

SENATE—Monday, March 29, 1993

(Legislative day of Wednesday, March 3, 1993)

The Senate met at 12 noon, on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the Honorable BOB GRAHAM, a Senator from the State of Florida.

PRAYER

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

Let us pray:

Except the Lord build the house, they labour in vain that build it: except the Lord keep the city, the watchman waketh but in vain.—Psalm 127:1.

Almighty God our Heavenly Father, the psalmist brings us face to face with the tragic limitations of the best that legislation can do—the futility of the finest human effort. All the statistics concerning crime, dysfunctional families, divorce, violence, drugs, teenage pregnancy, and suicide are growing. At the same time, leadership is doing everything in its power to stop regression.

Help us to see, Father, that this is the price a secular society pays when it rules God out of its life. Without God—without an infinite and eternal reference point—the animalism in humanity grows, and the world becomes a jungle. Without God, all the symptoms of paganism are manifest—cheapness of human life, violence, child sacrifice, hedonism, greed, lust, moral and ethical anarchy.

Gracious, patient God, our Founding Fathers were no better, no wiser than this generation, but they took God seriously. They prayed to Him, depended on Him, sought His will. Restore in us their faith.

We pray in the name of the holy Son of God. Amen.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

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

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, March 29, 1993.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, section 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable BOB GRAHAM, a Senator from the State of Florida, to perform the duties of the Chair.

ROBERT C. BYRD,
President pro tempore.

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

MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, there will now be a period for the transaction of morning business not to extend beyond the hour of 12:30 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for not to exceed 5 minutes.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader.

SCHEDULE

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, and Members of the Senate, there will now be a period for morning business during which Senators will be permitted to speak until 12:30 p.m., at which time the Senate will return to consideration of the pending bill, the supplemental appropriations bill, which includes the President's economic investment and stimulus program.

I have been advised that our Republican colleagues will be holding a caucus from 1 to 1:45 p.m. and have requested that the Senate stand in recess during that period of time. Of course, we will be pleased, as always, to accommodate that request. So the Senate will stand in recess from 1 until 1:45 and then at 1:45 will return to consideration of the supplemental appropriations bill.

Mr. President, I wish now to repeat what I have said on many, many occasions over the past 2 weeks. The Senate is scheduled to begin the Easter recess at the close of business on this Friday, April 2. Prior to that time, we must complete action on the pending measure, on the conference report on the budget resolution, and on the debt limit extension. We will be required to remain in session until those measures are completed. If, through diligence and good fortune, we are able to complete action on those measures prior to Friday, why, of course, we will discontinue our session at that time.

So I look forward to working with my colleagues to try to complete action on those important measures as soon as possible. Votes may occur at any time from 12:30 p.m. today on throughout the week until we complete action on these measures. There are no restrictions with respect to when votes may occur once we resume action on the supplemental appropriations bill at 12:30 p.m.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.
Mr. COCHRAN addressed the Chair.
The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Mississippi.

ECONOMIC AND POLITICAL REFORMS IN RUSSIA

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, this morning we have all watched very closely and read about the events unfolding in Moscow. We have observed with a great deal of concern the struggle for control over policies and direction of economic and political reform in Russia and in other states of the old Soviet Union.

It seems to me that this is a time when we in the Congress should work together on a bipartisan basis with the President to define policies and programs to help encourage the reformers in the Soviet Union and also to help ensure the success of economic and democratic reform in Russia.

Obviously, this is a problem that is too big for the United States to solve by itself, even with massive direct financial assistance, credits and other programs that we have discussed in recent months. In the final analysis, it is really up to the people of Russia and the Russian leadership to decide what their future will be. But our future is directly tied to the events that are occurring in Russia today. So I do not think we should sit back and passively observe the events without trying to be a constructive and positive force for multinational assistance to support the reformers in Russia.

We need to speak with one voice at this time, and I encourage all in the Senate to try to set aside partisan considerations at a time when we are trying to develop a program for active assistance to the reformers in Russia.

