



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

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

Vol. 142

WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 23, 1996

No. 22

## Senate

The Senate met at 11 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:

Dear God, bless America, beginning with these Senators on whom You have placed so much responsibility and from whom You expect so much. You have brought them to the Senate at this time, not only for what You want to do through them in leading this Nation, but also for what You intend to exemplify to the Nation in the way they work and live together.

You have revealed in Scripture, through the generations, and in our own experience, that You pour out Your power when there is unity, mutual esteem, and affirmation of the oneness of our patriotism. Bless us with Your spirit so that we may disagree without being disagreeable, share our convictions without being contentious, and lift up truth without putting each other down. Help us to seek to convince without coercion, persuade without power moves, motivate without manipulation. May we trust You unreservedly and encourage each other unselfishly. In the name of our Lord. Amen.

### RECOGNITION OF THE ACTING MAJORITY LEADER

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

Mr. LOTT. I thank the Chair.

### SCHEDULE

Mr. LOTT. Today there will be a period of morning business until the hour of 1 p.m., with the time equally divided on both sides of the aisle. Following the use or yielding back of the time in

morning business, the Senate will turn to the consideration of the conference report to accompany the District of Columbia appropriations bill. It is expected that a cloture motion will be filed on that conference report today. No rollcall votes will occur during today's session, however. The Senate may consider any legislative items that can be cleared for action.

As a reminder to all Senators, the next rollcall vote will be at 2:15 p.m. on Tuesday, February 27. That vote will be on the motion to invoke cloture on the D.C. appropriations conference report.

I understand, Mr. President, that there are some Senators who intend to arrive shortly to speak in morning business, but until they arrive, I note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURNS). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

### PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Maurice Huthinson, a legislative fellow on my staff, be permitted the privilege of the floor during my remarks on the floor this morning.

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

If the Senator from Georgia would suspend so that the Chair might perform some household duties that have not been performed.

Mr. NUNN. The Senator from Georgia will accommodate any request from the Chair.

### RESERVATION OF LEADERSHIP 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 the period for the transaction of morning business until 1 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein, the time being equally divided between the two sides.

The Senator from Georgia is recognized.

Mr. NUNN. I thank the Chair.

### THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND CHINA

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, I rise today to talk about the relationship between the United States and China.

Last summer the Aspen Strategy Group—cochaired by Ken Dam and myself—under Director Michael Armacost and Associate Director Bruce Berkowitz met in Aspen, CO, for 4 days. We had an intensive and productive discussion with a number of China experts participating, including Michel Oksenberg, Chas. Freeman, and Stapleton Roy. The views of all three of these American China experts and my subsequent discussions with Michel Oksenberg, Charles Freeman, and others have been very helpful in my own analysis of United States-China relations.

I also made a recent trip to Asia that included a stimulating and informative forum in Malaysia sponsored by the Asia Policy Group under the leadership of Doug Paal and hosted by the Deputy Prime Minister of Malaysia, Anwar Ibrahim, during this conference—attended by Senator KIT BOND, Senator BILL COHEN, and myself from the Congress—we had broad and stimulating

• 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 1285

discussions with government and business leaders from the ASEAN countries and the entire Pacific region. Some of those discussions included China, but the agenda was much broader than just China.

I have greatly benefited from these meetings and discussions with Deputy Prime Minister Anwar Ibrahim and the other leaders from throughout the region and with Doug Paal, who led our group. During my trip to Asia, I joined Senator DIANNE FEINSTEIN and Senator JOHN GLENN in China for a series of meetings with top Chinese leadership.

Mr. President, the growing importance of China in world affairs demands a purposeful, coherent, and consistent American policy toward China. History is littered with the uninformed and ineffective responses of an established power toward a rising power, often the rising power suffered from its own ambitions seeking to accelerate its rise through military means. In modern history, we need only recall the pre-World War II rise of Germany and Japan and the former Soviet Union and the opportunities and mistakes our country and the free world made in coping with their rise.

History should teach us that established powers must provide consistent and credible signals about their expectations and set forth reasonable terms on which they are willing to incorporate the rising power into the international system.

We are now watching the rise of China—a development of at least equal historical significance and implication as the rise of Russia, Germany, and Japan. This is occurring with the important background of the rapid industrialization of Asia. Within 25 to 50 years, Mr. President, the lives of 3.5 billion people who live in the arc from Korea to India to Pakistan are being transformed. This development is as significant for humanity and for the citizens of our country as the Renaissance or the Industrial Revolution which transformed our people into the most productive, wealthy, and free people on Earth. At the center of Asia's rise is China, a nuclear power with the largest military forces in terms of manpower, in the world, and a permanent member of the U.N. Security Council. China is a nation with 1.2 billion people, an economy growing at nearly 10 percent a year for over the last decade, and as we too often forget—a distinctive civilization of great antiquity.

China is in the midst of four major transitions:

First, from a planned economy to a state-guided market economy.

Second, from rule by the Long March revolutionaries who established the Communist regime to a rule by bureaucrats, technocrats, and military professionals.

Third, from a rural agricultural society to an urban, industrial society.

Fourth, from a largely self-sufficient, largely isolated economy to one that is

moving into the international economy and is increasingly dependent upon it.

Each of these alone is an enormous transformation. These transitions are occurring at varying speeds and with a scope unprecedented in history.

The process and outcome of China's transformations are unknown. Much about the Chinese future is unknown. What will the nature of the political system be a decade or a generation hence? Will the succession to Deng Xiaoping continue to be an orderly one? Will there be widespread social disorder? What about China's military? What will be its force structure a decade hence? How is its military doctrine likely to evolve as it acquires new weaponry? What are and will be China's foreign policy proclivities? Will the Communist Party remain in power? What are the chances for democratization in China? Can the Central Government remain in control or will China fragment or break apart, as we saw with the former Soviet Union? What would happen to its nuclear arsenal under such a situation? There is no consensus on the answers to these questions among the experts, either in or outside the Government.

The uncertainty about the Chinese future has several important implications. In light of China's growing importance, it is imperative that our country make a maximum effort to understand it. This entails ensuring that our Government has sufficient means to collect and analyze information about China, including extensive contact with Chinese leaders and bureaucrats at the national and provincial levels, and certainly people-to-people programs with the Chinese people themselves. President, our Nation must prepare itself intellectually for China's more extensive involvement in world affairs. This is absolutely essential.

It is difficult to conceive of the international community effectively addressing a number of pressing issues such as the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and their means of delivery, international terrorism, and narcotrafficking, environmental challenges, and the regulation of trade, without China's participation.

Because of the profound Chinese transition, American engagement is essential. We are not likely to significantly affect events over the short run, but—by engaging in dialog about our mutual interests and our grievances, by speaking in clear terms in this dialog; by participating in China's development; by greater military transparency between our countries; by helping to educate China's next generation of intellectuals, which we are doing by assisting it in alleviating some of its economic and institutional problems—its evolution is more likely to be in directions favorable to peace and stability in the Pacific as well as to American interests.

China's transition is likely to be protracted. The experts do agree on one

point: Uncertainty is a permanent quality of modern China. Even were China to embark a process that we would call democratization, the development would be a lengthy one. History shows it takes a long time to create a legal system, guarantees for private property, a parliamentary system, a vigorous and free press, and the political culture that can sustain a pluralistic and tolerant civil society. As the American and British experience demonstrates and as we can now see in the former Soviet Union, that process takes decades. Not only must our expectations be realistic, but we cannot wait to engage extensively with China until it has become more like us or until it has settled down and its future is more certain.

Realistically, we must engage with China and its current leaders now rather than remaining aloof from this vast, complex, ancient, and proud civilization until it becomes to our liking. In short, China's transition and its potential impels America, insofar as possible, to be actors on the scene.

Mr. President, as I mentioned earlier, I visited China last month with Senators DIANNE FEINSTEIN and JOHN GLENN. We had an opportunity to meet with President Jiang Zemin, Executive Vice Premier Zhu Rongji, Minister of National Defense General Chi Haotian, Vice Foreign Minister Li Zhaoxing, and others within China's leadership. We had cordial, informative and frank discussions on a number of issues relating to the relationship between our two countries and stability in the entire region. Our discussions were greatly facilitated by Senator FEINSTEIN's longstanding friendship with President Jiang Zemin, a friendship that grew out of their being mayors of sister cities—San Francisco and Shanghai at the same time. They had many visits during that period.

In recent weeks, China has stepped up its military exercises in areas close to Taiwan. It has mobilized a large number of forces on the mainland across from Taiwan. There have been credible reports that China has provided nuclear technology to Pakistan in contravention of the Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty and its solemn treaty obligations to over 150 state parties to the treaty. If those reports are verified, sanctions would be triggered automatically under U.S. law, unless they are waived by the President.

In recent months, China's behavior has raised concerns in Asia and in the United States. The concerns which have been expressed not only in this country, but also in Asia include:

China's military expenditures continue to rise along with its economy. It continues to test nuclear weapons despite the protests of its neighbors. It has made territorial claims far into the South China Sea. It has adopted an unyielding posture toward Hong Kong and has repeatedly threatened Taiwan. Its record on missile sales to Pakistan is troubling and in probable violation

of its assurances to both the Bush and Clinton administrations that it would respect the missile technology control regime [MTCR] even though it is not a member. Its human rights record, including the sentencing of Wei Jingsheng, raises basic human rights concerns, affronting American sense of fairplay as well. And its inability to crack down on violations of trade agreements, including intellectual property violations, raise serious trade concerns. It is certainly possible that these developments which are troubling, are also harbingers of difficult relations between our Nation and China in the months to come.

But there are also developments on the other side of the ledger that are too often ignored. China has not obstructed U.N. and NATO peacekeeping operations and sanctions even though it openly doubted their appropriateness or efficiency. It has made important contributions to maintaining stability in Korea and in settling the Cambodian civil war. It continues to expand economic and cultural relations with Taiwan and, until 1995, it was regularly expanding people to people ties to Taiwan and reducing military tensions in the strait. It is in the process of opening itself to foreign direct investment and to wide-spread consumption of U.S. consumer goods in ways that go well beyond the opportunities many other Asian countries allow. It has announced the reduction of tariffs by 34 percent and plans further reductions to the average of developing countries in the region.

It has modified its social and cultural control over its people, so that its authoritarian government, while still harsh, has moved far from the reign of terror of the cultural revolution days. While far from acceptable by our present standards, by every conceivable measure, China's treatment of its own people in 1996 is far better than at the time of President Nixon's opening in 1972 and President Carter's normalization in 1979. In the last 10 years, an enormous number of Chinese people have moved from poverty to a decent standard of living. I will have more to say on the subject of human rights in China in the weeks ahead.

Mr. President, China has pledged to cease nuclear testing, but not before the negotiation and entry into effect of a comprehensive test ban treaty. It has played a quiet but positive role in assisting our quest—a very important quest—for a nuclear-free Korean Peninsula. In the Middle East, the Chinese have now developed ties with the moderate states, including Israel.

This combination of welcome and troublesome developments requires a United States policy that is carefully managed. Unfortunately, the U.S. Government, the executive branch, as well as Congress, currently have not developed such a policy toward the most populous and the most rapidly developing country on Earth. To allow this vacuum to continue would be both irresponsible and dangerous.

As we begin to think about a China policy, perhaps we should begin, not just with our litany of concerns about China, but also with some understanding of their concerns about us. China has its own list of grievances about the United States. Although I believe that most of these complaints are due to misperceptions and misunderstandings, we must be aware that if China's leaders conclude rightly or wrongly that the United States looks upon them as adversaries, they will respond in kind. We have a right to demand that the Chinese keep their agreements—we must also keep ours.

America is seen by many in China as attempting to isolate, divide, encircle, and contain China. They cite, among others, the following list of grievances:

First, delay on China's application for membership in the World Trade Organization which they believe is a violation of our 1992 bilateral agreement on market access.

Second, refusing to grant China permanent, unconditional, most favored nation treatment.

Third, constant U.S. criticism on human rights.

Fourth, preventing China from hosting the 2000 Summer Olympics.

Fifth, 1992 sale of F-16's to Taiwan.

Sixth, visits to Taipei of U.S. Trade Representative Carla Hills in the Bush administration and Transportation Secretary Peña in the Clinton administration.

Seventh, visit of Taiwan's head of state to the United States, after being assured by top U.S. officials that the visit would not occur.

Beyond these frequently cited grievances, the leaders of China have several broader concerns about the United States. They are concerned that the United States wishes permanently to separate Taiwan from the mainland and perhaps to foster an independent Taiwan. They question whether the United States wishes them to be a full participant in the establishment of the post-cold-war order. They cite Washington's reluctance to see them as a member of the World Trade Organization or to invite them to join other groupings that formulate policy for the international community.

Perhaps most important, though these words are seldom spoken directly, with communism dead as an ideology and with no real democratic process conveying power and legitimacy, the Chinese leadership is vulnerable to nationalistic sentiment at home if they yield to what is seen as American pressure and demands. As a result, China is reluctant to undertake the responsibilities that the United States expects her to fulfill as an emerging great power.

We should not, however, underestimate American strength in Chinese eyes—economically, militarily, and ideologically. They understand and respect our military strength. They understand the importance of China's access to the American market. They ad-

mire our technology, and assuming a positive relationship, I believe the Chinese prefer buying from Americans over both Japanese and Europeans. I think we need to take that sentiment into account in our own trade posture and our own export posture.

Thoughtful Chinese know the United States is not seeking to contain China—I want to underscore that—but there are many in China who do not see it that way. We have welcomed over 40,000 Chinese students now enrolled in our universities. We are one of China's principal export markets. American businesses have invested \$9.45 billion in China since 1978. We have welcomed Chinese participation in the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, and regional multilateral organizations. With our Government's encouragement hundreds of American foundations, philanthropic organizations, and education and research institutes now have wide-ranging exchanges with counterpart Chinese institutions. This is the record of a partner, not an adversary, in world affairs.

China would like to build a stronger military-to-military relationship, and though it does not say so openly, it understands the stability that the United States military force presence brings to Northeast Asia. I believe that with some notable exceptions, including Taiwan, the Chinese military is more open to warmer United States-China ties than some other elements of the Chinese leadership and these inclinations have been strengthened by the visit and the leadership of Secretary of Defense Bill Perry. Thus, America has many strengths in dealing with China, yet there are serious limits on our ability fully to utilize these strengths. We need to also understand that.

First, China is embedded in Asia, politically and economically, and the United States cannot pursue a successful policy toward China in isolation from the rest of the region. Our allies in Asia would not be prepared or willing to follow America's lead if we decided to isolate China nor are they willing to employ economic sanctions. Our friends in Europe and Japan will be most delighted to fill any Chinese need which develops if the United States employs economic sanctions.

