



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 104<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 141

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, NOVEMBER 20, 1995

No. 186

## Senate

The Senate met at 10:30 a.m., and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. THURMOND).

### PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Lloyd John Ogilvie, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our gracious heavenly Father and Lord of all life, we praise You for hearing and answering our prayers. Today, we are very aware of how You work through men and women to get Your work done. Without You, we cannot; without us You will not. You are the source of all that we have and are. We are thankful that there is no limit to what can be accomplished when we humbly give You the glory and no limit to the problems that can be solved when we diligently seek what is best for our Nation.

You have been at work through us to plan for the future of our Nation. We thank You for using leaders in both parties to break the deadlock and get the Government moving again. Help us to affirm the truths we have claimed together for our fiscal future and inspire us to resolve differences that remain. We press on with awe and wonder over this vivid reminder of Your direct involvement in all the details of our lives and of Your willingness to accomplish Your plan through us. In the name of our Lord. Amen.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COVERDELL). The able majority leader is recognized.

### SCHEDULE

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, for the information of my colleagues, there will be a period for morning business with Senators entitled to speak up to 10 minutes each. Today, we expect to adopt an adjournment resolution in time for the Senate to adjourn for Thanksgiving. It is possible the Senate may consider any legislative or execu-

tive items that have been cleared for action, but there will be no votes today.

The House will not start voting until 5 o'clock this afternoon. Hopefully, they can have a near-unanimous vote on the resolution we passed yesterday to keep the Government going until December 15. If something should happen there, if there should be an amendment or something, we would be coming back an hour after that final disposition. I do not think that will happen, but we will have to leave that possibility open, just in the event there should be some other action on the House floor.

### A BUDGET TO BE THANKFUL FOR

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, the past few days have been historic ones in Washington, DC. As we approach Thanksgiving, I believe our children and our grandchildren will have a lot to be thankful for. They may not understand it. Maybe their parents will not understand it, maybe their grandparents will not understand it, but I do believe we have provided the leadership the American people have been waiting for, the leadership to do the most important thing we could ever do: pass a balanced budget for the first time in a generation.

While President Clinton says he opposes our budget, last night the Republican majority reached an agreement with the White House, with the President and congressional Democrats to enact legislation before the end of this year to balance the budget by the year 2002 using honest economic estimates of the Congressional Budget Office, a balanced budget in 7 years. That is what this discussion has been all about. We have never lost sight, on our side of the aisle, of our principles. We are fighting for America's future. Some may not appreciate it, some may not

understand it, but that is what the battle is all about.

We would like to make budget deficits a thing of the past. And make no mistake about it, this is all about America's future, all about generations yet to come. This may be our—maybe not last, but one of our best opportunities to make fundamental change in the way we do business, the way the Government does business, so that our children will inherit something. Maybe they can inherit a dream rather than crushing debt.

I think we owe all Americans an economy with lower interest rates so more people can buy a car, farm machinery, take out a college loan, or realize a lifetime dream of maybe buying a home. Believe me, if you look at the numbers—not my numbers but numbers from experts in the field—if, in fact, we have a balanced budget over 7 years, the markets will respond, interest rates will fall. It is like a tax cut. For every American it is like a big tax cut. If you pay less interest when you buy a car, buy a home, student loan, it is just as much money in your pocket as a tax cut would be.

So, for the hard-working Americans, we owe it to them to do what we should do. We owe it to America's seniors to save Medicare from bankruptcy, just as we saved Social Security from bankruptcy in 1983 in a bipartisan way. President Reagan, a Republican, Tip O'Neill, Democratic Speaker of the House, and Howard Baker, Republican leader of the Senate, put together a commission—and I was honored to be on the commission with the likes of Claude Pepper of Florida, the champion of senior citizens, and many others—and, in a bipartisan way, we rescued Social Security from bankruptcy in 1983.

I think we owe it to American families to give them back more of their

• 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 17499

own money—their money. I have repeated this story many times. We have a \$500-per-child tax credit in the Republican plan. The President has \$300 under a little different conditions. I met a man in Jacksonville, FL, who told me he had 10 children—10. He said, "Ten times 500 is \$5,000." And he said, "Senator, I can spend that money better for my children than you or anybody else in Washington, DC." That is what the tax credit is all about.

About 70 percent, nearly 80 percent of our total tax cuts go to families with children, or reduce the marriage penalty, or go to other areas we believe are family related. We also owe it to families who are trapped in the welfare system to create a new system based on work and hope and opportunity.

We believe we have a good plan—I think the Senate bill which passed, as I recall 87 to 12, it would have been 88 to 12 but Senator HATFIELD was unavoidably absent that day—and we are going to change welfare as we know it. It is going to be helpful to those who must rely on welfare.

We are going to send it back to the States. I just finished talking to the Republican Governors, by satellite, in New Hampshire. They are excited about the prospect. Let them make the decisions. They are excited about welfare reform. They are excited about returning Medicaid to the States.

I think, finally, we owe it to the American people just to keep our word and keep our promise. I know there is not a lot of precedent for it. They may not be used to it. But these things were promised the American people in 1994, and they are being delivered in 1995.

We cannot do everything in 1 year. When you have had 40 years going the other direction of a bigger central government, more spending, more taxes, it may take more than one session of Congress to turn it all around. But this is the beginning. This is only the beginning, but it is a start of the process.

We have been told that we can do it in 7 years. Those are the estimates of the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, which, I might add, have been, I think, right 14 out of 16 times when you compare the projections of the Congressional Budget Office and the Office of Management and Budget in the White House. That would be under Presidents of both parties. That is not intended to be criticism.

So, I thank all my colleagues, and I thank Senator DASCHLE, obviously, and others on the Democratic side, for coming together on an agreement. We can all say who won or who lost, but I think the bottom line is Federal employees are back at work. They are going to be paid. They are not going to suffer any loss of pay.

If we do what we should do between now and December 15, it will not make any difference who won and who lost. I think we won. We did not blink. We have a 7-year balanced budget using CBO estimates. But that may not be important. The important thing is, if

we do what we should do working together, the big winners will be the American people. The children will not understand it, and the grandchildren, but will understand it 5 or 10 or 15 years from now when they are looking for work, or want to get married, or want to buy a car, or want to go to college.

If we have turned the country in the right direction—right now I think 70 percent of the American people say we are going in the wrong direction—if we downsize the Government, and if we reconnect the values of this Government of ours with the average American out there, and if we regain our place as the leader of the international community, then I believe that we are off to a good start.

Everybody can take credit—Republicans, Democrats, the President, whoever. And it would be deserved. If we do the wrong thing, then I believe the American people will rebel. They will say, "Well, business as usual. They talk a good game but it never happens."

So I am excited today about the direction. I am excited about the agreement. I believe the House will pass the agreement we sent over last night, and I hope unanimously without much discussion. Then I would assume a week from today we will start the serious negotiations. We will be working with all of our colleagues on this side, and certainly I know Senator DASCHLE will work with his colleagues on the other side for input. We have also invited the Republican Governors to give us input which I think is very important.

So I want to thank my colleagues for their cooperation and wish them a well deserved and happy Thanksgiving.

I yield the floor.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, will the able Senator yield?

Mr. DOLE. I am happy to yield.

#### EXPRESSION OF APPRECIATION FOR SENATOR DOLE

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, as the President pro tempore of the Senate and on behalf of the Senate, I want to express our appreciation to our able majority leader for the great work he has done in getting the Government back into operation and for accomplishing what we did over the weekend. Without his leadership, it could not have been done. We are very appreciative of all that he does for the Senate, and this is another incident of his outstanding leadership for this country.

Mr. DOLE. I thank my friend from South Carolina.

I yield the floor.

Mr. LEAHY addressed the Chair.

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

#### COMMENDATION OF SENATORS AND STAFF

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I applaud leaders on both sides of the aisle for the work that was being done around here this weekend. I saw the hard work of Senator DASCHLE, and Senator DOLE, and of everybody else.

Let me just take a moment to applaud a lot of people whose names and faces do not get on the news, the men and women who keep the Congress running—many of whom were here not knowing whether they were going to be paid or not, who work extraordinary hours well past midnight night after night, whether they are the parliamentarians, the clerks, the security guards, the Capitol Police, the young pages, the men and women who come here to learn of the Government, whether they are from Vermont or any other State. The staff of Senators, Republicans and Democrats alike—those in the Cloakroom who, when many of us were able to go home at night, had to stay there for hours and hours after that time in case votes came up and we were called; and the same in the other body.

Those who keep doors open, those who make it possible for us to fulfill our constitutional responsibility to America to have this body—this body which should be the conscience of the Nation—open to the public; those who make sure that any member of the public who came here, even though Washington was shut down, could at least come and visit the Congress, and either be enlightened or enraged by the debate, depending upon how they might feel.

#### GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I will speak of other Government employees now. I strongly support the agreement's commitment to provide back pay for the thousands of employees and their families who were forced off the job last week through no fault of their own. It was an insult to these households held hostage through our inability to agree on a workable Government budget for all Americans. I regret that the shutdown punished hard-working families, not some faceless bureaucrats as some would have you believe.

I know an awful lot of men and women in Vermont who work very hard at keeping the Government of this great country running, from the Immigration and Naturalization Service to the Justice Department and Agriculture, food service, on and on. These are hard-working people. They are the Cal Ripkens of the Government who show up for work every single day, do their job, do it the very best they can, and suddenly are told they are not essential, we do not believe in what they have been doing, and they are sent home through no fault of their own.