I am optimistic that there are some things that we can do that will be very helpful. Encouraging the International Monetary Fund, for example, to be more aggressive and to be more generous in designing an assistance package for Russia would be a very meaningful first step. The \$84 billion debt that now hangs over the Russian economy needs to be refinanced. They are going to have to find some way to buy the goods to address their emergency and long-term investment needs.

As a part of this assistance package, there should be a fund for loans to entrepreneurs, both for those in the Russian Republic and for those seeking to do business in the Russian Republic. The goal would be to encourage entre-

preneurial activity and to help private businesses create jobs for workers that provide stable sources of income. Rather than subsidizing the state-owned industries and businesses which the opponents of reform want to do in Russia, we should try to use our influence to encourage private entrepreneurial and business activity that will assure economic growth. That is what is needed.

That will send a very clear signal to both the reformers and the people of Russia that they are not in this by themselves and that they are not being abandoned to the forces of opposition within Russia at this very perilous time in their transition.

There are training programs, Mr. President, that I think we could expand in order to teach Russian managers the precepts, the practices, and the benefits of private enterprise. We have some exchange programs that are already underway and are designed to deal with some sectors of the economy. We had a delegation from Russia visit my State of Mississippi recently to learn how private enterprise farming and agribusiness enterprises work. They saw how to modify their system to take advantage of proven practices in our system that have led to such a high standard of living for so many of our citizens.

I think we can use our experience and know-how, in a way that will help teach—not in a dominating way but in a helpful way—those in the old Soviet Union, in Russia, and in the other states who want to succeed in the modernization of their economy and their political system. We have to be involved. We should not just look the other way.

Their future is certainly at stake, but ours is, too. We would hate to see a reversal of the democratic reforms that have taken place and the return to a hostile militarism in the former Soviet Union. That is certainly not a happy thought.

So I hope in the days ahead, Mr. President, that we will work in a cooperative way here—Republicans and Democrats—with the President to define and promote programs that will help encourage reform, help give reform a better chance of succeeding than it would have without our assistance.

I think that is very important right now. I think our influence will be felt not only within Russia and the other States of the former Soviet Union, but in Eastern Europe, where they are struggling with democratic and free-market reforms, and it will also help encourage and bolster the resolve of other influential democracies around the world to be more generous and to become more involved in helping to assure effective multinational cooperative assistance for Russia and the democratic reformers there.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

NUCLEAR WEAPONS PROLIFERATION

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, our world faces change at a rapid pace. Although the cold war no longer threatens our very existence, the chilling after-effects still linger. In the last half-century, new technologies and other scientific discoveries have exceeded our expectations. One of the greatest scientific achievements of this century is the amazing discovery and progressive development of nuclear science. Nuclear science can yield enormous benefits for humanity. Unfortunately, the uncertainty of a post-cold-war world and the endless advance of technology have combined to increase the threat of nuclear proliferation.

I rise today to address the implications of nuclear proliferation and to commend Zachery Davis and his colleagues at the Congressional Research Service for their extensive research on nuclear disarmament and nonproliferation of nuclear material.

A few years ago, I asked the Congressional Research Service, known as CRS, to conduct comprehensive research on the problematic consequences of nuclear disarmament in accordance with international reduction treaties. I also asked CRS to publish the research findings in an issue brief. Since then, CRS has published many informative issue briefs on nuclear disarmament that my staff and I find very useful.

On the subject of disarmament, Churchill's fable said it best:

Once upon a time all the animals in the zoo decided that they would disarm, and they arranged to have a conference to arrange the matter. So the Rhinoceros said when he opened the proceedings that the use of teeth was barbarous and horrible and ought to be strictly prohibited by general consent. Horns, which were mainly defensive weapons, would, of course, have to be allowed. The Buffalo, the Stag, the Porcupine, and even the little Hedgehog all said they would vote with the Rhino, but the Lion and the Tiger took a different view. They defended teeth and even claws, which they described as honourable weapons of immemorial antiquity.

