executive committee. He was also a member of the Alabama Industrial Development Board. He organized the talent contest at the North Alabama State Fair, was youth talent director of the MidSouth Fair in Memphis, a talent scout for the Ted Mack Amateur Hour, and was instrumental in securing college scholarships for many deserving youth in the Shoals area.

In addition, Bill was talent coordinator for the Cerebral Palsy Telethon for many years, past president of the Gilbert School PTA, chairman of the administrative board of North Wood Methodist Church, and aide-de-camp to the battalion commander of the Alabama State National Guard. He was also part of the management of the Birmingham Barons baseball team.

William O. Graham was truly an outstanding community leader who gave of himself in many years over his long life. He will be sorely missed. I extend my sincerest condolences to his family in the wake of their loss.

TRIBUTE TO LEWIS E. MCCRAY

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, longtime West Alabama Planning and Development Council Executive Director Lewis E. McCray has announced his plans to retire at the end of this year. He has held the executive director position since October 1, 1967, when he became the first paid director of the council. When he was hired, the agency was known as the Tuscaloosa Area Council of Local Governments and its members consisted of Tuscaloosa County and the cities of Tuscaloosa and Northport. Initially, the agency was funded through a program of the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Under Lewis McCray's outstanding leadership, the agency has grown to a membership of 7 counties and 34 municipalities. Due to its expanded membership, its name was changed to the West Alabama Planning and Development Council in 1971. It has been designated an Economic Development District, Local Development District, Metropolitan Planning Organization, and an Area Agency on Aging. The Council also administers the Title V Senior AIDES Program and Community Development Block Grants and provides technical assistance to local governments.

Mr. McCray has been active in many civic and professional organizations. His professional affiliations currently include his service as president of the Alabama Association of Regional Coun-

cils, member of the board of directors of the National Association of Development Organizations, member of the National Association of Regional Councils, the Chamber of Commerce of West Alabama, the Tuscaloosa County Industrial Development Authority, and the Tuscaloosa Convention and Visitors Bureau.

He is a native of Hale County, AL, and was educated in the public schools of Moundville and at the University of Alabama. Before being named executive director of the council, he taught business law and accounting at Shelton State Community College. He also served as the executive assistant to the late U.S. Congressman Armistead Selden.

I congratulate and commend Lewis McCray for an outstanding career and for all he has done to benefit his community, region, and State. I wish him all the best for a long, happy, and healthy retirement.

THE REVEREND H. KENNETH DUTILLE, JR.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. President, as we all know, the Senate can impose tremendous demands on its Members as we grapple with the difficult decisions facing this body and this Nation. It is no surprise then, that the Senate begins each of its sessions with a prayer delivered by a distinguished religious leader.

Earlier today, that spiritual leadership came from the Reverend Kenneth Dutille, Jr., of the First Baptist Church in Bath, ME. Reverend Dutille is truly dedicated to his work, his congregation and his community, and I am very pleased that he was selected to be one of two guest Chaplains we will have this month.

The distinction is deserved, for Reverend Dutille visits us with many accomplishments. He is a graduate of Baptist Bible College in Springfield, MO, and the University of Maine. He holds a masters degree from the California Graduate School of Theology. In his many travels, educational and otherwise, he has preached in over 200 churches in New England alone.

It is particularly fitting that Reverend Dutille lead the Senate's invocation today because he brings with him an understanding of some of the demands and pressures on those in public life. He is a selectman in his town of Richmond and was a candidate for the Maine State Legislature in 1994.

Reverend Dutille also knows the strains and joys of a successful life as a small business owner, running the Good News Book Shop in Brunswick. Just recently, he added a book of his own to the shelves, "Images of America: Lewiston and Auburn."

As evidenced by Reverend Dutille's invocation this morning, he is an asset to his congregation and his community. His accomplishments, boundless energy, and exemplary service make

him an excellent choice as the guest Chaplain.

Again, I am very pleased to have Reverend Dutille, his wife Patricia, and his daughter Melissa with us here today. I'm sure I speak for all of my colleagues in extending a very warm welcome on this special day.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 60 seconds.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GREGG). Without objection, it is so ordered.

CUBAN LIBERTY AND DEMOCRATIC SOLIDARITY [LIBERTAD] ACT OF 1995

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, before the Senate proceeds to vote on the cloture motion on the substitute to H.R. 927, the Cuban Liberty and Democratic Solidarity Act, I state for the record that if cloture is invoked, it is my intention to seek recognition and to lay before the Senate amendment No. 2936, the Libertad Act, with titles I and II only.

I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, if I could use a little bit of my leader time?

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

THE CLOTURE VOTE

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I understand why the chairman made the decision to delete title III from the Cuban Liberty and Democratic Solidarity Act. A determined minority—at the urging of the White House—was able to prevent action on the legislation. Mr. President, 94 percent of Republicans voted to invoke cloture, and 17 percent of Democrats voted for cloture. I commend the Members of both sides of the aisle willing to bring debate on this measure to a close. I know for the Democrats it is not easy to stand up to the kind of White House blitz that has occurred.

Once again, the White House says one thing and does another. The White House talks about toughening the embargo on Cuba, and then works to undermine the sanction Castro fears most. The White House says it wants bipartisanship in foreign policy—in fact they are pleading with us on Bosnia—and then uses partisan arguments to derail this legislation. Policy toward Castro's Cuba has been a perfect example of three decades of bipartisan cooperation. In the House, 67 Democrats supported a tougher version of this legislation. Nine Senate Democrats support cloture, and I expect many more would without the kind of pressure coming from 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue. Let there be no mistake—White House inflexibility has forced the change made today.

As I said last week, the Dole-Helms amendment—we already made 10 changes to address administration concerns. We were willing to make more to

address issues raised in this debate—raising the threshold for legal action from \$50,000 to \$100,000 for example, or extending the effective date from 6 months to 2 years after enactment. These are changes that will presumably be considered in conference on H.R. 927.

I supported title III as drafted in the Dole-Helms substitute. Yes, it does give a new right of legal action that could bring more suits before American courts. But if clogging up the court system is a concern of the White House or of opponents of this bill, I call on them to join with me to enact comprehensive tort reform. Opponents of this bill say title III would create a right for Cuban-Americans not enjoyed by Polish-Americans. They are right. And there is one critical distinction—today, Poland is free while Cuba suffers under the boot of Castro's repression.

That is what it really comes down to—the Cuban people continue to suffer while Castro searches for ways to finance his dictatorship. There are legitimate differences over the best way to bring democratic change to Cuba but we should be very clear about one thing: It is the chilling effect on investment in Cuba caused by the provisions of title III that worries Fidel Castro the most.

I expect the Senate to conclude action relatively quickly on this legislation. The international embargo on Cuba will be strengthened, and important provisions for the eventual transition to democracy will be enacted. I remain hopeful—and I say this in a spirit of bipartisanship; we had it work in some other areas, not as many as we should—that we can continue to work out a solution to the issue of property stolen by Fidel Castro so that is acceptable to at least 60 Senators.

Again, I commend my colleagues on this side and the others on the other side, and I hope, now that title III has been deleted, we could have an overwhelming vote for cloture, let us go to conference, let us work in a reasonable way—with the White House, if they would like to. I am certain the Senator from North Carolina would be willing to do that.

Mr. HELMS. Hear, hear.

Mr. DODD. I ask unanimous consent I be able to address Senate for 1 minute.

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

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from North Carolina. I intend to vote for cloture as a result of the amendments he has made.

Let me say to my colleagues, this title III had virtually nothing to do with Cuba and an awful lot to do with our own claims process in this country. While Poland may be free today, Vietnam and the Peoples Republic of China are not. That would create unique distinctions for those of Cuban nationality. While I have great sympathy for them, in terms of their right to bring actions for expropriated property, this

would create an egregious raid on the Treasury, in my view.

My hope would be the House would adopt the Senate language, in the absence of title III and other provisions, so that we would be able to move forward and send this bill to the President for his signature.

So I support cloture and urge my colleagues to do so, that we then might consider other amendments on this legislation and move forward with the bill.

But our objections, those of us who did object to this, had little or nothing to do with White House pressure, but rather our own examination of the bill and our recognizing the problems associated with title III—as I said a moment ago, an egregious raid on the Treasury of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

CUBAN LIBERTY AND DEMOCRATIC SOLIDARITY [LIBERTAD] ACT OF 1995

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now resume consideration of H.R. 927, which the clerk report will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 927) to seek international sanctions against the Castro government in Cuba, to plan for support of a transition government leading to a democratically elected government in Cuba, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Dole amendment No. 2898, in the nature of a substitute.

Ashcroft amendment No. 2915 (to amendment No. 2898), to express the sense of the Senate regarding consideration of a constitutional amendment to limit congressional terms.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill.

CLOTURE MOTION

CALL OF THE ROLL

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the quorum call under rule XXII, has been waived.

VOTE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the substitute amendment No. 2898 to H.R. 927, the Cuban Liberty and Democratic Solidarity Act, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are required under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from Illinois [Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber who desire to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 98, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 491 Leg.]

YEAS—98

Abraham	Feingold	Lott
Akaka	Feinstein	Lugar
Ashcroft	Ford	Mack
Baucus	Frist	McCain
Bennett	Glenn	McConnell
Biden	Gorton	Mikulski
Bingaman	Graham	Moynihan
Bond	Gramm	Murkowski
Boxer	Grams	Murray
Bradley	Grassley	Nickles
Breaux	Gregg	Nunn
Brown	Harkin	Pell
Bryan	Hatch	Pressler
Bumpers	Hatfield	Pryor
Burns	Heflin	Reid
Byrd	Helms	Robb
Campbell	Hollings	Rockefeller
Chafee	Hutchison	Roth
Coats	Inhofe	Santorum
Cochran	Inouye	Sarbanes
Cohen	Jeffords	Shelby
Conrad	Johnston	Simon
Coverdell	Kassebaum	Simpson
Craig	Kempthorne	Smith
D'Amato	Kennedy	Snowe
Daschle	Kerrey	Specter
DeWine	Kerry	Stevens
Dodd	Kohl	Thomas
Dole	Kyl	Thompson
Domenici	Lautenberg	Thurmond
Dorgan	Leahy	Warner
Exon	Levin	Wellstone
Faircloth	Lieberman	

NOT VOTING—1

Moseley-Braun

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote the yeas are 98, the nays are zero. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

The Chair announces that amendment 2915 is nongermane and therefore falls.

The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. HELMS. I thank the Chair.

AMENDMENT NO. 2936 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2898

(Purpose: To strengthen international sanctions against the Castro government in Cuba, to develop a plan to support a transition government leading to a democratically elected government in Cuba, and for other purposes)

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I lay before the Senate amendment No. 2936 which includes title I and title II of the Libertad Act only. I ask 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 2936 to amendment No. 2898.

Mr. HELMS. I ask unanimous consent that further 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. HELMS. Mr. President, title I of the Libertad Act strengthens sanctions against the Castro government. Some of the principal provisions of that title include: urging the President to seek an international embargo against the

Castro dictatorship; authorizing the President to support democracy-building efforts in Cuba and to help the victims of Castro's repression; prohibiting financing to any person to finance transactions involving U.S. property confiscated by the Cuban Government; and ensuring that U.S. foreign aid to former Soviet states is not being used to subsidize Castro's regime.

Title II of the Libertad Act lays out a proactive strategy to support Cuba's transition to a democratically elected government. The provisions of title II include instructing the President to develop a plan for providing support to the Cuban people during a transition to a democratically elected government. This title also authorizes assistance to meet the emergency and basic humanitarian needs of the Cuban people during the transition period; and it gives the President flexibility to suspend the economic embargo during a transition and to terminate the embargo once a democratically elected government is in office in Cuba.

Mr. President, the Libertad bill sends a clear message to the Cuban people, and to other nations, that the United States will not do business with Castro's dictatorship.

Mr. President, I strongly urge Senators to support this legislation. I believe that enactment of the Libertad Act will help bring about Castro's departure from power, making Cuba free and democratic. The people of Cuba deserve freedom, and we must not desert them now.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. HELMS. I thank the Chair.

Mr. GRAMM addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, I rise in strong support of this legislation. Like many of our colleagues, I am profoundly disappointed that title III of this bill will be dropped today. I am disappointed that we could not get the 60 votes we need to break a filibuster by those who are not willing to tighten the noose tighter around Fidel Castro's neck.

It would be one of the great tragedies of history if the tidal wave of freedom that has covered the planet in the last 5 years were allowed to subside before it drowned Fidel Castro.

My basic objective here today, Mr. President, is to pass the Helms bill and go to conference, and then in conference bring back the title III provisions, the provisions which will deny Castro the ability to entice foreign private investment to prolong his life as dictator in Cuba which would prolong the misery of the Cuban people.

I believe that the bill that is now before us is an improvement over our current situation. It does strengthen the

embargo. It does set up a procedure whereby we make it more difficult for Castro's Cuba to get funding through the United Nations or the world financial organizations. The bill gives us the ability to link our aid to Russia's actions as they relate to Cuba, both in Russia's trade relationship and in their intelligence gathering. So I think the Helms bill, as it now is before the Senate, is an improvement on current law. What remains of that bill does not do the job the original bill did. We are all disappointed that we could not break the filibuster on that bill.

Yet, I am supportive of the remaining Helms provisions. I want to see them adopted. I want to see us go to conference. I want to put title III back in the bill and bring it back to the Senate and fight for its passage. I think it would be a great tragedy for our country, it would be a great tragedy for everything we stand for in the world, it would be a great tragedy for the Cuban people, if we do not do everything in our power to get rid of Fidel Castro.

The original Helms-Burton bill was an important step in the right direction. I am for that bill. I intend to continue to fight for it. I urge my colleagues to support this measure today so that we can go to conference and get back the original bill.

I yield the floor.

Mr. LIEBERMAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. I ask unanimous consent that I may be allowed to proceed as in morning business for up to 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. I thank the Chair.

TRIBUTE TO THOMAS J. DODD

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I want to speak with my colleagues today about a remarkable and really historic event that occurred in my State of Connecticut this past Sunday, October 15, when the University of Connecticut dedicated the Thomas J. Dodd Research Center, associated with the University of Connecticut library. It is a center named, obviously, for the great former Senator from the State of Connecticut, father of my colleague and dear friend, the current Senator CHRIS DODD.

It was a spectacular day, a beautiful fall day in Connecticut, but obviously it was more than the weather that distinguished the day.

What happened really was a fitting tribute, that will go on through the years and decades ahead, to Senator Tom Dodd and the remarkable record of achievement that he built here in the U.S. Senate where he served from 1958 to 1970 and in the years before then. The events began with a dedication at the library site itself and then proceeded to the Gampel Pavilion

where it looked to me like 8,000 or 9,000 people packed in to hear the President of the United States, President Clinton, deliver the first in a lecture series that will emanate from the Thomas Dodd Research Center, in this case specifically focused on the Nuremberg trials, 50 years after, because Senator Tom Dodd was a prosecutor there.

Mr. President, Tom Dodd, as President Clinton said, spent his life in the service of his country. He trained as a lawyer, served as an FBI agent, then as a lawyer for the U.S. Government. He was, throughout his career, a great fighter for freedom, for human rights. And it is to the study of human rights that this research center will be committed.