America is still viewed in China and in Asia as a land of wealth and opportunity. But, in China and elsewhere in Asia, among even United States friends, many believe and privately say, that we are a declining power economically and culturally. The attraction of American society has eroded not only in China, but elsewhere in Asia, primarily, in my view, as a result of our own social ills, which are publicized all over the world. In Asia, as elsewhere, perceptions matter.

The Chinese see much that is attractive in the Asian model of development pursued by Japan, Korea, Taiwan, and Singapore.

The United States had a relationship with China that expanded and prospered from 1972 to 1989. We worked together in areas of common interest, exchanged views, tried to harmonize our views whenever we could, sought common policies, and sought to narrow and contain differences. Since 1989, we have been deferring discussion of common interests and emphasizing differences. To continue down this path is a prescription for posturing, animosity, brinkmanship, and danger.

Mr. President, our Nation must develop a purposeful, coherent and consistent American policy toward China and a strategy to implement our policy. We must also explain in clear terms to both our own citizens and to the Chinese the underlying rationale for our policy and our actions.

In the absence of a clear policy, it is inevitable that we in the Congress will chase off in separate directions with different priorities, while the executive branch lurches from one transitory issue to the next, addressing each problem in an ad hoc fashion. In the absence of an overall policy framework, policy becomes fragmented, the captive of single issue constituencies.

Those in the executive branch bear the primary responsibility for enunciating our policy, but as we see from Taiwan's President Li's visit to the United States, the actions of Congress often influence U.S. policy, for better or worse. United States policy towards China must be developed in close consultation with the congressional leadership of both parties.

In the immediate future, we should begin a dialog between China and the United States at all levels, including the highest levels—to discuss and where appropriate to act in unison in addressing these areas. Both the United States and China must get away from the current practice of diatribe and criticism. This dialog should not be portrayed as resolving our differences but rather beginning to find common ground and to reserving our different views for those issues that cannot be immediately resolved. Similarly, established channels for dialogue between Washington and Taipei must be utilized and strengthened so that there is a clear understanding of our respective views.

And may I remind my colleagues that 7 years have passed since an American President or Vice President has journeyed to Beijing or the President or Premier of China has been in Washington. During that time, the leaders of China have been to every major capital in the world, and the leaders of other major countries have visited Beijing on many occasions. Misunderstandings and misperceptions are bound to flourish in the absence of dialog. Meetings do not guarantee agreement. But they reduce the chance of conflict through miscalculation.

It would be irresponsible and dangerous for the United States and China to continue on our present course. It is

time to end the period of estrangement between the United States and China. President Clinton's meeting in New York with President Jiang Zemin was a beginning down that road, and I hope we can greatly intensify those visits to the top level and, indeed, the working level.

This dialog can inspire mutual confidence and understanding, but only if we display an unambiguous willingness to be firm when China's leaders do not meet their responsibilities and commitments, as well as a meticulous management of our China policy to ensure that we adhere to our commitments.

Mr. President, I do not pretend today to offer a comprehensive China policy, but I do offer a few observations and suggestions.

First, the Clinton administration should develop a broader policy framework regarding United States-China relations and stability in Northeast Asia and a strategy to advance that policy.

Regarding this framework, I believe some of its components—and I am not pretending to name them all this morning—are clearly visible: a continued and robust American military presence in Asia is fundamental to the stability of Northeast Asia and peace in the region; and we should approach China in close coordination with Japan, Korea, and our Asian partners. We cannot pursue a successful China policy unless that policy is supported in the region. We must make clear that the cooperation we seek from our traditional allies and friends is not for the purpose of confronting or containing China, but for involving China more extensively and constructively in regional affairs. We should strengthen the linkages between China, the United States, and the rest of Asia so that China becomes firmly integrated with the United States in the emerging Pacific community. We must reverse a widespread perception that America's role in the region is in decline.

Second, we should make it clear that we are prepared to facilitate China's participation in the international economy and international security arrangements in the expectation that China will abide by the norms of those international regimes. The incorporation of China in the world community will entail some mutual adjustments, but China cannot expect to derive the benefits without bearing the burdens of its newly acquired status. China's admission to the various international institutions will be facilitated and accelerated if they are able to demonstrate a solid record of compliance with their international commitments, including trade agreements, the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty and the guidelines of the Missile Technology Control Regime, which they were not part of formulating, but they have agreed to the basic principles of it. In the nonproliferation arena, China should be involved in formulating the policies we expect them to abide by.

Our strategy should be to welcome and incorporate China in the world community at a relatively early stage in its rise, with the explicit Chinese commitment to abide by international standards and to develop the domestic institutional capacity to do so.

This approach should serve not only America and international interests, but China's interests. Our strategy should be intended to elicit Chinese cooperation rather than to compel Chinese behavior.

Third, a framework with China must be based upon mutual dignity and mutual respect. We must seek to identify our important mutual interests and make progress in these areas while striving to ensure that our points of disagreement do not dominate every agenda. If we proceed in this fashion, the areas of disagreement are likely to be put into a broader perspective where progress can be made toward resolution over time. In spite of our recent disagreements, there are clearly crucial areas of strong mutual interests between the United States and China, including avoiding an arms race in Northeast Asia; avoiding confrontation on the Korean Peninsula and preventing a nuclear weapons buildup by either North or South Korea.

Also, avoiding the introduction of nuclear weapons in the Persian Gulf area; avoiding the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and their means of delivery; easing tensions in South Asia between India and Pakistan; maintaining stability in Northeast Asia and the general area of the Pacific; maintaining stability in Southeast Asia, including the emergence of a peaceful Vietnam and ending and healing the conflict in Cambodia.

Also, enhancing the efforts of the U.N. Security Council to maintain international peace and security; keeping sea lanes open for commerce; addressing transnational problems, such as illegal narcotics and terrorism; protecting the environment, including the seas; enhancing the rule of law in China; and, finally, maintaining the prosperity of Hong Kong and Taiwan. This is clearly in the interests of China, as well as the United States.

Our two nations will not always agree on how to address these interests, but we have enough mutuality to find significant areas of common approach and cooperation. Without this framework for the discussion of mutual interests, little progress is likely to be made on the issues where we differ. With this framework, I believe that progress can be made even in difficult areas of disagreement.

Finally, Congress should pass no laws or concurrent resolutions on China or Taiwan at least until after the elections in Taiwan which take place on March 23—in just a few weeks. I believe that Members of Congress should speak their views on these issues frankly and candidly, but in the present tense atmosphere congressional legislation or resolutions are likely to create more

heat than light. I also hope that our China policy will not become a partisan political issue during the United States Presidential election campaign. Each time that has happened in past Presidential campaigns, our China policy has been the victim rather than the beneficiary of that kind of partisanship.

Mr. President, we have a number of important differences and misunderstandings with China which must be discussed firmly and frankly within our overall strategic framework. These issues include arms proliferation, trade disputes, and human rights concerns, which I will discuss in the coming weeks.

The most dangerous of these differences is the issue of Taiwan.

The Chinese leaders by their words and by their actions make it abundantly clear that any attempt by Taiwan to establish its independence from the mainland will result in a confrontation with the mainland. It is clear that the Chinese do not desire a military clash, but it is also clear that they believe that their national sovereignty and national pride are at stake on the question of Taiwan's future. Neither America nor Taiwan should take lightly this Chinese position. Beijing has drawn a firm line on this question.

It is essential that America also should make our policy and our intentions clear. The framework for American policy on Taiwan already exists in the three joint communiques under President Nixon in 1972, President Carter in 1979, and President Reagan in 1982 and the Taiwan Relations Act of 1979. The joint communiques establish that the Government of the People's Republic of China is the sole legal government of China, that there is but one China, that the United States acknowledges China's claim that Taiwan is part of China, and that the resolution of the Taiwan issue is a matter to be worked out peacefully by the two sides themselves. This is America's solemn agreement with China entered into by Presidents Nixon, Carter, and Reagan and followed as United States policy by Presidents Ford, Bush, and Clinton.

President Reagan stated our policy very clearly in his letters of April 5, 1982, to Vice Chairman Deng Xiaoping and Premier Zhao Ziyang. In his letter to Vice Chairman Deng Xiaoping, President Reagan stated "There is only one China. We will not permit the unofficial relations between the American people and the people of Taiwan to weaken our commitment to this principle." In his letter to Premier Zhao Ziyang, President Reagan stated, "The differences between us are rooted in the long-standing friendship between the American people and the Chinese people who live on Taiwan. We will welcome and support any peaceful resolution to the Taiwan question."

The Chinese should understand that the Taiwan Relations Act is the law of our land. This act, passed in 1979, un-

derscores that America's relations with the People's Republic of China rest upon the expectation that the future of Taiwan will be determined by peaceful means; that we would consider any effort to determine the future of Taiwan by other than peaceful means, including by boycotts or embargoes, a threat to peace and security of the Western Pacific and of grave concern to the United States. This act also declared it to be our policy to provide Taiwan with arms of a defensive character; and to maintain the capability of the United States to resist any resort to force or other forms of coercion that would jeopardize the security, or the social or economic system, of the people of Taiwan.

This framework of the three communiques and the Taiwan Relations Act has served both sides of the Taiwan Strait as well as the United States and the Pacific region well for almost 17 years. For example, it made possible the relaxation of tensions in the strait which allowed trade and interaction of the two sides to take place.

It encouraged Taiwan to abolish martial law and become a prosperous democracy.

It made available to the Chinese on the mainland the talents and capital of the people on Taiwan.

It played a major role in the success of China's drive for modernization.

It produced a sense of security that allowed the emergence of critical conditions in which both Taiwan and the mainland could prosper.

Americans have applauded the building of economic and people-to-people ties across the strait. These ties have not just been between individuals and families but also between businesses and academic institutions. We have applauded the efforts of both sides to build on those ties toward an expanded relationship. Such an expanded relationship advances the realization of longstanding American hopes for the peaceful settlement of the dispute between the people on both sides of the Taiwan Strait.

A military confrontation between China and Taiwan would harm both China and Taiwan. It would have long-term consequences for Northeast Asia and the Pacific and would likely set off a serious arms race in Asia as Charles Freeman pointed out in his op-ed piece in the New York Times last week, a war in the Taiwan Strait "would not only threaten Taiwan's democracy but also finish any hopes of America's building a constructive relationship with China." And, in commenting upon a United States decision to either intervene or not do anything in the case of a war, he stated that "the results in either case would probably be Japanese rearmament, military rivalry between Tokyo and Beijing, a loss of confidence between Tokyo and Washington and alarm throughout Asia." And as Michel Oksenberg points out, while war is not the primary danger at this point, a protracted military confrontation could

produce many of these same results. It would also disrupt the economies of China and Taiwan and would result in a tragic loss of life and property. Surely we all wish to avoid a repeat of Quemoy-Matsu tension, which lasted for a long time, to the detriment of the people on both the mainland and Taiwan.

Americans feel very close to the people of Taiwan. We are very proud of their accomplishments. The people of Taiwan have made enormous strides economically as well as politically. There are an example to much of the developing world.

It is important for the United States, as a friend, to be clear with the Taiwanese that they must not misjudge China on the question of Taiwan independence.

It is important that the people of Taiwan understand that a unilateral declaration of Taiwan's independence would be inconsistent with United States foreign policy as set forth and followed by President Nixon, President Ford, President Carter, President Reagan, President Bush, and President Clinton.

It is also important for the Chinese to understand that the United States values its friendship and its relationship with the people on Taiwan. It is crucial that the Chinese understand that if China uses force to resolve the Taiwan issue, the United States will not stand idly by but will surely respond.

For our part, the United States should make it very clear that we will oppose either side's attempt to change the status quo either by the use of force by Beijing or by unilateral declaration of independence by Taiwan. The United States position should be clear that we are prepared to live with any outcome negotiated in good faith between China and Taiwan. The future of Taiwan must be settled by mutual agreement between the parties, not by the unilateral actions of either. For that to happen, Taipei must stop its political provocations and Beijing must stop its military provocations.

The people of China and the people of Taiwan should resume a high-level dialog to foster clear understandings and increased cooperation. Enormous progress has been made in economic cooperation and people-to-people contacts as well as visits on both sides of the strait. While economic development and people-to-people cooperation are emphasized, political questions are complicated and emotional and their resolution will require a long-term effort. This will involve a trait for which the Chinese people are famous—patience.

I thank the Chair, and I thank my colleagues.

Mr. BREAUX addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (MR. DEWINE). The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. BREAUX. Let me inquire of the Chair of the time situation. I know time is allotted to both sides. How much is remaining on this side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair advises the Senator from Louisiana that the minority has 19 minutes 54 seconds remaining.

Mr. BREAUX. I thank the Chair.

#### AMTRAK REAUTHORIZATION

Mr. BREAUX. Mr. President, I take this time to comment on legislation that has been reported out of the Senate Commerce Committee reauthorizing the Amtrak rail system in this country and also instituting not just a reauthorization but as well an effort to try to bring about major reforms to the Amtrak passenger rail system in this country.

Let me say that the committee worked long and hard. The distinguished Presiding Officer is a member of the Senate Commerce Committee that worked on that legislation. It is apparent that I have expressed some public concerns about bringing this piece of legislation to the floor of the Senate under a unanimous consent arrangement to be handled in the Senate without the possibility of any amendments—indeed, without any discussion, just bring it up under a unanimous-consent procedure and then pass it and send it on to the other body, over to the House side. I have objected to that procedure because I think this, indeed, is a subject that needs to be discussed and debated in this Chamber.

Let me start by first saying that I very strongly support the concept of and the need for Amtrak reauthorization. The passenger rail system provides incredible economic assistance and transportation to industries and individuals in this country. Indeed, our entire rail system in this country is second to no other country. We can be proud of what Amtrak has brought in terms of passenger service to this country, as well as the freight and private carriers, and the good economic possibilities that they make happen every day by having this national transportation system of railroads in our country. All our industries and our businesses and our individual lives are touched every day by having such a fine rail system. I think by and large the various private companies do an outstanding job in maintaining their level of providing these services as well as doing their best to provide quality services in a safe manner so that everybody who uses the rail system can be assured of their safety.

The concern that I have—a concern we need to have this Senate body debate and discuss—is making sure that we do not do anything in this legislation to lessen the requirements of these private companies and, indeed, our public Amtrak system in the standards of safety that they must provide to the American public.