The Panther, the Leopard, the Puma, and the whole tribe of small cats all supported the Lion and the Tiger. Then the Bear spoke. He proposed that both teeth and horns should be banned and never used again for fighting by any animal. It would be quite enough if animals were allowed to give each other a good hug when they quarreled. No one could object to that. It was so fraternal,

and that would be a great step toward peace. However, all the other animals were very offended, with the Deer and the Turkey falling into a perfect panic.

The discussion got so hot and angry, and all those animals began thinking so much about horns and teeth and hugging when they argued about peaceful intentions that had brought them together that they began to look at one another in a very nasty way. Luckily the keepers were able to calm them down and persuade them to go back quietly to their cages, and they began to feel quite friendly with one another again.

Like the peaceful existence of the animals in Churchill's fable, the cold war has subsided. Bipolarism no longer exists. The process of full-scale disarmament is underway. The greatest scientific minds are no longer being directed toward the annihilation of the human race.

Recently, the United States experienced a possible terrorist attack—the bombing of the World Trade Center in New York City. The facts of the explosion still are being unearthed among the twisted steel and concrete rubble. The explosion was of conventional non-nuclear compounds. However, imagine for a moment that the terrorists had access to nuclear material. If the terrorists had obtained or constructed a device, need I elaborate on the catastrophic outcome?

The optimist would argue that terrorists would never be able to obtain or operate nuclear material. A recent CRS report, "Swords Into Energy: Nuclear Weapons Materials After the Cold War," concluded otherwise. According to the CRS, small quantities of nuclear materials have disappeared from arsenals within the former Soviet Union. It is believed these and other nuclear materials have reached the black market. Since the Soviet Union's collapse, several arrests have been made in Europe in connection with nuclear technology. So far, the material confiscated has not been suitable for nuclear-grade explosives.

A CRS Issue Brief, "Nuclear Weapons: Dismantlement and Disposal of Retired U.S. and CIS Inventories," suggests several methods of disposal of nuclear material in accordance with the Strategic Arms Reduction Talks [START] Treaty. Some of the recommendations are highly controversial and may be improbable solutions. But the fact of the matter is that there is an urgent need for a plausible and responsible solution to this frightening nuclear dilemma. Time is of the essence.

It is somewhat reassuring to know that U.S. nuclear material can be traced. There are viable safeguards to prevent our nuclear material from falling into the wrong hands. Such a vital system does not exist in the former Soviet Union.

To assure the same degree of accountability in nuclear disarmament in the former Soviet Union, the United

States should continue its assistance in Russia's nuclear dismantlement. Without strong international cooperation to maintain a safeguarded nuclear arsenal, the risk of retired nuclear materials being used as a viable terrorist threat is much greater.

On September 29, 1992, I gave a speech regarding possible options for disposal of current nuclear stockpiles. Included in my speech was the CRS report entitled "Nuclear Material From Dismantled Warheads: What To Do With It and How To Verify Its Disposal." Since that time, CRS has continued its extensive research on this vital subject. I commend Zachery Davis and his colleagues at CRS for their exemplary work.

Hopefully, the international community will continue to coordinate successful efforts to prevent nuclear material from proliferating to hostile governments or terrorists. Time is short, and further inattention to the issue will only increase potential risks. Nuclear nonproliferation should be of the highest priority on the international agenda.

Mr. President, I speak as ranking member of the Terrorism, Narcotics, and International Organization Subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee. We all have to think very seriously about what would happen if a small amount of nuclear material were in the hands of the type of terrorists who bombed the World Trade Center in New York.

We also have to follow the events in Russia very closely. Last year, I made a trip to several of the CIS States, including Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan, and others, and many of those still possess some nuclear materials. I know there are plans for destroying our missile silos, at least in western South Dakota.

The Russians supposedly are destroying their nuclear silos. But there is still a great deal of nuclear material in this world now controlled by smaller countries with unstable governments. Those governments desperately need hard currency. They desperately need money. And we are unsure exactly who is in control of that nuclear material in many of those countries.

I know that this is not an easy problem, but some of the steps that the Clinton administration and the Congress are taking in regard to Russia are related to controlling this nuclear material. Several of our colleagues in the Senate have done a good job. But it is a very sobering thought—had these materials been carried in a suitcase—as to what would have happened at the World Trade Center had those terrorists had nuclear materials.