Senator Dodd fought the tyranny of racism as an attorney prosecuting civil rights cases in the 1930's, which was a long time before most other Americans thought about the idea of civil rights.

And throughout his time here in the Senate, and before in the House, he was a great fighter against the tyranny of communism, one of the great, principal, fervent anti-Communists of the cold war period who put us as a nation on a course to understand that the cold war was not, as some historical revisionists would have us believe, just a kind of tug of war between two great powers—the United States and Russia—but a conflict of ideas, a continuation of the struggle between good and evil, between freedom and tyranny. That is, in its way, the history of our species on this Earth.

Senator Tom Dodd understood that the battle against communism, the cold war, was part of that struggle of good against evil.

His passion for justice, his hatred of oppression, his understanding that human rights began with the vision that every individual is sacred because God created that individual, his understanding that we had to strive to establish the rule of law to protect human rights and to promote justice was expressed magnificently, brilliantly in his work as an executive trial counsel at the Nuremberg War Crimes Tribunal after the war.

A film was shown of some of Tom Dodd's appearances at the Nuremberg trial. It was riveting. He was brilliant and compelling, and in that extraordinary human historic experience, coming out of the devastation and lawlessness of the Holocaust, established the principle of justice through law.

Senator CHRIS DODD, who spoke that day, reminded us that one of the remarkable achievements of the Nuremberg trial was not just those who were guilty, who were convicted and severely punished, but that three people were actually acquitted at Nuremberg and that, in its way, is a testament to the rule of law and justice as well.

A beautiful building, 50,000 square feet, a repository of historic papers, Senator DODD's and others—a living legacy that will go on from generation to generation bringing scholars there

to study, to write and to be reminded of the centerpiece of the career of Senator Tom Dodd, which was the struggle for human rights and justice through law and the need to continue to fight that battle.

Mr. President, the day on Sunday was a day in which we dedicated a building, but it was also a day in which I think Connecticut was struck and riveted by what was happening to bring the building about. It was truly an expression of devotion of a son to his father, an expression of the love of CHRIS DODD and his brothers and sisters for their father and their commitment to honor his memory. As I had the opportunity to say on Sunday in Connecticut, as beautiful a fulfillment as I have ever seen of the Biblical commandment, honor one's father and mother, and the Dodd family did it with dignity and with purpose befitting their father, Tom Dodd, on Sunday in Connecticut.

But, of course, the truly significant way and the ongoing way in which my colleague from Connecticut and dear friend, CHRIS DODD, honors the memory of his father is by the extraordinary quality of his service in this body by his personal fight for human rights throughout the world and at home, and particularly at home for the rights of children, understanding and reminding each of us, as Senator CHRIS DODD has so often on this floor, that a child who is without adequate food, without adequate shelter, without adequate parentage, without decent health care, without safety and protection from crime and abuse, suffers in that child's way, as much as people who are forced to live under tyranny, and in that sense, is deprived of human rights as well.

It struck me, and I know my colleagues on the floor, knowing and loving Senator CHRIS DODD as I do, will share the thought that I had on Sunday, which was, as we thought about Nuremberg and we thought about the Second World War and the films were there of the Holocaust and the genocide, that our colleague and friend, Senator CHRIS DODD, in his service, in his life, is the diametric opposite of the evils that were portrayed and lived and suffered through in the Second World War; really a person without bias, a person of great warmth and compassion, a person of openness to all and a person who really in his life carries on the legacy that his father left.

It was a spectacular day which had great meaning for the Dodd family, which truly honored the memory of Senator Thomas Dodd, which the President graced with a magnificent speech, talking as the President did about the record of Senator Tom Dodd, but also bringing it to bear on the acts of genocide that have occurred in the former Yugoslavia, on the importance of the war crimes tribunal that is now going on in The Hague directed to the war crimes that have been committed in the former Yugoslavia. And, finally, the President expressed support for the

idea of a permanent court of international justice, a permanent court operating perhaps through the United Nations, emanating out of the United Nations, which could stand as witness and deterrent, as Senator Dodd did at Nuremberg, to prosecute those who violate accepted rules of international justice and fairness.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the text of President Clinton's remarks at the University of Connecticut dedication of the Thomas J. Dodd Research Center on Sunday, as well as several articles from the Connecticut press, the Hartford Courant in particular, about the life and service of Senator Tom Dodd and what it means to each of us today.

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

TRANSCRIPT OF PRESIDENT CLINTON'S REMARKS AT DEDICATION OF THOMAS J. DODD RESEARCH CENTER, OCTOBER 15, 1995

Thank you very much, President Hartley. Governor Rowland, Senator Lieberman, members of Congress, and distinguished United States senators and former senators who have come today; Chairman Rome, members of the Diplomatic Corps; to all of you who have done anything to make this great day come to pass; to my friend and former colleague, Governor O'Neill, and most of all, to Senator Dodd. Ambassador Dodd, and the Dodd family: I am delighted to be here.

I have so many thoughts now. I can't mention one—since President Hartley mentioned the day we had your magnificent women's basketball team there, we also had the UCLA men's team there. You may not remember who UCLA defeated for the national championship—(laughter)—but I do remember that UCONN defeated the University of Tennessee. And that made my life with Al Gore much more bearable. (Laughter.) So I was doubly pleased when UCONN won the national championship. (Applause.)

I also did not know until it was stated here at the outset of this ceremony that no sitting President had the privilege of coming to the University of Connecticut before, but they don't know what they missed. I'm glad to be the first, and I know I won't be the last. (Applause.)

I also want to pay a special public tribute to the Dodd family for their work on this enterprise, and for their devotion to each other and the memory of Senator Thomas Dodd. If, as so many of us believe, this country rests in the end upon its devotion to freedom and liberty and democracy, and upon the strength of its families, you could hardly find a better example than the Dodd family, not only for their devotion to liberty and democracy, but also for their devotion to family and to the memory of Senator Tom Dodd. It has deeply moved all of us, and we thank you for your example. (Applause.)

* * * * *

[From the Hartford (CT) Courant, Oct. 12, 1995]

FROM FATHER TO SON, DODD NAME PASSED ALONG IN SENATE
(By David Lightman)

WASHINGTON.—It was not that Chris Dodd didn't love running the Stamford campaign for his father's 1970 U.S. Senate bid.

In fact, the task fit him. He was 26 and full of energy and ideas for his first formal brush

with elective politics. He loved people, loved the political arena, loved everything about it.

But the campaign was sputtering, and even a rookie could understand why. Three years earlier, Sen. Thomas Dodd, D-Conn., had become only the seventh person in history to be censured by the U.S. Senate. And now the censure—for improper use of campaign funds—hung like an anvil around the neck of the candidate.

Of course, what everyone, including young Dodd, could see coming, happened. And when the Election Day mauling was over, he drove back to the family's Old Lyme home, crushed. He thought he had let down the father he respected and loved so much.

But Daddy, as Chris Dodd called his father, was not scowling. "He poured a glass of Dewar's scotch," recalled Chris Dodd, "and thanked me for putting in the time."

His father's grace in defeat—rather than his triumphs at the top—helped convince Chris Dodd that politics was an honorable profession. And the son, now Sen. Christopher J. Dodd, D-Conn., has dedicated at least part of his own career to ensuring that his father is remembered as an honorable politician.

"Sometimes, I think almost everything Chris Dodd does down here is meant to vindicate his father," said Sen. Daniel K. Inouye, D-Hawaii, who served in the Senate with both Dodds.

He has taken up some of the issues his father held dear, such as foreign policy and children's welfare.

He has kept his father's memory alive in the Senate chambers. Chris Dodd sits behind his father's desk and keeps his father's barrel-back, wood-and-leather chair in his office. A huge illuminated portrait of Thomas Dodd looks down on visitors to the office's conference room.

And he has worked quietly to rehabilitate the Dodd name. The very presence of Chris Dodd in the U.S. Senate is daily testimony to the success of that effort. And Sunday's dedication of the Thomas J. Dodd Research Center at the University of Connecticut is his monument.

The Dodd family helped raise over \$1 million for programs at the center, which will house the senior Dodd's political papers, along with other archival material.

The four-day conference that coincides with the center's dedication will focus on the legacy of the Nuremberg trials. Thomas Dodd's year as a Nuremberg prosecutor was "the seminal event in my father's professional life," Chris Dodd said.

"I had given thought over the years to what would be a fitting memorial," the younger Dodd said. "We'd thought of a road or a bridge or a park, but I didn't like the idea of people driving over his name."

"This is a research center at the flagship university in our state, just a few short miles from where he was raised. There's a lot of symbolism to it. My father would have loved this," he said.

SHIELDED FROM CENSURE

Chris Dodd said he has been able to maintain his love of politics, while many in his family have not, because he was not a witness to his father's humiliation. After graduating from Providence College in 1966, the younger Dodd joined the Peace Corps and went to the Dominican Republic.

He was there when his father became the first caught by an ethical system that was undergoing profound changes in the 1960s. Stung by charges that Secretary of the Senate Bobby Baker used his office to help his business, the Senate set up an Ethics Committee in 1964.

The Dodd case would be its first mission. In February 1966, a month after columnists

Drew Pearson and Jack Anderson began writing articles accusing Dodd of using campaign money for personal expenses, Dodd asked the new committee to look into the complaints.

The committee held hearings in the summer of 1966 and continued them the next year. Dodd testified that money raised at testimonial dinners were "to be spent at the discretion of the recipient." In response to a complaint that he helped a Chicago public relations representative gain favor with the West German government, Dodd said he was simply an errand boy for the executive.

The committee recommended he be censured on two counts—using campaign money for personal expenses and billing trips to both the Senate and to private organizations.

The Senate would not censure him on the second charge; it agreed to strike it, 51-45. But it did vote 92-5 to censure him on the first charge, with only Sens. Abraham A. Ribicoff, D-Conn.; John Tower, R-Texas; Russell Long, D-La.; Strom Thurmond, R-S.C.; and Dodd himself opposing the resolution.

It was a stunning setback for a politician who just three years earlier was being seriously considered by President Johnson for the vice presidency.

Chris Dodd received newspaper clippings, sent by family and friends, about his father's ordeal, but he did not live through it directly. He did not have to endure the daily batterings from Pearson and Anderson, or read about the march of Connecticut figures to the Ethics Committee in 1967 to testify about his father, or hear his father's May 15, 1967, radio speech to the people of Connecticut in which he called his pending censure "a strange coming together of hateful and vengeful interests."

"They may have been trying to shield me," Chris Dodd said of his family. "I was living in a vacuum."

By the time he returned to the United States on Christmas Eve 1968, U.S. politics involved other topics.

Despite the Senate's resounding verdict, Thomas Dodd continued to serve, maintaining his seniority and chairmanship of the juvenile delinquency subcommittee and vice chairmanship of the internal security subcommittee. In 1968, he saw Congress pass the gun control legislation he had championed for years, albeit a watered-down version of what he had sought.

He lost his seat in 1970, largely because of the censure. Lowell P. Weicker, Jr., then a U.S. representative from southwestern Connecticut, won with 41 percent of the vote. Democrat Joseph Duffey got 34 percent, and Dodd was third with 24.5 percent.

When Thomas Dodd died in May 1971, four months after leaving the Senate, the rehabilitation of the Dodd name began in earnest.

Senators offered tributes on the floor. Sen. James Allen, D-Ala., recalled how, "He fought unceasingly against crime, juvenile delinquency and drug addiction." Sen. James Buckley, Conservative-N.Y., called him "an eminent analyst of Cold War strategy."

In February 1972, Ribicoff asked the Senate to give its unanimous consent to printing colleagues' eulogies in a special book, a memorial to Thomas Dodd. That book is available today in the U.S. Senate library.

WINNING AS A DODD

But restoration of the Dodd name has come more from his son's political success than his colleagues' flowery words.

Thomas Dodd did not urge his children to become involved in politics—"We were never asked to pose for pictures," recalled Chris Dodd—but the son could not help notice all

the excitement his father's work was generating.

Chris Dodd was a teenager when his father was elected to the Senate in 1958. "He was working all the time, and at night he'd most likely be at some function or another," Chris Dodd said. "But when he'd come to the house, you'd be aware of his arrival. Dogs would bark, people would get excited. He may not have been home for dinner at 5:30, but bonds were forged in different ways."

The younger Dodd liked the idea of going into politics, but it was not a burning ambition. "I knew enough to know that was not the kind of ambition you should have, that becoming a member of Congress is something you don't always control," he said.

Chris Dodd did not make the classic young man's political moves. He moved to North Stonington, hardly a hotbed of Democratic activity. He joined a law firm that did not encourage people to run for office. And he lived in a congressional district represented by Robert H. Steele Jr., a Republican who at the time looked like he could hold the seat until the 21st century.

Still, Chris Dodd ran for the House of Representatives in 1974, an election held three months after President Nixon resigned in the wake of the Watergate scandal. Even though it was a good time for Democrats, "A lot of people told me I could never get elected with the Dodd name," Chris Dodd recalled. He did, of course, "and then people told me it was because of the Dodd name," he said.

Inouye viewed the son as a man on a mission.

Chris Dodd's style, his choice of issues, his way of dealing with people is all meant to convey the idea that his father was a person of honor and Chris is here to remind you of that, said Inouye and others.

Though he was only 36 when he joined the Senate in 1981, he quickly befriended some of his father's colleagues, including Inouye and Sens. Ernest F. Hollings, D-S.C.; Robert C. Byrd, D-W.Va.; and Edward M. Kennedy, D-Mass.

And he didn't forget one of his father's few supporters during the censure vote. Chris Dodd was one of only three Democratic senators to back John Tower's controversial and unsuccessful nomination as secretary of defense in 1989.

"Their presence on the Senate floor is very similar," said Inouye. "When I look at Chris Dodd and close my eyes, I can imagine Tom Dodd speaking."

Kennedy also notices a similarity in how the two men put together legislation. Chris Dodd makes a habit of visiting Connecticut high schools to talk to youngsters, particularly about the problems of weapons in schools. Then he returns to Washington and uses anecdotes to help him push for a bill.

Thomas Dodd would do the same kind of thing. "He'd get in his car and, go around Maryland and Virginia and go to gun shops," Kennedy recalled. "He would find out what was happening and then translate that into legislation."

"When Tom Dodd or Chris Dodd wanted something, they were bulldogs," Kennedy said.

There are, however, important differences between the two. One of them is their relationship with the Kennedys.

Chris Dodd is viewed as Kennedy's best friend in the Senate. Thomas Dodd, on the other hand, was one of the few prominent New England officeholders to endorse then-Senate Majority Leader Lyndon B. Johnson over then-Sen. John F. Kennedy in the 1960 battle for the Democratic presidential nomination.

There are personality differences as well. "Tom Dodd was more reserved; Chris is more of a glad-hander," said Thurmond, who was a

Democrat when Tom Dodd arrived in the Senate.

Hollings put it more bluntly. "Christopher has a much more engaging personality," he said.

And Chris Dodd is much more of an insider than Thomas Dodd ever was. In 1963, the elder Dodd blasted Senate Majority Leader Mike Mansfield, D-Mont., on the Senate floor.

Chris Dodd, on the other hand, competed for the job of Senate Democratic leader last year and lost, even after a late start, by only one vote. A month later, he became President Clinton's hand-picked choice as Democratic National Committee general chairman.