We all have witnessed this month a set of accidents around this country that I think are very disturbing, to say the least. Look at the headlines that have appeared in newspapers just in

the month of February. February 2, 1996: "Two Killed, 20 Hurt in California Train Derailment." On February 10, this year: "Three Die in New Jersey Transit Commuter Train Wreck." February 16, again, this month, the third such incident: "Brake Failure Causes Yet Another Train Wreck—9 Workers Injured, FBI Called In To Probe." And, of course, one that we are very familiar with in this area, on February 17: "MARC-Amtrak Trains Collide Killing 12." And then the fifth such accident, on February 22: "Colorado Train Derails, 2 Killed, Acid Spills."

Mr. President, I say to all of our colleague who may be listening and to the American public that these five major train accidents that occurred in a 1-month period are disturbing to me, disturbing to my colleagues and, I think, indeed disturbing to the American public. They want to know that the trains they ride on, the trains that carry the goods and services of this Nation are safe, they can be counted on and that they are dependable.

Again, I will point out that I have a great deal of respect for all of these private companies. They are attempting to do a good job. The concern I have right now and the reason I objected to bringing the Amtrak reauthorization legislation to this body without the ability of any discussion, under a unanimous consent agreement that prevents any ability to offer amendments to that legislation, is because I think there is a real possibility that some would like to further restrict individuals' rights to be compensated when rail accidents occur. When you have five in 1 month, Mr. President, I think we need to look at how these railroads are operating, how we can help them do a better job, and, yes, at the same time make sure that people who are injured by accidents where negligence was the cause of that accident are adequately compensated, and, yes, even to the point of providing punitive damages when gross negligence occurs and is the proven cause of that particular accident.

Now, the reason I bring up these concerns to the Senate today is because of the provisions that are in the bill that has already passed the House of Representatives and what they attempt to do to the American public in the area of safety and the ability to be compensated. Two things leap out that I am very concerned about, and some of these features are in the Senate bill.

First, there is a cap on punitive damages in the House-passed bill. In other words, if a railroad is found to be grossly negligent, almost to the point of saying: "We don't care what happens. If you get hit, we will pay the damages; we don't care." And I am not saying anybody fits in that category. It is very rare that punitive damages are awarded. But when they are awarded, it is to say to the defendant who has been grossly negligent, "We are going to penalize you so you don't do it again. Do not think it is easier to pay the damages than to fix the problem."

The House bill puts a cap on the punitive damages that can be awarded instead of letting a jury or a judge determine, after seeing the facts, what it should be. The Senate bill has a similar provision that puts a cap on punitive damages as well; in other words, restricting how much someone can be penalized by a judge and a jury for causing an accident where gross negligence has been proven beyond a doubt.

That I think is simply wrong. We should not be moving in that direction. We should allow punitive damages to be assessed on those rare occasions when they need to be, as a form of saying to a corporation or an individual, "Do not do that again. If you do, you are going to be severely penalized." That is an incentive to do a better job. That is an incentive to make things safer. That is an incentive to do more inspections and to make sure things work the way the American public has come to depend on their working.

The second thing I am concerned about is that there is a cap in the House-passed bill on the Amtrak reauthorization on limiting how much a person can recover for pain and suffering in an injury from a rail accident. How do we in Congress, sitting in Washington, DC, where we have not been out to interview a family or not heard testimony of those who have lost a member of their family or been disfigured or lost the ability to have any income in the future because of the injuries, how do we in Washington pick a number and say this is the maximum amount they can receive for pain and suffering as a result of the negligence of someone that has injured them?

How can we in Washington, who have never seen the injured people, never heard their testimony in a trial, never viewed that testimony firsthand, pick a number and say this is a fair number in every case that ever happens in America? How many of us in this body or the other body have interviewed any of the people injured in five train wrecks all over the country just this month?

How can we say that  $x$  amount of money is a cap that can never be exceeded? That is not a function of the U.S. Senate. Those numbers and those amounts for pain and suffering, when someone is severely injured, can best be decided, I think, by juries and by courts and by judges who, in a public forum, have listened to the witnesses, seen their injuries, heard expert testimony about how bad they are injured. Maybe for the rest of their lives they are going to suffer those same injuries. Let them decide what is an adequate amount for compensation.

The third concern that I have, which is probably the biggest concern, is something that I just do not understand and, quite frankly, I think was a terrible mistake on the part of the other body when they passed this legislation. It is called indemnification. I will just read it and then I will attempt to try to explain it, because we write

laws sometimes that nobody can ever understand unless they put it in English. Sometimes I think we write in foreign languages.

The House bill says:

INDEMNIFICATION OBLIGATIONS—

This is in title IV of the House-passed bill. It says:

Obligations of any party, however arising, including obligations arising under leases or contracts or pursuant to orders of an administrative agency, to indemnify against damages or liability for personal injury, death, or damage to property described in subsection (a), incurred after the date of the enactment of Amtrak Reform and Privatization Act of 1995, shall be enforceable, notwithstanding any other statutory or common law or public policy, or the nature of the conduct giving rise to the damages or liability.

If you read that the first time, your eyes glaze over. Certainly mine do. And I say, "What did he say?" It sounds convoluted and like it was written by a lawyer. Yes, it probably was.

What that section that is in the House-passed bill simply says—and one of my biggest fears is that the Senate may agree to it in a conference—it says as simply as I can put it, if a private railroad that owns the track and owns the signals and has not kept them up, has completely ignored conditions or put in the wrong signals or has their own train that is running on their own tracks, when the engineer is grossly negligent, who is maybe intoxicated or under the influence of drugs, is running their train, that if all those things occur, and it runs into an Amtrak train and, heaven forbid, kills passengers on that Amtrak train, that this section specifically says that the private railroads can have an indemnification agreement that absolves them of any responsibility, absolves them of any liability no matter how negligent they were, and they can shift that liability to Amtrak and say that the American taxpayer, who happens to fund Amtrak, is going to have to pay for the damages, pay for pain and suffering, pay for the damages to the community, the damages that are caused by that wreck, even though it was completely and totally the fault of the private railroad.

I suggest to my colleagues that it is not good public policy to allow a private industry to shift the responsibility and the liability for their negligence, no matter how bad it is, their gross negligence, to shift that responsibility to somebody else—in this case the American taxpayer—that it is not right. It is not good public policy. In fact, it is very bad public policy.

Under that section of the House-passed bill, when we go to conference, if it were somehow to be incorporated into the final package and passed into law, every private railroad would say, "Look, I have much less of an incentive to do the right thing because if we have an accident that involves an Amtrak train," which many of these that I just cited have, "I'm not going to be responsible."

I just think it makes no sense whatsoever from the standpoint of any standard of public policy to say that we should allow indemnification agreements to allow someone to shift their responsibility, even when they are grossly negligent, to some other party and say, "You take it. You take my responsibility. You take my responsibility for the pain, for the damages that my negligence caused," and particularly in this case when it is the Federal taxpayer, because we in this authorization are funding Amtrak.

When we fund Amtrak, the taxpayers are paying for Amtrak. So why should the taxpayer be paying for the gross negligence of some private industry when it is their fault that the accident occurred? I think we have to look at this very carefully. We have to reject it if it comes back. It is not part of the Senate bill, but it is part of the House-passed bill, along with the caps on punitive damages, along with the caps on pain and suffering.

If there ever was a time when we should be more careful about protecting the rights of injured people and more careful about ensuring mechanisms in our laws that provide incentives and inducements for both public bodies and public railroads and private railroads to do a better job, now is the time.

I cannot imagine someone standing up on the floor at this critical time and suggesting that what we ought to do is make it harder and more difficult for people who are injured in rail accidents to be justly compensated. I cannot imagine anybody at this critical time coming to the floor of the House or the Senate and suggesting that private railroads should be able to shirk their legal responsibility for gross negligence, if and when it occurs, onto the backs of the American taxpayer instead of standing up and saying, "Yes, we were responsible. Yes, we have to pay. Yes, we are going to correct this problem."

That is the issue, as simply as I can possibly state it, that we are going to be facing when this legislation comes to the floor. That is the reason that I have said time and again, do not bring this to the floor under a unanimous-consent agreement. Do not tie the hands of Members of Congress in our ability to talk about this. Do not prevent us from being able to offer amendments to correct these problems so that we do not make a very serious mistake with this legislation when it comes to the floor.

We should have the opportunity to improve it, to correct it, to amend it. And if we can work out that type of structure, I am looking forward to the debate with my colleagues in the Senate and, ultimately, hopefully, in a conference with the House.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. DORGAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, we are in morning business; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

## POPULISM

Mr. DORGAN. There is an old axiom in politics, when your adversaries are having a healthy feud, never walk across the street and get involved in it. I will not do that this morning. I am tempted to. However, I wanted to discuss, at least a bit, the issue of populism. I will not discuss so much the details of the feud that is going on in the Republican Party and in the primaries, but I do want to talk about the issue of populism.

What propelled me to do that today was Time magazine. There is a picture of Pat Buchanan in a hard hat and work shirt, and Lamar Alexander peeking over his shoulder in his plaid shirt, and then Bob DOLE and Steve Forbes behind them.

It says, "Grand Old Populists." So I am presuming, I guess, that GOP means "Grand Old Populists." I wanted to talk a little about this issue of populism. It is a fascinating concept to see these, as one of my colleagues in the Senate calls them, Grey Poupon-eating-, Jacuzzi-, country-club folks, wearing hard hats and work shirts and calling themselves populists.

Let us put all this in perspective. About 80 or 90 million years ago, the brontosaurus and triceratops and tyrannosaurus rex were running across southwestern North Dakota. They are digging some of them up, by the way. Then we skipped and fast forwarded, and it was about 5,000 years ago that we discovered there were people around, and about 2,000 years ago Jesus was alive. About 500 years ago Columbus was relatively lost and stumbled onto the southern part of this continent, and despite the fact that the folks who were living here greeted his boat, he was credited with discovering something or another.

And 200 years ago our country was born. Then 100 years ago we created planes, trains, and automobiles, roughly speaking. And 75 and 50 years ago it was the radio, then television. And 25 years ago we put a man on the Moon. Then 10 years ago the computer became something that you could have in your home and then later carry on your lap as you traveled. And now in the Republican Party "GOP" means "Grand Old Populists." And it is causing quite a stir, actually.

I noticed in this morning's paper one of the strategists, William Kristol, who speaks more often than most on politics from the conservative side, spoke of this issue.

He is speaking now about the turmoil that is going on in the Republican primaries. "William Kristol," according to the story this morning as a result of something he wrote recently—I guess this week—"sees no need for the Republican Establishment to succumb, in Pat Buchanan's phrase, to 'terminal panic.' A junior member of that Establishment, Kristol doesn't cower when



the high-riding presidential contender thunders about the terrified knights and barons of the GOP," et cetera, et cetera.

"Someone needs to stand up and defend the Establishment," says Kristol, a sometime strategist, party ideologist and editor of the conservative *Weekly Standard* magazine. "In the last couple of weeks, there's been too much pseudo-populism, almost too much concern and attention for, quote, the people—that is, the people's will, their prejudices and their foolish opinions. And in a certain sense, we're all paying the price for that now . . . After all, we conservatives are on the side of the lords and the barons."

He says there is "almost too much concern and attention for the people \* \* \* we are on the side of the lords and barons."

Well, what to make of this: The grand old populist with the hard hat and the honest conservative who says, "Wait a second, there's too much attention being paid to the people here, the people and their foolish opinions," Mr. Kristol says. "We are on the side of the lords and the barons."

God bless the lords and the barons. They are a good group of folks, but it is the people who run this country. It is the people for whom elections are held, because the Constitution gives the people in this country the right to grab the steering wheel and decide in Montana or North Dakota or Nevada or New York or Texas in which direction they want America to move. They nudge that steering wheel by collectively voting. It is the people, not the lords and barons, the people who grab the American steering wheel every even-numbered year. That is part of the miracle of the American Constitution. It is a miracle guaranteed every even-numbered year to the people in this country.

What of this issue of populism? It is interesting to me, coming from a State where populism had its roots. In North Dakota, in the early 1900's, nineteen teens, there was a legislator named Treadwill Twitchell who stood up in the chamber of the State legislature and told the farmers to "go home and slop your hogs with great arrogance." He was someone who represented one of the big cities in our State. "Go home and slop your hogs," he said.

They went home all right, and 2 years later, they organized section line by section line all across North Dakota. They came back and took over in North Dakota in the 19 teens. They were populists. There is a book written about it called "Prairie Fire," in which the people took hold and said, "This is our destiny."

They built themselves in North Dakota a bank saying, "We're tired of having public money put in private cronies' banks. We will have our own bank which belongs to people." My State is the only State in America that still has a Bank of North Dakota, and all public money goes into that bank used for the public good. It is not a case in our State where some of the State's money goes into some crony's

bank someplace. It goes into the bank the populists created in the 19 teens.

They built a mill and elevator because they were sick and tired of the big mills in the East taking advantage of our farmers. They said, "We are going to build a mill and elevator." They passed a farmers bill where they said, "We want farmers, not corporations; we want yard lights where families live on the farm."

The populist legacy in our State is a legacy about people having power. Part of what I find heartening these days is the discussion in the political system, especially in the Republican primaries, but also in our party, the Democratic Party, a discussion about what kind of economic system does this country have. For whose benefit does it operate? Who reaps the rewards of this economic system?

There are some things I have heard and seen in recent weeks that trouble me greatly, and I am sure that is true of many in this Chamber: Top advisers to campaigners out there who give speeches to white supremacist groups and use code words. Those kinds of things really bother me a lot, because there is a dark tinge to some of this discussion, and that ought to be rejected, and rejected quickly, by the American people.

But there is also, in my judgment, an arrow headed straight to the center of what ought to be the economic debate in this country, and the center of the economic debate is how are American families doing? Are they advancing? Is their standard of living improving? When they sit down for dinner with the family to talk about their circumstance, are they able to say, "Our jobs are secure; we have good jobs with good incomes; we have decent health care at affordable prices; we go to good schools"? Are they able to say that? Or do they say, "Too often these days, we're not so sure about our job security. We worked for the same company for 22 years, but the company just reported record profits, the CEO makes \$4 million, just got a \$2 million raise and laid off 8,000 people, because they call that progress."

So, too many families now sit down at dinner and understand the companies they have worked for for 20 years see them like they see a wrench or a punch press: As a tool, perfectly expendable and completely expendable once the company has decided it is in their interest to decide to get rid of them now and hire another tool or another worker.