TRIBUTE TO BOB KASTEN

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to our colleague,

the distinguished former senior Senator from Wisconsin, Bob Kasten. I am honored to be able to follow Senator Kasten as the ranking member of the Senate Small Business Committee, a committee on which he served during his entire tenure in the Senate.

Bob Kasten was known throughout Wisconsin as "Mr. Small Business." His reputation as a tireless worker and advocate for small business in the Senate earned him that well-deserved title. Senator Kasten was a small businessman. He helped run his family's shoe business in Thiensville and Campbellsport, WI. The family business gave him the firsthand, real life experience of meeting a payroll, keeping the balance sheets in the black, and dealing with Federal taxes, regulations, and paperwork. The insights Senator Kasten gained in his family business would later shape his entire legislative agenda in the U.S. Senate. He was a staunch advocate for small business, economic growth, and job creation.

Mr. President, a great example of Senator Kasten's commitment to protect small business from Government overregulation came with the successful repeal of the outrageous tax regulation known as section 89. As my colleagues may remember, section 89 of the Internal Revenue Code was a backdoor scheme to tax fringe benefits. It required small businesses to prove—at their expense—that their employee health benefit plans did not favor one group of workers over another. Businesses that failed to comply would be taxed. Compliance with section 89 would have been so complicated and so expensive for small businesses that many would have been forced to lay off employees—or drop their health insurance plans altogether.

Senator Kasten diligently offered a total of eight amendments throughout the spring and summer of 1989 to repeal section 89. Finally, in August, he succeeded with an appropriations amendment to prohibit the IRS from using funds to issue regulations and enforce section 89. Senator Kasten was not finished. On November 7, 1989, legislation to repeal section 89 passed the Senate and was signed into law by President Bush the next day. While many legislators wanted to compromise or back down, Senator Kasten held firm to his pledge to repeal the entire law. In a letter to Senator Kasten, John Motley, vice president of government relations for the National Federation of Independent Business, wrote:

You were the one who pushed the fight (on section 89) forward, who kept the issue before the Senate and the one who worked the hardest to make repeal a reality. You and your terrific staff did what so many said was impossible.

Senator Kasten demonstrated his commitment to small business in other ways, as well. Senator Kasten was the principal Republican sponsor of a pro-

posal to cut payroll taxes. He believed that high levels of payroll taxes are a barrier to job creation because they raise labor costs for small business. Senator Kasten was a proponent of simplifying the payroll tax deposit system; extending the minimum wage exemption for small business; and stopping efforts to undo regulatory exemptions that have protected the smallest employers and farmers from programmed OSHA safety inspections.

Bob Kasten also supported efforts to assist small businesses in complying with the 1990 Clean Air Act amendments. He also worked tirelessly to strengthen the hand of the President to stop burdensome bureaucratic rules and intrusive redtape in order to achieve a goal of 5 percent annual reduction in the Federal paperwork burden.

In order to expand economic opportunities for minorities and the disadvantaged, Senator Kasten led the fight for Federal urban and rural enterprise zones. In conjunction with the chairman of the Small Business Committee, Senator BUMPERS, Senator Kasten also worked to create and expand the Federal Microloans Program. His efforts were instrumental in delivering four Microloans Programs for Wisconsin to provide much-needed capital for new and existing small businesses.

With the American economy supporting 70 percent of the world's lawyers and many small businesses diverting their resources from the creation and production of goods to costly, needless self-defense measures, Senator Kasten believes, as do I and many of my colleagues, that our product liability laws need reform.

Senator Kasten was a tireless advocate for improving our current product liability laws and the U.S. legal system in general. I was proud to work closely with him in that effort. From his first day in the Senate, Senator Kasten worked tirelessly to convince Congress to fix this out-of-control system through his Product Liability Fairness Act. Year after year, Senator Kasten was successful in getting his legislation passed out of the Commerce Committee, but the trial lawyers and their advocates in the Senate were able to thwart his efforts on the Senate floor.