LIKING THE LINKAGE

The father and son have taken up some of the same issues. Chris Dodd likes to draw a line between his father's work in the 1930s with the National Youth Administration, a Depression-era agency that helped children from poor families get education and employment training, and his own work today.

Chris Dodd chaired the Senate's subcommittee on children, families, drugs and alcoholism until Republicans won the Senate in 1994. He remains the Senate's leading voice on children's issues, most recently brokering a compromise to the welfare reform bill that will mean \$8 billion in extra money for child-care programs during the next five years.

"I can see him moving bills like that," said Chris Dodd. "I'd like to think he'd be more supportive than not of what I do, very proud."

In foreign policy, Chris Dodd was able to see finished something his father had helped start.

In 1950, Thomas Dodd, then a member of a special American Bar Association committee, had urged members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to approve a treaty establishing penalties for genocide.

Yet the Senate for years refused to ratify the treaty, some senators fearing the U.S. sovereignty would be compromised.

The son battled hard for his father's cause. In 1984, Chris Dodd, who like his father served on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, quoted on the Senate floor his father's words from two decades earlier: "For me, the genocide convention has a special personal meaning because as executive trial counsel at Nuremberg I had spread before me, in nightmarish detail, the whole incredible story of Nazi barbarism."

Two years later, as the Senate debated the treaty again, Sen. William Proxmire, D-Wis., recalled the senior Dodd's commitment. "Tom Dodd, the father of Sen. Chris Dodd, contributed a special zeal to this effort," he said. "It was his opinion that had it [the treaty] been in existence when Hitler first came to power the tragic events of his regime might have been prevented."

Finally, in 1986, as the Cold War wound down, the Senate approved the treaty.

Father and son, however, were not always in sync, particularly on foreign policy.

Thomas Dodd was a relentless anti-Communist from his Nuremberg days. Though representatives from the Soviet Union were part of the tribunal, his dealings with them made him think they were capable of the same kinds of horrors as the Nazis.

They are "probably doing this same sort of thing behind the Iron Curtain now," he said in his 1950 testimony. "Russia in its plan, as I see it, wishes to influence people all over the world."

While many Democrats were urging the United States to pull troops out of Vietnam in the late 1960s, Thomas Dodd remained staunchly behind the war effort.

By contrast, his son, though no rabid anti-war activist, came to oppose the Vietnam War in 1968, and served in the U.S. Army Reserve to avoid being sent to Vietnam.

In the Senate, Chris Dodd opposed the Reagan administration's efforts to provide military aid to "freedom fighters" trying to unseat the democratically elected and socialist government of Nicaragua. He pushed hard for economic aid to address fundamental economic problems in the Caribbean and Central America.

But the son warned that the differences between father and son should not be overstated. They are of two different eras, but share the same values and thoughts, he said. "I have a lot of affection and admiration for my father," said Chris Dodd. "I like the tradition. I like the linkage."

[From the Hartford Courant, Oct. 8, 1995]

TOM DODD'S LETTERS OPEN NEW WINDOW INTO HISTORY

(By Mark Pazniokas)

A half-century ago, amid the rubble of a vanquished Germany, the victorious Allies put Nazi leaders on trial for crimes against peace and humanity.

The Reich's unspeakable atrocities were laid bare in a dozen trials and hundreds of convictions. But the Nuremberg trials had an even more noble aspiration: to make international law a force for peace.

Beginning today, The Courant will explore the meaning of the trials and their ambiguous legacy in a four-part series. Next week, the University of Connecticut will commemorate the 50th anniversary by dedicating the Thomas J. Dodd Research Center and holding a conference on human rights and the rule of law.

Horror fills the yellowed letter, written long ago in a bombed out hotel. It is dated Aug. 14, 1945, the day after a wide-eyed Thomas J. Dodd arrived in Nuremberg, Germany, to prosecute the Nazis.

Three months after V-E Day, the stench of death still hung heavy in the summer air. An estimated 20,000 dead lay entombed in the rubble of the old city, where legions had rallied for Hitler before the war.

Half the population of 400,000 fled before the Americans took the city in April. Many of those who stayed now slept in cellars, emerging each morning like mice to forage in the dusty ruins.

"Grace, my dearest one," Dodd wrote to his wife, safe at home in Connecticut with their five children, the youngest being the 14-month-old Christopher. "Here I am in the dead city of Nuremberg."

So began an unbroken stream of letters that Tom Dodd, then a 38-year-old government lawyer abroad for the first time, would write daily from Nuremberg until sailing home in October 1946.

The collection remained unseen outside the Dodd family until last month, when Sen. Christopher J. Dodd granted The Courant access for stories marking the 50th anniversary of the first Nuremberg war-crimes trial.

Nuremberg was the real "trial of the century," a yearlong dissection of how the Nazis murdered millions and pillaged a continent.

Twenty-one men stood trial before an unprecedented International Military Tribunal, which the four Allied powers created to mete out justice and compile an incontrovertible record of Nazi outrages. Architects of the tribunal also had a higher hope: to set an international standard for judging war crimes.

Tom Dodd returned home a hero from Nuremberg, poised for a political career that would make him a congressman, a senator and a national figure opposed to communism, which he viewed as the moral equivalent of Nazism.

But the letters to his wife show a man who was at a crossroads at Nuremberg, bedeviled by doubts about his career and even his continued participation in what he knew was a historic trial.

Hopes of entering politics seemed to be slipping away. He told his wife in one pessimistic letter that the future belonged to the men who spent the war in uniform. Dodd had been a federal prosecutor during the war.

Dodd's children long had viewed the letters as his private notes to their mother. She supported their father through his many triumphs and, in 1967, his censure by the Senate for misusing campaign funds. The Dodds died within 20 months of each other: Tom in May 1971, months after losing his Senate seat; Grace in January 1973.

"Many of them," Chris Dodd said recently of his father's Nuremberg letters, "are what I would consider to be love letters."

They are full of tender references to "that day in St. Paul." Tom Dodd and Grace Murphy married May 19, 1934, in St. Paul, Minn., where he was assigned as an FBI agent.

Most are written by hand in a flowing script, in ink when available, in pencil when necessary. They are conversations between the sometimes-crusty prosecutor and his "dearest Grace."

"I am not conscious of proper grammatical construction or of word choice or any formality," he told Grace. "I am on the sofa and I am talking to you and I'll be darned if I will pick my words like a parson preparing a sermon."

FROM NORWICH TO LONDON

Tom and Grace Dodd made their goodbyes before dawn at Union Station in Washington, D.C., on July 27, 1946. Dodd had been recruited from the U.S. attorney general's staff for the United Nations War Crimes Commission.

"You made a memorable picture for me as I gazed out the taxicab window until the dimness of the dawn light blotted your loveliness out," Dodd wrote her from London, his first stop in Europe.

He one day would become a foreign policy expert, relied upon by Lyndon B. Johnson, but in 1945 he was small-town Connecticut. He was born in Norwich and lived in Lebanon, a part of the state that had more cows than people.

His letter from London is enthusiastic travelogue, full of details about his flight aboard a military transport that hoppedscotched from Washington to Newfoundland to Prestwick, Scotland, where he caught another flight to London.

Trans-Atlantic air travel was still a novelty, and Dodd stayed up most of the night chatting with a crewman, who regaled him with tales of planes lost without a trace in the North Atlantic.

At first light, Dodd wrote gratefully, "The sun came up beautifully about 4:30 a.m. London time."

Dodd had graduated from Yale Law School in 1933, an Irish-Catholic at a blue-blooded institution. He was president of the Yale Democratic Club and organizer of "the Flying Wedge," a cadre that passionately defended Franklin D. Roosevelt's New Deal.

He spent a year as an FBI agent, chasing John Dillinger through the Midwest; served for a time as director of the National Youth Administration in Connecticut; then tried civil rights cases for the Justice Department. During the war, he prosecuted spies and profiteers.

He cut an impressive figure. His hair, prematurely going gray, was brushed straight back. He had piercing eyes and thick, dark eyebrows, a ringing speaking voice and the same sarcastic wit later shown by Christopher, the son who would follow him onto the national political stage.

In London, Dodd felt humbled by the war-weary populace.

"They stared at the cab from eyes that I could not meet, attired in clothing that made me wince," Dodd wrote. "I really feel ashamed when these people stare—for they recognize an American by the quality of his clothing."

Of course, he had seen nothing yet. In a few months, Dodd would be numb to the horror of war and complain about being bored by the confession of a man who murdered 1½ million people at Auschwitz.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. I thank the Chair, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

CUBAN LIBERTY AND DEMOCRATIC SOLIDARITY [LIBERTAD] ACT OF 1995

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I have a consent agreement which has been cleared by both sides.

I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate resumes H.R. 927, the following amendments be the only amendments in order postcloture: Helms amendment No. 2936; Bradley amendment No. 2930 or 2931; Dodd amendment No. 2906; Dodd amendment No. 2908; Simon amendment No. 2934.

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

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all listed amendments be considered second-degree amendments to Helms amendment No. 2936.

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

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, let me indicate we believe we can have debate on the Simon amendment yet this afternoon. I understand the Senator from North Carolina will offer an amendment which will be accepted on behalf of Senator BRADLEY. That will leave the Helms amendment and the two Dodd amendments.

We are hoping to start at 10:30 tomorrow morning on the bill and recognize Senator DODD, with, if there is not a time agreement, a short period of debate. We are trying to accommodate Senator DODD's schedule, so I hope he will accommodate ours tomorrow.

I want to congratulate the Senator from North Carolina. I regret we were one vote short, 59 to 36. So it was necessary, as the chairman has indicated, to delete title III.

It is the hope of everyone when we get into conference we can work out some consensus so we can come back with a conference report and pick up that additional vote and maybe more.

It seems to me there are good points to this bill. The strength of this bill was title III, and we will revisit it. There will be some version of it in the conference report. Again, I think the

chairman is to be commended. We will go to conference and see what happens.

Also, it is my hope tomorrow—I discussed this briefly with Senator KERRY from Massachusetts—that we could move to the State Department reorganization bill. They indicate they will make an offer to Senator HELMS this afternoon.

Mr. HELMS. That is correct.

Mr. DOLE. If that is acceptable under a 4-hour time agreement, we can complete action on that, too.

After the debate on the Simon amendment, and anything else being done with reference to this, I think it is my intention to recess so the Senate Finance Committee can meet and complete its work, because they may be going late into the evening.

Mr. HELMS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished majority leader, and I share his regret that we had to go through all of this. Sometimes it is absolutely essential that we do. I have no hard feelings toward anybody about it. I just wish we could have moved along a little more rapidly. I appreciate all the help the majority leader has given.

AMENDMENT NO. 2930 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2936

(Purpose: To make limited exceptions to restrictions on assistance for the independent states of the former Soviet Union imposed by the bill)

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk on behalf of Senator BRADLEY and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HELMS], for Mr. BRADLEY, proposes an amendment numbered 2930 to amendment No. 2936.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 14, strike line 1 and all that follows through line 14 on page 16 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(5) except for assistance under the secondary school exchange program administered by the United States Information Agency, for the government of any independent state effective 30 days after the President has determined and certified to the appropriate congressional committees (and Congress has not enacted legislation disapproving the determination within the 30-day period) that such government is providing assistance for, or engaging in nonmarket based trade (as defined in section 498(k)(3)) with, the Government of Cuba, or".

(2) Subsection (k) of section 498B of that Act (22 U.S.C. 2295b(k)), is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(3) NONMARKET BASED TRADE.—As used in section 498A(b)(5), the term 'nonmarket based trade' includes exports, imports, exchanges, or other arrangements that are provided for goods and services (including oil and other petroleum products) on terms more favorable than those generally available in applicable markets or for comparable commodities, including—

"(A) exports to the Government of Cuba on terms that involve a grant, concessional price, guarantee, insurance, or subsidy;

"(B) imports from the Government of Cuba at preferential tariff rates;

"(C) exchange arrangements that include advance delivery of commodities, arrangements in which the Government of Cuba is not held accountable for unfulfilled exchange contracts, and arrangements under which Cuba does not pay appropriate transportation, insurance, or finance costs; and

"(D) the exchange, reduction, or forgiveness of Cuban government debt in return for a grant by the Cuban government of an equity interest in a property, investment, or operation of the Government of Cuba or of a Cuban national."

"(4) CUBAN GOVERNMENT.—(A) The term Cuban government includes the government of any political subdivision of Cuba, and any agency or instrumentality of the Government of Cuba.

"(B) For purposes of subparagraph (A), the term 'agency or instrumentality' is used within the meaning of section 1603(b) of title 28, United States Code."

(d) FACILITIES AT LOURDES, CUBA.—(1) The Congress expresses its strong disapproval of the extension by Russia of credits equivalent to \$200,000,000 in support of the intelligence facility at Lourdes, Cuba, announced in November 1994.

(2) Section 498A of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2295a) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(d) REDUCTION IN ASSISTANCE FOR SUPPORT OF INTELLIGENCE FACILITIES IN CUBA.—(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the President shall withhold from assistance provided, on or after the date of enactment of this subsection, for an independent state of the former Soviet Union under this Act an amount equal to the sum of assistance and credits, if any, provided on or after such date by such state in support of intelligence facilities in Cuba, including the intelligence facility at Lourdes, Cuba.

"(2)(A) The President may waive the requirement of paragraph (1) to withhold assistance if the President certifies to the appropriate congressional committees that the provision of such assistance is important to the national security of the United States, and, in the case of such a certification made with respect to Russia, if the President certifies that the Russian Government has assured the United States Government that the Russian Government is not sharing intelligence data collected at the Lourdes facility with officials or agents of the Cuban Government.

"(B) At the time of a certification made with respect to Russia pursuant to subparagraph (A), the President shall also submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report describing the intelligence activities of Russia in Cuba, including the purposes for which the Lourdes facility is used by the Russian Government and the extent to which the Russian Government provides payment or government credits to the Cuban Government for the continued use of the Lourdes facility.

"(C) The report required by subparagraph (B) may be submitted in classified form.

"(D) For purposes of this paragraph, the term appropriate congressional committees, includes the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate.

"(3) The requirement of paragraph (1) to withhold assistance shall not apply with respect to—

"(A) assistance to meet urgent humanitarian needs, including disaster and refugee relief;

"(B) democratic political reform and rule of law activities;

"(C) technical assistance for safety upgrades of civilian nuclear power plants;

"(D) the creation of private sector and nongovernmental organizations that are independent of government control;

"(E) the development of a free market economic system;

"(F) assistance under the secondary school exchange program administered by the United States Information Agency; or

"(G) assistance for the purposes described in the Cooperative Threat Reduction Act of 1993 (title XII of Public Law 103-160)".

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. President, I have sent an amendment to the desk to ensure that high school exchanges with students from the New Independent States of the former Soviet Union will continue to build bridges between our country and theirs. In essence, this amendment exempts the high school exchange program from the operation of section 107 of this bill, which would otherwise allow such programs to cut off if an NIS country engages in certain activity enumerated in that section.

This program is unique. It calls for a personal involvement that other aid programs do not demand of Americans. It not only benefits the newly independent states, but it benefits Americans as well. Host families and American students learn from having foreign students in their homes and classrooms. Americans studying in Kiev, St. Petersburg, Vilnius, and Almaty are witnessing first hand the new frontiers of democracy and they return home with a better understanding of the people of those nations.