All too often in China, Malaysia, Indonesia, Bangladesh, Sri Lanka, somewhere where they can hire someone without the restrictions on age—you can hire a kid if you wish—without the nettlesome restrictions that you have to pay a living wage—you can pay 14 cents an hour to someone who makes tennis shoes in Malaysia—without the restriction that you have to have a safe workplace, without the restriction that you cannot dump chemicals into the air or dump chemicals into the water.

So people now understand that they are expendable, and that is the sadness of the lack of security in the job place in America. Not only do they see they have less security, they also see that they make less money; they work harder, but they make less money. If one adjusts their wage for inflation and goes back 20 years and measures it, what has happened is they are working harder and 20 years later they are making less money and have less purchasing power than they had 20 years ago.

Is there any reason that the American people have some anxiety about that? We can talk forever that the GDP numbers are up, America is on the move, our economy is growing, and it does not matter if the standard of living for American families is not advancing.

I have spoken on the floor previously about this—I know it is repetitive—but it is important to say you do not and cannot measure America's economic health and its future promise by what it consumes. I am just flat sick and tired of hearing the news reports that the Commerce Department said this, the Federal Reserve Board this or that, car sales are up, home sales are up, shoes sales are up. At issue is not how much we bought, how much we consumed.

The issue is what did we produce in this country? It is production that gives you good jobs. Good jobs come from our productive sector and, as our manufacturing jobs are moving, we are losing manufacturing jobs. They are being moved by international economic enterprises who do not say the Pledge of Allegiance and they do not sing the national anthem. They are interested in international profits. They do not care whether they produce in Pittsburgh or Malaysia. They will produce where it is the most profitable to produce, and manufacturing jobs are leaving America in droves. Witness the trade deficit we have.

Last year, the trade deficit was larger than our budget deficit. There is nobody saying much about it, and it is almost a conspiracy of silence. The trade deficit means we buy from abroad more than we sell abroad. What that means is jobs that would have been here are instead somewhere else in another country.

Corporations that are producing are producing elsewhere, and the American people have some role in this as well. It is not unusual to find somebody wearing a Chinese shirt, slacks from Taiwan, shoes from Italy, shorts from Mexico, driving a Japanese car, and then saying, "Where on Earth have American jobs gone?" You are wearing where it has gone. So there is enough responsibility to go around.

But the center of the economic debate in this country has to come to this issue about what is fair trade and how do we construct a circumstance in which we have a healthy, vibrant growing manufacturing base in our country.

To those out on the campaign trail these days wearing hard hats and



preaching populism, I say to them, "Come here and help us."

I offered an amendment in the U.S. Senate, and it was as simple as could be. No one could misunderstand it and no one could even, in my judgment, mistakenly vote wrong on it. I lost on a partisan vote.

The amendment very simply was to say: Let us stop providing tax breaks so that companies can close their American plants and open up plants overseas. Let us stop providing tax breaks so that American corporations can move their jobs to foreign countries. Let us put an end to the insidious giveaway in our Tax Code that allows companies to do that: Fire American workers, hire foreign workers, become more profitable, and destroy job security in our country.

I could not even get that adopted in the Senate. Mr. President, to all of those who voted and voted wrong, they are going to get a chance 6, 8, 10, 12 more times, if I have my way, this year to rectify that, because this country should not and cannot continue to have economic incentives in its tax laws to say "it is our aim to encourage you to move your jobs overseas."

It is my aim to encourage American companies to invest here, to produce here, and to hire here in this country.

There are twin responsibilities that we have. The American worker has a responsibility, but productivity is on the rise. Workers are working harder. Workers do have a responsibility to be motivated, educated, dedicated, and to be good workers. But companies then have the responsibility, as well, to care about the people who make up that company, to care about the people who make the products that the company sells with that company's name on it.

About a month or so ago, I read a piece in the Minneapolis Tribune as I was going through the airport. I came to the floor of the Senate and told, briefly, about what I had read because it was so foreign to everything that is going on in this country. It was about a fellow who had owned the company that make inline skates called Rollerblades. He and his wife had purchased this company and built it into something substantial, an enormously successful company, making inline skates. Rollerblades is the name of the company. And then this fellow, named Bob, sold the company some months ago. He had made a substantial amount of money because the company was enormously successful. Of course, all of us understand what has happened with inline skates. At Christmastime, some of the workers at this company began getting in the mail a letter from the fellow who had owned this company. They began to open their Christmas greeting from this fellow and his wife, and it turned out that he had sent them money. He no longer owned the company, but he sent all of the employees—I think something like 270 employees who worked for that company in the factory lines, custodial, the

painters, and everything—if memory is correct, he sent them \$160 for every month they worked for the company.

In some cases, those folks on the factory lines, who had been there all the time he had the company, got up to a \$20,000 check from this fellow and his wife. Do you know what else he did? He prepaid the taxes on it. So he said to them, "This gift is for you. You owe no taxes on it. I have prepaid the taxes."

I called him and said, "This is remarkable, at a time when we hear about all of the selfishness and layoffs and moving jobs overseas. I want to tell you how remarkable it is to hear about what you did." What he said to me was perfectly understandable. He said, "I made money with that company because all of those folks helped make that company work. They worked on the factory lines. They are the ones who made the company, it was not just me, it was them as well, and I wanted to share something with them. I wanted to tell them that they contributed something significant in the success of that company."

I thought, "What a hero." He did not have to do that. We do not hear many stories like that—stories that are unselfish, where the CEO says, "You people really make this company work. When we put our company name on the product, we are proud because you helped make the product." That is almost unheard of these days. Nowadays it is, "Well, you worked for us, but tomorrow you are like a used wrench. You might be out of here with no security, no health care, and maybe no pension. We might be hiring your replacement 6,000 or 8,000 miles away."

Well, would it not be nice to hear more people do what that man did, and recognize that part of this country's success is to have a vibrant, expanding, growing manufacturing base, and to recognize the workers out there on the line producing products, doing good work, working hard, and are also part of the success and part of the competitive team?

I just think that we have kind of gone in a different direction in this country, in which we have had economists, CEO's, and others develop an economic model that says that it is fine if we produce elsewhere and sell here as long as we are buying cheap. That is not fine. Major jobs are gone, and a major future is gone with it. That needs to be the center of the economic debate. How could we create conditions in which manufacturing in this country expands again, in which there is fair international competition, in which we reduce the trade deficit, bring jobs back to this country, and rev up the American economy to a reasonable economic growth.

On a related but slightly different issue, yesterday, the President reappointed Alan Greenspan to head the Federal Reserve Board for another term. He is going to submit his name to us. Certainly, the Congress will accept that. I am terribly disappointed

by that. I have great respect for Mr. Greenspan, but I have profound disagreements with him, as well. I agree with Jack Kemp on the issue of economic growth. The Federal Reserve Board sees itself as a set of human brake pads. That is their mission in life. They say America cannot have an unemployment limit below 6 percent because it is inflationary, or economic growth above 2.5 or 3 percent because it is inflationary. But wages are going down, not up, so that is nonsense.

When you consign our economy to a meager growth rate of 2.5 percent, you consign an economy to an anemic future that is far less than what it should be for all Americans. It means fewer jobs and less opportunity. I am very disappointed the President has seen fit—not that Mr. Greenspan is a bad person, I have great respect for him. But I would have much preferred new leadership at the Fed—not leadership that says inflation is not important because, of course, it is. We have seen stable prices and a growing economy. Inflation has been going down—under 3 percent for 4 years in a row. Yet, the Fed has its foot on the brakes with higher interest rates than the producers in this country should be paying.

Mr. President, I notice my friend from Nevada on the floor. He has some things to say today. So let me finish with a couple of other brief comments. This issue of populism, or the power that people have in this country to affect their lives and to force this political system to debate what it ought to debate, is a very important concept. We just finished debating a farm bill in the U.S. Senate. A fellow named Robert Greene, an Associated Press writer—somebody who I think does an excellent job of synthesizing what we do with foreign policy in the Congress. He wrote a piece that is probably the best piece I know of describing what we did on the farm policy. We passed the so-called freedom-to-farm bill, which I fought against and voted against because I think it is a terrible piece of legislation. Here is what he said about it:

With a mix of luck, work and unusual organization, the lobby for the big grain companies, railroads, meat companies, millers and shippers scored a big win in the Senate-passed overhaul of farm programs.

The freedom-to-farm bill is a serious act of mislabeling. It is everything that big railroads wanted, that big grain trading firms wanted, that all the millers wanted, that all the food processors wanted. Guess what it means to the family with the yard light on at night trying to figure out how to operate the family farm? These large interests want lower grain prices. Talk about economic populism, about putting jam on the lower shelf so everybody can reach it. This sort of nonsense, the freedom-to-farm bill, which gives everything they want to the big grain trading firms, and shortchanges family farmers is the wrong way, not the right way, to address the issue of

whether we should have family farmers in our future. If it becomes law, we will have large agrifactories from coast to coast, and you will see precious few yard lights on because family farmers will not be able to make a living.

I was going to talk about other economic issues that relate to the same thing—who gets, who gives, who has the power, and who does not. As Mr. Kristol says, “Who are the lords and barons, and what do they get?” I will end where I began with not so much surprise at the message, but at the candor in the article this morning where Mr. Kristol says, “Someone needs to stand up and defend the establishment. In the last couple of weeks there has been too much pseudo-populism, almost too much concern and attention for ‘the people.’”

Mr. Kristol has not served in the House or the Senate, but the people control the House and the Senate. This is their Chamber; it is their body. They, by their election, determine who serves here. I guess maybe some people, who have not run for county sheriff or Congress, for that matter, probably sometimes dismiss the interests of the people.

There is a desk here that I was assigned to the first day I came to the Senate, and I have since been reassigned. It was temporary. I opened the drawer and, as is the custom, deep in the drawers, in the history of the Senate, everyone carves their names in the desk. That is not a practice we recommend to schoolchildren, but the history is that we do that. The desk that I was assigned to the first day I was here indicates that Harry Truman carved his name in the desk. A desk I was assigned to later says that Warren Harding sat in that desk. He later became President. Below his name is the name of one of the great populists in this country, Robert La Follette from Wisconsin. He understood about economic power. He understood about the people, and he would understand when I express enormous surprise that there is anyone who comments on, is interested in, or is involved in politics, who believes that there is too much concern and attention being paid to the people in our political campaigns.

Frankly, there is not enough concern and attention being paid to the center issues that affect people, who, every day, are trying to figure out how do we get a good education, how do we afford decent health care, how do we find a good job that pays well, how do we find a company to work for that will value and trust us and keep us and appreciate our work? Those are the center concerns of a lot of people in this country, who believe that over two centuries of growth, through innovation and through hard work, America has succeeded beyond the dreams of most when you look at two centuries; but who also believe that the best days in this country are still ahead of us, if its best days are consigned to the interests of the people in this country, who still

have the opportunity to control its direction and still have the opportunity to tell us what they think is important and what they think will make America a better country in which to live.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. REID addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID] is recognized.

#### ACCENTUATING THE POSITIVE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, when I first came to the Senate, President Reagan surprised everybody in his State of the Union Message when he referred quite often to Presidents Roosevelt and Kennedy, using them as examples of good Government. President Bush followed. In his State of the Union Messages he constantly referred to the Democratic Presidents including, of course, Franklin Roosevelt and John Kennedy.

Mr. President, it appears in the primary battles that are going on in the Republican Party at this time to pick their nominee for the President of the United States they have been studying the Democrats probably a little too literally. It seems they have studied so hard that their primaries are now being conducted like ours used to be conducted. They are going to wind up, it appears, with their nominee chopped and beaten, I guess comparable to a McGovern or a Mondale.

Mr. President, the primary process that we have heard debated and watched debated has been one where there has been nothing but negativism. It is not what they can do. It is how much they can berate each other generally and the Government.

I think we should talk about how good things are rather than how bad things are, because I truly believe we are doing very well as a country. Now, when we say “doing well,” that does not mean we do not have a long way to go; we have a long way to go to become better, but we are doing extremely well.

We need to improve, of course, on our immigration policies. There is a lot of improvement that can be made there. And the trade policy.

As an example, I did not vote for NAFTA; I did not vote for GATT, but I hope they work. I do not come in the Chamber and berate what is going on as a result of NAFTA and GATT. I hope they work. Even though I do not think it was right to pass NAFTA, I do not think it benefits me or my country to continually stand up and say how bad things are and it is all a direct result of NAFTA. I do not believe that is the case. I believe we have some problems with our trade. They are not all related to NAFTA and GATT.

We need to do better with crime fighting, especially, Mr. President, with juvenile crime.

Let us talk about how well we are doing. Last year was the third year in a row where we had a declining deficit. It did not decline enough each year,

but it declined. For the first time in 40 years we had 3 years in a row with a declining deficit. We should talk about that. That is good. That does not take away from the fact that we should have a balanced budget. We can do that. But let us talk about what we have accomplished that has been positive.

New jobs, about 8 million new jobs in the last 3 years. That is good. Let us talk about it. That is important. Lowest inflation, lowest unemployment in well over 30 years. Economic growth has not been so high since the days of Kennedy and Johnson. Corporate profits have never been higher. A couple times in the history of this country they have been as high but never any higher.

We have heard speeches for years about how big Government is, but it was not until this administration that something was done about it. We now have 200,000 fewer civilian employees than we had 3 years ago. That is important, and that is good. We should talk about it. Government is smaller than it used to be. It is now at about the same level it was during the days of John Kennedy, even though the country has grown significantly. Consumer prices rose 2.5 percent last year, the second smallest increase in three decades. That is good. We should talk about it. It is important. Stock prices benefiting from strong corporate earnings growth and low long-term interest rates have risen almost 75 percent during the last 3 years. Good does not mean good enough, but let us talk. It is still good.

During the last 3 years, over 16,000 pages of obsolete regulations have been eliminated, part of Vice President GORE's reinventing Government, and also as a result of Vice President GORE's reinventing Government we have 200,000 fewer Government jobs than we had when he became Vice President. We have more new small businesses. A record number of new small businesses have been created since the start of this administration. Home ownership is at its highest level in 15 years. And also even though we can do better with trade, the United States beat Japan and every other country in the world in the last 2 years in the production of automobiles, the first time that has happened since the 1970's. That is good and we should talk about it.

Education. Fewer students are dropping out of high school. In fact, since 1991, the dropout rate has fallen by 16 percent. That is staggeringly good. Welfare rolls are down since March 1994 by 8 percent—not down enough. We still need welfare reform. It is broken and needs fixing, but let us talk about some of the good things that are happening in our country as we speak.

The misery index. The combined rate of unemployment and inflation is at its lowest levels since the 1960's. It sounds pretty good to me. And I wish those Presidential candidates would talk about that, would talk about how good things are in America today.