They just want to work. I had so many call my home, call my office, and

say: We are ready to come to work. We will volunteer. There are things that have to be done. Passports have to be issued; social welfare claims have to be heard; and so on. It is the same throughout this country.

Remember these same Government employees who died for this country in Oklahoma, these same Government employees who make the greatest democracy on Earth operate with a quarter of a billion people. They should not become pawns in a budget chess match.

#### THE BIPARTISAN BUDGET AGREEMENT

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I applaud the bipartisan budget agreement that was reached yesterday between President Clinton and the congressional leaders in both parties because it ends the longest Government shutdown in our history, and it sets the stage for bipartisan negotiations to achieve a balanced budget by 2002, something that in the debate most people forget. The vast majority of Republicans and Democrats want that balanced budget.

So it is truly a bipartisan compromise in the best sense of both of those words. It puts away partisan politics. It uses common sense to reach shared values. It commits Congress and the President to the worthy goal of a balanced budget in 7 years while also committing us to achieve a balance with compassion—not just “hard, cold, numbers crunching,” as the expression goes. We are past, I hope, the political posturing and the finger pointing.

Thanks to those Government employees who will keep the Government working during the time of the negotiations in the coming weeks as the Congress and the President build on this temporary agreement. It is not going to be easy. But we have to succeed.

I suggest three principles of common sense and reason to make these negotiations work.

First, scale back the \$245 billion in tax cuts in the Republican budget plan. I learned many years ago that the best way to get out of a hole is to stop digging. Past Presidents and Congresses have spent our country into a \$5 trillion debt. With this kind of huge debt we cannot afford \$245 billion more in tax cuts. We ought to be spending that money to get us out of debt—not create more debt.

Second, plow back the savings from scaled-back tax cuts that will lower the reductions in Medicare and Medicaid. Keep our commitment to the current generation of Medicare recipients, and preserve the system for future generations. Also keep the Medicaid safety net in place for our most needy citizens. If we scale back those tax cuts, we can avoid unnecessary cuts in Medicare and Medicaid.

Third, invest in our future; provide adequate funding for education and nutrition programs for our children. It only makes sense that we give the next

generation every chance to succeed in today's demanding economy, an economy far more demanding than when I was a child. We also have to maintain our environmental protection to preserve our natural resources for future generations.

If we use these three principles, I believe Democrats and Republicans can resolve our differences, and make our Government work to achieve a fair balanced budget.

We have to understand, Mr. President, that all of us are in this together, and that each one of us is going to have to cast votes that will be unpopular. It will be unpopular for Democrats or unpopular for Republicans. We have to take steps that may be unpopular at the moment but that are for the good of the future.

We are not going to pass a Gingrich budget. We are not going to pass a Dole budget, or a Daschle budget, or a Clinton budget, or a Leahy budget. But we can pass parts of each that will make a better budget for this country. But think of the long-term gains. Think about what we want in the future. Think of our children. My children are going to live most of their lives in the next century. That is probably true of many of them. Let us think of them and have a policy for our country.

We have been guided by policy through pollsters. Instead, let us be guided by legislation through leadership. It would be a refreshing change in this country. Just ignore the polls of the day.

It seems that we come in here and somebody sneezes or gives a speech, and there is a poll of the hour. There is a poll that says the President is ahead at this moment, the Congress is behind; 3 hours later the Congress will be ahead and the President will be behind, and we seem to try to adjust to that.

I do not think the American people are impressed by that. I think the American people would be impressed if the polls said what we are doing is what we think is best in moving forward. If we do that, we are going to have the kind of budget we want.

I was 1 of 11 who voted against Reaganomics back in the 1980's. With the deficits and the huge increase in our national debt built up during that time, we are now spending \$1 billion a weekday in interest, \$1 billion a weekday in interest on what we did then. I remember the polls were 10 to 1 against my vote. But I think it is like some of the votes on Vietnam at one time; a lot of people wish they could go back and do it over again.

We have to find a way. I voted for the plan of the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. CONRAD]. I voted for a lot of things in that plan that are going to be unpopular back in Vermont, but they bring us to a balanced budget.

Let us assume that we all want that balanced budget, and we do. But we also have to invest in our future. We also have to make sure our education opportunities are there for our chil-

dren. We have to make sure we do those things that create jobs, that allow us to lower the enormous trade deficit.

The enormous trade deficit in this country is hurting us more than our deficit in our Federal budget because it is owed to people outside of this country exclusively, and the more that deficit builds up the more our jobs flee the United States and go to the Pacific basin and go to Europe and go to other parts of the world.

Let us improve our ability to compete with the rest of the world in our education, in our financing, and all these other things so that we create the jobs here and we start exporting far more and the money comes back into this country. That would not only lower our trade deficit but it would, more importantly, put hundreds of thousands, millions of Americans back to work in good, productive jobs. Bring those jobs back into the United States. Use the productivity and the genius of our Nation but make sure our investment is in keeping that genius and that productivity in education, in health and nutrition.

Mr. President, I think now is the time for us to step back, applaud the good motives of people in both parties and of the President, but let us close the door on the pollsters setting policy. Let us use our own leadership to pass legislation that is good for this country.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. COCHRAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Senator will suspend just one moment, I failed to read the previous order.

#### RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

#### MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be a period for the transaction of morning business with Senators permitted to speak therein for not to exceed 10 minutes each.

The Chair recognizes the Senator from Mississippi.

#### CONDITIONAL RECESS OR ADJOURNMENT OF CONGRESS FROM NOVEMBER 20 OR 21 UNTIL NOVEMBER 27 OR 28, 1995

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, at the request of the majority leader and with the understanding that it has been cleared on both sides of the aisle, I send the adjournment resolution to the desk and ask that it be considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 32) providing for a conditional recess or adjournment of the Senate on Monday, November 20,

1995, until Monday, November 27, 1995, and a conditional adjournment of the House on the legislative day of Monday, November 20, 1995 or Tuesday, November 21 until Tuesday November 28, 1995.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be considered and agreed to and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

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

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 32) was agreed to, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 32

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring).* That when the Senate recesses or adjourns at the close of business on Monday, November 20, 1995, pursuant to a motion made by the Majority Leader or his designee, in accordance with this resolution, it stand recessed or adjourned until a time to be determined by the Majority Leader on Monday, November 27, 1995, or until one hour after the House has voted on H.J. Res. 122, unless the House agrees to the Senate amendment.

SEC. 2. The two houses shall convene at 12:00 noon on the second day after Members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 3 of this resolution, whichever occurs first; and that when the House of Representatives adjourns on the legislative day of Monday, November 20, 1995, or the legislative day of Tuesday, November 21, 1995, it stands adjourned until 12:30 p.m. on Tuesday, November 28, 1995, or until 12:00 noon on the second day after Members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 3 of this resolution, whichever occurs first.

SEC. 3. The Majority Leader of the Senate and the Speaker of the House, acting jointly after consultation with the Minority Leader of the Senate and the Minority Leader of the House, shall notify the Members of the Senate and the House, respectively, to reassemble whenever, in their opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, the resolution provides that the Senate adjourn today until Monday, November 27 or 1 hour after the House votes, if they amend or defeat the continuing resolution that the Senate passed last night.

#### DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, it is very reassuring to this Senator to see the Congress work out this continuing resolution as it has done over this past weekend providing for the continued funding of the departments of the Government that had not been funded through the passage of regular appropriations bills.

There has been a great deal of confusion over what the issues were and why the continuing resolution was needed. I think everyone in the Senate and certainly those who worked to put together the resolution which was adopted by the Senate fully understand it all, but the American people, who do not have access to the information

that is available on a daily basis here, had to be confused by the procedures and what the issues were.

One of the issues that can also be dealt with today is whether or not the bill that has been passed by Congress to fund the Department of Defense for the next fiscal year can be signed by the President so that not only can people who work for the Department of Defense be secure in the knowledge that they are going to be paid under the terms of not only employment arrangements but contracts, independent contractors, defense contractors, and the rest, but that we will be keeping a commitment to the military so that they can make plans, they can use the funds that are coming to them under the regular fiscal year 1996 appropriations bill in a thoughtful way that does not actually end up costing money.

What worries me is that the President is sending signals that he may veto this bill because he thinks it provides too much money for defense, more than he had requested in his budget submission. I will tell you a lot of things have changed in the world since the President submitted his budget to the Congress. For example, we are seeing negotiated right now among different factions in the former Yugoslavia an arrangement which the President says may require additional United States forces, activities under our NATO alliance on the part of United States defense forces that will require more money than had been anticipated when this budget was submitted.

One of the provisions in the Defense appropriations bill which our committee approved was a contingency appropriation of \$643 million which is made available to the administration, to the Commander in Chief for use by the Department of Defense for contingency operations that had not been anticipated when that budget had been submitted. If this bill is not signed, there will be prolonged negotiations among the committees of the Congress with jurisdiction over defense matters. We do not know what the next bill will provide. We do not know how much will be provided or denied for contingency operations. There is a great deal of controversy right now, and the President surely knows this, in the Congress over whether we ought to support and fund and provide the resources for a massive ground force in the former Yugoslavia as a part of any peacekeeping operation.

So I am suggesting that is an issue which can be certainly dealt with in a way that ought to be pleasing to the administration and favorable to the administration's interests, if this Defense appropriations bill is signed.