Since 1993, over 12,000 high school students from the New Independent States have visited the United States to live with American families and study in this country. As their home countries of Armenia, Russia, Ukraine, Kazakhstan, and the other NIS countries are making the transition to post-Soviet societies, these students come to our country eager to learn about the privileges and opportunities that come with living in a democracy and free market economy.

This program plays a tremendously important role in our relationship with the newly independent states. It allows these young students to experience life in a multicultural, market-based democracy. It forges connections between the people of this country and theirs, which will continue as these future leaders take back to their home countries a new perspective on the world and valuable, lasting bonds. But the impact of the exchanges goes beyond those students who are actually chosen to participate in the program. There is a ripple effect, as these students share their experiences with their families, friends, and fellow students back home.

This unique program accords tremendous benefits and for that reason, it must be allowed to continue.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I strongly support the secondary exchange programs in the Bradley amendment. These semester and academic year pro-

grams are one of the more successful assistance programs we have with the new Independent States of the former Soviet Union. The Senator's amendment is in keeping with the spirit and intent of the Russia sections of the Libertad bill. I am prepared to accept the amendment exempting this program from the Libertad bill's restrictions on aid to the former Soviet States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 2930) was agreed to.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote, and I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. WELLSTONE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized.

WE MUST END THE CYCLE OF VIOLENCE IN AMERICA AND MAKE EVERY HOME SAFE

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I know we are about to go into recess, and I thank my colleagues for their graciousness. I appreciate this time. I come before the Senate to underscore my commitment to ending domestic violence in America. As I have said on the floor before, every time a person in my State of Minnesota dies at the hand of an abuser, I will make sure that their story becomes a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

As my colleagues know, October is Domestic Violence Awareness Month. It is a month that is designated to raise awareness about domestic violence. In addition, the YWCA has designated this week as their call for a "Week Without Violence." Today, in particular, their efforts will focus on confronting violence against women. So, Mr. President, it is for this reason that I have chosen this special day to come to the floor of the Senate to make this statement.

It is with some sadness, pain, and anger that I will read the names of five Minnesota women and one Minnesota child who were apparently killed at the hands of someone they knew. The circumstances are described in the record compiled by the Minnesota Coalition for Battered Women. Mr. President, I must state at the onset that none of the people charged in these murders has been convicted yet. Therefore, I will not use the victims' real names.

I come to the floor of the Senate to describe these cases so that we will remember how deeply this violence scars our society. And most importantly, as a reaffirmation of any commitment—and I hope the commitment of all of my colleagues, Democrats and Republicans alike—to work toward ending the cycle of violence. Indeed, Mr. President, if we are ever going to stop the violence in our communities, in our

workplaces, and in our streets, we are going to have to begin by stopping violence in our homes.

Mr. President, domestic violence continues to be the single most significant cause of injury to women in the United States of America. Yet, this violence knows no boundaries of age, or gender, or race, or geography, or income, or education. The violence goes on year after year and generation after generation. A study by the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention at the Department of Justice found that mistreated youngsters who grow up in violent homes were twice as likely to commit brutal crimes as were children from nonviolent homes. Not surprising. If you grow up in brutal circumstances, that can very well make you brutal.

In Minnesota, in 1994, at least 19 women and 7 children were brutally killed by a spouse, a former partner, or someone they knew. So it is with pain, but also with great determination, I ask that we honor the memory of individuals who apparently died as a result of domestic violence. We should be mindful of the fact that these women could be your friends, they could be your neighbors, they could be your coworkers, they could be your sisters, they could be your mothers, they could be your wives.

It is from my heart that I ask that we end this kind of violence, that we do everything we can to end this kind of violence that has such a painful cost for individuals, their families, and their communities.

Individuals: Sue, 31. A sheriff's deputy found the bodies of her and her ex-husband in a bed in their home. Authorities had no doubt the homicides were murder-suicide, and believe her ex-husband shot her as she slept, and then shot himself. Both were wearing nightclothes, and a single-shot, 12-gauge shotgun was found by the side of the bed.

Joyce, age 27. She and her boyfriend were found dead in the apartment they shared. The police said that the boyfriend apparently shot her and then turned the gun on himself. A shotgun was found near the bodies.

Marie, 30. She was found dead from stab wounds. Her husband was arrested and charged with second-degree murder.

Deborah, age 51. She was found buried in a wilderness area. Her son was charged with first-degree murder in the strangulation death of his mother. He admitted to killing her because she did not like his girlfriend. He said he strangled his mother with the power cord of his radio, and then put her body in the trunk of the car and drove to the wilderness area and buried her.

Carol, age 40. Her 6-year-old son reported that she and her boyfriend were seated on the couch and fighting. Her boyfriend had a rifle pointed at her head and told her he would kill her if she contacted the police. She then reportedly said, "Go ahead." And her son

said he then heard two shots. The boyfriend has been charged with second-degree murder.

Anne, age 3. She died after being stabbed in the head. Her stepfather has been charged with first-degree murder in her death and attempted murder and second-degree assault in the stabbing of his wife. The details of her death are too gruesome to talk about on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. President, these are the recent cases of victims only in Minnesota, and only those that have been documented and well-publicized. Looking at the national statistics, I know there must be many more cases that go unreported.

An American Medical Association report cites some horrifying statistics: Nearly one quarter of the women in the United States of America—more than 12 million—will be abused by a current or former partner sometime during their lives—one quarter of the women in the United States of America; 47 percent of husbands who beat their wives do so three or more times a year; according to FBI statistics, at least 30 percent of murdered women are killed by their intimate male partner; every 13 seconds, a child in the United States of America is reported abused or neglected; and more than three children—more than three children—die each day in the United States as a result of abuse or neglect.

Mr. President, we can no longer stand by and say it is someone else's problem. What are we waiting for? Too many have spoken with their voices and with their lives, and this violence must end.

Last year, the Congress passed new laws to protect victims and to prevent violence. Senator BIDEN has taken a major leadership role in helping to pass the Violence Against Women Act.

The first comprehensive piece of legislation on the subject of violence against women was milestone legislation for this Congress and for this Nation. We all must continue to fight any efforts to weaken the crime bill, including efforts to scale back the Violence Against Women Act or the funding for it.

Mr. President, domestic violence is also a critical issue to me when we talk about reforming the welfare system.

I said on the floor before, it took Monica Seles 2 years to play tennis again after being stabbed. Can you imagine what it would be like if you were beaten over and over and over again?

We must make sure that States have the option to give exemptions to women who have been beaten or children who have experienced this. They may not be able to work in 2 years. The last thing you want to do is cut them off of assistance and give them no other choice but to go back into very dangerous homes.

There is much to be done. We must be a voice for the victims; the women, the men, and the children who live in fear every moment of their lives, never

knowing when the abuse will come or how lethal the next attack will be.

We must be unrelenting in our campaign to say as Senators what my wife Sheila says wherever she goes in Minnesota: We will not tolerate the violence; we will not ignore the violence; and we will no longer say it is someone else's responsibility.

I urge all of my colleagues to work with the survivors, the advocates, the medical professionals, the justice systems in our States, and to support full community funding and full community involvement in ending this violence. I urge my colleagues to work with passion and conviction to make this a priority of our work in the U.S. Senate. We must do everything we can to make homes the safest places that they can be.

I yield the floor. I thank my colleague from North Carolina for giving me this opportunity.

CUBAN LIBERTY AND DEMOCRATIC SOLIDARITY [LIBERTAD] ACT OF 1995

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

AMENDMENT NO. 2934 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2936

Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, my staff is on the way with an amendment. Let me describe the amendment and tell you what it is and say why I think it is important we pass the amendment.

It is an amendment that in terms of philosophy I think my friend and colleague from North Carolina—and he is my friend—I think that in terms of philosophy he would agree to whether or not he agrees with this particular amendment.

I believe American citizens ought to have the freedom to travel wherever they want with no barrier from our Government unless an American citizen is at risk. That is a different situation than we face right now.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SANTORUM). The clerk will call the roll. The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SIMON. 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. SIMON. Mr. President, I call up amendment numbered 2934.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. SIMON] proposes an amendment numbered 2934 to amendment No. 2936.

Mr. SIMON. 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 text of the amendment is located in the October 17, 1995, RECORD under "Amendments Submitted.")

AMENDMENT NO. 2934, AS MODIFIED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator wish to modify his amendment?

Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to modify the amendment with the modification I have at the desk.

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

The amendment, as modified, is as follows:

At the appropriate place insert:

SEC. . TRAVEL TO CUBA.

(1) FREEDOM TO TRAVEL TO CUBA FOR UNITED STATES CITIZENS AND LEGAL RESIDENTS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the President shall not restrict travel to Cuba by United States citizens or legal residents, except in the event that armed hostilities between Cuba and the United States are in progress, or where such travel presents an imminent danger to the public health or the physical safety of United States travelers.

(2) AMENDMENTS TO TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT.—Section 5(b) of the Trading With the Enemy Act (50 U.S.C. App. 5(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

"(5) The authority granted by the President in this section does not include the authority to regulate or prohibit, directly or indirectly, any of the following transactions incident to travel to or from Cuba by individuals who are citizens or residents of the United States:

"(A) Any transactions ordinarily incident to travel to or from Cuba, including the importation into Cuba or the United States of accompanied baggage for personal use only.

"(B) Any transactions ordinarily incident to travel to or maintenance within Cuba, including the payment of living expenses and the acquisition of goods and services for personal use.

"(C) Any transactions ordinarily incident to the arrangement, promotion, or facilitation of travel to or within Cuba.

"(D) Any transactions ordinarily incident to non-scheduled air, sea, or land voyages, except that this subparagraph does not authorize the carriage of articles into Cuba except accompanied baggage.

"(E) Normal banking transactions incident to the foregoing, including the issuance, clearing, processing, or payment of checks, drafts, travelers checks, credit or debit card instruments, negotiable instruments, or similar instruments.

This paragraph does not authorize the importation into the United States of any goods for personal consumption acquired in Cuba other than those items described in paragraph (4)."

"(6) The authority granted to the President in this subsection does not include the authority to regulate or prohibit, directly or indirectly, travel to Cuba incident to

"(A) activities of scholars;

"(B) other educational or academic activities;

"(C) exchanges in furtherance of any such activities;

"(D) cultural activities and exchanges; or

"(E) public exhibitions or performances by the nationals of one country in another country,

to the extent that any such activities, exchanges, exhibitions, or performances are not otherwise controlled for export under section 5 of the Export Administration Act of 1979 and to the extent that, with respect to such activities, exchanges, exhibitions, or performances, no acts are prohibited by chapter 37 of title 18, U.S. Code."

(3) FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961.—Section 620(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2370(a)) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

“(3) Notwithstanding paragraph (1), the authority granted to the President in such paragraph does not include the authority to regulate or prohibit, directly or indirectly, any activities or transactions which may not be regulated or prohibited under paragraph (5) or (6) of section 5(b) of the Trading With the Enemy Act.”

(4) APPLICABILITY.—The authorities conferred upon the President by section 5(b) of the Trading With the Enemy Act, which were being exercised with respect to a country on July 1, 1977, as a result of a national emergency declared by the President before such date, and are being exercised on the date of the enactment of this Act, do not include the authority to regulate or prohibit, directly or indirectly, any activity which under section 5(b) (5) or (6) of the Trading With the Enemy Act (as added by this Act) may not be regulated or prohibited.

Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, as I indicated, I think part of free speech is that we do not just get the Government line on anything. I do not care what it is—popular, unpopular. That means that we ought to have the freedom to travel where there is no risk.

That includes unpopular countries. That includes China. I happen to be one of those, along with the Senator from North Carolina who is very critical of the human rights record of the Chinese Government, but I defend the right of American citizens to travel.

I defend the right of American citizens if there is no risk to travel to Iran or Iraq. It does not mean I approve of any of those governments. The same for Cuba.

The leader of Cuba has probably the worst human rights record of any leader in this hemisphere. There is no question about that.

There are two questions. One, do you change policy by restricting travel, or do you change policy by permitting travel? That is one question. The second question is, is this a first amendment right or is it in the spirit of the first amendment?

On the first question, whether it can change and modify the government there, I recognize that people who are sincere can disagree. We faced this same debate with the Soviet Union. There were those who for a time said Americans should not travel to the Soviet Union because you simply encourage that Government by giving them hard currency. Others said—and it turned out to be right—we ought to travel there so we can expose more people to our point of view.

Virtually every other government in the world—the British, the French, the Canadians—in fact, when I say “virtually,” I think we are alone and the Senator from North Carolina can correct me, I think we are alone among the nations of the world in not permitting travel to Cuba.

Israel was the only nation that voted with us in the United Nations but Israel is putting in investment in Cuba.

I just think our isolation here just does not make sense. The reality is,

American citizens do travel to Cuba today. Now, they go by way of Canada or Mexico, but not one American citizen has been arrested for it. Not one American citizen has been fined. Not one American citizen to my knowledge has had his or her passport taken away.

I think our policy just does not make sense. Americans ought to have the liberty, the freedom, to travel to Cuba unless there is a physical risk.

Now, if there is a danger that someone is going to be taken as a captive there, or something like that, that is different. The southern part of Lebanon, for example, would not be safe for Americans. I understand that. But I think we ought to be free to travel there, and that goes for any dictatorship anywhere. I think it is a way of promoting freedom. I think it is also a basic freedom that American citizens ought to have.

That is basically my argument. In terms of philosophy, my guess is the Senator from North Carolina would agree with me. In terms of its specific application to Cuba, he may not.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, before I make comments about the amendment of the Senator, let me ask if he is aware of the effort by the majority and minority leader to achieve a time for the Finance Committee to meet? There is an objection to the committee meeting while the Senate is in session.

Mr. SIMON. I am not trying to prolong that. I am willing to recess at this point. I was told by my staff what the majority leader preferred.

Mr. HELMS. I wanted to be sure that the Senator knew that. I do not want to interrupt the Senator's delivery or his argument at all.

Will the Senator be willing to enter into a time agreement for this afternoon, provided both sides have 10 minutes each in the morning?

Mr. SIMON. That will be perfectly acceptable to me.

Mr. HELMS. Very well, how much more time this afternoon?

Mr. SIMON. I, frankly, have presented the cause. It is not complicated. So I am willing to yield to my colleague. I probably would like 2 minutes to respond to whatever he might have to say, and then we could recess and each have 10 minutes tomorrow morning.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Illinois, my friend and my neighbor in the Dirksen Building, is always cooperative. If I say anything to excite him about his amendment, he will be entitled to take as much time as he needs to reply to me.

I do not agree with the amendment, and I hope it will not be accepted. But let me say this, Mr. President, I never have any question about the good intent of the Senator from Illinois on any issue, including this one. He sincerely believes the flow of American

citizens to Cuba will promote positive change in Cuban society. But, in the context of Fidel Castro's regime, in my judgment, the belief that tourism will change Castro's tyranny cannot be supported by the facts. Here is why.

I say, with all friendliness, the loudest advocate of the Senator's amendment would be Fidel Castro, because he is trying to lure tourists into Cuba so they will bring hard cash which he could use to buy a little bit more time for his regime.