What the people running for President should be talking about, for example, is health care. Thousands and thousands of new people each month are saying, "I have no health insurance." Businesses more and more each day are saying, "We do not supply our employees health insurance." Health care costs are still skyrocketing. Health care costs this year alone will go up \$1 billion. We need to have candidates talking about health care reform.

Minimum wage. We need to talk about raising the minimum wage. It is not a bunch of people, the stereotypical teenagers flipping hamburgers at McDonald's. The fact is that 60 percent of the people who receive the minimum wage are women. For 40 percent of those people, that is the only money they get for them and their family. The minimum wage needs to be increased. If it was good when we adopted it in the Depression years, it is good today and we should do what we can as a Congress to make sure it maintains its rate in keeping with inflation.

The environment. I have not heard a single candidate on the Republican ticket running for President talk about the environment. They are in that beautiful area of New Hampshire. I have never been to New Hampshire but the pictures are beautiful. I would love to go there and see that State. On television, you think of the pristine environment. We need to be talking about the environment. The only thing we have seen especially from the other body this past year is to roll back the environmental laws—22 riders on 1 appropriations bill to roll back environmental regulations. People in that body want to wipe out the Clean Water Act, the Clean Air Act, wipe out the endangered species law. They should be talking in a positive sense about what we can do to improve the environment.

I repeat. What I have talked about has been good. It does not mean it is good enough, but it means it is good. Let us give our constituents, let us give the people of America the positive spin. We are doing fine. Let us have these candidates talk about senior citizens and Medicare and not hear the nonsense that we are not cutting Medicare; we are only cutting the rate of increase, without leveling with the American people and saying, of course, we have to maintain an increase in funding for Medicare because thousands of new people are coming on the rolls every day. Medical costs are rising out of the roof. Of course, we have to increase spending for Medicare. It does not mean we do not need to do some work to make it a better system, but we need not decimate it. We do not need to have it wither on the vine as the leader in the other body says that it should.

Education, let us talk about education in a positive sense instead of what we are seeing happen this past year. We are seeing programs that I believe are good programs like School-to-

Work—only 25 percent of the kids who graduate from high school graduate from college. What do we do about the other 75 percent? We have one way of helping. That is our School-To-Work Program which is a fine program that deals with that 75 percent and involves local businesses. In the State of Nevada, we have a wonderful School-to-Work Program. But what are they doing in the other body? They want to wipe it out, and in fact that is what we have. It has been wiped out.

What about our Goals 2000? In Nevada, we have set our Goals 2000. They are led by the First Lady of Nevada, Sandy Miller. About a month ago in Nevada they published their goals for the year 2000, good goals dealing with literacy, math education, reading, but it is being wiped out by this Congress. That is unfortunate. It is unfair to kids.

Crime. Crime is staggeringly bad in this country, but let us talk even there about the fact that the crime rate is declining with the number of murders reported dropping by 12 percent, robberies down 10 percent, car theft down 5 percent. As a result of the Brady bill, more than 45,000 fugitives and felons have been blocked from buying handguns. We have more cops on the street, about 30,000 across the country, over 150 in the State of Nevada. It has helped. Now, where we are failing—I have no problem discussing this—is with juvenile crime. It is becoming more violent, more vicious, and more random. We need to do something about that. But let us even talk on a positive note there about the President's State of the Union message where he said he was going to ask the head of the FBI to focus on juvenile crime, on gangs. That is important.

There is where the discussions should come. Let us talk positively. Let us talk about how well we are doing and how much better we can do.

Mr. President, there was an article recently by Daniel Gross that I assume ran in a number of different newspapers around the country. One of the things he said, and I quote, was:

The wealthy would be well served to also recall that the three most dramatic investment events of this century—the panic of 1907 and the crashes of 1929 and 1987—all took place in the watch of Republican Chief Executives.

The two worst Presidencies for stocks were those of Republicans Herbert Hoover, under whom the Dow fell an appalling 75 percent, and Richard Nixon. Between November 1968 and August 1974 the market fell 18 percent. Factor in the high inflation of the early 1970s, and the loss becomes a 6.9 percent annual rout.

Mr. President, I close by saying I think it is extremely important that the primaries, as they develop, be ones that the candidates focus more on the positive, talk about what is good that is happening in the country; and then on a positive note talk about how much better we can be, rather than the continual harangue we hear about how bad things are and how, in effect, the

future looks bleak. I do not believe that. I think we are as good as our past. And our past has been good.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I observe the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

#### CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is now closed.

#### THE BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, at the close of business Thursday, February 22, the Federal debt stood at \$4,987,959,914,205.44, about \$13 billion shy of the \$5 trillion mark, which the Federal debt will exceed in a few months.

On a per capita basis, every man, woman, and child in America owes \$18,932.73 as his or her share of that debt.

#### ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The following enrolled bill, previously signed by the Speaker pro tempore of the House (Mrs. MORELLA), was signed on today, February 23, 1996, by the President pro tempore (Mr. THURMOND):

H.R. 1718. An act to designate the United States Courthouse located at 197 South Main Street in Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania, as the "Max Rosen United States Courthouse."

#### INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second time by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. BURNS:

S. 1571. A bill to provide for the exchange of certain lands within the State of Montana, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. DEWINE (for himself and Mr. LUGAR):

S. 1572. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to provide funds and incentives for closures of rail-highway crossings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. D'AMATO:

S. 1573. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish and provide a checkoff for a Breast and Prostate Cancer Research Fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

#### STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. BURNS:

S. 1571. A bill to provide for the exchange of certain lands within the

State or Montana, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

THE LOST CREEK EXCHANGE ACT OF 1996

• Mr. BURNS. Madam President, today I am introducing the Lost Creek Land Exchange Act of 1996.

This bill would accomplish two important things. It authorizes the acquisition of the Lost Creek area for the public, and it may help prevent the closure of the Brand-S mill in Livingston MT.

I want to emphasize that this bill is a starting point. I fully anticipate major changes will need to be made. Yet, the process needs to move forward.

Under this bill, 14,500 acres of blue-ribbon bighorn sheep habitat known as Lost Creek would become a part of the Deerlodge National Forest. For the past few years, local sportsman and conservation groups, the Forest Service, and many others have been interested in the public acquiring this prime habitat. I, too, believe this is a worthwhile endeavor.

The bill I am introducing today would transfer the Lost Creek area, and 3,000 additional acres currently owned by R-Y Timber, to the Forest Service. In return R-Y Timber will acquire the deed to 3,600 acres and 46 million board feet of timber.

As most people in Park County know, R-Y Timber has an option to purchase the Brand-S mill in Livingston. If R-Y Timber decides to not purchase this mill by the middle of March, it is my understanding that the chances for the mill to remain open will be very slim. While R-Y Timber already has a mill in Townsend, this land exchange could allow R-Y Timber to keep both mills operating, and therefore, prevent the loss of 130 much-needed jobs in the Livingston area.

As I stated earlier, R-Y Timber will receive the deed to 46 million board feet of timber in the Deerlodge, Helena, and Lewis and Clark National Forests. However, the areas for harvesting have not been identified.

In addition, this timber will be harvested according to the Montana Forestry best management practice, Montana streamside zone management law, and other State laws. Between 20 and 30 percent of the timber will be available each year, and R-Y Timber will have 5 years to complete the harvest.

Language has also been included to assure that designation of the timber will not slow down the present limitations on the numbers of trained Forest Service personnel. Under this bill, the Forest Service would be required to use outside contractors to perform whatever field work is necessary for the designation.

The Lost Creek area has been valued at about \$8 million. And the days of the Federal Government simply paying the price tag are over. This bill provides a way for the public to purchase this prime bighorn sheep habitat while providing some timber jobs in our communities.

Madame President, as I stated earlier the bill I am introducing today is a starting point. We have much work ahead of us. Over the next couple months, I hope that the parties involved will continue to work together so this win-win bill can make it to the President's desk. •

By Mr. DEWINE (for himself and Mr. LUGAR):

S. 1572. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to provide funds and incentives for closures of rail-highway crossings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

THE RAILROAD CROSSING SAFETY ACT OF 1996

• Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, today I introduce legislation that would make America's railroad crossings a lot safer.

According to the National Safety Council, over the past 4 years an average of 522 people have been killed each year in train-vehicle collisions. Last year, 37 of these deaths occurred in my own State of Ohio.

Almost 50 percent of these accidents occur at crossings that are already equipped with active warning devices. Simply adding more warning devices, therefore, is not a complete solution to this problem.

Some of these railroad crossings are just too dangerous. They are life threatening. They are not needed, and they ought to be closed.

We all know, however, that people get accustomed to taking certain routes. And communities get used to certain traffic patterns. That's why it's sometimes difficult for localities to close these crossings, even when it's clear on safety grounds that a particular crossing must be closed.

Clearly, the local communities need some help. That's the purpose of my legislation.

Currently, the Federal Government pays 90 percent of the cost of closing a rail-highway grade crossing. But other grade crossing safety projects—such as traffic signs, guardrails, and traffic lights—are eligible for 100 percent Federal funding.

The bill I am introducing today will make grade crossing closure projects eligible for that same 100-percent Federal funding. This will remove the current incentive against closure projects.

If the safest thing to do is close a crossing, localities should have an incentive to do that.

This bill does not involve new Federal money. The money for this bill is already allocated for crossing safety purposes—and all we are trying to do is deploy that money in the most rational and effective way.

My bill will also provide up to \$7,500 to a local highway authority for each crossing closed. Furthermore, the railroad that is operating the crossing will match this money.

That means up to \$15,000 for a local community—just to close a crossing.

Obviously, this is just the beginning of a many-pronged assault on a major

safety problem. We can't close every single crossing that might be dangerous. So we want to make certain that the remaining railroad crossings are as safe as possible.

Last summer, I brought together Federal and State officials to see whether changes could be made to speed the process for dealing with unsafe railroad crossings.

Previously, the installation of safety lights and gates followed a linear process—one step had to be completed before another was allowed to begin. We created a new, streamlined process that allows officials to identify hazardous crossings and to implement expedited safety measures.

We eliminated the waiting periods between design, funding, and construction. The safety installation process used to take up to 2 years—but with this new, streamlined process, we are hoping it will only take about 12 months. This new process is being tried on 31 different sites throughout the State of Ohio.

It is a very promising approach, and if it works in Ohio, it deserves to be extended all over America.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 1572

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

**SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.**

This Act may be cited as the "Railroad Crossing Safety Act of 1996".

**SEC. 2. FUNDS AND INCENTIVES FOR CLOSURES OF RAIL-HIGHWAY CROSSINGS.**

(a) INCREASE IN FEDERAL SHARE OF CROSSING CLOSURES.—Section 120(c) of title 23, United States Code, is amended by inserting "rail-highway crossing closure," after "carpooling and vanpooling,".

(b) INCENTIVE PAYMENTS FOR AT-GRADE CROSSING CLOSURES.—Section 130 of such title is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(i) INCENTIVE PAYMENTS FOR AT-GRADE CROSSING CLOSURES.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this section and subject to paragraphs (2) and (3), a State may, from sums available to the State under this section, make incentive payments to local governments in the State upon the permanent closure by such governments of public at-grade railway-highway crossings under the jurisdiction of such governments.

"(2) INCENTIVE PAYMENTS BY RAILROADS.—A State may not make an incentive payment under paragraph (1) to a local government with respect to the closure of a crossing unless the railroad owning the tracks on which the crossing is located makes an incentive payment to the government with respect to the closure.

"(3) AMOUNT OF STATE PAYMENT.—The amount of the incentive payment payable to a local government by a State under paragraph (1) with respect to a crossing may not exceed the lesser of—

"(A) the amount of the incentive payment paid to the government with respect to the crossing by the railroad concerned under paragraph (2); or

“(B) \$7,500.

“(4) USE OF STATE PAYMENTS.—A local government receiving an incentive payment from a State under paragraph (1) shall use the amount of the incentive payment for transportation safety improvements.”.

**SEC. 3. GUIDELINES FOR ANALYSIS OF COSTS AND BENEFITS OF NEW RAILWAY-HIGHWAY CROSSINGS.**

Not later than 18 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Transportation shall prescribe guidelines to assist the States in analyzing the costs and benefits to the public of new railway-highway grade crossings. The purpose of the guidelines is to encourage uniformity in the analysis of such costs and benefits by the States.●

By Mr. D'AMATO:

S. 1573. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish and provide a checkoff for a Breast and Prostate Cancer Research Fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

**THE TAXPAYERS' CANCER RESEARCH FUNDING ACT OF 1996**

● Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, breast and prostate cancer have taken a horrible toll on women and men throughout the world and we must make every effort to eradicate these pervasive diseases. Breast cancer is a deadly epidemic that strikes over 180,000 women each year. It will kill more than 44,000 women this year alone. Similarly, prostate cancer will strike an estimated 317,000 men, and will kill roughly 41,000 men this year. We cannot allow these appalling rates to continue unabated. We need to do something now. We need a cure and finding a cure takes money—a tremendous amount of money.

I rise today to introduce legislation to add another weapon to our arsenal in the fight against breast and prostate cancer. My bill will provide vital resources for the fight to eradicate this dire threat to the lives of women and men across our Nation. In addition, my bill will support our efforts to combat one of the leading cancer killers of men: prostate cancer. This is a very straightforward bill. This bill will augment existing Federal research funding by easily allowing taxpayers to get directly involved by contributing to a newly established fund expressly earmarked for breast and prostate cancer research.

On the Federal income tax return there currently exists a box that can be selected for Federal campaign contributions. My bill will amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 by establishing a similar box for a Federal breast and prostate cancer research fund. This will allow our citizens to cross swords with this dual scourge by simply placing a check in a box on their income tax return, as with the campaign contribution fund. One point needs to be made very clear—this is not an additional tax. This is a purely voluntary means by which concerned citizens may earmark a minor but vital portion of their Federal income tax

payments expressly for breast and prostate cancer research.

Breast cancer is a truly horrible disease. Its incidence is rising at an alarming rate. In 1960, 1 out of every 14 women developed breast cancer in her lifetime. A few years ago it was 1 in 10. Now the figure is one in eight. We cannot allow this trend to continue. According to the National Cancer Institute's calculations, breast cancer comprises about 30 percent of all female cancers and it is estimated that the cost to the nation in the form of direct and indirect health care costs will exceed \$16 billion annually. The NCI also says that reductions in breast cancer mortality will have a significant influence on these costs to the Nation.

Like breast cancer among women, prostate cancer is a leading killer of American men. According to the American Cancer Society, this dreaded disease is the second leading cause of cancer death in men. It is projected to take the lives of approximately 41,000 men in 1996 alone.