The President has stated in numerous public addresses his commitment to a strong national defense. As a matter of fact, in his second State of the Union Address on January 25, 1994, President Clinton said:

The budget I send to Congress draws the line against further defense cuts. It protects

the readiness and quality of our forces. Ultimately, the best strategy is to do just that. I hope Congress without regard to party will support that position.

I suggest that this Defense appropriations bill does support that position. There are some in Congress and in the administration who are going to argue that the President should veto the bill because it exceeds his budget request, but there are things that have come to light in terms of threats against the security of our country, particularly the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and the capabilities that some countries have now of sending such weapons over long distances with new missile technologies that are beginning to develop around the world. These are in countries that are historically not our most serious security threats, but have become so or are capable of becoming so through these emerging technologies and the ability to acquire technologies from countries willing to sell these weapons and sell these new technologies.

So, provided in this Defense appropriations bill are some additional funds to help meet these new threats, and it seems to me that this is a matter of grave national concern. I hope that the President will sign the bill, not only because it takes the Department of Defense out from under the continuing resolution which we just adopted last night, but because it goes a long way toward meeting the challenge that the President himself laid before the Congress in his last State of the Union Address and the address in 1994.

I hope we can resolve these issues as they develop. There are other bills that are contentious as well. The Senator from Vermont mentioned a couple of them. The distinguished leader mentioned the Labor-HHS appropriations bill, which has not yet been brought to the floor of the Senate because the Democrats have been objecting and insisting on debating at length the motion to proceed to consider the bill. We hope that bill can be passed and the President will sign it as well.

Mr. President, seeing no other Senator seeking recognition, 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. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I understand we are in a period of morning business with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

## TAX RELIEF FOR THE AMERICAN FAMILY

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I had the opportunity to listen to the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Vermont. And now that we have established this interim accord and agreement, thankfully, for the first time in decades we will have a balanced budget in the United States. Now will come the debate of the priorities within that balanced budget, and we saw a precursor in the remarks by the Senator from Vermont.

The Senator takes exception to the tax relief proposal that is in the congressional budget that we will soon give to the President. Both the House and the Senate have approved \$245 billion in tax relief for American families and communities and businesses over a 7-year period.

Mr. President, just several weeks ago the President of the United States acknowledged to an audience in Houston, TX, that his 1993 tax increase, which was the largest in American history, might have been a mistake. In fact, he said it was a mistake. And it was indeed.

What is interesting is the size of that tax increase that the President has now suggested was a mistake was about \$250 billion. It is interesting to note that this tax relief that we are talking about is \$245 billion. One cannot miss the similarity of the two numbers. In fact, Mr. President, what you are about to have here is a Congress acknowledging that that tax increase was a mistake and is in the business of refunding it and undoing it and fixing it.

I am rather new here, Mr. President, but I am always amazed by the idea that you hear expressed here that the best way for the resources of America to be managed, in the minds of so many people in Washington, is that everybody gets a wheelbarrow out and ships everything they have earned up here so that a policy wonk can decide what the priorities are of American families and businesses and communities. I do not think our forefathers had that in mind, Mr. President.

I was just over at the first Senate Chamber a moment ago. I like to walk by there and think about Thomas Jefferson giving his inaugural address there. He did not have in mind that all the fruits of labor of American families was supposed to be shipped up to the capital and reconfigured and sent back according to the priorities of somebody here.

That is not what they had in mind. In fact, he is very quotable on this subject, almost refers to it as treasonous when the fruits of labor are taken from the person who earned it, removed from them and given to somebody else to pursue another set of priorities.

Mr. President, just 40 years ago—we do not have to go all the way back to Jefferson—just 40 years ago American families, in 1950, were sending 2 cents—2 pennies—out of every dollar they

earned to Washington, to defend the Nation, to build the ports, the roads, the basic functions of the Federal Government. Today, that same family sends virtually a quarter of their labor to Washington, and then almost that again to local and State governments. But the important point I am addressing here today is that a quarter of all the earnings of an American family are removed from the family.

We hear about, and heard it all through this debate, about how we have to have program after program for the benefit of the American family. And I can tell you, Mr. President, that if you line the American families up and ask them, "Would you rather have the resources yourself to decide how to best house and educate, provide for the health of your family, or would you rather send the check in to the Federal Government and let them decide how to manage your family," the crescendo in chorus of Americans would be, "We can do it better."

The leader just referred to the gentleman that had 10 children who under this tax relief proposal would have \$5,000 more to provide for those children. He is so right when he says, Mr. President, "I can do it better than you or the Federal Government."

In general, this tax relief will put \$2,000 to \$3,000 on the kitchen table of every average American family—\$2,000 to \$3,000. That is a combination of lower interest rates and an expanding economy that comes from the balanced budget and the tax credits and the tax relief.

Now, after we get through raking the Government through these families, they end up with about \$25,000 to \$27,000 that is left for them to run the average American family. That is disposable income, money that we have not taken away. That is not very much.

We have marginalized middle America. We have pushed them to the wall. So a proposal that gives \$2,000 to \$3,000 represents virtually a 10- to 15-percent pay raise and one they get to keep.

This money all becomes disposable income. That is a dramatic infusion of resources that will improve that family's ability to care for itself. In the end, Mr. President, it is the family we count on to raise America, not the Government. It is the family we count on to nurture and grow America and work and build a home and heat it and educate their children and care for the older members of the family. It is the family unit that we depend on to build America. That is where the resources need to go.

America will prosper from this because we will make those families stronger, more able to do the very jobs we want them to do for us. That is where America is built, in those average, hard-working families from my State to yours, Mr. President.

This proposal produces so much good for them. It means we will enter the new century with our families in better

condition. We will relieve the burden on them. We will have an expanding economy, and the world is watching us—the world is watching us. You suggested that in your remarks—the dangers of the world. We will be most able to be the superpower we are if we are financially healthy, and these balanced budgets do just that. These balanced budgets mean America will march into the new century, not stumble into the new century.

Mr. President, this Senator, and I know many, many others, like yourself, have waited long, long years for a Congress to seize our financial affairs and do the kinds of things that will make us a strong nation, because in the end, none of us know a family or a person or a business or a community that can do the job it is supposed to do if it becomes financially decrepit, which is the path we are on. You do not know people like that, nor will you ever, and this is true of nations as well, Mr. President. A nation must first be financially healthy, and then it can carry out its duty honorably and appropriately.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and in that no other Senator is present, 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. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

## EXPRESSING THANKS AND GOOD WISHES TO THE HONORABLE GEORGE M. WHITE

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 33, a concurrent resolution to express thanks and good wishes to the Honorable George M. White on the occasion of his retirement as Architect of the Capitol, submitted earlier today by Senators MOYNIHAN, WARNER, and PELL.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 33) expressing the thanks and good wishes of the American people to the Honorable George M. White on the occasion of his retirement as Architect of the Capitol.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I submit a concurrent resolution expressing the thanks and good wishes of the American people to the Honorable George M. White, FAIA, on the occasion of his retirement as the Architect of the Capitol on November 21, 1995,

after nearly a quarter-century of service to the Nation.

It is not widely known, and as is the case with active men, soon overshadowed by yet larger accomplishments, but within a few short months of his appointment as Architect of the Capitol in January 1971, George Malcolm White did something which had long eluded Nixon and was even beyond the grasp of the second Roosevelt. He reshaped the High Court. With a few strokes of the pen, he changed the shape of the Supreme Court bench from straight to slightly angled toward the ends and back at the middle. Chief Justice Warren Berger assembled the Associate Justices and explained, "When it comes to architecture, by law, the Supreme Court will obey this man." And the Court has been the better for it.

That George White should instantly command such respect as Architect came as no surprise to me; after all, I had recommended him to the office. Since Washington's time and until 1989, the Architect was simply picked by the President and presented to the Congress. No advice and consent involved. I was domestic counselor to President Nixon when on May 24, 1970, word came that the previous Architect, former Congressman and former contractor J. George Stewart, had died in office. President Nixon asked me to find him a successor. I suggested that this time we pick an architect. The result was George Malcolm White, the ninth architect of the Capitol. And 25 years later, the Capitol has never looked better.

I am aware that the Capitol as we know it is a felicitous accretion of separate elements. Some would reason from that, apparently, that each succeeding generation may add to the building at its pleasure. But the various pieces that now comprise this magnificent composition were all designed in the course of one-half century's work by a string of extraordinary minds, both Architects and Presidents. If the tone of architectural debate has been lowered since the day Jefferson and Latrobe locked horns over whether the column capitals in the House Chamber should be modeled after those in the Theater of Marcellus in Rome or the Choragic Monument to Lysicrates in Athens—Latrobe won; choragic it was—it is a failing purely on the part of the modern-day Executive. George White has upheld the tradition of the early Architects of the Capitol.

Like them, he is a polymath. He holds degrees in engineering, in business administration, and in law as well as in architecture. He is registered in and has practiced these as well. Unlike Thornton, he is not a medical doctor, but that can be excused. Beginning in 1988, I had the pleasure of chairing the Judiciary Office Building Commission, a body which was careful to stay out of George White's way as he used his master-planning skills to propose, his legal skills to enact, his business skills to finance, and his architectural and engi-

neering skills to design and construct what is generally considered the best new Government building in a generation, the Thurgood Marshall Federal Judiciary Building at One Columbus Circle.