Finally, Mr. President, Senator Kasten was recognized as a leader in the fight to revitalize our economy through progrowth tax reforms. As one of the principal authors of the so-called Kemp-Kasten tax reform bill, he was instrumental in the Tax Code revolution of the mid-1980's. In the late 1980's, he led the effort to restore the capital gains deferential to spark entrepreneurship.

Senator Kasten's efforts on behalf of small business were recognized by entrepreneurs in Wisconsin and across the country. He is one of only a handful of Senators to receive the National

Federation of Independent Business' Guardian of Small Business Award and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce's Spirit of Enterprise Award for his pro-small-business voting record in every year he served in the Senate. And in 1992, NFIB gave Senator Kasten a special Small Business Legislator of the Decade Award in recognition of his overall leadership on behalf of the small business community.

Again, Mr. President, on behalf of America's small business community, let me reiterate our deep appreciation for Bob Kasten's 12 years of faithful service to small business in this distinguished body. It is a great pleasure and privilege for me to stand here today and publicly thank Senator Bob Kasten for his efforts. I am sure all of my colleagues will agree when I say it is our hope that Senator Kasten left this body with a deep feeling of satisfaction for a job well done. We miss him.

EFFECTS OF TAX PROPOSALS ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, I would like to report to the Senate that I held the first of a series of meetings and hearings on small business in Sioux Falls, SD, last Saturday morning. I reported to the small businessmen and women what effects the Clinton tax proposal might have on small business. As the ranking member of the Small Business Committee, I listened to their concerns and answered their questions. We had a panel discussion on small business, on the tax increases included in Clinton's package, the investment tax credit and the energy tax increases. I am very concerned that small business is being asked to pay for President Clinton's spending increases. Small business tax rates will go up to 42.5 percent while the rates for large corporations will be 36 percent. Small business cannot pass on the additional costs energy tax. It is true that it appears there will be some benefit from the investment tax credit. I think the tax policy of this body regarding small business should be carefully scrutinized because small business creates most of the new jobs and the new technology in our society, and under Clinton's plan, small business has been hit hardest, at least in my State.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD summaries of statements and excerpts of statements from small businessmen who were responding to the current economic conditions on small business as it affects South Dakota and our Nation.

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

OFFICE OF SENATOR LARRY PRESSLER
CONSTITUENT CALL

Call from: Bill Ferguson, Rt. 2, Box 71, Witten, SD 57584.

Mr. Ferguson called to say he saw Senator Pressler on C-SPAN this morning and has a few comments.

During the debate on Senator Pressler's Small Business Tax Fairness Amendment to the Budget Resolution, Senator Sasser, who was arguing against Senator Pressler and small business, made an incorrect statement.

Senator Sasser said that all business costs are deductible before taxes, and that is wrong. The costs of day to day operations are deductible, but the principal payments on loans are not. Principal payments, especially on land, can be large and are a necessary expense of owning a small business or farm. Mr. Ferguson would like Larry to correct Senator Sasser's remarks.

Mr. Ferguson also wanted Larry to know that the Administration's plan would have a devastating impact on farming and small businesses operations such as his. Mr. Ferguson was appreciative of Senator Pressler's efforts on behalf of small businesses and family farms.

Rapid City, SD.

DEAR SENATOR PRESSLER: Thank you for the invitation to the Small Business Seminar in Sioux Falls on the 27th.

I am glad you continue to try to reduce the amount of Federally mandated regulations and paperwork. I waste a lot of time on it.

Sincerely,

ALAN SEWELL,
President, The Little Print Shop.

CHAMBERLAIN, SD.

March 12, 1993.

SENATOR PRESSLER: Stop Spending First.
Thanks.

ROBERT G. KEINER.

IRRESPONSIBLE CONGRESS? HERE IS TODAY'S BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, the Federal debt—run up by the U.S. Congress—stood at \$4,222,072,198.199.65 as of the close of business on Thursday, March 25.