Congress has just begun to pay more attention to these terrible diseases by devoting increased funding for breast and prostate cancer research at the Federal level. We have made tremendous progress, but much more remains to be done. Given current budget constraints we need a mechanism to increase breast and prostate cancer funding every year from here on out.

Our current method of breast cancer treatment is not a cure. Today's treatments for breast cancer are very crude. We treat women with poison, radiation, and radical surgery with the hope that we will kill the cancer and not the woman. This is similar to dropping a tiny atom bomb. What we need is a smart bomb for breast cancer. Something which will specifically kill the breast cancer cells without causing destruction to the rest of the women's body and immune system. This can only be accomplished with an additional infusion of breast cancer research dollars. We also need to recruit more scientists and new ideas and innovations into this field. More money will jumpstart research but it must also cover the funding needs of research scientist and their programs.

I am personally determined to do everything I can to fight for the eradication of breast and prostate cancer. I hope to enlist the aid of my colleagues in the establishment of this Federal breast and prostate cancer research fund. Breast and prostate cancer can only be understood, and eventually conquered, through increased research. We need a cure and we need one now. It is therefore critical that we all join together in this effort to help speed the discovery of a cure for these dreaded diseases.

Mr. President, I urge the adoption of this critical bill.●

**ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS**

S. 55

At the request of Mr. INOUE, the name of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS] was added as a cosponsor of S. 55, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to deem certain service in the organized military forces of the Government of the Commonwealth of the Philippines and the Philippine Scouts to have been active service for purposes of benefits under programs administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

S. 529

At the request of Mr. GRAHAM, the name of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] was added as a cosponsor of S. 529, a bill to provide, temporarily, tariff and quota treatment equivalent to that accorded to members of the North American Free Trade Agreement [NAFTA] to Caribbean Basin beneficiary countries.

S. 881

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. FAIRCLOTH] was added as a cosponsor of S. 881, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify provisions relating to church pension benefit plans, to modify certain provisions relating to participants in such plans, to reduce the complexity of and to bring workable consistency to the applicable rules, to promote retirement savings and benefits, and for other purposes.

S. 1039

At the request of Mr. ABRAHAM, the names of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CRAIG] and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. LOTT] were added as cosponsors of S. 1039, a bill to require Congress to specify the source of authority under the United States Constitution for the enactment of laws, and for other purposes.

S. 1108

At the request of Mr. SMITH, the name of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. FAIRCLOTH] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1108, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow individuals to designate that up to 10 percent of their income tax liability be used to reduce the national debt, and to require spending reductions equal to the amounts so designated.

S. 1129

At the request of Mr. ASHCROFT, the names of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. NICKLES] and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HELMS] were added as cosponsors of S. 1129, a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to permit employers to provide for flexible and compressed schedules, to permit employers to give priority treatment in hiring decisions to former employees after periods of family care responsibility, to maintain the minimum wage and overtime exemption for employees subject to certain leave policies, and for other purposes.

S. 1245

At the request of Mr. ASHCROFT, the name of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. FAIRCLOTH] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1245, a bill to amend the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 to identify violent and hard-core juvenile offenders and treat them as adults, and for other purposes.

S. 1344

At the request of Mr. HEFLIN, the name of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BREAUX] 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. 1379

At the request of Mr. SIMPSON, the name of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1379, a bill to make technical amendments to the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, and for other purposes.

S. 1491

At the request of Mr. GRAMS, the name of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GRASSLEY] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1491, a bill to reform antimicrobial pesticide registration, and for other purposes.

S. 1553

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the name of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. KYL] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1553, a bill to provide that members of the Armed Forces performing services for the peacekeeping effort in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina shall be entitled to certain tax benefits in the same manner as if such services were performed in a combat zone.

S. 1560

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SANTORUM] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1560, a bill to require Colombia to meet antinarcotics performance standards for continued assistance and to require a report on the counternarcotics efforts of Colombia.

## SENATE RESOLUTION 85

At the request of Mr. CHAFEE, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KERRY] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Resolution 85, a resolution to express the sense of the Senate that obstetrician-gynecologists should be included in Federal laws relating to the provision of health care.

## SENATE RESOLUTION 215

At the request of Mr. LAUTENBERG, the names of the Senator from Maine [Mr. COHEN] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] were added as cosponsors of Senate Resolution 215, a resolution to designate June 19, 1996, as "National Baseball Day."

## SENATE RESOLUTION 217

At the request of Mrs. KASSEBAUM, the names of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. COCHRAN], the Senator

from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], the Senator from Illinois [Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. DEWINE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBB], the Senator from Maine [Ms. SNOWE], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. JEFFORDS], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. LUGAR] were added as cosponsors of Senate Resolution 217, a resolution to designate the first Friday in May 1996, as "American Foreign Service Day" in recognition of the men and women who have served or are presently serving in the American Foreign Service, and to honor those in the American Foreign Service who have given their lives in the line of duty.

## ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

## THE 250TH ANNIVERSARY OF MERRIMACK, NH

• Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to Merrimack, NH, on their 250th anniversary. On April 2, the 22,500 residents of Merrimack will begin a year-long birthday celebration encompassing numerous town activities to mark this historic occasion.

Very few towns in the United States can claim 250 years as part of their heritage. In 1746, King George II of England issued the town's first charter. During the Revolutionary War, Merrimack residents volunteered as some of the original Minute Men. The volunteers fought in the Battle of Bunker Hill in Charlestown, MA. Miraculously, only one Merrimack life was lost in this battle. Later, over 40 Merrimack men served heroically in the areas of Massachusetts, Rhode Island, West Point, Valley Forge, White Plains, and Fort Ticonderoga. The town of Merrimack paid their soldiers with Indian corn since money was scarce at that time. This is the sort of patriotism and commitment to freedom that Merrimack residents still embody today.

Commercial development in Merrimack began even before King George II issued the first charter. In 1656, John Cromwell established the first trading post. More settlers began arriving via the Merrimack River, from many surrounding areas. Other trading posts were established at ferry landings where stores were stocked with beeswax, molasses, flint, and powder, along with the best sellers of the day, rum and spirits.

In the early 1880's, rich deposits of clay were found in Merrimack allowing the town to create a thriving brick-making industry. By 1846, there were 12 brickyards in town, employing 100 people. Many of the local buildings began using brick with granite foundation from nearby quarries in their construction. Brickmaking and river boating flourished until the railroad arrived in 1852.

In 1872, a cooperage shop at Reed's Ferry was established where English

immigrants came to work. In 1897, other immigrants from Greece, Poland, and Slavic countries arrived to work in the many mills and factories being built.

Today, Merrimack is one of the thriving industrial towns just north of the Massachusetts border, housing many of New Hampshire's most prosperous manufacturers.

Over the years, Merrimack has had a number of famous residents; including Dr. Matthew Thornton whose signature appears on the Declaration of Independence. Among his numerous distinctions, Doctor Thornton was the surgeon of the New Hampshire Troop in 1745, was elected to the Continental Congress in December 1776, and served in the State senate from 1784 to 1786. In 1789, he purchased a large estate, and spent the rest of his 89 years in Merrimack. A monument to honor Matthew Thornton is displayed on the corner of route 3 and Greeley Street.

Today, Merrimack's population has grown to include 22,500 residents. The town boasts a dynamic business environment with a number of small to medium size businesses, many of which are family owned. In addition, Fortune 500 companies, particularly technology firms, dot the business landscape in Merrimack and are continuing to hire more and more residents each year. Merrimack residents are very politically active, attending town and school board meetings regularly. The local chamber of commerce and Rotary Club are also both very involved in local activities.

I wish the town of Merrimack a very happy 250th birthday. I share the pride of all New Hampshire citizens in the accomplishments and rich historic background of this wonderful town and its people. Congratulations Merrimack. •

(At the request of Mr. DORGAN, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.)

## FELIX ROHATYN'S WITHDRAWAL IS A LOSS FOR THE NATION

• Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I would like to share with my colleagues my deep sense of regret over the decision by Felix Rohatyn to withdraw his name from consideration as a nominee to the position of Vice Chairman of the Federal Reserve's Board of Governors.

My disappointment is based upon two factors: The first is that the Nation has lost an opportunity to benefit from the services of someone who not only has deep insights into the how the American economy functions, but someone who also has decades of practical economic experience both in the public and private sector.

Mr. Rohatyn is justifiably celebrated for his successful efforts that brought New York City from the edge of bankruptcy onto sound financial ground. He did so through a combination of public and private action that resulted in downsizing the Nation's fourth largest

government, thus creating the foundation that has allowed New York City to achieve a balanced budget for every year for most of the past two decades.

Felix Rohatyn has also achieved great success in the private sector as the managing partner of the investment banking firm of Lazard Freres. Few people in the Nation can claim to have a better understanding of our capital markets and be able to back up those claims with the cold, hard proof of continued profitable returns for the company that he runs.

But it is the manner in which, and the basis upon which, Mr. Rohatyn was prompted to withdraw his candidacy for this important position that prompts me to take the floor today.

I fully respect—indeed, I encourage—the right of my colleagues to form and express their personal opinions about Presidential nominees. But that respect is diminished when that opposition takes a form that precludes a nominee from even getting a fair and open hearing before the Senate. That respect is diminished when instead of confronting a nominee during the hearing process and allowing that nominee to respond directly to his or her critics, leaked staff reports and innuendo are used to derail a nominee's chances.

But we must go beyond the manner in which these objections were raised to examine the objections themselves, for they portend a slavish devotion to an economic orthodoxy that is out of place in our system of Government.

I could understand active opposition to a nominee if he or she had been an advocate of Marxist economic thought or believed that isolationism was a cure for America's economic ills or was an advocate for some other discredited economic theory.

But it appears that Mr. Rohatyn simply failed to meet some arbitrary litmus test as to who is or isn't a strong advocate for ending "the era of big Government."

Mr. Rohatyn's sin? He proposed that the U.S. Government make investments in the infrastructure of the Nation. That radical thought places Mr. Rohatyn squarely in the camp of such noted American rebels as Daniel Webster, Henry Clay, Theodore Roosevelt, and most notorious of all, Dwight Eisenhower.

Mr. Rohatyn also has the heretical notion that it is possible for the American economy to grow, without risking inflation, at a faster rate than the puny 2.5 percent per year that some—I repeat, some—economists believe is the maximum safe rate of growth.

It is amazing to me that some of my colleagues can become so wedded to specific static numbers in the field of economics, as if the numbers themselves were some sort of Rosetta Stone that could unlock the secret of economic prosperity. Some people must believe that understanding the economy is as easy as calibrating the atomic clock or measuring the snowfall at National Airport. In fact it is the phi-

losophy and methodology that underlies these otherwise meaningless statistics that is of critical importance. On that score, Felix Rohatyn is extremely well qualified to serve on the Federal Reserve Board.

The Federal Reserve is supposed to be an arena in which varying economic ideas can be debated, free from the constraints and pressures of the political arena. In that sense, it mirrors our greatest democratic institutions; if a diversity of opinion wasn't desired, there would be no need to have a Vice Chairman, or a Board of Governors. If monolithic thought were the intent, we would simply have a single Director at the Federal Reserve, whose edicts would be carved onto marble tablets and then disseminated throughout the land.

Mr. President, Mr. Rohatyn's credentials are virtually unquestioned.

The chairman of the Senate Banking Committee recently stated that he thought the Mr. Rohatyn did "an excellent job in New York," referring to his rescue of that city from bankruptcy.

Mr. Rohatyn's colleagues on Wall Street said: "Most people on Wall Street have great respect for Rohatyn and his financial skills. He is a guy who is not at all soft on inflation, so [we] don't know where those rumors to the contrary came from."

The Financial Times said "there are not many U.S. bankers worth listening to. Rohatyn is the exception."

The Washington Post stated, in an editorial entitled, *Playing Games with the Fed*, that "the elected branches in recent years have pretty well given up on the broad management of the economy. They mainly add to the problem, which is then left to the Fed to resolve. They ought not compound the burden they create by spreading to the Fed their own doctrinal quarrel."

Some may view the withdrawal of Mr. Rohatyn from consideration as a victory of sorts. But by depriving the Nation of the benefits of Felix Rohatyn's talents and by imposing an ideological straightjacket on Federal Reserve Board nominees, those who are rejoicing today may find that theirs is a Pyrrhic victory indeed.●

#### TRIBUTE TO U.S.S. "GREENEVILLE"

● Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, on Friday, February 16, I traveled to Norfolk, VA, to deliver the keynote address at the commissioning of the U.S.S. *Greeneville*. This naval attack submarine, was named after the small city of Greeneville, TN, as a tribute to the rich history of the city and its citizens. I ask that my remarks at the commissioning be printed in the RECORD.

The remarks follow:

#### TRIBUTE TO THE U.S.S. "GREENEVILLE"

On behalf of the citizens of Greeneville—and indeed all the people of the great State of Tennessee—it is an honor to be with you on this proud day.

Standing here before this great warship—and the officers and crew who will guide her in defense of freedom—we are filled not only with pride in our Nation and our Navy, but also with confidence that we can and will meet any challenge that lies ahead.

It's been said that each new ship, as she leaves land to find her home in the sea, begins to form a personality that will be hers alone. A personality that encompasses the hopes and dreams of all who built her and all who sail in her. But her personality also takes on the spirit of those in whose honor she is named.

If that is so, the U.S.S. *Greeneville* will be imbued with the courage, pride, and patriotism epitomized by Greeneville, and by the thousands of other small towns across our great land whose people are the heart and soul of America.

She will carry with her the valor of Revolutionary War hero General Nathanael Greene, for whom Greeneville was named. The unflinching integrity of Greeneville's honored son President Andrew Johnson, who helped unite the country after the assassination of Abraham Lincoln. And the pluck of the great Greeneville frontiersman Davy Crockett, who blazed a trail into the wilderness and died defending the Alamo.

And she will carry the pride of every Greenevillian. From Mayor Love and all our elected officials; to the men and women of the Greeneville Metal Manufacturing Company, a subsidiary of the Newport News shipyards; Admiral Francis McCorckle, former commander of the battleship *New Jersey* and a resident of Greeneville for all of his 86 years; and so many others—who wrote letters, signed petitions, and lobbied Congress, the Navy, and anyone who would listen, to have this magnificent submarine bear its name.

While many today advocate a sharply diminished defense in the post-Cold War world, those of you who guard the frontiers of freedom know that the price of peace is eternal vigilance. And it is this vessel—the nuclear attack submarine—that leads the way. It is the sword point of our forward-deployed defenses—the first to respond to threats from potential aggressors, and the first to arrive in times of crisis.