While the Capitol grounds and several of the buildings in the Capitol complex bear his stamp, George White has made the Capitol itself the focus of his life's work. He added balance and proportion where he found it lacking and improved what was existing when it needed his care. Who else could recognize stone shock in the west front and repair it to a state better than before the British arrived? From the foundations of the east steps of the House, to the Minton tiles on the floor, to the murals and frescoes on the walls—indeed, to the crown of the Statue of Freedom atop the dome which he climbed and made new with great panache and little regard for his own safety—nothing has escaped his hand, and all is better than he found it.

The Capitol was built as an expression of our beliefs. It was not an efflorescence of elite aestheticism; it was and remains the bone and muscle of our democracy. More than we care to realize, what we build, destroy, or preserve tells future generations the sort of people we are. Next to the social edifice of our Constitution and our Bill of Rights, the Capitol may be the most important legacy we leave behind. For nearly a quarter-century as Architect of the Capitol, George White has given his very fiber to preserving and improving that legacy, and we are thankful for it.

Mr. President, this is a resolution to recognize and commend the Architect of the Capitol, the Honorable George M. White, FAIA, for his outstanding service to the Nation, and to tender to him the thanks and good wishes of the American people on the occasion of his retirement.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I am honored to join my good friend and colleague from New York, Mr. MOYNIHAN, in submitting this resolution recognizing the Honorable George M. White on the occasion of his retirement as Architect of the Capitol.

Since being appointed by President Nixon in 1971, Mr. White has served the Congress and the Nation with the utmost dedication and professionalism. During the nearly 25 years he served as Architect of the Capitol, Mr. White presided over the construction and preservation of numerous buildings on the Capitol Grounds. But most importantly, his commitment and expertise has assured that future generations will be able to visit the grounds and enjoy the rich history that is encompassed in the Capitol buildings.

Mr. President, I thank Mr. White for his distinguished service to our Nation and wish him the very best in his future endeavors.

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution and preamble be

agreed to, en bloc; that the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, en bloc; and that any statements appear in the RECORD in the appropriate place as if read.

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

So the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 33) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The concurrent resolution, with its preamble, is as follows:

S. CON. RES. 33

Whereas at its inception, the Capitol of the United States of America was blessed to rise under the hand of some of this Nation's greatest architects, including Dr. William Thornton, Benjamin Henry Latrobe, and Charles Bullfinch;

Whereas prior to the Honorable George Malcolm White, FAIA being appointed by President Nixon on January 27, 1971, it had been 106 years since a professional architect had been named to the post of Architect of the Capitol;

Whereas Mr. White has served the Congress through an unprecedented period of growth and modernization, using to advantage his professional accreditation in architecture, engineering, law, and business;

Whereas Mr. White has prepared the Capitol Complex for the next century by developing the "Master Plan for the Future Development of the Capitol Grounds and Related Areas";

Whereas Mr. White has added new buildings to the Capitol grounds as authorized by Congress, including the Thurgood Marshall Federal Judiciary Building, the Philip A. Hart Senate Office Building, and the Library of Congress James Madison Memorial Building, and through acquisition and renovation, the Thomas P. O'Neill and Gerald R. Ford House Office Buildings, the Webster Hall Senate Page Dormitory, and the Capitol Police Headquarters Building;

Whereas Mr. White has preserved for future generations the existing historic fabric of the Capitol Complex by faithfully restoring the Old Senate Chamber, the Old Supreme Court Chamber, National Statuary Hall, the Brumidi corridors, the Rotunda canopy and frieze, the West Central Front and Terraces of the Capitol, the House Monumental Stairs, the Library of Congress Thomas Jefferson and John Adams Buildings, and the Statue of Freedom atop the Capitol Dome;

Whereas Mr. White has greatly contributed to the preservation and enhancement of the design of the District of Columbia through his place on the District of Columbia Zoning Commission, the Commission of Fine Arts, the Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation, and other civic organizations and commissions; and

Whereas upon Mr. White's retirement on November 21, 1995, he leaves a legacy of tremendous accomplishment, having made the Capitol his life's work and brought to this century the erudition and polymath's capacity of our first Architects: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring),* That the thanks and good wishes of the American people are hereby tendered to the Honorable George M. White, FAIA, on the occasion of his retirement from the Office of the Architect of the Capitol after nearly a quarter-century of outstanding service to this nation.

Mr. COVERDELL. 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. BURNS. 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. BURNS. Mr. President, I might inquire, what is the order of the day or hour?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is in morning business, with Senators authorized to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I would like to speak in morning business, then.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized.

#### IMPROVING THE MANAGEMENT OF THE PUBLIC LANDS

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I rise today to address an issue that has been highly controversial in the State of Montana, and throughout the West, for that matter. As we speak, there has been a campaign of disinformation aimed at confusing and scaring residents of Montana into believing that we in Congress are about to sell or give away all of the public land managed by the Bureau of Land Management and sell those lands to big corporations and, of course, to the rich. Of course, nothing could be further from the truth.

I want to take this opportunity to clear the air on some misapprehensions about the issue and where we stand on it, or where I stand. First, let me say I do believe we have to make some changes in the management of public lands because of all the conflict and the controversy that surrounds them. The real issue here is letting local citizens have an effective voice in the management of those lands which have such a direct and important bearing on their lives and their livelihood.

I have cosponsored S. 1031. It was drafted by my good friend, Senator THOMAS, of Wyoming. That bill, if passed, will provide the opportunity to transfer public lands now managed by the Bureau of Land Management, a Federal agency, to those States which wish to have them. This has been proposed by State and local governments, among others, for some time.

The States believe that being closer to the land, they are more capable of managing those lands for the public than ones who were, say, from a State that has no large concentration of public lands or even us here in Washington, DC. And that is probably true. I believe it is time to take a serious look at the alternatives and to decide whether it is an option we want to use in some situations.

As I said, I think some changes should be made in this bill before final passage. But, nonetheless, I want to give the States and their citizens an opportunity to make a decision about local control themselves. Through the public hearing process and committee and floor debates and amendments, we

can decide if, and how, we use this concept to better serve the public's needs.

We face many problems in the management of public land resources today and all those natural resources found on those lands. We have a host of laws which have been developed over more than a century. In many cases they conflict. They are often interpreted differently by agencies responsible for implementing them, so they have different requirements for complying with the law. The result for the average citizens trying to use these lands is conflict, confusion and, of course, frustration. Just like the Federal regulatory process in general, the public land regulations are, in a sense, a mess. Of course, we have to start this process of reforming them.

We had testimony from the head ranger of the Forest Service. He tells us, just about the time they try to make a decision with regard to natural resources found on those lands—we have a lot of laws, and when they get down to the small end of the funnel to where the decision could be made, all at once they are in conflict and therefore no decision is made. Therefore, the inefficiency of running these lands comes to the forefront.

To illustrate what I mean, I have made up these charts. The first shows the BLM permitting process. Those would be those permits required by Federal agencies under law now. The red spots represent all of those other agencies which can deny a permittee the use of BLM land.

When we talk about permittee, that is, if you want to do anything on public land, before you can do anything—and I mean that is from grazing to recreation—it has to jump through the hoops.

I just want to point out, the red dots are Federal agencies that have control over the decisions made on permitting on BLM land. Also, the yellow diamonds are places of conflict which could derail the process and deny access or deny the permittee the use of those lands. Of course, the X's mean that is where it stops; everything stops, the permit is denied.

Whatever it costs, what you want to do is get from here to here and still have money enough to do what you want to do on public lands. Sometimes that gets to be a big race. You start off when the project is proposed. It goes through documents and plan conformance. If they say no, it does not do it, so you start through the process. You amend it, there is public comment, there is a protest. If there is protest by anybody with a 32-cent stamp—a letter from anybody in the country can protest that particular permittee—then it has to go through conflict resolution, through an appeal process again, back to the district manager, and that can be appealed.

So, if the appeal is upheld, the project is not OK'd. If the project is not appealed, if everything goes right and they say no, that appeal should not be

in here, then we start up here and we start through this process. And then, if they allow a resolution, then we have to go back down through here again. We have to jump on.

Remember, I would remind the Chair, remember when we were debating the health care situation of a year ago, a proposal by the administration on all the hoops you would have to jump through and all the new agencies it would create in order to take care of just health care in this country under the plan proposed by the administration? I guess they just love hoops.

Anyway, when you get over it all, walk it all the way through, when you get to here—and remember this all costs a little bit of money along the way—this is the area where you try to work out if you have jumped through all of, or some of, your conflicts. If you get all those done—if you do not get them done you can kill the project here. Here is another stop sign, another place for the project to die. If you get through this—and all this takes time and time is money—before it can be finalized, then something else enters into the project and that is other agencies.

Other agencies now come into play because you have just about done everything required by the agency that really has the responsibility of managing the land, it has pretty much said, OK, so far, so good. Now we have to go to other agencies. For water quality, you have to go through EPA. If EPA says yes, then the permit is approved. Then it goes from there, you have to have public comment on that. When the EPA says OK, still there is an area where the public has access, they can make comment. If they say no, then we are back doing another EIS or another dead end, a stop sign, and the project can die. But say they approve it and say we get along pretty good.

The EPA—and we get down here. So far so good. There is also another section, section 401. That is the Clean Water Act. The State has to sign off on it. The State of Montana does. So does the EPA. There are two different steps in there. It takes time. You have to have a bureaucrat in every one of those stages. Somebody has to push the paper. Somebody has to lick the stamp to get it to go on.