Anybody remotely familiar with the U.S. Constitution is bound to know that no President can spend a dime of the taxpayers' money that has not first been authorized and appropriated by the Congress of the United States. Therefore, no Member of Congress, House or Senate, can pass the buck as to the responsibility for this long-term and shameful display of irresponsibility. The dead cat lies on the doorstep of the Congress of the United States.

During the past fiscal year, it cost the American taxpayers \$286,022,000,000 merely to pay the interest on reckless Federal spending, approved by Congress—spending of the taxpayers' money over and above what the Federal Government has collected in taxes and other income. This has been what is called deficit spending—but it's really a form of thievery. Averaged out, this astounding interest paid on the Federal debt amounts to \$5.5 billion every week, or \$785 million every day—just to pay, I reiterate for the purpose of emphasis, the interest on the existing Federal debt.

Looking at it on a per capita basis, every man, woman, and child in Amer-

ica owes \$16,437.31—thanks to the big spenders in Congress for the past half century. The interest payments on this massive debt, average out to be \$1,127.85 per year for each man, woman, and child in America. Or, looking at it still another way, for each family of four, the tab—to pay the interest alone, mind you—comes to \$4,511.40 per year.

Does this prompt you to wonder what America's economic stability would be like today if, for the past five or six decades, there had been a Congress with the courage and the integrity to maintain a balanced Federal budget? The arithmetic speaks for itself.

A TRIBUTE J. CALEB BOGGS

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I rise and report to the Senate with great sadness the death of former Delaware Governor, Representative and Senator J. Caleb Boggs, who passed away Friday night in Christiana Hospital, near Wilmington.

Cale, as he was known, was a public servant, a lawyer, a family man—and Delaware's friend. He was my friend. When I first came to Washington in the 1960's as Delaware's Member of the House of Representatives, and when I joined the Senate in 1971, Senator Boggs was generous with his time and with his advice. He was there to answer my questions, to listen, and to lend a helping hand to the new kid on the block.

Cale Boggs was Delaware's consummate politician. He did it all. Governor Boggs served for 8 years, from 1953 until 1961. He was the First State's Representative from 1947 until 1953; and he was Senator for two terms, from 1961 until 1973.

Cale Boggs was a true Delawarean, born in Cheswold, whose family's Delaware roots date back to pre-Civil War days. He graduated from the University of Delaware and then received a law degree from Georgetown University. Cale later served with distinction in World War II and in the Delaware National Guard. After his career as Governor and in Washington, Cale returned to his law practice in Wilmington, and remained there until he retired.

Delaware has lost a great man. We have lost a man who loved his State with a passion; who knew most people by their first names, regardless of their age, race, or color; and, who considered every Delawarean his friend. He will be missed by me—and more than 600,000 other Delawareans.

I ask that obituaries pertaining to his death appear in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the obituaries were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wilmington (DE) News Journal,
Mar. 28, 1993]

MR. DELAWARE: DIAMOND STATE'S GLOW IS DIMMER TODAY WITH CALE BOGGS' DEATH

J. Caleb Boggs, Mr. Delaware, died Friday night after a lengthy, often painful, illness.

He was a man who loved his native state and its people. He was a generous man who gave constantly and expected nothing in return. He was an unassuming man who never seemed to allow high office to rob him of the ordinary pleasures of life.

Will Rogers used to say he "never met a man he didn't like." Well, we've never met a person who didn't like Cale Boggs. From the Green Acres suburb in north Wilmington where he lived to Selbyville on the Maryland border, everyone loved Cale. And why not? He never put on the airs of a big-time politician—though he was as big and important as they come. Whether as governor or just Cale Boggs, attorney, his hand was out in greeting accompanied by a warm "Hi, good to see you." It wasn't false. It was warm and true, like the man.

Over the years, Cale Boggs held just about every important office a person could hold in Delaware: governor, U.S. senator, U.S. representative, judge. He was a Republican through and through, but counted oh, so many Democrats, among his close friends.

J. Caleb Boggs was as comfortable and confident on a soybean field as he was in a law office conference room. He slowed his pace only recently when his body gave him no choice.