As a matter of fact, for years Mr. Castro has lured Europeans, Canadians, Mexicans, and others to Cuba. But from the beginning, Castro typically set up a structure to isolate foreign tourists and tourist facilities from the larger Cuban population. As a matter of fact, some of the major newspapers in this country and elsewhere refer to this system of Mr. Castro's as “tourist apartheid.”

What has been Mr. Castro's purpose in promoting tourism? It has not been to improve the lives or freedoms of the Cuban people. Tourists visiting Cuba have access to food, shelter, and recreation not available to the poor Cuban people themselves. But this does not bother Fidel Castro and his cronies. Mr. Castro tolerates the tourist trade because he needs, as I said earlier, the hard cash—the hard currency generated by tourism to subsidize his corrupt regime.

Even the employment generated by tourism supports the regime. Here is how that works. The Cuban Government, that is to say Castro's officials, decide who will work in the tourist resorts. Nobody else need apply. With the Cuban State economic sector collapsing, jobs are becoming more and more scarce in Cuba and working in a tourist area becomes leverage that Castro uses as people struggle to find work in order to feed and care for their families.

There is another tragic phenomenon that has emerged from Castro's efforts to attract foreign tourists. It is called sex tourism. More and more, Cuban women, some little girls as young as 14 years of age, are prostituting themselves because they cannot find any other way to feed themselves and their families. An Italian travel magazine recently identified Cuba as the “paradise of sexual tourism,” ranking it above Thailand and Brazil as the place to go for what the magazine called “erotic tourism.” This is just one of the perverted legacies of the Castro revolution.

The free flow of American citizens to Cuba would be no more effective in reforming Castro's regime than has been the flow of Canadian, European, and Latin American tourists up to now. And lifting the travel restrictions, I say to my friend with all due respect, will not—will not—expedite Castro's departure. Rather, it will help keep Castro in power by giving him badly needed hard currency.

The Treasury Department rules now allow for travel by journalists and by

people engaged in educational or religious activities, as well as travel for humanitarian reasons, including permission to travel for those accompanying humanitarian donations to the Cuban people and individuals traveling in connection with recognized human rights organizations.

Restrictions on the right to travel are within the bounds of the Constitution. Twice the United States Supreme Court has heard challenges to the rules governing travel to Cuba. Every time, the Court has upheld the regulations, holding that the right to international travel is not without limitations when the restrictions are connected with the national security interests of the United States. In the case of Cuba, it is in our national interest to deny Fidel Castro the hard currency that would be brought in by tourism.

If the amendment of my friend is approved, the result would be to limit the President's ability to restrict travel. There are, in my judgment—and I say this with respect to my friend—there are valid national security reasons why travel to Cuba should be regulated. Approval of this amendment will serve to give hope to Castro, and that is why I must oppose it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that two articles from the Miami Herald, one on April 24, 1995, and one on February 28, 1995, be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Miami Herald, Feb. 28, 1995]

ITALIAN MAGAZINE RANKS CUBA AS A SEXUAL PARADISE

The Italian travel magazine *Viaggiare* has named Cuba the "paradise of sexual tourism" after an informal survey of journalists, travelers and tour operators.

Cuba obtained 23 points out of a possible 30, higher than Thailand and Brazil, each of which scored 21 points, and the Dominican Republic, which had 20 points, the magazine said in a special section in its March edition devoted to "erotic tourism" worldwide.

"We suggest staying in the cottages of the Hotel Comodoro . . . where it will be much easier to retire in sweet company," the magazine says. It also suggests that readers walk along Fifth Street in Varadero beach, "where you can easily find jineteras, the local prostitutes."

Cuba, which has said tourism will soon surpass sugar exports as its largest source of hard currency, has its largest European clientele in Italy.

NEED FOR TOURISTS' DOLLARS FUELING CUBA PROSTITUTION

(By Lizette Alvarez)

The young woman takes a drag on her cigarette and slides off her slippers. The rickety wooden chair she sits on wobbles. A bare light bulb dangles above.

"Some I like, some I don't like," she said, a touch of regret frosting her words, "But I'm not with them for love. I'm with them out of necessity."

In Cuba, prostitution has become a tourist trade like any other, only it pays better. Young women cluster outside the Riviera Hotel, home to a trendy salsa club. They sit in fashionable restaurants. They amble down

the Malecon, flagging down tourist cars, advertising their availability with tight ultra-short skirts.

The Italian magazine *Viaggiare* recently raved about Cuba as a sexual playground for tourists. The island—which closely controls the spread of AIDS—ranked first in the magazine's sex-destination survey, surpassing even brothel hot spots like Thailand and Brazil.

For a country that took great pride in stamping out prostitution after the 1959 revolution, it's a distinction the government could do without.

Vilma Espin, head of the Cuban Federation of Women and estranged wife of Raul Castro, recently railed against prostitutes in Cuba, calling them a "great embarrassment" to the country. She blames a shortage of morals, not money, for the booming sex trade, as does her brother-in-law, President Fidel Castro.

Her speech, widely publicized in Cuba, did not sit well with the island's women, who skewered Espin for sidestepping reality. One Havana woman argued that prostitution in Cuba today is much more disturbing than it was prior to 1959 because it is more blatant.

"This prostitution did not exist before," said the Havana woman. "You didn't have professionals—engineers, architects—prostituting themselves . . . The revolution has created this. And now Vilma Espin stands on the stage with her Christian Dior dress."

A few days after the speech, the young hooker seated in this two-room apartment smirks at Espin's words. Nobody believes that a morality breakdown is driving Cuba's flourishing prostitution trade, she said.

Among most people here there is no rousing condemnation, only an implicit understanding. You do what you must.

"There are other ways to survive in this country," she admitted. "But they are too difficult. And I have my son and my mother to think about."

Prostitutes, who generally work for themselves, are routinely fined by police for "sexual contact" and are detained for a spell. But in reality, prostitution is a game, a nod, and a wink and a handshake—between client, hooker, and government workers.

Finding a hooker is not difficult. Hookers linger outside hotels and inside expensive restaurants. The clients wine and dine them and the women stay with them during the length of the trip, a week or so. When the men go home, they leave behind \$50 or \$100.

"Usually you don't ask for money up front," the young woman said. "It's up to them. Sometimes they don't leave you anything."

The whole arrangement is based on a series of bribes. To get a jinetera, as they are dubbed, up to a hotel room, a tourist slips \$20 to the guard on duty and another few dollars to the elevator operator, the two people who see everyone's comings and goings.

Some prostitutes fear their newfound international notoriety could trigger a crackdown. That is not likely to happen as long as the economic crisis shaking the country persists. Even tourism officials say there is not a lot that can be done.

"We have to find a way so that Cuban women can find other ways to live," said Orlando Rangel, a tourism official.

But for women along the Malecon that's wistful thinking.

"This isn't ever going to change," the prostitute said. "Since I was 14 I was told it was going to change, but every day the only thing I see more of is need."

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, I will be very brief in response to my friend.

I could buy his arguments on assisting with hard cash if there was any consistency to our policy. We do not follow that in China. The Senator from North Carolina and I agree, we do not like the government that is in charge in China. We do not follow that in North Korea. We are in agreement, we do not like the Government of North Korea. You can list a number of nations and, in terms of security, frankly, Cuba is less of a long-term threat than China is, for example, in terms of security. So I think that argument simply is not valid.

The second basic thrust is, somehow we can isolate Castro. That has been our policy for the last few decades and, obviously, it has not worked.

I think it makes much more sense to try to open up Cuba and to also keep in mind that, if tomorrow Fidel Castro should die of a heart attack or something happen to him, we ought to be preparing the ground so the successor government is a free government, is a democracy. That is in our interest. That is in the interest of the people of Cuba.

Under the present law, theoretically—I say theoretically because any American who wants to get around this can do it very easily by giving some money to a Mexican airline or a Canadian airline, and a great many other countries. But you cannot travel directly from the United States to there, and people who have relatives cannot visit the relatives. And human rights organizations, like Amnesty International, which would go there and be critical of the Castro record on human rights—which is not a good record—are not permitted to do so.

I think we would be much better off if we said to Americans that—unless you have a physical threat—Americans can travel wherever they want so that we do not have to follow some Government line in terms of how we get information. I think it is a basic freedom that we ought to have as Americans.

I hope the amendment can be adopted. I do not want to prolong this. I know the Finance Committee wants to meet. I yield to my friend from North Carolina.

Mr. HELMS addressed the Chair.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, again, every time I get into a debate with Paul SIMON it is like a fraternity meeting. We are such close personal friends even though we frequently disagree.

I say to the Senator that the policy against Cuba is working. Castro is on the ropes. And he wants the hard currency that tourism brings in because that will give him a few more days, and a few more weeks, or whatever. As far as a heart attack that he may have, I will not say that I want anybody to have a heart attack. But I want him to get off the backs of the Cuban people as quickly as possible, and I know the Senator from Illinois does, too.

The infusion of hard currency is the only thing that is going to save Castro

now. He needs that money, and that is the reason he is selling off real estate which does not belong to Castro's government any more than that table does. But he is selling this property off nevertheless. He is frantic to get hard currency. That is the reason he wants very much to have the tourism.

And the proximity of Cuba—how many times have we said this Communist country is 90 miles off our shore? That is precisely the point. You cannot make a case about China and North Korea because they are so far away that the number of United States tourists are relatively minimal because many Americans cannot afford to travel there.

I say to the Senator with all due respect that I just cannot agree with the amendment. That is my last word.

Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, believe it or not, I will take just 1 more minute. When you say Castro is on his last ropes, I heard that 5 years ago. I heard that 10 years ago. I heard that 15 years ago. I heard it 20 years ago, and so forth.

Mr. HELMS. If the Senator will yield.

Mr. SIMON. I yield.

Mr. HELMS. I thank the Senator. I have already violated my last word stipulation. But back then they had an infusion of cash from the Soviet Union which no longer exists.

Mr. SIMON. That is true. But today they have an infusion of British, French, and other investments that they did not have then.

Let me just say—because the Senator mentioned North Korea—that the place in the world today where you have more troops facing each other across a border where there is no contact with the other side is Korea. I do not remember the number, but I think we have about 140,000 troops in South Korea; American troops. I think you could use the argument we should not be propping this Government that might be a threat to American troops. But we do not, and we believe—and I think this is correct—maybe we can have an influence on that Government of North Korea which, believe it or not, is even harsher than the government of Castro.

But I respect my colleague from North Carolina. This is an area where we simply have a disagreement.

I yield the floor.

Mr. HELMS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that prior to the vote on the Simon amendment tomorrow there be 20 minutes equally divided between the two sides.

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

Mr. HELMS. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I say that the Senate will recess shortly—within 5 minutes.

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.

MORNING BUSINESS

SAMMY HOWARD, MAYOR OF PHENIX CITY, ALABAMA

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I rise today to congratulate Sammy Howard for his recent election as the new mayor of Phenix City, Alabama, a vibrant community in the east-central part of the State. Still widely called "Coach" Howard since he was a high school football coach for so many years, Sammy most recently was a highly successful banker in Phenix City. As a coach, he led his teams to 113 victories out of a total of 140 games.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of an article which appeared in the Columbus, GA, Ledger-Enquirer on the life and career of Sammy Howard be printed in the RECORD after my remarks. It tells about his odyssey from student athlete to coach to banker to mayor.

I wish "Coach" Howard all the best as he takes over the reins of government in Phenix City.

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

[From the Columbus (GA), Ledger-Enquirer, Sept. 11, 1995]

PHENIX CITY MAYOR-ELECT NOT IN GAME FOR SELF

(By Richard Hyatt)

Nina Jo Keel had her rules. You made a speech in class or you failed. But there was something about that shy kid who nervously told her he would have to take an "F," that he couldn't get up in front of his friends and do that. Bending her own rule, she let him make his speech in private so he could escape with a "D."

Forty years after she taught speech at Central High School, she would watch the 6 o'clock news and mentally get out her red pencil. Her health wasn't good and the boys she taught had turned into men, but in her heart, they were still her students and she was still their teacher. That's why she picked up the telephone and called that 10th-grader who had become a successful Phenix City banker.

"She finally taught me how to say amphitheater," Sammy Howard said.

She died several months ago, so Nina Jo Keel never got to see that frightened high school kid become Mayor-elect of Phenix City. He couldn't make a speech in class, but next month he will become the spokesman for the community in which he grew up.

Never did anyone forecast that Curtis Samuel Howard Jr. would ever be called mayor. He was a football player, then a coach, and in a universe the size of Phenix City, there are no higher callings. It's been 17 years since he blew a whistle or covered a blackboard in X's and O's and yet he can't escape the game that paid for his education.

"Some people still look at me as coach," Howard said. "I saw a former player in the bank the other day and he called me Coach Howard. They don't call me mister and they can't bring themselves to call me Sammy. I'll always be the coach."

The traits of a player and coach are as close to him as debits and credits. He has used them to build a banking career and he talks about the need for teamwork in making the city operate effectively. There are a few football trappings in his office, including a mint-condition ticket to the 1951 Auburn-Alabama game, the season the two schools renewed their rivalry.

Growing up, some of those traits were not so attractive.

"I've always been driven by a desire to win," Howard said. "That almost got me barred from Little League. I'd get mad at the other kids if they made an error. Chuck Roberts, with the Housing Authority, was my coach. He talked to me and said I couldn't chase the other players around the field when I got mad."

Red Howard, his late father, was also a competitor. In 1919, he scored Auburn's only touchdown in a victory over Georgia. He was the manager of the Frederick Douglas housing complex in Phenix City. He also had a temper.

"Sammy and I were double-dating one time and we borrowed Mr. Howard's 1953 Pontiac couple. We had a flat tire and we jacked up the fender instead of the bumper. Mr. Howard had some choice words for us," said Pat Thornton, a Central High classmate who is plant manager of Brumlow Mills in Calhoun, Ga.

The Howard family lived on Dillingham Street, not far from the bridge into Columbus and not far from many of the gambling joints that—like it or not—are so much a part of the community's history.

"We were just a few blocks away, but you know, we never felt scared. We never even locked our doors," Howard said.

But when he started playing football, he soon learned that being from Phenix City was a stigma in the eyes of God-fearing people who had heard the Sin City reputation.

"This is still an issue. This problem won't go away in my lifetime. We still have that reputation," Howard said.

The Central team he played on was a talented group. They went 6-1-3, including a victory over Sidney Lanier, ending that Montgomery school's 19-game victory streak. Howard ran back a kickoff 95 yards. But his classmates talk about one he didn't score. That one came with 20 seconds to play against Columbus High. Central was seeking a third straight Bi-City championship. Howard had scored twice and apparently scored a third touchdown that would have meant a victory.

It was called back because of a penalty.

"It was better to complain about the call because if you admitted the call was right people would want to know who was guilty. They would have run him out of town," Howard said.

He was captain of the football team, vice president of the senior class and an All-Bi-City player. He was even voted the cutest male graduate. Only he wasn't cute enough to get a college football scholarship.

"Bill Bush and I went 400 miles for a try-out at Southwest Mississippi Junior College in Summit, Mississippi. We had to make it. We didn't have the money to get back home," he said.

In his second year, he was an All-American halfback on a team that was undefeated. He even married the homecoming queen.

Those two years were important to Howard. He was away from home. He found there was more to life than football. That was a painful lesson. He had to overcome two concussions and a broken nose his first year in Mississippi.