Whether the mission calls for a continuous presence, as in the Caribbean off of Haiti; covert surveillance and reconnaissance, as in the Adriatic off Bosnia; or special operations forces, such as those we have maintained for years in the Korean theater; submarines provide critical direct and indirect support to our military forces, and are a mainstay of our strategic deterrence platform.

As General Nathanael Greene's colleague General George Washington put it, "There is nothing so likely to produce peace as to be well prepared to meet an enemy." Or as a more recent commentator put it, "Today the real test of power is not capacity to make war but capacity to prevent it."

That is why our military and civilian leaders must exercise their vigilance with foresight, with one eye always on the future. The price of unpreparedness is too high in American blood and treasure. We do well today to recall when the decision to build the U.S.S. *Greeneville* was first made, the current commander-in-chief was governor of Arkansas, and I was performing heart transplants in Nashville. And the *Greeneville* will continue to defend America into the next century, after both of us have returned to our home states.

While the Russians continue to produce and improve their submarine capabilities, and we face increased proliferation of submarine technology among many other nations, the United States continues to field the finest submarine force in the world.



And for that we owe a deep debt of gratitude to the skilled men and women of Newport News, who have built and maintained the subs that have kept us ahead of our adversaries. No nation on earth can match the quality and pride that shows in every weld, fitting, and watertight hatch.

We also owe a great debt to the submariners who patrol the icy depths of the world's waters in times of peace and in times of war. Their courage—and devotion to duty—are a model of sacrifice worthy of emulation and gratitude from all of us. Americans are a patriotic people who agree with the poet Homer when he writes: "He serves me most who serves his country best."

To every person who played a role in the fitting-out and commissioning of the U.S.S. *Greeneville*—Thank you.

To the officers and crew who will sail her into the uncharted waters of the future—Good luck and Godspeed. In every sea, on every mission, the spirit and prayers of the people of *Greeneville* will go with you.

They, too, can repeat with you the Midshipman's prayer of the Naval Academy: "Almighty God, whose way is in the sea, whose paths are in the great waters, whose command is over all and whose love never faileth: . . . Protect those in whose love I live. . . . Guide me with the light of truth and give me the strength to faithfully serve thee, now and always."

Finally, to all here today to watch the U.S.S. *Greeneville* come alive, God bless you, God bless *Greeneville*, and God bless America.●

(At the request of Mr. DORGAN, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.)

#### TRIBUTE TO FREDERICK DOUGLASS AND THE TOWN OF HIGHLAND BEACH

● Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, today I join with the citizens of Highland Beach, MD, as they pay tribute to the memory of Frederick Douglass—one of Maryland's most celebrated native sons—by preserving his historic house as a museum. His house, facing the Chesapeake Bay, looks out onto the open sea and was a joyful reminder to Douglass of the freedom he so greatly treasured.

While Frederick Douglass was born in Talbot County, MD, and worked on the docks of Fells Point in Baltimore, he found peace and solace at his home in Highland Beach. Highland Beach was the first town to be established by African-Americans in the State of Maryland and was officially incorporated in 1922, although settlers had been living in the vicinity for decades. The house that is dedicated here today was designed by Douglass, but sadly, he never saw its completion. Instead his son fulfilled the task that was set forth by his father, ensuring that the second floor balcony that Douglass had dreamed of was erected so that, "as a free man, I could look across the bay to the land where I was born a slave."

The Frederick Douglass house was placed on the National Registry of Historic Places in 1992 after extensive renovations were completed. The house has also received the Orlando Rideout Prize for exceptional renovation in December 1995 by the Anne Arundel Coun-

ty Trust for Preservation. While these awards reflect the beauty and history of Douglass' home, that Frederick Douglass could own a home as a free man is the true monument. Douglass rightly believed that owning property was a very important economic accomplishment for African-Americans in the years following the Civil War.

It is, in my view, most fitting that the commemoration of one of Maryland's most noted African-Americans comes during Black History Month. Over the course of history, Maryland has been the home of many prominent African-Americans including writer Langston Hughes, actor and singer Paul Robeson, Washington Judge Robert Terrell, and educator and author Booker T. Washington; all of whom either visited or lived in Highland Beach.

Mr. President, as the Frederick Douglass house becomes a monument in the splendid community of Highland Beach, it provides an avenue for residents and visitors to share in its unique and distinguished past. I join the citizens of Anne Arundel County in demonstrating their pride in the history of Highland Beach and their expectation of continued success in the years ahead.●

#### COMMENDING DEBORAH WOELFLEIN AS THE 1996 NEW HAMPSHIRE TEACHER OF THE YEAR

● Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I rise today to congratulate Deborah K. Woelflein, an English teacher at Merrimack High School, on being named New Hampshire's 1996 National Teacher of the Year. As a former teacher myself, I commend her outstanding accomplishment and well-deserved honor.

Deborah, who is a Nashua resident, will spend the next year representing New Hampshire's teaching profession at various statewide and regional functions. As New Hampshire's Teacher of the Year, she will be considered for the National Teacher of the Year Award sponsored by the Council of Chief State School Officers and Scholastic, Inc. The National Teacher of the Year Program is the oldest and most prestigious honors program to focus public attention on excellence in teaching. New Hampshire's Commissioner of Education, Elizabeth Twomey, named Deborah the Teacher of the Year.

Among Deborah's numerous accomplishments as a teacher are several successful conferences she organized to draw together talented teachers to share their expertise with their colleagues. Timothy Mayes, principal at Merrimack High School, called her "one of our most respected faculty members."

New Hampshire has always been lucky to have many talented teachers, but Deborah Woelflein is certainly a role model among the teachers of the Granite State. I am proud of her commitment to education and congratulate her distinguished achievement.●

#### THE FARM BILL—WETLAND RESTORATION

● Mr. LEAHY. Sections 357 and 358 of S. 1541 were included in an amendment to which we jointly agreed. Section 357 establishes flood water retention pilot projects under which farmers may receive incentives to restore land to fully functioning wetlands. The restoration of these wetlands will benefit their neighbors by reducing flooding.

Section 358 was included in the bill to ensure that when a farmer voluntarily restores a wetland on land now exempt from Swampbuster penalties, that land will not subsequently be considered a converted wetland under Swampbuster. Section 364 was then added because of concern that section 358 did not protect against abandonment related regulatory policies. The sections need to be rewritten to work correctly.

Would the Senator from Indiana agree that I have correctly described the history of these amendments?

Mr. LUGAR. I agree with my colleague about the history of these amendments.

Mr. LEAHY. It is important that these amendments be correctly drafted if they are included in the final bill. Would my colleague agree that we will work together in conference to develop a provision based on the following principle:

Swampbuster should operate in a manner that encourages voluntary restoration of wetlands. A farmer should not suffer a Swampbuster penalty if land he restores to a wetland later reverts to its prerestoration status. However, such a provision should be implemented in a fashion consistent with the wetland protection goals of Swampbuster.

Mr. LUGAR. I agree with my colleague and will work to rewrite this provision according to this principle in conference.●

#### THE UNIVERSITY OF NEW MEXICO OPENS AN ONLINE GATEWAY SITE TO THE U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE [GPO]

● Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize the collaborative efforts of the libraries of the University of New Mexico and the U.S. Government Printing Office to make important Federal Government documents more accessible to the public. On February 29, 1996, the University of New Mexico will officially open a gateway site that will allow online access to the U.S. Government Printing Office. This online feature will allow students, constituents, and the public equal and timely access to Government documents including the Federal Register, the Congressional Calendar, congressional bills, public laws, and the United States Code.

UNM has long been a leader in education and research in both New Mexico and our Nation. This initiative reaffirms the University of New Mexico's

commitment to building and maintaining a world class research library. The university offers outstanding programs that promote the use of invaluable documents that are included in the GPO's data base.

The GPO has chosen UNM to be one of seven libraries in the country that will provide World Wide Web access to the GPO. With the Internet connection, individuals all over the world will have the opportunity to search and access some of the most important documents in our Nation. Built on an existing campus and a public network, this gateway depository will serve as a model to the electronic library depository system nationwide.

Mr. President, for its outstanding accomplishments, sincere interest in opening the information superhighway, and its outstanding service to New Mexico and our Nation in the area of education and technology, I would like to commend the University of New Mexico.●

#### COMMENDING GORHAM HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS FOR THEIR PARTICIPATION IN THE "WE THE PEOPLE . . . CITIZEN AND THE CONSTITUTION" PROGRAM

● Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I would like to commend 17 students from Gorham High School in Gorham, N.H. who were recently selected to compete in the national finals of the "We the People . . . Citizen and the Constitution" program to be held April 27 to 29 in Washington, DC. These high school students competed on the State level on January 29 for the opportunity to represent New Hampshire at the national competition, and will be among more than 1,200 students from 49 States and the District of Columbia to participate.

The distinguished members of the team representing New Hampshire are: Elizabeth Baker, Sarah Belanger, Mary Anne Bevin, Erika Clark, Amy Davis, Alexandria Dery, George Eichler, Kathy Fortin, Kevin Glines, Andrea Guay, Kari Horne, Kami Michaud, Chad Miller, Gina Piattoni, Amie Tanguay, Alicia Turner, and Jamie Washburn.

All 17 New Hampshire students will be tested on the Constitution and Bill of Rights before simulated congressional committees to demonstrate their knowledge of constitutional principles and their relevance to contemporary issues. The competition in Washington will consist of 2 days of hearings; and the 10 finalists, with the highest scores, will compete for the title of national winner on Capitol Hill in a congressional hearing room.

Michael Brosnan, a teacher at Gorham High School, also deserves special recognition for helping these students prepare for the intense constitutional testing. Raymond Kneeland, the District coordinator of the "We the People . . . Citizen and the Constitution" program, Holly Belson, the State coordinator, and Howard Zibel, of the New Hampshire Bar Association, all con-

tributed a significant amount of time and effort to help the students reach the national finals. I applaud all of them on their commitment to enriching the lives of these students.

The "We the People . . . Citizen and the Constitution" program provides an excellent opportunity for students to gain an informed perspective about the history and principles of our Nation's constitutional government. I wish these young constitutional experts from Gorham High School and their teacher, Michael Brosnan, the best of luck in preparing for the April National finals. We are proud to have them representing New Hampshire, and wish them luck as they prepare to be America's leaders in the 21st century.●

(At the request of Mr. DORGAN, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD)

#### BLACK HISTORY MONTH

● Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I rise today to add my voice to those who have already spoken in recognition of February as Black History Month. Since 1926 this Nation has designated February as the month in which we honor the achievements and contributions of African-Americans to our history, our culture, and our future.

One could also say that February is the month in which we honor our Nation's unsung heroes—from the African-American soldiers who have often received no acknowledgement for fighting in the American Revolution to the African-American poets and authors often excluded from literary anthologies. The history of African-Americans is the history of what this country has come to mean to so many people around the world. It is the story of seemingly unsurmountable odds overcome and challenges yet to be faced. This year the President has asked us all to pay a special tribute to the achievements and contributions of black women who have risen above the twin burdens of racism and sexism.

Black History Month provides our Nation with an opportunity to reflect upon the progress which we have made as a nation in our struggle to promote the constitutional principles of liberty, equality, and justice. One black woman who contributed to the preservation of those principles was Barbara Jordan. I was honored to have served alongside Barbara Jordan in the Congress, and I recall very well her steadfast devotion to our Constitution. Barbara Jordan eloquently and with great faith articulated and lived the basic principles underlying our democratic government and society. I witnessed this dedication first-hand during our service on the House Judiciary Committee during the impeachment proceedings of former President Nixon. Barbara Jordan understood that our Constitution is a precious covenant and did her utmost to defend and uphold its promises to all of the citizens of the United States. With her recent passing, our Nation has lost

one of the Constitution's great defenders, and I know that my colleagues will agree with me when I say that Barbara Jordan will be greatly missed.

Mr. President, my own State of Maryland has been blessed to be the birthplace and home of countless outstanding black Americans. Maryland was a bedrock of the underground railroad which helped many African-Americans find their way out of slavery to freedom. In fact, and Harriet Tubman, the African-American woman credited with leading more than 200 men, women, and children to freedom on the underground railroad, was a Marylander.

Born into slavery around 1821 on a Dorchester County plantation, Harriet Tubman escaped in 1849. However, instead of turning her back on those she had left behind, Harriet Tubman used her knowledge of Maryland's Eastern Shore to help other slaves escape to freedom. She was so successful that Maryland plantation owners placed a \$40,000 price on her head, dead or alive. Although she is most often remembered for her work on the underground railroad, Harriet Tubman's service to this Nation continued throughout her life. During the Civil War, she served as a spy for the Union Army as well as a scout and a nurse. After the Civil War Harriet Tubman worked to resettle Negro war refugees, to establish the African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church, and on behalf of women's suffrage.

The history of Maryland is replete with the contributions of African-American women—many of which have gone undocumented and unrecognized. Black History Month affords all Americans an opportunity to honor our heroes both past and present, and to remind ourselves of the many national heroes whose faces do not adorn currency or postage stamps and whose stories are not told in history books or encyclopedias.

Mr. President, as we near the end of this month, I hope that each of us will take a moment to remember the lessons of Black History Month and to carry them with us throughout the year as a reminder of all that is truly possible. Two hundred years ago, how many Americans would have imagined a Barbara Jordan or an Alice Walker? Black History Month is a time to celebrate—to celebrate all of the great achievements of African-Americans, to celebrate how far this country has come, and to remind us of how much further we have to go.●

#### PAUL G. GOEBEL, JR.

● Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, I rise today to mark the passing of Paul G. Goebel, Jr., insurance executive and longtime friend to the University of Michigan, Kent County Republicans, and the people of Michigan. Paul's life showed how hard work, honesty, and decency can still produce success in

America, and how they also can produce a giving character and important good works.

After graduating from the University of Michigan in 1954, Paul served a 2-year hitch in the U.S. Army. On returning home he entered the insurance business. In the mid-1960's he began work with the Goebel-Hammon agency, which became the Paul Goebel Group in the mid 1980's. This successful agency provided coverage for professional associations and businesses. In 1994 he left the business in the capable hands of his daughter, Margaret.

Paul's activities were never limited to his business. He served as president of the University of Michigan Grand Rapids Alumni Club. As early as 1968 he received the Outstanding Young Man of the Year Award from the Grand Rapids Jaycees. He was appointed an honorary member of the United Way of Kent County in 1977 and served in a variety of capacities for that agency, including president.