Cale Boggs was born in rural Cheswold in Kent County—the very heart of Delaware. In so many ways, Cale Boggs represented the heart of our state: quiet, strong, life-enriching.

[From the Wilmington (DE) News Journal,
Mar. 28, 1993]

J. CALEB BOGGS: 1909-1993—FORMER
DELAWARE GOVERNOR, U.S. SENATOR DIES
(By Nan Clements)

CHRISTIANA.—J. Caleb Boggs, who returned all the love Delawareans gave him, died Friday night in Christiana Hospital, almost a year to the day after the April 1 death of his beloved wife, Bess.

The former governor and U.S. senator, who had suffered from cancer, diabetes and other serious ailments for several years, was 83.

"Cale was such a wonderful person that it's hard to understand why he had to suffer such a terrible death," said former Gov. Sherman W. Tribbitt, a longtime close personal friend.

"He suffered too much, for too long," said his daughter, Marilu Boggs.

The Cheswold-born Republican, whose family's Delaware roots pre-dated the Civil War, was one of the First State's biggest boosters.

"I think it's a great little state *** [with] high-class, first-class people," he said in a 1991 interview.

He was qualified to make the judgment—he probably knew more Delawareans than anyone in the state's history. Because he knew so many, his governorship and his political campaigns were intensely personal.

"He went to every event regular people cared about," said U.S. Sen. Joseph R. Biden Jr., D-Del. "And he still went to those events after his political career ended, until his health got too bad."

Fellow politicians spoke of his remarkable memory, which served him well to the end.

"He seemed to know everyone," said U.S. Rep. Michael N. Castle, R-Del. "It might take him a minute or two to place you, but once he did, you were locked into place."

Mr. Boggs thought nothing of marching across the street, stopping traffic if necessary, to greet a friend—and he considered nearly everyone his friend. Virtually no one called him "Mr. Boggs"—the man with a bright twinkle in his eye was "Cale" or "Governor" or "Senator."

He and his chauffeur, the late Walter Nedwick—who became a close hunting and fishing companion—logged more than 500,000 miles on Delaware roads while Mr. Boggs was governor.

His personal contacts stood him in good stead in 1954, during his first term as governor, when the U.S. Supreme Court, as part of the landmark *Brown vs. Board of Education* decision, ordered the desegregation of Delaware schools.

"I had to take a position on that *** and I had to go up and down the state because I knew people felt differently than I did, and I wanted them to understand all the aspects [of integration] as I saw it," he said of his support for the decision. "I felt close to the people, I needed the benefit of their counsel and advice. ***"

Fellow politicians thought he'd killed any chance at re-election, but he fooled the naysayers and won a second term. Then he moved on to the U.S. Senate.

Former Democratic Gov. Elbert N. Carvel, whose two terms bracketed Mr. Boggs' stint in the state's highest office, considered him something of a state treasure.

"Caleb served Delaware on all levels," Carvel said two years ago. "Caleb is much beloved in Delaware, and he deserved every attention the state can give him."

Mr. Boggs considered the naming of the J. Caleb Boggs Federal Building in Wilmington the highlight of his life—and his joy showed vividly on his face in a picture taken that day.

His life began in Kent County on May 15, 1909. He was educated in public schools, then went to the University of Delaware. He graduated in 1931, the same year he married Elizabeth "Bess" Muir of Carbondale, Pa.

Then he went to Georgetown University, where he received his law degree in 1937.

Mr. Boggs joined the Delaware National Guard in 1926. During World War II, he served with the 6th Armored Division fighting in Normandy, the Rhineland, the Ardennes and central Europe. He earned five Campaign Stars, the Legion of Merit, the Croix de Guerre with palm and the Bronze Star with cluster.

After being deactivated as a colonel, he was appointed a brigadier general with the Delaware National Guard. He retired from military service in 1963.

After the war, Mr. Boggs intended returning to his law practice, but Delaware Republicans "came looking for someone to run for Congress" and launched his public service career.

Before that career ended, he had served eight years as governor, from 1953 to 1961, and represented Delaware in both the U.S. House of Representatives (1947-53) and Senate (1961-73).