His play grabbed the attention of major college coaches. Even though he had grown up as one of the few confessed Auburn fans in

Phenix City, a few minutes alone with Bear Bryant changed all that. At Alabama, his injuries continued to mount so he played very little. Three decades later, he is reminded of those injuries.

"I had my neck operated on a few years ago and the surgeon said I had either been in a bad car wreck or else I got one lick too many playing football."

Coaches and teachers had played an important role in his life, so he decided to become a high school coach. Red Jenkins, his junior college coach, had become head coach in Yazoo City, Miss., and he offered Howard a job as a junior high coach.

His career almost ended after a single game.

His team played a terrible first half and he took them to the end zone where he pitched a fit, throwing his clipboard and using locker room language, with the heat of his tirade directed at a single player.

The next day he was summoned to the superintendent's office and when he arrived the room was filled with a number of proper ladies. They were horrified at his behavior. He was in trouble until the superintendent asked the only woman who hadn't spoken what she thought.

"What did you say to that boy?" she asked the young coach who didn't want to repeat his words.

"I said something I shouldn't," he said.

"What did you say?" she said again.

He sheepishly repeated the word.

"That's exactly what I would have called him," she said.

The woman was Mrs. Jerry Clower. Her husband was a fertilizer salesman then. Their son was a football player like his dad, who had played at Mississippi State. They were staunch Baptists and became staunch friends to Howard, who two years later became head coach.

Clower, a member of the Grand Ole Opry, is now a legendary comedian who gets paid for telling the stories he has always told.

"I thank my God for every remembrance of Sammy Howard. In 1969, he took 30 little boys and won a state championship. They played against teams from Jackson that would dress out 100 players and they won every game," Clower said.

Clower, who offered the pre-game prayer before every game, talked about Howard's decency and how he was real, not a phony. It was a difficult time in Yazoo City. During Christmas break, federal judges ruled that after the holiday they would be only one school in town. Desegregation came abruptly.

One of the students who came from the black school was Mike Espy, who became a congressman from Mississippi and, most recently, Secretary of Agriculture. He was president of the student body at his school and the adults were quibbling over who would be president at the new school.

"I was impressed," Howard said. "He said he thought the white student ought to be president—as long as they promised that the following year a black student would have the job."

Clower was impressed with Howard.

"My son played every minute under Sammy Howard. He so loved him that he wanted to be a coach like Sammy Howard. Right now, he is coaching in Gulfport, Mississippi," Clower said.

Wanting a challenge and wanting to be nearer home after the death of his father, Howard became football coach at Hardaway High in Columbus, a program that the previous year did not produce a single victory. He made progress, but in three years took a different challenge.

In 1973, he moved home to Phenix City, becoming head coach at Glenwood School, at

the time a fast-growing private school. He was there five years. He became principal as well as coach and in his final year won a state title. He left coaching with 113 victories in 140 games.

He joined F&M Bank as a trainee in 1978 and in two years was made president. Through evolution, that bank became part of the Synovus family and Howard its president. Jimmy Yancey, former president of CB&T in Columbus, is now his boss at Synovus. Yancey said it isn't unusual for someone with a coaching background to be successful as a banker.

"It obviously has to do with leadership and Sammy showed that as a high school coach. He gets along with people and he deals with people. Those things are more important than a technical knowledge of banking. He inspires people to rally around him and Phenix City is fortunate that he wanted to be its mayor," Yancey said.

Howard was among a group of leaders shopping for a candidate. Everybody said no. Finally, Jerry Holly, a rival banker, turned to Howard and asked why he didn't run.

Judy Howard was one reason. She had been the wife of a coach, so she had sat in the stands and heard her husband ridiculed and criticized. As the wife of a mayor, she would face similar taunts. So will Howard.

"The mayor is the most visible of any elected official. You're always there. I'm going to the Central game and I'll bet 20 people will ask me about being mayor. Coaching prepares you for this," he said.

Forty-seven of his 56 years have been spent in this community, so he thinks he knows its needs. He talks about the need to bridge the gap between north and south Phenix City and he has set three goals:

To improve the appearance of downtown Phenix City.

To improve the city's infrastructure, such as roads and sewers.

To narrow the scope on what kind of industry the community will seek.

These things are challenges.

"We are a city of 30,000 with the tax base of a town of 15,000," he said. "If we were a city sitting alone like Eufaula it would be different. But we aren't. Our people do so much of their shopping in Columbus."

Working for a Columbus organization, he believes the friction between the two towns is vanishing. "The problem isn't between the cities, it's between the states," he said.

Howard said yes to becoming mayor—no one ran against him—because of the needs in the business community and because of the life this city has given him.

"That sound like the politically correct thing to say but I mean it," he said. "I didn't need this job. I didn't need the recognition. I've had more of that than I deserve in a lifetime. I won't be out there for myself. I'll be out there for Phenix City."

Just like a coach who wants to win.

"I see that as a plus in being mayor because we will be in a quest for a championship. I guess if I ever lose that desire it'll be time to quit."

HAL SELF SELECTED FOR ALABAMA SPORTS HALL OF FAME

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I rise today to congratulate Hal Self, who was recently selected as one of the 6 new inductees into the Alabama Sports Hall of Fame for 1996. He was an outstanding football player at the University of Alabama and later revived the football program at Florence State College, now the University of North Alabama. Due to his leadership and

dedication, football at North Alabama has emerged as one of the very best small college programs in the entire nation, having claimed the national championship in 1993 and 1994.

Sports has always run through the veins of Hal Self. He was a standout in football, basketball, and baseball at Decatur High School before entering the University of Alabama in 1941. He quarterbacked the Crimson Tide teams in 1941, 1942, 1944, and 1945, leading his troops to all four of the major post-season bowls at that time—Cotton, Orange, Sugar, and Rose.

He went into coaching after college, serving for 2 years at Athens High, where he went 15-5. In 1949, he began restoring the football program at Florence State and coached there for 21 years, compiling a 110-81-8 record, often playing against much larger schools with older and more established programs.

In 1969, he gave up coaching for the athletic director's post, serving there for 2 years. He stayed on as a full professor in the University of North Alabama physical education department until he retired in 1984.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of a recent article on Hal Self appearing in the Huntsville Times be printed in the RECORD after my remarks.

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

HAL SELF GETS TOP SPORTS HONOR

(By John Pruett)

Hal Self, who grew up in Decatur, went on to football fame at the University of Alabama and later resurrected the football program at Florence State College, has been selected as one of the six new members of the 1996 class of the Alabama Sports Hall of Fame.

Self joins a six-man group that includes former Auburn football star Bo Jackson, the 1995 Heisman Trophy winner; former Alabama, basketball player Leon Douglas; former Auburn Olympian Harvey Galance, now Auburn's head track coach; former Alabama High School Athletic Association executive director Herman "Bubba" Scott; and Jacksonville State's former one-armed football star, Jodie Connell.

Self and the others will be inducted into the ASHOF on Saturday, Feb. 24, at the Birmingham-Jefferson Civic Center.

"This, in my opinion, is the ultimate honor for anyone who was ever involved in sports in the state of Alabama," Self told The Huntsville Times over the weekend from his home in Florence, where he lives in retirement. "I'm deeply honored and humbled by the whole thing. What it does is put you up there with the best."

Self grew up as a football, basketball and baseball star at Decatur High School, where he played for legendary coach Shorty Ogle. He was the quarterback in Ogle's Notre Dame Box, the same offense that Self found when he went to Alabama on a football scholarship in 1941.

Self had several other scholarship offers and almost went to Howard College, but was persuaded to attend Alabama by Crimson Tide assistant coach Paul Burnham.

"Alabama had a whale of a football team when I got down there," Self said. "The morale was great and Coach Frank Thomas was

in his prime. We had some terrific players, guys like Holt Rast at end and Taterhead Nelson at tailback, both All-Americans."

Self played on the freshman team in 1941 and was redshirted the following season. Alabama did not have a football team in 1943 because of World War II, but Self was a starter in 1944 and became one of the top players in the Southeastern Conference in 1945, when he won the coveted Jacobs Blocking Trophy.

He played in Alabama's 29-26 loss to Duke in the Jan. 1, 1945 Sugar Bowl and scored two touchdowns in the Tide's last Rose Bowl appearance, a 34-14 romp over Southern California in 1946. Self scored two touchdowns against the Trojans in the final college game.

"Those were two games to remember," Self said. "Grantland Rice called the Duke game 'the greatest bowl game ever played.' The Rose Bowl was of those special memories. Nobody gave us a chance, but it was never a game, really. Harry Gilmer just went to work and they couldn't handle him. We finally cleared the bench. Late in the game, Coach Thomas turned to Nick Terlizzi, who had a cast on his leg, and said, 'Nick, you want to tell your kids some day that you played in the Rose Bowl?' Nick said sure, and he went limping into the game, wearing that cast."

At 24, Self was hired as head coach at Athens High School, where he compiled a 15-5 record. Two years later, Florence State president Ed Norton hired Self to take over the long-dormant athletic program at what would later become the University of North Alabama. For the next 21 years, Self and his lone assistant, George "Bull" Weeks, built a first-rate small college football program with limited scholarship funds. The Lions were 110-81-8 during the Self regime, which ended in 1969 when he stepped down to become the school's athletic director.

Self moved into the UNA physical education department two years later and stayed on as a full professor until his retirement in 1984.

"The thing I treasure most about my years at Florence is that in 21 years, we never had a player who participated for four years that didn't get a degree to go with it," Self said. "That, and the fact that we had more than 100 of our boys who went on to become coaches."

TRIBUTE TO JAMES M. JONES

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I rise today to commend and congratulate James M. Jones, who recently retired from his position as the clerk of court for the U.S. Bankruptcy Court for the Middle District of Alabama. Mr. Jones served with the bankruptcy court for nearly 30 years, from September 1966 through his retirement effective September 1 of this year.

James began his career as an insurance manager in 1954. After 12 years in the field, he found his true calling as a member of the judicial staff of the U.S. Bankruptcy Court, eventually rising to become clerk of the court for the middle district. He served there for 16 years with distinction, dedication, and consummate professionalism. He was an active member of the National Conference of Bankruptcy Clerks [NCBC], assisting in the incorporation of the organization and in the writing of its original bylaws. He later chaired and served on numerous committees of NCBC, and has been a featured speaker

at numerous organizational meetings and seminars on the issue of bankruptcy.

James Jones was born June 30, 1930 in Morgan County, AL to James D. and Dora Kilpatrick Jones. In 1950, he married Janene Hocutt, with whom he had four children—Sharon, Steve, Craig, and Lyn. He was educated at Auburn University and Jones Law School in Montgomery. He served in the U.S. Army during the Korean war, and represented the First Army as an observer to the second atomic bomb test at Yucca Flat, NV in 1951.

I extend my very best to James and his family as he embarks on his well-deserved retirement. I hope it is as long, healthy, and productive as his career has been.

TRIBUTE TO DR. TOM VAUGHAN

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I want to take a few moments to commend and congratulate Dr. John Thomas "Tom" Vaughan, who retired from his position as dean of the College of Veterinary Medicine at Auburn University last month. The fifth dean in the history of veterinary medicine at Auburn, he served from June 1977 until September 1995.

A Tuskegee, AL, native, Dr. Vaughan graduated with honors from Auburn's College of Veterinary Medicine in 1955. His affiliation with the field of veterinary medicine as a student, faculty member, department chair, and dean spanned an incredible 42 years.

As dean, Dr. Vaughan successfully led the college through numerous challenges. Despite major fiscal limitations, his leadership inspired dynamic instructional changes which made Auburn an internationally recognized institution in animal welfare and computerized teaching. He stimulated plans for curriculum alterations to coincide with the changes inherent to the field. As chairperson of the Auburn University Core Curriculum Commission, his was a pivotal voice in initiatives which led to the school's enhanced overall academic reputation.

Dr. Vaughan's strategic vision including the expansion of career opportunities for veterinarians in clinical practice, corporate enterprises, research projects, and in government agencies. He was committed to the Extension Service, agribusiness, and public health. His work has benefitted the public greatly through improvements in the food animal industry, research on diseases and pathology common to animals and people, expansion of graduate programs, and the training of quality veterinarians from all segments of society.

Dr. Vaughan served in several capacities on behalf of the National Association of State Universities and Land-grant Colleges. He chaired its Commission on Veterinary Medicine and served on its Commission on Food, Environment, and Renewable Resources. He is a former president of both the Amer-

ican College of Veterinary Surgeons and the American Association of Equine Practitioners.

He authored a total of 22 chapters in various veterinary textbooks, wrote numerous professional journal articles, and coauthored two books. He was selected as the Alabama Veterinary Medical Association's Veterinarian of the Year in 1985. Just last year, he received the Distinguished Service Award from the prestigious Tennessee Walking Horse Breeders and Exhibitors' Association. At Auburn University, Dr. Vaughan was an enthusiastic member of the John and Mary Franklin Foundation Lectures Committee and also a member of the University Senate.

Dr. Tom Vaughan's outstanding leadership and total dedication to his field have contributed directly in innumerable ways to the distinguished service of many graduates of Auburn's veterinary school, one of the oldest in the nation. He has established benchmarks of service and excellence that will inspire and sustain his colleagues, as well as challenge the profession for many years into the next century.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Thomas, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 12:05 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Ms. Goetz, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 629. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to participate in the operation of certain visitor facilities associated with, but outside the boundaries of, Rocky Mountain National Park in the State of Colorado.

H.R. 1026. An act to designate the United States Post Office building located at 201 East Pikes Peak Avenue in Colorado Springs, Colorado, as the "Winfield Scott Stratton Post Office".

H.R. 1606. An act to designate the United States Post Office building located at 24 Corliss Street, Providence, Rhode Island, as the "Harry Kizirian Post Office Building".

H.R. 1715. An act respecting the relationship between workers' compensation benefits and the benefits available under the Migrant and Seasonal Agricultural Worker Protection Act.

H.R. 1743. An act to amend the Water Resources Research Act of 1984 to extend the

authorizations of appropriations through fiscal year 2000, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2070. An act to provide for the distribution within the United States of the United States Information Agency film entitled "Fragile Ring of Life".

H.R. 2353. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend certain expiring authorities of the Department of Veterans Affairs relating to delivery of health and medical care, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker signed the following enrolled bill:

H.R. 1976. An act making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes.

The enrolled bill was signed subsequently by the President pro tempore (Mr. THURMOND).

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and second times by unanimous consent and referred as indicated:

H.R. 629. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to participate in the operation of certain visitor facilities associated with, but outside the boundaries of, Rocky Mountain National Park in the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 1743. An act to amend the Water Resources Research Act of 1984 to extend the authorizations of appropriations through fiscal year 2000, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Environment and Public Works.

H.R. 2070. An act to provide for the distribution within the United States of the United States Information Agency film entitled "Fragile Ring of Life"; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

H.R. 2353. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend certain expiring authorities of the Department of Veterans Affairs relating to delivery of health and medical care, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following measures were read the first and second times by unanimous consent and placed on the calendar:

S. 1322. A bill to provide for the relocation of the United States Embassy in Israel to Jerusalem, and for other purposes.

S. 1328. A bill to amend the commencement dates of certain temporary Federal judgeships.

MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bill was read the first time:

H.R. 1715. An act respecting the relationship between workers' compensation benefits and the benefits available under the Migrant and Seasonal Agricultural Worker Protection Act.