Then you get down here. The permit is approved. You have another comment area. If somebody with that 32-cent stamp is handy again, he can protest it, and it goes into conflict. So now you have to go through another process that kicks it back through the process of the EIS.

There might be some wetlands on it. If you think the Corps of Engineers only does business around the navigable rivers and around our coastlines of this country, you are wrong. The Corps of Engineers does business where you could not float a stick.

So you have to go to the Corps of Engineers. You have to file the application because you have wetlands on



this. Maybe the EIS showed a wetlands. The Corps of Engineers has to check off on it. This process is a little bit longer. They approve the permit. It goes to public comment. Then it can be appealed. If the appeal is successful, that kills the project. If it does not, it still has to go to the EPA through another appeal, and finally it has to go down to the Fish and Wildlife Service.

All of these are Federal agencies. I do not know how your history has been in dealing with Federal agencies. But you can see there are a lot of things to take into consideration in this line right here when you start talking about wetlands.

Say you are successful at that. You want to count the time. In this line right here it is probably quite a lot.

The next is air quality. You have to take that into consideration. It goes to the EPA, or to the State. It can go to either one. But I would guess, if I was a guessing person—which I am—it would probably go to both. They get notice. There is a comment period. And there is also an area down here where, if there is a conflict on the air quality—if you get down here and see there is no conflict, we move on. If there is conflict, then we go back through the process again. And also here is another area, one more area where the permit could be denied.

Then you have another law called the Endangered Species Act. Some folks have said the act is really not working, and it will be, I think, amended and reauthorized this year. So then you have to take your permit and go to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. They are in consultation. Here again is another area for public comment, and a place where a 32-cent stamp comes in that says you can file an appeal, and there is a conflict noted. Then you have to go through that decision process.

The only thing we are trying to do is get from here to here. But it looks like a regular steeplechase.

I am going to have this chart made up smaller and pass it out to my colleagues. I am wondering as we put laws into effect and try to develop some kind of rules and regulations for the protection of the people's property. Sometimes we actually destroy the people's property while we are doing it. Of course, this process is expensive. You hope by the time you start the process up here and by the time you get down here that you have money enough to implement the proposed action.

Mining—the editorial for mining the other day in the Washington Post said, Who is minding the mint? It takes 10 to 15 years to permit mining of a metal, or a trace metal, or whatever you want to mine on that property. Right now the property has doubtless value. Before you can give it value there has to be something to make it valuable. I am not sure the Government wants to spend money on its own land or speculate with that money to give that land value before the mine is sited—10 to 15

years. If you are thinking about running out West and starting a mine, you want to be ready because all of this is just for you. In mining it becomes a little more. There are a few more things that you have to talk about.

The difference? Here is what we are trying to do. We are trying to simplify and still gather the same information on the activities of BLM. Under the State permitting system, in the State of Montana we have a board of land managers which is made up of the Governor, the Lieutenant Governor, and it manages those school sections under the school trust. They manage for a benefactor which is the schools. That is the way we fund our schools. On every range there are a couple of sections that are set aside and managed, whether it is farmland, or woods, or timber, or whether it is mining for whatever. Any time you have to do business on State land, they do not have as many hoops to jump through. According to a white paper that was done by a woman out of the University of California at Berkeley, it showed that State lands are managed 25 percent more efficiently than Federal lands because of a benefactor, which are the schools.

Basically what we are doing is we have a request for an activity. It goes through MEPA, which is the environmental act in the State of Montana, and it also has public and Federal comment only. It goes into a field evaluation. There is a notice of competitive bidding. In other words, if something is going to happen on that land, notice is given to everybody if they want to participate. That goes out to all interested parties. There is a bid acceptance, and the lease is issued. They derive an improvement settlement. That can be appealed. Then arbitration, and maybe another appeal. It goes to the State director. Maybe there is another appeal. And then it goes to the district court. That all happens pretty fast. But, nonetheless, to get from here to here is the time saved, the expense saved, and it also provides as much opportunity for public comment as any other process and with very few conflicting laws as we can have.

I will have a chart of this also done for my colleagues so they understand what we are trying to do.

Basically, the bill that was crafted by Senator THOMAS says this. They are going to offer the BLM's to the State. If the States do not want them, then they will continue to be managed by the Bureau of Land Management. If they do, then there is a 10-year transition period.

I would say before it is over that we will not know what the final form of this bill will take because there are some people who would like something to happen, and some people would not. It is big Government. They all want to sit here in Washington, DC, and the decisions made here in Washington. I happen to think that people who live next to the land, basically those people who live in the State of Montana, can

make those decisions probably better about the resources and the resource management on those lands.

So the laws and regulations of public land ownership have been developed over the years. We have areas in Montana that are checkerboard. This gives them an opportunity for land exchanges, and to block it and make it more efficient. The land management agencies complain that most of their resources are dedicated to paperwork and paperwork exercises, and they are stymied with conflicting requirements. We are trying to take some of that out of that, and also to take out some of those areas where there are conflicts caused by nuisance more than they are by substance.

There is a lot of funding and manpower in the United States. I know from just dealing with the State of Montana. When I went to the State of Montana as a young man, I think the BLM probably did not have 50 people that managed all of the BLM land in the last 30 years. They probably did not have 50 people when I first went to Montana managing around 8 million acres. I will stand corrected on that. Now there are over 300 in one sector and 500 in another all paid by the taxpayers of America of which they are getting no return for those people working out there. No return unless it is from resource management, and, of course, some of that resource management is held up because of the first chart.

So, Mr. President, that sort of clears the air. There is also another bill that would set up a commission, a commission to take a look at our laws and how they apply to our public lands, how to manage them, and also the resources found on them and to make some recommendations back to Congress. I think both of those pieces of legislation should move.

#### A LEGISLATIVE BLUEPRINT

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I thank you for allowing me to run over my time. I wish to at this time thank the leadership of Congress. I know the last 2 or 3 days have been the most grueling days in trying to iron out some sort of a blueprint on which we can get this country and this Government back in some kind of fiscal order.

The President stepped up. I congratulate him. But I think you have to look around at the faces of those who have worked all through it. Some of us kind of took some time off and did some things we wanted to do on Friday and Saturday, not being involved in leadership, but that was not something that was afforded to leadership because they had to stay and stay. When you read this commitment to a 7-year balanced budget, even when it gets down to saying, yes, we have to assure Medicare solvency, that is the reason most of us come down for it. And Medicaid, or Medigraunt they are calling it now, or welfare, all of this is something we



campaigned on in 1994. It is still the parameters of which we will do business.

If we did not care for these programs, we would do nothing, we would not fight to make sure that this Government stays solvent; that we can pay our bills; that we can take care of the next generation in Medicare and Medicaid and help those people who we really sincerely believe need help. It is our responsibility to help them. That was the driving force behind this whole plan on the Republican side when I campaigned last year.

Had we not cared, we would have turned our back on this and said, "Do it any way you want to, Mr. President. We will keep on doing business the way we have been doing it for 40 years," or at least the last 6 years that I have been here. We could have said no, but we did not do that. We did what was responsible. We came to the forefront to fix it, to save it, to make it stronger and make sure we assure the integrity of the programs designed to serve the people on Medicaid and Medicare, the needy and not the greedy.

I think we have done that. Now the hard work begins. We will get onto the main playing field. There will be a lot of dust and a lot of talk, but basically what you looked at yesterday is exactly what we campaigned on in 1994 and which continues to be the noble goal of this Congress.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

#### LABOR, HHS APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, for several years I had the privilege of chairing the appropriations Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, Education and Related Agencies. This year, the chair is Senator SPECTER from Pennsylvania. We had our bill finished in pretty good time, but now it is being held up and there have been various unanimous-consents propounded about trying to bring it up. Last week, we hotlined it on this side, and I am informed that the Republicans hotlined it on their side to bring the bill up without the legislative riders and simply pass it on voice vote. No Democrat on this side objected to that. The objection came, as I understand it, from the other side.

I thought perhaps over the weekend and in the spirit of compromise and in the spirit of moving this legislation forward I might try to propound a unanimous-consent request again.

So, Mr. President, I ask unanimous-consent that the Senate proceed immediately to the consideration of H.R. 2127, the Labor-HHS appropriations bill; that the language on page 21, lines 3 to 10, relating to striker replacement, be stricken; that all other committee amendments be agreed to en bloc; that the bill be read a third time and passed and that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table, with the above occurring without intervening action or debate.

Mr. BURNS. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. BURNS. There is objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I guess I probably expected that there would be objection to my unanimous-consent request.

I wish to make the case again that this bill is ready to come to the floor but for a legislative rider that is on this appropriations bill which deals with striker replacement. It has no business being on an appropriations bill. There are other legislative bills that will be before this body before we adjourn on December 15, or whenever that occurs, that would be more appropriate for that to be attached.

I would also point out that we have voted twice on this issue in the Senate and cloture could not be obtained. Again, I would just for the record repeat for the record what Senator DOLE, our majority leader, said on this bill on September 29, 1995. He said, "I agree with the Senator from Pennsylvania," meaning Senator SPECTER, "and the Senator from Iowa," meaning me, "that we ought to pass the bill on a voice vote. We cannot get cloture. There were two votes, 54 to 46, party line votes." That was on the striker replacement. "So my view is we ought to do it, pass it and find out what happens after a veto in the next round."

I might also say for the record that I checked with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SPECTER] before I propounded this unanimous-consent request, and he also concurs that this is the way we ought to do it—bring the bill up without legislative riders, pass it on a voice vote, go to conference with the House, and work on the legislation from there.