An Ada Township resident, Paul also was a big supporter of the Republican cause in Kent County and in Michigan as a whole. The son of Paul G. Goebel, Sr., mayor of Grand Rapids during much of the 1950's, he also served as a Kent County commissioner from 1972 to 1974 and was once chairman of the county GOP. In 1974 he launched an unsuccessful bid to win back for the Republicans the seat once held by Gerald Ford. Disappointing as it was, however, this loss could hardly mar a life filled with friendship, family, and an active desire to serve the community.

Paul passed away on February 15, just a few weeks after being diagnosed with lung cancer. My thoughts go out to his family but, sad as I am at his passing, I also feel privileged to have known a man of his warm and giving character.●

#### CHARLES CAMPBELL'S SPEECH IN HONOR OF SENATOR RICHARD B. RUSSELL

● Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, on January 24, 1996, I joined many of our colleagues in honoring the late Senator Richard Brevard Russell of Georgia. Almost 25 years after the death of Senator Russell, hundreds of Russell family members, friends, and former colleagues dedicated a 7-foot marble statue of Senator Russell in the rotunda of the Senate Office Building which bears his name.

In the near future, our distinguished colleague, the Honorable ROBERT C. BYRD, will insert a transcript of the ceremony into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Today, I want to share with the Senate excerpts from a speech delivered last fall at the Governor's Mansion in Atlanta by Mr. Charles E. Campbell, president of the Richard B. Russell Foundation in Atlanta. I am grateful to Mr. William Jordan, my friend and a former senior staff assistant to Senator Russell, for making this text available to me.

Mr. President, I ask that excerpts of Mr. Campbell's speech be printed in the RECORD so that it may be part of the historical record of Senator Russell's distinguished career in public service.

The material follows:

REMARKS BY CHARLES E. CAMPBELL AT THE RUSSELL STATUE LUNCHEON, OCTOBER 23, 1995

Thank you, Governor Miller. First, I would like to express the appreciation of the Russell Foundation to Governor Miller and Senator Nunn for hosting this luncheon today. Zell Miller and Sam Nunn have long been friends of Richard Russell and of the Russell Foundation.

I had the privilege of working for the last 6 years of Senator Russell's life as a member of his staff in Washington. Today, I have the honor to serve as Chairman of the Richard Russell Foundation. The Russell Foundation is a non-profit corporation established by admirers of Senator Russell in Georgia. It supports numerous activities related to the preservation of the Senator's memory, his records and discussion of public policy questions in which Senator Russell had a particular interest.

Next January will mark the 25th anniversary of Richard Russell's death. At that time, we will have an opportunity to participate in an event that will not only bring great credit to Senator Russell but to our State as well. I refer to the dedication of the Richard B. Russell Statue. The Russell Statue is a 7-foot marble statue that will be placed in the Rotunda area of the Russell Senate Office Building. The Russell Senate Office Building is the oldest and most prestigious of the three senate office buildings in Washington. In 1972—the year after Senator Russell died—the Congress, through joint resolution, renamed what had been known as the "Old Senate Office Building" as the "Richard B. Russell Senate Office Building." The Russell Senate Office Building is one of the most important buildings in our Nation's Capitol. It was there that such momentous events in the history of our country took place as the hearings to inquire into President Truman's dismissal of General Douglas MacArthur during the Korean War (hearings which Senator Russell chaired incidentally), the announcement of John F. Kennedy's presidential campaign, the Senate Watergate hearings (of which Senator Talmadge was such an important part), and, more recently, the Clarence Thomas confirmation hearings.

The dedication of the Russell Statue at 4 p.m. on January 24, 1996 will focus on three distinct aspects of Senator Russell's Senate career: (1) Richard B. Russell—A President's Senator; (2) Richard B. Russell—A Senator's Senator and (3) Richard B. Russell—Georgia's Senator.

The President of the United States has been invited to speak on the first topic and, while he has made no final commitment, the initial indications are positive for his participation. Senator Robert Byrd, the former Majority Leader of the Senate, and Senator Robert Dole, the present Majority Leader of the Senate, have both agreed to speak on Richard B. Russell—a Senator's Senator. Our Governor will speak on the topic of "Richard B. Russell—Georgia's Senator." Senator Sam Nunn will serve as Master of Ceremonies.

Many of you in this room knew Richard Russell personally and many others of you know him by reputation. His career was one of the most outstanding in our Nation's history. He served 50 continuous years in public office. He served 10 years in the Georgia House of Representatives, including the last 4 as Speaker. He became Speaker of the Georgia House in 1926 before he was even 30 years of age. He became Georgia's youngest

Governor in 1930 at age 32 during the depths of the great depression. The administration of Governor Russell was one of decisive change in our State—he cut the number of State agencies from 102 to 17 and cut the cost of Government by 20 percent. At the same time, there were numerous progressive achievements of the Russell administration including the creation of a unified system of higher education under a Board of Regents insulated from politics. That system survives today.

When a Senate seat became vacant in 1932, Governor Russell ran successfully and took office at the age of 34 on January 12, 1933. He was the Nation's youngest Senator.

Richard Russell served 38 years in the U.S. Senate, becoming the first person in the history of the United States to serve over half their life in the Senate. During this time, from 1933 through 1970—he never missed a single opening session of Congress. You might call him the Cal Ripken of the Senate.

Senator Russell's Senate career was perhaps unique in the history of our Country. No Senator, at least in modern times, has amassed the power and influence that Richard Russell enjoyed both in the Senate itself and at the White House.

When we refer to Richard Russell as a "President's Senator" we are referring to the fact that he enjoyed an extremely close relationship with every American President from Franklin Roosevelt through Richard Nixon and was a confidential advisor of every one of them.

Four of the Presidents with whom Senator Russell served—Harry Truman, John Kennedy, Lyndon Johnson and Richard Nixon—had previously served in the Senate where Richard Russell was the preeminent Senator. He knew them all well and they all knew before they arrived at the White House that Richard Russell was the foremost congressional authority on national security and a Senator who was good to his word in all matters. The other two Presidents—Franklin Roosevelt and Dwight Eisenhower—also had extensive prior relationships with Senator Russell. Franklin Roosevelt and Richard Russell became friends as young men when they were both serving as Governor of their States—Franklin Roosevelt in New York and Richard Russell here in Georgia.

In fact, at the 1932 Democratic National Convention, Richard Russell made a nominating speech for Franklin Roosevelt in the first of Roosevelt's four successful campaigns for the White House. Even though he was a new Senator at the time, Richard Russell had a significant leadership role in the Senate in passing New Deal farm legislation that created the Farmer's Home Administration, established farm price supports and soil conservation protection measures. During this time, he authored the National School Lunch Program.

Senator Russell, as a result of his position of influence on the Senate Armed Services Committee, dealt extensively with Dwight Eisenhower when General Eisenhower was the Supreme Allied Commander in World War II. They had become close friends before 1952 when General Eisenhower was elected President. Their friendship continued and grew during the Eisenhower Presidency.

One characteristic that was dominant in Senator Russell's relationship not only with Presidents but with everyone else was his staunch independence. No matter how close a friend he was of a President nor how much political pressure was brought to bear on him, he steadfastly refused to support any measure in which he did not personally believe. Probably the two Presidents who were the closest personally to Richard Russell were Franklin Roosevelt and Lyndon Johnson. However, in both instances, Richard

Russell could not support important legislative matters pursued by them. He was one of four Senators to provide the decisive votes against President Roosevelt's efforts to pack the Supreme Court after it declared several of the New Deal programs unconstitutional. His independence also caused strains in his relationship with Lyndon Johnson 30 years later when he opposed certain provisions in the President's civil rights legislation, the social programs of the "Great Society" and the way in which the War in Vietnam was conducted.

In all things, Richard Russell remained true to his view of what was best for the Country.

If Senator Russell's friendship with Presidents was unusual, his standing in the Senate itself was perhaps unique. His power was such that he could have become Majority Leader or Minority Leader on any number of occasions. However, he declined because of his desire to maintain independence of thought and voting, making it impossible for him to agree in advance to support the program of any administration. Instead of becoming Majority or Minority Leader of the Senate, he largely selected several such leaders and became the Senate's mentor. Senators of both parties, of all political persuasions and from all parts of the country turned to Richard Russell more than anyone else for guidance and for help in the discharge of their Senate duties. They knew he was a man of integrity, independence and good faith.

Richard Russell was, in deed, a Senator's Senator.

He was also Georgia's Senator. Many times, it seems that one who achieves the position of national prominence and power as did Richard Russell, forgets his or her home state constituents because of the press of what are viewed as more important duties. Such was not the case with Richard Russell. Up until the very end, he considered among his most important duties that of faithfully representing the people of Georgia in Washington. He was fond of saying "I have been elected to represent and work for Georgia's interest in Washington and not Washington's interest in Georgia."

Georgians have benefited immensely and continue to benefit from Richard Russell's public service career. Benefits directly traceable to his representation of Georgia in the Senate include Lockheed—Georgia as a prime military contractor and a principal employer in this State, the National Communicable Disease Center here in Atlanta, the Richard Russell Federal Building that houses our federal court system, the numerous Corps of Engineers lake developments on Georgia's rivers, and too many outstanding military bases to even mention.

I relate two brief stories to illustrate the importance serving Georgia had to Richard Russell up until the very end. Several years before he died, Senator Russell became the President Pro Tempore of the Senate—which is in some ways roughly equivalent to the Speaker of the House of Representatives. As President Pro Tempore, he was the titular head of the Senate and third in line of succession to the Presidency. A part of the job as President Pro Tempore was to make appointments to various national commissions or boards where the President had an appointment, the Speaker of the House had an appointment and the President Pro Tempore of the Senate had an appointment.

After routinely approving recommended appointments for a couple of weeks, Senator Russell called me into his office one day and had on his desk a proposed appointment to a national commission. He asked me: "Isn't there anyone in Georgia qualified for any of these positions?" We got to looking around

and found out that the particular appointment in question was in a discipline in which a professor at Georgia State University here in Atlanta was a nationally recognized expert. Senator Russell deleted the name of the recommended appointee and inserted the Georgia State professor instead. Amazingly, thereafter the names of qualified Georgians started appearing with greater frequency on the lists.

A second true story I would relate involves Senator Russell's decision regarding activities relating to his death. Before he died, he specified that his body was to be returned to Georgia immediately upon his death. This is because he wanted his body to lie in State at Georgia's Capitol here in Atlanta as opposed to in Washington. It is ironic that when the President's Senator and the Senator's Senator died, there were only three official activities marking his death in Washington: (1) The President of the United States ordered American flags to half staff; (2) the President paused in his State of the Union Address for a moment of silent prayer and (3) the hearse carrying Senator Russell's body was viewed by the entire Senate standing on the Capitol steps on its way to Andrews Air Force Base to be returned via Air Force One to Georgia.

Richard Russell, was, in deed, Georgia's Senator. The inscription selected by the Russell Foundation to be placed on the Russell Statue will read simply as follows:

"Richard B. Russell, Jr.—Senator from Georgia—1933–1971."•

#### ASTRONAUT RICHARD SEARFOSS

• Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I rise today to congratulate Astronaut Richard Searfoss, a Portsmouth, NH, native, who will pilot the space shuttle *Atlantis*, scheduled to leave Cape Canaveral, FL, in March. This is an exceptional honor for an astronaut, and everyone in his home State of New Hampshire is very proud of his accomplishment.

Richard attended Portsmouth High School and as a student scored a perfect 1,600 on his scholastic aptitude test. He was also the keynote speaker at the Portsmouth High School graduation ceremony for the class of 1994. Later, Richard on a National Science Foundation Fellowship in 1979 earned a master of science degree in aeronautics from the California Institute of Technology. The people of Portsmouth recognize Richard as an outstanding role model for all of his hard work and determination in becoming an exemplary astronaut.

Richard will pilot the 9-day *Atlantis* mission that will allow the five astronauts on board to hook up with the Russian space station, *Mir*, and drop off Astronaut Shannon Lucid. Shannon will spend 4 months aboard the manned space station, located about 200 nautical miles from Earth. *Atlantis* will dock at the space station for 5 days and then return to Earth with one of the three other astronauts who manned the station. The flight will also include a spacewalk.

This mission is not the first time Richard has been in space. As a test pilot in the October 1993 space mission, Richard was one of seven crew members to participate in a 2-week life sciences mission on the space shuttle

*Columbia*. I had the opportunity to meet Richard in February 1994, and his commitment to the space program and to America was heartening.

New Hampshire is very proud of Richard's leadership in the NASA space program and wish him continued success in the future. We are honored to have him represent us in the final frontier.●

#### DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996—CONFERENCE REPORT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Chair lays before the Senate the conference report to accompany H.R. 2546, the D.C. appropriations bill, which the clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The committee on conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2546) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses this report, signed by a majority of the conferees.

The Senate proceeded to consider the conference report.

(The conference report is printed in the House proceedings of the RECORD of January 31, 1996.)

#### CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The bill clerk read as follows:

#### CLOTURE MOTION

We the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the conference report to accompany H.R. 2546, the D.C. appropriations bill:

Robert Dole, James M. Jeffords, Richard Lugar, Conrad Burns, Strom Thurmond, Slade Gorton, Charles Grassley, Robert F. Bennett, Christopher Bond, Nancy Kassebaum, Mark Hatfield, Arlen Specter, Mitch McConnell, Ted Stevens, Connie Mack, and Pete V. Domenici.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, for the information of all Senators, this cloture vote will occur on Tuesday, February 27, at 2:15 p.m., and will be the first vote of the week.

#### ORDER FOR RECORD TO REMAIN OPEN UNTIL 2 P.M.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the RECORD remain open today until the hour of 2 p.m., for the introduction of bills and the submission of statements by Senators.

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

---

PROGRAM

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, under the previous order, when the Senate completes its business today, it will stand in recess until the hour of 3 p.m., Monday, February 26, and that following the prayer, Senator AKAKA will be recognized to read President George Washington's Farewell Address. I ask unanimous consent that following the reading of the address, there be deemed to

have been a period for morning business so that Senators may submit statements for the RECORD until 4 p.m., or until the reading of Washington's Farewell Address is completed, whichever is later.

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

Mr. LOTT. No further business will be transacted on Monday and there will be no rollcall votes. Senators are reminded that the next rollcall vote will be at 2:15 p.m., Tuesday, February 27, to invoke cloture on the District of Co-

lumbia appropriations conference report.

---

RECESS UNTIL MONDAY,  
FEBRUARY 26, 1996, AT 3 P.M.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I now ask that the Senate stand in recess under the previous order.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:53 p.m., recessed until Monday, February 26, 1996, at 3 p.m.