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-1516. A communication from the Director the Office of Management and Budget, the Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual Federal Financial Management Report and Five-Year Plan; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1517. A communication from the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Review of the Department of Human Services' Foster Care Reimbursement Efforts"; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1518. A communication from the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Financial Review of the District of Columbia's Drug Asset Forfeiture Program"; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1519. A communication from the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Audit of the District of Columbia's Recycling Program"; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1520. A communication from the Secretary of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report entitled, "To Assure the Free Appropriate Public Education of All Children with Disabilities"; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petitions and memorials were laid before the Senate and were referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM-358. A petition from a citizen of the State of Georgia for a redress of grievance; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

POM-359. A petition from a citizen of the State of Georgia for a redress of grievance; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

POM-360. A petition from a citizen of the State of Georgia for a redress of grievance; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

POM-361. A petition from a citizen of the State of Georgia for a redress of grievance; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

POM-362. A petition from a citizen of the State of Georgia for a redress of grievance; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

POM-363. A petition from a citizen of the State of Georgia for a redress of grievance; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

POM-364. A petition from a citizen of the State of Georgia for a redress of grievance; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

POM-365. A petition from a citizen of the State of Georgia for a redress of grievance; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

POM-366. A petition from a citizen of the State of Georgia for a redress of grievance; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

POM-367. A petition from a citizen of the State of Georgia for a redress of grievance; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

POM-368. A petition from a citizen of the State of Georgia for a redress of grievance; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

POM-369. A petition from a citizen of the State of Georgia for a redress of grievance; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

POM-370. A petition from a citizen of the State of Georgia for a redress of grievance; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

POM-371. A petition from a citizen of the State of Georgia for a redress of grievance; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

POM-372. A petition from a citizen of the State of Georgia for a redress of grievance; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

POM-373. A petition from a citizen of the State of Nebraska for a redress of grievance; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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. MCCAIN:

S. 1330. A bill to make available without fiscal year limitation the offsetting collections of the Federal Communications Commission for electromagnetic spectrum auctions; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. HATCH:

S. 1331. A bill to adjust and make uniform the dollar amounts used in title 18 to distinguish between grades of offenses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1332. A bill to clarify the application of certain Federal criminal laws to territories, possessions, and commonwealths, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1333. A bill to provide for a reduction of sentence for providing useful investigative information, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRIST:

S. 1334. A bill to amend chapter 28 of title 35, United States Code, to provide for noninfringing uses of patents on medical and surgical procedures; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. MCCAIN:

S. 1330. A bill to make available without fiscal year limitation the offsetting collections of the Federal Communications Commission for electromagnetic spectrum auctions; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

THE SPECTRUM AUCTION OFFSETTING COLLECTION AVAILABILITY ACT

• Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, today I am introducing the Spectrum Auction Offsetting Collection Availability Act. This bill is simple and would save a fiscal problem currently being faced by the Federal Communications Commission [FCC].

The FCC currently must expend funds in order to conduct spectrum auctions. When such auctions occur, the Commission is authorized to retain from the auction proceeds to offset the overhead costs of conducting the auction. This plan is logical and clearly benefits all concerned—especially the taxpayers.

However, it has been brought to my attention that when an auction is conducted late in the fiscal year, and the revenues come in too late to be expended during that fiscal year, the Commission does not have the authority to use the funds collected. This creates an unintentional monetary crisis at the collected. This creates an unintentional monetary crisis at the FCC. Clearly, the FCC should be able to keep this money for more than 1 year in order to support spectrum auctions.

Currently there is much debate as to whether we should cut the FCC's funding or not. That is a debate for another

day and quick passage of this bill should not be interpreted by any as an indication as to a Member's view on overall FCC funding levels. This bill simply allows the FCC to continue to conduct its auctions in a manner that does not require the use of appropriated funds.

Similar language has already been added to both H.R. 1869, the FCC Authorization Act of 1995 and the proposed House Reconciliation bill. It is not controversial and makes common sense.

I would hope that it would be passed by the Senate in the very near future or that it could be added to the first appropriate legislative vehicle moving on the Senate floor. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill appear in the RECORD.

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

S. 1330

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 "Spectrum Auction Offsetting Collection Availability Act".

SEC. 2. AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FROM SPECTRUM AUCTIONS.

Section 309(j)(8)(B) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 309(j)(8)(B)) is amended by inserting after the second sentence the following new sentence: "Such offsetting collections shall remain available until expended.".

By Mr. HATCH:

S. 1331. A bill to adjust and make uniform the dollar amounts used in title 18 to distinguish between grades of offenses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

TITLE 18 UNIFORMITY ACT OF 1995

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Title 18 Uniformity Act of 1995 and urge my colleagues' support for this bill.

This bill makes technical adjustments to make uniform the dollar amounts used in title 18 to distinguish between grades of offenses.

This bill raises the dollar threshold that triggers more severe punishment of certain unlawful acts. This change allows the punishment to better fit the crime by raising the threshold to a reasonable level before the extended imprisonment option becomes effective. This bill furthers our interest in applying equal justice and better utilization of incarceration space. I urge its passage.

By Mr. HATCH:

S. 1333. A bill to clarify the application of certain Federal criminal laws to territories, possessions, and commonwealths, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

THE POSSESSIONS AND TERRITORIES CRIMINAL LAW CLARIFICATION ACT OF 1995

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Possessions and Territories Criminal Law Clarification Act.

This law, which is purely technical in nature, is needed to clarify an ambiguity in a number of Federal statutes as to their coverage of crimes occurring in the territories, possessions, and commonwealths of the United States. This ambiguity arises because these statutes contain references to State law, without any indication of whether they are to be applied to territories or other entities which are not States.

My bill would clarify that these ambiguous Federal criminal statutes apply to the territories, possessions, and commonwealths of the United States, as well as to the 50 States. I ask my colleagues to support this legislation, and urge its swift approval.

By Mr. HATCH:

S. 1333. A bill to provide for a reduction of sentence for providing useful investigative information, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

THE SUBSTANTIAL ASSISTANCE CLARIFICATION AMENDMENT ACT OF 1995

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Substantial Assistance Clarification Amendment Act of 1995. This amendment to Federal sentencing procedures clarifies the procedures by which the Government may move that the court sentence a defendant below a statutory minimum sentence based on the defendant's cooperation with the Government.

My bill removes the requirement that a substantial assistance reduction be based on information relating to a particular person being investigated or prosecuted. Instead, under my bill, such a reduction could be given in exchange for substantial assistance in the investigation or prosecution of any offense, even if the defendant is unaware of the specific person or persons involved.

My bill will assist Federal prosecutors in their task of bringing criminals to justice by giving them additional leverage with which to uncover needed evidence. It will also provide incentives to defendants to come clean, and mitigate their crimes by cooperating with the prosecution.

This bill does nothing to lessen the punishment for truly culpable defendants who deserve the full measure of punishment the law provides. It simply strengthens a tool in the prosecution's toolbox. It furthers the interests of justice, and I urge its passage.

By Mr. FRIST:

S. 1334. A bill to amend chapter 28 of title 35, United States Code, to provide for noninfringing uses of patents on medical and surgical procedures; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

THE MEDICAL PROCEDURES INNOVATION AND AFFORDABILITY ACT

• Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce legislation that will address what I believe is a growing problem in the medical community. It may come as a surprise to my colleagues in the Senate, to health care

consumers, and even to some physicians, that the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office issues patents for purely medical procedures.

Most physicians are unaware that patents can be issued for medical procedures, and even if they were, few would seek to limit the ability of other physicians to use the most up-to-date and effective procedures in providing health care. Yet, an alarming trend of obtaining and enforcing medical procedure patents is on the rise in the medical community, and I strongly believe that a legislative solution is necessary.

Mr. President, for most of our history, advancements in medical procedures, independent of a new medical device or pharmaceutical, were not considered patentable. In 1954, the Patent Office reversed its prior rulings and issued a decision which has been interpreted to provide broad authority for the issuance of medical method patents. The increasing incidence of the issuance of these patents is in conflict with broader health policy goals.

Mr. President, advances in health care are encouraged and fostered in an atmosphere where professionals share their research and publish the results of their work. Physician specialties conduct annual meetings to discuss the latest techniques, and important discoveries are published and subject to the critical peer review process. There is simply an element of unfairness if doctors are allowed to claim ownership of procedures which were developed based on years of cooperative clinical experience and research.

A recent lawsuit, and increasing demand for the payment of royalties on patented medical procedures, has caused a growing concern that the issuance of medical method patents will increase the cost of health care, and quite possibly, keep physicians from providing the best treatment available. For example, in 1993, Dr. Samuel Pallin, an Arizona ophthalmic surgeon, sued Dr. Jack Singer, a Dartmouth Medical School professor of ophthalmology, for patent infringement involving a technique for stitchless cataract surgery. Dr. Pallin sought a patent on the technique, even though many ophthalmic surgeons, including Dartmouth's Dr. Singer, were using this technique before Dr. Pallin sought his patent.

And this is not an isolated example. Medical method patents issued in recent months include patents relating to implanting a knee prosthesis, closing an incision in muscle tissue, calculating the risk of coronary heart disease, using donor plasma for ear infections, diagnosing Alzheimer's disease, treating rheumatoid arthritis, performing laser surgery without damaging nearby tissue, treating bone disorders, treating aneurysms, and the list goes on and on. Obviously, doctors and others have begun to realize that if the practice of granting and enforcing medical method patents continues to spiral, they must protect themselves

by seeking patents on procedures they use. That prospect is frightening.

Mr. President, the practice of enforcing medical patents against physicians and other health care providers has profoundly negative implications for the entire health care field. And that is why I am introducing legislation that would provide an exception from the definition of patent infringement for medical and surgical procedures. With this approach, physicians and others will still be entitled to seek and obtain a medical method patent, but there will be no infringement if the procedure is used by other physicians or other licensed health care practitioners. And because the legislation does not impose a ban on the issuance of medical method patents, there should be no concern that the legislation would prohibit biotechnology companies from enforcing their patent rights against commercial users with respect to any patentable advancements in areas such as gene therapy, cell therapy, or with respect to new uses for well-known drugs. Additionally, Mr. President, there is an explicit exemption for the commercial manufacture of drugs, medical devices and any other products regulated by the Food and Drug Administration, which should also provide substantial protection for the biotechnology industry.

Mr. President, more than 80 nations, including Japan, Germany, Great Britain, and France, prohibit the issuance of medical method patents. Increased enforcement of medical method patents will increase health care costs, limit access to quality health care, and ultimately put patient privacy at risk. The legislation I am introducing will limit the enforcement of medical method patents against physicians, while preserving the rights of the biotechnology industry. I believe this legislation is both balanced and necessary, and I urge my colleagues to support its passage. ●

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 881

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. McCONNELL] was added as a cosponsor of S. 881, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify provisions relating to church pension benefit plans, to modify certain provisions relating to participants in such plans, to reduce the complexity of and to bring workable consistency to the applicable rules, to promote retirement savings and benefits, and for other purposes.

S. 942

At the request of Mr. BOND, the name of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GRASSLEY] was added as a cosponsor of S. 942, a bill to promote increased understanding of Federal regulations and increased voluntary compliance with such regulations by small entities, to provide for the designation of regional

ombudsmen and oversight boards to monitor the enforcement practices of certain Federal agencies with respect to small business concerns, to provide relief from excessive and arbitrary regulatory enforcement actions against small entities, and for other purposes.

S. 949

At the request of Mr. GRAHAM, the names of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SANTORUM], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. FORD] were added as cosponsors of S. 949, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the 200th anniversary of the death of George Washington.

S. 1027

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. KYL] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1027, a bill to eliminate the quota and price support programs for peanuts, and for other purposes.

S. 1028

At the request of Mrs. KASSEBAUM, the name of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. FORD] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1028, a bill to provide increased access to health care benefits, to provide increased portability of health care benefits, to provide increased security of health care benefits, to increase the purchasing power of individuals and small employers, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED

THE CUBAN LIBERTY AND DEMOCRATIC SOLIDARITY [LIBERTAD] ACT OF 1995

HELMS AMENDMENT NO. 2938

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. HELMS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to amendment No. 2898 proposed by Mr. DOLE to the bill (H.R. 927) to seek international sanctions against the Castro government in Cuba, to plan for support of a transition government leading to a democratically elected government in Cuba, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

() Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, but for purposes of Title III, any person or entity, including any agency or instrumentality of a foreign state, shall be deemed to have received the notices described in subsections (B)(I) and (B)(ii) with respect to any claim certified prior to the effective date hereof by the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission.

() Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, but for purposes of Title III, an action may be brought under Title III by a United States national only where the amount in controversy exceeds \$100,000, exclusive of costs, attorneys' fees, and exclusive of interest under sections 302(a)(I)(I), (II), and (III), and exclusive of any additional sums under section 302(a)(3)(B).

() Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, but for purposes of Title III, a

United States national who was eligible to file the underlying claim in the action with the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission under Title V of the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949 but did not so file the claim may not bring an action under this Title.

() Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, but for purposes of Title III, in the event some or all actions or claims filed under this section are consolidated by judicial or other action in such manner as to create a pool of assets available to satisfy such claims, including a pool of assets in a proceeding in bankruptcy, every certified claimant who filed such an action or claim which is consolidated in such manner with other claims shall be entitled to payment in full of its claim from the assets in such pool prior to any payment from the assets in such pool with respect to any claim not certified by the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission.

() Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, but for purposes of Title III, in the case of any action brought under this Title by a United States national whose underlying claim in the action was timely filed with the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission under Title V of the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949 but was denied by the Commission, the court shall accept the findings of the Commission on the claim as conclusive in the action under this Title.

() Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, any provisions in this Act related to the import of sugar or sugar products shall be deemed "sense of the Congress" language.

NOTICE OF HEARING

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I would like to announce that the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs will hold a hearing on S. 1327, the Saddleback Mountain-Arizona Settlement Act of 1995, a bill to transfer certain lands to the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian community and the city of Scottsdale, AZ. The hearing will take place on Thursday, October 26, 1995, beginning at 9:30 a.m. in room 485 of the Russell Senate Office Building.

Those wishing additional information should contact the Committee on Indian Affairs at 224-2251.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be allowed to meet twice during the Wednesday, October 18, 1995, session of the Senate for the purpose of conducting an oversight hearing on the Amateur Sports Act and a hearing on S. 1043, the Natural Disaster Protection and Insurance Act.

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

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, October 18, 1995, at 10 a.m.

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

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, October 18, 1995, at 10 a.m. to hold a hearing on the Omnibus Property Rights Act of 1995.

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

COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Labor and Human Resources be authorized to meet for a hearing on emerging infections, during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, October 18, 1995, at 9:30 a.m.

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

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, October 18, 1995, at 2 p.m. to hold an open hearing on intelligence matters.

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

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Special Committee on Aging will hold a hearing on Wednesday, October 18, 1995, at 10 a.m., in room 628 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building. The hearing will discuss quality of care in nursing homes.

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON TERRORISM, TECHNOLOGY AND GOVERNMENT INFORMATION

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Terrorism, Technology and Government Information of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, be authorized to meet during a session of the Senate on Wednesday, October 18, 1995, at 11 a.m., in Senate Hart room 216, on the Ruby Ridge incident.