So again I wanted to point out that it is really not this side holding up the Labor, HHS bill. We are willing to get it now in 60 seconds, voice vote it through but for the legislative rider that was attached in committee, which, as I have pointed out, is a legislative rider and is not a matter of appropriations whatsoever. If that side is willing to strike that, we can bring up that bill and pass it, as I said, within 60 seconds.

As I said, I hotlined this last week and no Democrats objected to it, and unless the majority leader has changed his mind I think he agrees with that process also, as he stated on September 29.

So, Mr. President, I wanted to make that point because I feel strongly it is important we move ahead with that bill. It not only appropriates the money for the Department of Labor and for job training programs but also the Department of Health and Human Services to administer the Medicare program, for the Health Care Finance Administration, HCFA. It also appropriates money for the National Institutes of Health and for all of the programs there, for biomedical research,

and also the Department of Education, some very important programs and agencies that need to be funded with the appropriations bill. And as I said, there is really no reason why we should not pass it except for the insistence by some that they have a legislative rider attached to it, which, again, I understand the process here.

A lot of times people try to attach legislative riders. Sometimes it is done without too much concern, people support it on both sides; they will support a legislative rider on an appropriations bill. But I think in a case like this, where you have a legislative rider which is so adamantly opposed by at least a majority on this side—and I think maybe even a few on the other side—this is no place for that legislative rider.

Lastly, Mr. President, let me say that I am glad that both sides over the weekend worked out an arrangement, an agreement on the continuing resolution, and also on the budget. As I have said before, the continuing resolution should not have taken that long since it is only a sense of the Senate anyway. It has no binding force and effect. But I am glad we did agree on the 7 years. I had voted for 7 years for balancing the budget. What I oppose, however, is the manner in which it was proposed that we do it.

I still object to the budget that was passed here. That is why I voted against it. And I trust the President will veto it sometime later this week, and then we will begin in earnest next week in trying to work out some compromise on the budget. That will be the important work of the Senate and of the House in the next 2 weeks or so, because that is the budget, that is the money. That is where we sign on the dotted line, so to speak, as to who is going to pay and who is going to benefit in the next 7 years when we do reach a balanced budget.

I must say that I agree with an article in the U.S. News & World Report written last week by David Gergen in which he pointed out that "the lowest 20 percent of the population [in income] would lose more income under these spending cuts than the rest of the population combined. At the other end, the highest 20 percent would gain more from the tax cuts than everyone else combined."

As Mr. Gergen pointed out, he said:

Ronald Reagan is often invoked as the patron saint of this revolution. How soon we forget that as President, Reagan insisted that seven key programs in the safety net—Head Start, Medicare, Social Security, veterans, Supplemental Security Income, school lunches and summer jobs for youth—would not be touched; now, six of those seven are under the knife. Reagan believed, as he said in his memorable address accepting his party's nomination in 1980, that "we have to move forward, but we're not going to leave anyone behind."

This budget that this Senate passed, which I voted against, which is going to the President, moves a few people ahead. As a matter of fact, it is like

Monopoly. It moves them to the Boardwalk. They did not have to pay any rent either. But for everyone else, especially for the lowest 20 percent, it is "Go to jail" and "Do not pass 'go,'" "Go directly to jail," because that is where they are going to be kept.

This budget pulls up that ladder of opportunity, that ladder of opportunity that I believe my party, the Democratic Party, has always believed in, in making sure that as you make it to the top, as others make it in this country—and there is nothing wrong with making it; there is nothing wrong with being rich and there is nothing wrong with being a success; that is the American dream—but we have always believed, and I have always believed as a Democrat, as an American, that one of the prime purposes of Government is to make sure, when you make it to the top and others make it to the top, that we leave that ladder down there for others to climb.

And I choose my words carefully. I say a "ladder." I did not say an "escalator." I did not say something that someone could get on and ride to the top. I said a ladder, or a ramp of opportunity. The ladder is the structure, but individuals have to exert their own energy to climb it. A ramp is a structure, but those with disabilities have to exert the energy to go up that ramp.

And, yet, what this budget does is it takes away the ramp and it takes away the ladder. When you cut Head Start, when you cut education as deeply as the budget does, when you cut summer youth training, job training, when you cut education support, student loans, yes, even when you cut Medicare as much as this does and push it all to the upper income, you take away that ladder of opportunity.

So, that is why I will fight as hard as I can over the next couple of weeks to make sure that as we reach a compromise—and I understand it has to be a compromise—that we—perhaps I will continue to invoke the words of Ronald Reagan that we should not leave anyone behind, and, no, those seven key programs ought to be left untouched, because those programs really do leave that ladder of opportunity down there. And that ought to be the sentiment that guides the Senate over the next couple weeks.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. DOLE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GREGG). The majority leader.

#### TRIBUTE TO SENATOR NANCY LANDON KASSEBAUM

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, during my years in the U.S. Senate, it has been my privilege to serve alongside two remarkable colleagues from Kansas.

The first was Jim Pearson, who was a Senator of great common sense and great integrity who was widely respected by Members on both sides of the aisle.

When Senator Pearson retired in 1978, Kansans replaced him with an-

other person of common sense and integrity—Senator NANCY LANDON KASSEBAUM. Kansans reelected Senator KASSEBAUM in 1984 and 1990 by overwhelming margins.

And there is no doubt that she would have received another landslide next November.

This morning in Topeka, however, Senator KASSEBAUM announced that she would retire from the Senate at the end of next year.

Yes, this announcement was not unexpected, but still it comes as a blow to Kansans, and to all of us here in the Senate who have grown to count on Senator KASSEBAUM's leadership, wisdom, and friendship.

I will have more to say about Senator KASSEBAUM in the coming weeks and months, but I did want to take just a minute today to pay tribute to our colleague and friend.

The Senate has debated many historic and important issues in the past 17 years, and Senator KASSEBAUM has played a key role in many of them.

As a member of the Labor and Human Resources Committee—a committee she now chairs—Senator KASSEBAUM has tirelessly worked for legislation to assist America's working men and woman.

Kansans have a tradition for helping neighbors in need, and Senator KASSEBAUM continued that tradition here in the Senate, as she devoted time and energy to improving programs that help the less fortunate.

Senator KASSEBAUM also emerged over the years as a strong force in shaping America's foreign policy. One example of her leadership in the arena was her instrumental role in shaping the policy that helped move South Africa to a new era of equality.

Senator KASSEBAUM's father, the great Alf Landon, once said, "there are some smart people in Washington. There are more of 'em in Kansas."

Senator KASSEBAUM has succeeded because she has always kept those words in mind, and she has always understood that Kansans and Americans did not need the Federal Government to run their lives and make decisions for them.

Mr. President, NANCY KASSEBAUM's record of intelligence, integrity, and independence has ensured that she will always be remembered as one of the true giants of Kansas political history.

And I know I speak for all Members of the Senate in saying that we are very proud to call her our colleague and our friend.

#### MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 4, 1995, the Secretary of the Senate, on November 19, 1995, during the adjournment of the Senate, received a message from the House of Representatives announcing that the House agrees to the amendment of the Senate to the joint resolu-

tion (H.J. Res. 123) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1996, and for other purposes.

#### MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE RECEIVED DURING RECESS

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 4, 1995, the Secretary of the Senate, on November 20, 1995, during the recess of the Senate, received a message from the House of Representatives announcing that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled joint resolution (H.J. Res. 123) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1996, and for other purposes.

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 4, 1995, the enrolled joint resolution was signed on November 20, 1995, during the recess of the Senate by the President pro tempore (Mr. THURMOND).

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

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

H.R. 529. A bill to authorize the exchange of National Forest System lands in the Targhee National Forest in Idaho for non-Federal lands within the forest in Wyoming (Rept. No. 104-175).

#### SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. DOLE:

S. Con. Res. 32. A concurrent resolution providing for a conditional recess or adjournment of the Senate on Monday, November 20, 1995, until Monday, November 27, 1995, and a conditional adjournment of the House on the legislative day of Monday, November 20, 1995, or Tuesday, November 21, 1995, until Tuesday, November 28, 1995; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. MOYNIHAN (for himself, Mr. WARNER, and Mr. PELL):

S. Con. Res. 33. A concurrent expressing the thanks and good wishes of the American people to the Honorable George M. White on the occasion of his retirement as the Architect of the Capitol; considered and agreed to.

#### ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 837

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the name of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. LIEBERMAN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 837, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the 250th anniversary of the birth of James Madison.

S. 851

At the request of Mr. JOHNSTON, the name of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. KEMPTHORNE] was added as a cosponsor of S. 851, a bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to reform

the wetlands regulatory program, and for other purposes.

S. 1316

At the request of Mr. CHAFEE, the names of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. LEAHY] and the Senator from Maine [Mr. COHEN] were added as cosponsors of S. 1316, a bill to reauthorize and amend title XIV of the Public Health Service Act (commonly known as the "Safe Drinking Water Act"), and for other purposes.

S. 1344

At the request of Mr. HEFLIN, the name of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. LOTT] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1344, a bill to repeal the requirement relating to specific statutory authorization for increases in judicial salaries, to provide for automatic annual increases for judicial salaries, and for other purposes.

S. 1360

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1360, a bill to ensure personal privacy with respect to medical records and health care-related information, and for other purposes.

#### SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 32—PROVIDING FOR A CONITIONAL RECESS OR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DOLE submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was considered and agreed to.

S. CON. RES. 32

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring).* That when the Senate recesses or adjourns at the close of business on Monday, November 20, 1995, pursuant to a motion made by the Majority Leader or his designee, in accordance with this resolution, it stand recessed or adjourned until a time to be determined by the Majority Leader on Monday, November 27, 1995, or until one hour after the House has voted on H.J. Res. 122, unless the House agrees to the Senate amendment.

SEC. 2. The two houses shall convene at 12:00 noon on the second day after Members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 3 of this resolution, whichever occurs first; and that when the House of Representatives adjourns on the legislative day of Monday, November 20, 1995, or the legislative day of Tuesday, November 21, 1995, it stand adjourned until 12:30 p.m. on Tuesday, November 28, 1995, or until 12:00 noon on the second day after Members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 3 of this resolution, whichever occurs first.

SEC. 3. The Majority Leader of the Senate and the Speaker of the House, acting jointly after consultation with the Minority Leader of the Senate and the Minority Leader of the House, shall notify the Members of the Senate and the House, respectively, to reassemble whenever, in their opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

#### SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 33—RELATIVE TO THE RETIREMENT OF THE ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

Mr. MOYNIHAN (for himself, Mr. WARNER, and Mr. PELL) submitted the

following concurrent resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. CON. RES. 33

Whereas at its inception, the Capitol of the United States of America was blessed to rise under the hand of some of this Nation's greatest architects, including Dr. William Thornton, Benjamin Henry Latrobe, and Charles Bullfinch;

Whereas prior to the Honorable George Malcolm White, FAIA, being appointed by President Nixon on January 27, 1971, it had been 106 years since a professional architect had been named to the post of Architect of the Capitol;

Whereas Mr. White has served the Congress through an unprecedented period of growth and modernization, using to advantage his professional accreditation in architecture, engineering, law, and business;

Whereas Mr. White has prepared the Capitol Complex for the next century by developing the "Master Plan for the Future Development of the Capitol Grounds and Related Areas";

Whereas Mr. White has added new buildings to the Capitol grounds as authorized by Congress, including the Thurgood Marshall Federal Judiciary Building, the Philip A. Hart Senate Office Building, and the Library of Congress James Madison Memorial Building, and through acquisition and renovation, the Thomas P. O'Neill and Gerald R. Ford House Office Buildings, the Webster Hall Senate Page Dormitory, and the Capitol Police Headquarters Building;

Whereas Mr. White has preserved for future generations the existing historic fabric of the Capitol Complex by faithfully restoring the Old Senate Chamber, the Old Supreme Court Chamber, National Statuary Hall, the Brumidi corridors, the Rotunda canopy and frieze, the West Central Front and Terraces of the Capitol, the House Monumental Stairs, the Library of Congress Thomas Jefferson and John Adams Buildings, and the Statue of Freedom atop the Capitol Dome;

Whereas Mr. White has greatly contributed to the preservation and enhancement of the design of the District of Columbia through his place on the District of Columbia Zoning Commission, the Commission of Fine Arts, the Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation, and other civic organizations and commissions; and

Whereas upon Mr. White's retirement on November 21, 1995, he leaves a legacy of tremendous accomplishment, having made the Capitol his life's work and brought to this century the erudition and polymath's capacity of our first Architects: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring).* That the thanks and good wishes of the American people are hereby tendered to the Honorable George M. White, FAIA, on the occasion of his retirement from the Office of the Architect of the Capitol after nearly a quarter-century of outstanding service to this nation.

#### NOTICES OF HEARINGS

##### SUBCOMMITTEE ON FOREST AND PUBLIC LAND MANAGEMENT

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate and the public, the Subcommittee on Forests and Public Land Management has scheduled an oversight hearing on the administration's implementation of section 2001 of the Funding Rescissions Act of 1995.

The hearing will be held on Wednesday, November 29, 1995, at 9:30 a.m., in room SD-366 of the Dirksen Senate Of-

fice Building in Washington, DC. The hearing will be conducted jointly with the forest salvage task group of the House Resources Committee.

The only witnesses will be the administration and the General Accounting Office. Those who wish to submit written statements should write to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC 20510. For further information, contact Mark Rey at (202) 224-6170.

##### COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the public that a hearing has been scheduled before the full Committee on Energy and Natural Resources to receive testimony regarding S. 1271, the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1995.

The hearing will be held on Thursday, December 14, 1995, it will begin at 9:30 a.m., and will take place in room SD-366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building in Washington, DC.

For further information, please call Karen Hunsicker or Betty Nevitt at (202) 224-0765.

#### ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

##### THE BALANCED BUDGET ACT OF 1995

• Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, last week I had submitted for the RECORD a statement regarding the Balanced Budget Act of 1995 that appears to not have been printed. Therefore, Mr. President, I would ask that my statement appear in the RECORD today.

Mr. President, I want to commend the hard work of all my colleagues in producing this legislation. Although there are parts that do concern me, in general I strongly support this bill and the goal of balancing the budget in 7 years.

As one of the Senate Commerce Committee members who drafted title IV of the Senate bill and served as a conferee for this section of this legislation, I want to clarify for the record what I believe is intended by this bill regarding spectrum auctions.

Under the bill, the Federal Communications Commission [FCC] is mandated to identify and make available for public auction 100 Mhz of spectrum. I believe that auctioning this and other spectrum is the fairest, most equitable manner in which to allocate spectrum. I would hope that the Commission would understand this fact and become spectrum auction proponents. The auctioning of spectrum in an orderly manner—done so that the public interest is served both by maximizing revenue to the Treasury and ensuring that services that use the spectrum continue in a manner that benefits the public—should be a goal of all FCC proceedings regarding the spectrum.

The bill before the Senate contains several criteria that the FCC should use in selecting which blocks of spectrum to auction. I want to emphasize

for the record that the inclusion of any particular criteria for the FCC to consider should not be viewed as limiting the Commission's authority to make a determination under its overall public interest standard of what existing spectrum uses may need to be continued, or from considering in making its decision the impact on any existing users of having to move to other frequencies or from requiring, as a condition of any move, that the costs of relocation be paid by new users.

Most importantly, I urge the Commission to examine all the spectrum referenced in this act and make determinations as to its allocation that are fair, equitable, and that do not unduly hurt or burden any one group or industry.

Mr. President, I hope this clarification helps guide the FCC as it moves toward auctions as mandated by this bill. I yield the floor.●

#### AN OUNCE OF PREVENTION AS COSTLY AS THE CURE

Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, Henry Aaron, a respected economist at the Brookings Institution, and Prof. William B. Schwartz who teaches medicine at the University of Southern California, had an op-ed piece in the Washington Post commenting about what is driving up health care costs.

It is a solid piece of information when too often we are looking for superficial answers that may temporarily help the budget situation.

I have said for many years that the Federal Government has to look to additional revenue sources if we are to provide the fundamental services that our people want and deserve.

Nothing that I have seen has changed my mind on that.

Our inattention to our revenue problems has caused an escalation of the deficit in this country; and it has caused expenditures of huge amounts of money for interest, in addition to discouraging industrial investment.

The Henry Aaron-William Schwartz article talks about realities in the medical field, realities we seem reluctant to face but I hope will.

I ask that their op-ed piece be printed in the RECORD.

The material follows:

[FROM THE WASHINGTON POST, NOV. 16, 1995]  
AN OUNCE OF PREVENTION AS COSTLY AS THE CURE

(By Henry J. Aaron and William B. Schwartz)

On the op-ed page of Oct. 25, Joseph Califano and Robert Samuelson independently comment on solutions to the excessive level and growth of health care spending. Califano invokes prevention as the long-term solution. Samuelson points to managed care, although he prudently warns of possible abuse by profit-hungry managers. Both miss the simple truth—that any sustained slowdown in the growth of health care spending will require health care rationing.

Contrary to popular belief, the principal causes of rising health care spending are not waste, fraud and abuse, an aging population

or increasingly unhealthful behavior. Waste, fraud and abuse can account at most for about one-tenth of the increase in spending over the past two decades. Aging has been an even smaller factor, although its importance will grow. And people have been eating more healthfully, exercising more and smoking less than in the past.

The primary force driving up health care spending is the proliferation of new health care technology. Scientific advance accounts for at least half and probably more of the 120 percent growth in real per capita health spending that has occurred since 1975. There is no indication that the pace of scientific advance is slowing or will slow. It may be accelerating. And population aging will not stop for decades.

It would be nice if investing in preventive care could significantly slow the growth of health spending. Alas, it cannot, for two related reasons. First, with few exceptions (vaccinations stand out), most preventive health measures must be applied to large populations to prevent a relatively small amount of illness.

Take screening for colon cancer, which kills about 50,000 people annually at a treatment cost of about \$1 billion. Deaths from colon cancer could be cut by 20,000 annually if all people age 50 and over were tested annually for blood in their feces and all those who tested positive underwent a colonoscopy. That sounds like a strong case for preventive colonoscopies. And indeed it is—on grounds of public health. But the added cost of the preventive tests would run \$4 billion to \$6 billion annually, depending on how aggressively patients with benign polyps were treated subsequently. This example illustrates a more general point: Some preventive health measures are good for health, but they seldom cut costs.

The same is true of substance abuse. Califano would like to reduce it. So would most of the rest of us. But measures to reduce substance abuse are costly and have few short-run effects on behavior. They may eventually induce less abuse or better diet, but these changes do not come quickly.