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

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

ABDICATING ON THE CASE FOR ENDOWMENTS

• Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I rise to invite the attention of the Senate to an article in the October 2 edition of the Washington Times entitled "Abdicating on the Case for the Endowments." The author is Leonard Garment, a Washington lawyer who has followed the issue of Federal funding of the arts and humanities since he worked as White House counsel to President Richard Nixon.

"That soft gurgling you hear," writes Mr. Garment, "is the sound of the National Endowments for the Arts and Humanities being slowly strangled to death."

In the article, Mr. Garment lists the abuses of the public trust that, in his words, "denigrate the values of millions of taxpaying Americans." The notorious Andres Serrano project. The panels that judge projects by ideological litmus tests and fund the politically correct. The wheelbarrows full of money dumped into frivolous whimsies.

He concludes that the solution is not to throw the baby out with the bathwater—to risk weakening America's cultural treasures because of these abuses. Rather, he advocates a clean break with the past. He would disassemble and rebuild them from the ground up.

"Such reforms," he writes "are not only possible but already on the congressional table—in the form of a bill, jointly introduced by Senators Kay Bailey Hutchison of Texas and Robert Bennett of Utah, that addresses every one of these issues."

I am gratified that a man of Mr. Garment's stature and experience supports our bill. I recommend this excellent article to my colleagues, and I ask that it be printed in the RECORD.

The article follows:

[From the Washington Times, Oct. 2, 1995]

ABDICATING ON THE CASE FOR THE ENDOWMENTS

(By Leonard Garment)

That soft gurgling you hear is the sound of the National Endowments for the Arts and Humanities being slowly strangled to death. The House of Representatives has voted to fund the endowments at drastically reduced levels and take them out entirely in two years. The Senate, while not imposing a similar deadline, has also slashed the endowments' money.

Yet most fans of the endowments are walking around with "What, me worry?" smiles on their faces. Since they survived, they think their arguments worked and that they can just keep making these arguments again and again until their opponents' fervor cools. Then it will be business as usual.

I fear the endowment enthusiast overestimate the stamina of their friends and underestimate the resentment of their adversaries, in Congress and out. The editorial stalwarts at The Washington Post, for example seem to have quietly tiptoed out of the current debate, leaving it to Jonathan Yardley. The Post's senior book reviewer and distinguished social commentator—a man with cast-iron convictions, by the way—to call for an end to the Endowments (Aug. 28, Sept. 10, Sept. 25). During this barrage, the Post gave "Taking Exception" time to a wearily hackneyed defense of the humanities endowment by one of its senior officials (Sept. 19). Jane Alexander, chairman of the National Endowment for the Arts, the lead horse of the cultural troika, appears to have taken a sabbatical powder from public advocacy, apparently content to let matters rock along without risking a misstep that might upset the congressional stay of execution.

The national endowments are making a miserable mistake in thus defaulting on the attacks against them, letting the once-splendid arts and humanities enterprise fade slowly into history with little more than befuddled whimpers of support. This is a pity, since every legitimate objection made by those who want to pull the plug on the endowments can be answered. What has been missing, as usual, is the creative intelligence and the legislative will necessary to do so.

After 30 years of reasonably close observation of the spasms of congressional support and hostility toward the endowments, it seems to me that the current mixture of indifference and resentment, reflecting the powerful conservative political tide, involves five major categories of complaint. First, it is said that the endowments have supported artistic and humanities projects that denigrate the values of millions of taxpaying Americans. Robert Mapplethorpe, Andres Serrano, Annie Sprinkle and Her Magnificent Speculum, blah, blah, blah. All true. However these unpleasant projects came to be funded, the relevant fact is that they should not have been. But the chance of such mistakes in the future can be reduced to near-zero if the endowments are prohibited from awarding grants, subgrants or fellowships to individuals. These personal subventions have been the main instruments of the corrosive damage inflicted on the endowments.

Next, the endowments are called mutual back-scratching societies that use their hundreds of so-called "peer panels" to support highly personal and ideological judgements about art and scholarship. True again. But this need not be if we eliminate the large array of narrow and manipulable peer panels and create a small number of cross-disciplinary advisory groups, less vulnerable to parochialism and conflict of interest, to advise the endowment leadership on the distribution of endowment resources. The arts and humanities are too important to be left to artists and humanities—who are intensely concerned, and understandably so, with self-expression, not with safeguarding cultural institutions from political harm. Individual grants and fellowships are a fine idea but quintessentially the business of private foundations and corporate or individual donors. And I refuse to believe that an artist or scholar who has something important to say will pack up his palette or PC if he or she is not paid in advance. Just try making the argument for the necessity of individual grants to the hordes of young writers, painters and musicians who work without complaint at part-time jobs to support their particular muses.

Third, critics contend that the endowments are used by federal arts bureaucracies as instruments for their own private agendas. Also true. To the extent that the law permits, we should clear out these long-timers—who think they, not the taxpayers, own the endowments. We should make the rest accountable to a council subject to Senate confirmation as well. The council should be composed of mature persons required by law to be genuinely "learned in the arts and humanities." Even allowing for the occasional political hack who will slide through, such a council would be very difficult for bureaucracies to roll.

Front and center for years now, the big complaint is that the endowments try to be all things to all constituencies rather than acting out of their own sense of national cultural mission. For this grievance Congress has a remedy at hand. It can establish by law that the endowments will support only American cultural institutions whose weakening or destruction would mean the loss of irreplaceable treasures. These institutions—there are not that many—would be selected by the national council and would be the nation's indisputable best: The great museums, symphony orchestras, jazz ensembles, art schools, performing arts centers, ballet, operas and theater companies. In short, they would be the emblems of the honor that America gives to its major cultural institutions and of the importance it ascribes to them as instruments of aesthetic education. Congress also can (and should) stipulate that

a substantial part of the federal arts and humanities budgets will be distributed, by formula, to states and local governments for the support of local equivalents of the national treasures, mandating substantial community outreach as a condition of the award of public support. This money would also be subject to a categorical ban on individual grants.

Finally, the endowments are said to be overloaded with administrative costs and redundancies in areas, such as film production, already supported by the Corporation for Public Broadcasting and the Public Broadcasting System. A final "true." To solve this problem, the two endowments (and the Institute for Museum Services) should be consolidated into a single endowment under unified leadership, with a presiding chairman and three deputies for the arts, humanities and museum services components. This merger would save millions of dollars, and each of the constituent organizations would benefit immensely from the enhanced cross-disciplinary scrutiny. The humanities section of the new endowment could be constructively pared by at least a third of its present budget with that money redistributed to meet large and urgent arts and museum services needs. (Thumb through the annual NEH catalogue of humanities grants; if you can explain 10 percent of these mystifying projects, you should be the next dean of Harvard College.)

Such reforms are not only possible but already on the congressional table—in the form of a bill, jointly introduced by Sens. Kay Bailey Hutchison of Texas and Robert Bennett of Utah, that addresses every one of these issues. It would be a shame if partisans of the endowments ignored this bill and thus missed the opportunity to anticipate and block the future proposals that will otherwise lead inevitably to the evisceration of the endowments. It may be too late in the budget cycle to consider structural reforms' right now; but reauthorization or deauthorization time will soon roll around and a deep breath and a careful look at the history and future structure of the endowments will be in order.

The national endowments are powerful symbols of an American commitment to the support and dissemination of the arts and humanities at a time when a horrifying junk culture pervades our public spaces. Even aside from this concern, abandoning the endowments would be a shabby act, utterly unworthy of a great nation. Their massive 30-year contribution to American culture dwarfs their mistakes. They furnish unequaled cognitive tools for early education for the children of what will be the largest and most complex multi-cultural nation in the world.

Ways and means can be debated; what I believe unarguable is that the endowments should not be destroyed—slowly, swiftly or at all—simply because aggressive cultural predators and self-indulgent members of the federal bureaucracy have occasionally corrupted the work of the agencies over the past three decades. And if these persons and organizations now hope to stave off reform, believing responsible defenders of the endowments will simply go away, those of us who care for the arts and humanities and understand their importance should not let them get away with it. •

THE BAD DEBT BOX SCORE

Mr. HELMS. While we are waiting, Mr. President, let me mention that since February 1992, I have each day the Senate has been in session reported to the Senate the exact total of the

Federal debt as of the day before the close of business, or in the case of Mondays the previous Friday. I call it the bad news about the Federal debt, and today's news about the Federal debt is pretty bad.

Before we have "another go," as the British put it, with our little pop quiz that I so often have, I hope Senators will remember one question, one answer, about this \$5 trillion debt that the Congress of the United States has run up for future generations to pay off. That one question on my pop quiz is: How many millions of dollars would it take to add up to \$1 trillion?

While anybody within earshot is thinking about that, I would suggest that we bear in mind that it was the U.S. Congress, where I work—here and the House of Representatives on the other side—that ran up this Federal debt that now exceeds \$4.9 trillion. We are going to hit \$5 trillion before this year is out. And these young people who are serving as pages, their generation and generations following them, will be struggling to pay off the debt. Every day that we fail to balance the Federal budget runs the debt up further.

All right, what about the total Federal debt as of the close of business yesterday, October 17? The total Federal debt down to the penny stood at \$4,968,953,453,657.73. Now, this figure is not far from \$5 trillion.

Another depressing figure discloses that on a per capita basis, assuming that every man, woman, and child would accept and pay off somehow his or her share of the debt—and we know that only about half of the people, men, women, and children, will in fact pay any taxes at all, but if everybody had a share and paid it off, it would amount to \$18,862.23 per man, woman, and child.

Now, then, remember the question that I asked in my little pop quiz? How many million in \$1 trillion? There are 1 million million in \$1 trillion. That gives you some idea of the enormity of the debt and the enormity of the irresponsibility of the Congress during the past generation or more.

I suggest the absence of a quorum, awaiting wrap-up information.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HELMS. For the final time this afternoon, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be dispensed with.

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

Mr. HELMS. I thank the Chair.

BILL READ FOR THE FIRST TIME— H.R. 1715

Mr. HELMS. Now, Mr. President, I will inquire of the Chair if H.R. 1715 has arrived from the House of Representatives?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has. It will be read for the first time.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1715) respecting the relationship between workers' compensation benefits and the benefits available under the Migrant and Seasonal Agricultural Worker Protection Act.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I am going to object to my own request since there is no Democrat on the floor. I am going to do their job for them in this instance.

I now ask for its second reading. And I object to my request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. HELMS. So the bill will remain at the desk and be read a second time following the next adjournment of the Senate; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. HELMS. All right.

ORDERS FOR TOMORROW

Mr. HELMS. Now, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in recess until the hour of 10 a.m., tomorrow, Thursday, October 19, 1995, and that following the prayer, the Journal of proceedings be deemed approved to date, that the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and that there then be a period for morning business until the hour of 10:30 a.m., with Senators to speak for up to 5 minutes each, with the exception of two Senators: Senator KASSEBAUM 10 minutes and Senator DORGAN 10 minutes.

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

Mr. HELMS. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent that at 10:30 a.m., tomorrow, the Senate resume consideration of H.R. 927, the Cuba Libertad bill, and that at that time Senator DODD be recognized to offer his two amendments that remain in order under a previous unanimous-consent agreement.

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

Mr. HELMS. I thank the Chair.

PROGRAM

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, for the information of all Senators, it is the hope of the leadership that the Senate may complete action on H.R. 927 by 12 noon, or thereabouts, tomorrow; therefore, votes can be expected to occur prior to 12 noon tomorrow.

So I ask unanimous consent that the vote occur on or in relation to the Simon amendment numbered 2934, Thursday, October 19, at a time to be determined by the majority leader, after consultation with the Democratic leader, following 20 minutes of debate to be equally divided in the usual form.

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

Mr. HELMS. I thank the Chair.

Following the disposition of H.R. 927, it is the hope of the leader that the

Senate may consider the State Department reorganization bill, if the manager's amendment can be worked out by that time.

Now then, the NASA authorization is a probability in terms of consideration tomorrow.

Therefore, additional votes can be expected following the disposition of H.R. 927.

Also, all Senators should be on notice that the majority leader intends to turn to the Labor-HHS appropriations bill on Friday of this week.

ORDER FOR RECESS

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, following the remarks of the majority leader, if there be no further business to come before the Senate at that time, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess under the previous order.

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

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

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

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I understand that we are on automatic pilot. When I finish, we will go out?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DOLE. I will say, the Senate Finance Committee will resume markup of the \$245 billion tax reduction bill. I am not certain precisely when that will be. I think somewhere around 5 o'clock. The chairman, Senator ROTH, will be in contact with the committee members.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, Washington can be a scary place sometimes and

pretty scary around the time of Halloween. But yesterday's announcement from Treasury Secretary Robert Rubin about expiration of the debt ceiling on October 31 brings Halloween scare tactics to a whole new level.

I was dismayed to see the administration resort to this sort of game-playing on the debt ceiling and the budget situation. And I am sure many in the financial community were as dismayed as I was.

Mr. President, investors around the world are watching our performance here in Washington and they are particularly watching how we Republicans are handling the Nation's financial situation.

So far the reaction has been very positive. Look at U.S. long-term interest rates, a key sign of investor confidence in the U.S. economy. The bond market has been strong and the rates have been steadily declining as the financial community sees our determination as a Republican Congress to finally deal with the problem of the Federal budget deficit once and for all.

Last December—right after the Republicans swept the 1994 congressional elections—the interest rates on 30-year bonds began their decline from 8.0 percent to 6.29 percent today. The interest rate on long-term bonds has declined steadily since this spring when we passed our budget resolution to get on a path to a balanced budget by the year 2002. It is our actions as a Republican Congress that have spurred confidence in our country's future economic security.

Today we find ourselves in the ironic situation of a Secretary of the Treasury—the U.S. Government official with the primary responsibility of promoting confidence in the economy—actually trying to disrupt the financial markets.

Secretary Rubin has politicized this debate. His actions yesterday to reduce normal, previously scheduled borrowing next week can only be interpreted as designed to disrupt the market. No

Secretary of the Treasury should try to be destabilizing our financial markets.

As Secretary Rubin said in his letter—about the only sentence in it I agreed with—"This is no way for a great Nation to conduct its financial affairs."

I hope that no one will be fooled by these Halloween scare tactics from the administration. In fact, even after yesterday's announcement the bond market was strong. The American people want us to do the job of getting the deficit under control.

Mr. President, no one wants a default. And scare tactics are no way to prevent such a default. I can guarantee that we in the Congress will work hard to see to it that there is no default by the U.S. Government on its obligations.

But make no mistake: We will not retreat in our battle to end the stranglehold that the Federal deficit has on future generations of Americans. This is the year to do the heavy lifting necessary to get our Nation's financial house in order and I trust the administration will choose to be helpful in the serious work ahead of us in the coming weeks.

RECESS UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I move the Senate stand in recess under the previous order.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate, at 3:54 p.m., recessed until Thursday, October 19, 1995, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate October 18, 1995:

THE JUDICIARY

NINA GERSHON, OF NEW YORK, TO BE U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK VICE LEONARD D. WEXLER, RETIRED.

BARBARA S. JONES, OF NEW YORK, TO BE U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK VICE KENNETH CONBOY, RESIGNED.

JOHN THOMAS MARTEN, OF KANSAS, TO BE U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF KANSAS VICE PATRICK F. KELLY, RETIRED.