Meanwhile, the second reason prevention does not save money comes into play. It may be possible, at a price, to reduce particular forms of illness. But all of us who survive life's other hazards will one day sicken and die. Smokers spared coronaries and alcoholics spared cirrhosis will eventually get sick and consume health care. The ghoulish fact is that many people who are spared cheap death from a tobacco-induced coronary will eventually succumb to costly debility from Alzheimer's.

Treatment for degenerative diseases such as Alzheimer's, arthritis and miscellaneous organ failures will eat up much of the savings achieved through preventive measures and could end up costing more than any direct savings achieved through prevention campaigns. The offset will not be exact. Some money may be saved. Stopping smoking does cut health costs, but only modestly. In other cases, some net costs may be incurred. But the idea that prevention will materially divert the health cost juggernaut is fantasy.

Samuelson is right to remark on the importance of the managed care revolution. He is properly worried about the effects of an infusion of profit-oriented managed care plans on the quality of care. But he is too credulous about the achievements of managed care in slowing the growth of health care spending.

Yes, health care spending slowed in California during the 1980s as managed care plans spread. But education spending also slowed as California fell from 22nd in the nation in 1979-80 to 33rd in 1991-92. California

experienced a protracted recession during the 1980s. Recessions produce unemployment and reduce incomes. Both cause growth of spending of all kinds to slow.

Samuelson is right that some companies have stopped growth of health insurance premiums by shifting to managed care. But that slowdown could come from reductions in benefits, increased cost-sharing and cost-shifting to other payers through negotiated discounts, as well as from genuine increases in efficiency. Despite the vaunted achievements of managed care, inflation-adjusted health care spending grew 5 percent in the past year, the same as the average for the past four decades.

Maybe managed care will do better in the future than it has in the past. But if 70 percent of all those privately insured already have managed care, as Samuelson reports, one should hesitate before cracking open the champagne in celebration of victory over rising health costs.

Managed care may eventually succeed in saving money by squeezing out waste, but it will have to save enough to pay for the extra administrative costs it generates. Much waste has been squeezed out already. Hospital days have fallen by one-third since 1984. And waste can only be squeezed out once. After it is gone, the same forces that have been driving up health care costs—technology and aging—will reassert themselves.

A sustained slowdown in health care spending can be achieved in only one way: by denying some beneficial services to some people. People have been reluctant to repose such power in government bureaucrats, who have nothing personal to gain from the decisions they make. One wonders whether they will be more willing to cede such sensitive authority to well-paid managed care executives who make larger profits every time they decide some procedure is not worth what it costs them.●

#### THE BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, more than 3 years ago I began these daily reports to the Senate to make a matter of record the exact Federal debt as of close of business the previous day.

As of the close of business Friday, November 17, the Federal debt stood at exactly \$4,989,662,795,523.25. On a per capita basis, every man, woman, and child in America owes \$18,940.85 as his or her share of the Federal debt.

It is important to recall, Mr. President, that the Senate this year missed an opportunity to implement a balanced budget amendment to the U.S. Constitution. Regrettably, the Senate failed by one vote in that first attempt to bring the Federal debt under control.

There will be another opportunity in the months ahead to approve such a constitutional amendment.

#### ADDRESSING THE CONCERNS OF ATOMIC VETERANS

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, last month, President Clinton at a White House ceremony accepted the final report of the Advisory Committee on Human Radiation Experiments. Following Energy Secretary Hazel O'Leary's announcement early in 1994 about secret human radiation experiments carried out or sponsored by the

U.S. Government, President Clinton created the advisory committee to advise the Human Radiation Interagency Working Group on the ethical and scientific issues related to such experiments. The Human Radiation Interagency Working Group, is a Cabinet-level body that includes the Secretary of Veterans Affairs Jesse Brown.

I believe the advisory committee should be commended for devoting considerable attention to atomic veterans in its final report and including two recommendations concerning compensation for them. On several occasions, I strongly advocated that the advisory committee include atomic veterans in their inquiry. In February, for example, I issued a statement urging the panel to include atomic veterans in their final report and recommend specific options for the Government to provide recourse to atomic veterans seeking compensation. At that time, I stressed:

By any standard atomic veterans are perhaps America's most neglected group of veterans, and with the work of the advisory committee we now have an excellent opportunity to finally answer some of these veterans' questions and to address some of the injustices they have suffered.

In March, I had the honor of being the only Senator to publicly testify before the advisory committee—dedicating my testimony to the Forgotten 216th. I did so not only because many of these atomic veterans are Minnesotans but also because they have done so much to educate me about the plight of atomic veterans and their brave and continuing fight for justice.

Mr. President, since January 1994, I have had numerous meetings and contacts with the men of the Forgotten 216th and their families. Since their problems typify those of other atomic veterans nationwide, permit me to tell you about veterans of the U.S. Army's 216th Chemical Service Company and about why they now term themselves the Forgotten 216th.

The Forgotten 216th participated in a series of atmospheric nuclear tests in Nevada in 1952 called Operation Tumbler Snapper. They believed their Government's assurances that it would protect them against any harm, but now are convinced they were used as guinea pigs with no concern shown for their safety. Many were sent to measure fallout at or near ground zero immediately after a nuclear bomb blast, encountering radiation so high that their geiger counters literally went off the scale while they inhaled and ingested radioactive particles. They were given little or no protection, sometimes even lacking film badges to measure their exposure to radiation and were not informed of the dangers they faced. Moreover, they were sworn to secrecy about their participation in nuclear tests, sometimes denied access to their own service health records, and provided with no followup health care or even medical monitoring. Many members of the 216th have already

died, often of cancer. Is it any wonder these men now refer to themselves as the Forgotten 216th?

Given this horrendous situation, I was delighted to see that the advisory committee report included a recommendation that held out hope that the Forgotten 216th and other atomic veterans may never again be forgotten by the Government that placed them in harm's way. The report urged the Human Radiation Interagency Working Group to work in conjunction with Congress to promptly address the concerns expressed by atomic veterans. Among these concerns cited by the committee are several that I have long believed needed to be addressed, including:

The list of presumptive diseases for which atomic vets automatically receive VA compensation is incomplete and inadequate.

The standard of proof for those atomic vets without a presumptive disease cannot be met and, given the incompleteness of the exposure records retained by the Government, inappropriate.

Time and money spent on contractors and consultants in administering the program, particularly the dose reconstructions required for most atomic vets filing claims with the VA, would be better spent on directly aiding vets and their survivors.

With regard to the last two concerns, it is important to note that the advisory committee found that "the Government did not create or maintain adequate records regarding the exposure of all participants [and] the identity and test locale of all participants. \* \* \*" This finding justifiably calls into question the ability of the Government to come up with accurate dose reconstructions on which the approval of claims for VA compensation of many atomic veterans depend.

In the aftermath of the President's acceptance of the report, Jesse Brown announced the establishment of an interagency working group consisting of representatives from the VA, HHS, and DOD in response to the advisory committee's recommendations concerning compensation for atomic veterans. The interagency working group is expected to submit its report to the Human Radiation Interagency Working Group in the spring of 1996.

Both advisory committee recommendations on atomic veterans urge the Human Radiation Interagency Working Group to work in tandem with the Congress to implement them and, therefore, I have requested that my distinguished colleague Chairman SIMPSON hold hearings soon after the interagency working group established by Secretary Brown issues its report in the spring. The purpose of the hearings would be to permit the Committee on Veterans' Affairs to determine what legislative action may need to be taken.

It is worth noting that the cover of every copy of the Atomic Veterans

Newsletter, the official publication of the National Association of Atomic Veterans, contains the simple but eloquent statement: "The atomic veteran seeks no special favor \* \* \* simply justice." Their fight for justice has been long, hard, and frustrating, but these patriotic and deserving veterans have persevered.

Mr. President, I urge my colleagues from both sides of the aisle to join me in seeking to ensure that atomic veterans finally win their struggle for justice.

#### ORDERS FOR MONDAY, NOVEMBER 27, 1995

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today it stand in adjournment until the hour of 1 p.m., on Monday, November 27, that following the prayer, the Journal of proceedings be deemed approved to date, no resolutions come over under the rule, the call of the calendar be dispensed with, the morning hour be deemed to have expired, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and then there be a period for morning business until 3 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

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

Mr. DOLE. I also ask unanimous consent that the Senate begin consideration of the HUD-VA conference report at 3 p.m., on Monday, November 27.

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

#### PROGRAM

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, for the information of all Senators, the Senate will begin consideration of the conference report accompanying the HUD-VA appropriations bill at 3 p.m. The Senate may also be asked to take further action with respect to the foreign operations appropriations bill. However, any votes ordered will be postponed to occur at 2:15 p.m., Tuesday, November 28, 1995.

#### RECESS SUBJECT TO THE CALL OF THE CHAIR

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, it is my understanding the House will not act on the adjournment resolution until about 5 o'clock. I do not know of any other Senators seeking recognition, so I now move we stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The motion was agreed to; and at 12:09 p.m., the Senate recessed until 3 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. DEWINE).

#### AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO REPORT

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, notwithstanding

the adjournment of the Senate, that on Tuesday, November 21, committees have from 10 a.m. to 3 p.m. to file any legislative or executive reported business.

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

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 1 P.M.,  
MONDAY, NOVEMBER 27, 1995

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now stand in adjourn-

ment under the provisions of Senate Concurrent Resolution 32.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 3 p.m., adjourned until Monday, November 27, 1995, at 1 p.m.