Even in high office, Mr. Boggs never set himself above others. Delaware then had no governor's mansion and the Boggs lived in an apartment complex north of Wilmington. Later, when he was elected to the Senate, the family moved to the house they occupied for about 30 years, his last address, at 1203 Grinnell Road in Green Acres, a suburb north of Wilmington.

He retired from the Wilmington law firm of Bayard, Handelman & Murdoch about 10 years ago.

He was a New Castle County Family Court judge in 1946 and chairman of the National Governors Conference in 1959. Other official positions included an honorary membership in the Japanese Diet (1965); membership in the Joint Committee on Organization of the Congress (1965-66), the White House Con-

ference on International Cooperation (1965) and the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO (1964-66).

[From the Wilmington (DE) News-Journal,
Mar. 28, 1993]

J. CALEB BOGGS: 1909-1993—FORMER DELAWARE GOVERNOR, U.S. SENATOR DIES AT AGE 83

He also served as Senate member of the National Commission on Fire Prevention and Control (1971-72) and was a member of the board of visitors for the U.S. Military Academy at West Point (1965), the U.S. Naval Academy at Annapolis (1966 and 1972) and the U.S. Air Force Academy at Colorado Springs (1970).

One of his primary interests was Kappa Alpha, the social fraternity he joined while a student at the University of Delaware. He held every high national office in the fraternity, which honored him several years ago with a significant contribution in his name to the national Kappa Alpha Scholarship Fund.

Mr. Boggs was a trustee of Goldey-Beacom College for more than 25 years. The business school made him an honorary life trustee and awarded him an honorary doctorate. He also received honorary doctorates from Delaware State College, Bethany (W.Va.) College and the University of Delaware.

His directorships included RLC Corp., Rollins Environmental Services Inc., Beneficial National Bank, Artisan Savings Bank, Delaware Safety Council, Blood Bank of Delaware, Greater Wilmington Development Council, Delaware Automobile Club, the Delaware Chapter of the Arthritis Foundation and the Salvation Army Regional Advisory Board.

Mr. Boggs was a member of the American and Delaware Bar Associations, the Sons of the American Revolution, the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Kiwanis Club, Ducks Unlimited, the Delaware Grange, the National Lawyers Club in Washington, the U.S. Capitol Hill Club and Former Members of Congress.

Surviving, besides his daughter, Marilu of Green Acres, is a son, J. Caleb Boggs Jr. of Wilmington; a brother, Calvin Boggs of Cheswold; and two grandchildren.

Services will be at 2 p.m. Friday in Cheswold Methodist Church, where friends may call an hour earlier. He will be buried beside his wife in Old Presbyterian Church Cemetery, Dover.

Friends who wish to attend the funeral by bus would call the president's office at Goldey-Beacom College, 998-8814, before noon Wednesday.

The family suggests donations to Cheswold Methodist Church, the Delaware Chapter of the Arthritis Foundation, or the Wilmington Endowment Fund of the Salvation Army.

[From the Wilmington (DE) News Journal,
Mar. 28, 1993]

J. CALEB BOGGS: 1909-1993—"DELAWARE HAS
LOST A GIANT"

"I long to end my public career with the reputation he had *** No one ever questioned Cale Boggs' integrity, honesty and decency."—Joseph R. Biden Jr., Democratic senator.

"Cale was the greatest patriarch the Delaware Republican Party has ever had. I admired his feel for people. *** He was an incredible human being in relating to others."—Michael N. Castle, Republican representative.

"Cale was a great, conscientious fellow who never lost his composure. I don't have

enough words to describe what a wonderful man he was."—Sherman W. Tribbitt, former Democratic governor.

"I've never seen a man so unselfish. * * * He gave himself to serving the state and the people."—John W. Rollins, Boggs' lieutenant governor.

"With the death of J. Caleb Boggs, Delaware has lost a giant. When I sought his counsel, he always told me I was doing just fine."—Gov. Carper.

"I remember a letter from Roy Wilkins (president of the national NAACP), urging us to support Cale Boggs for re-election. Cale was our friend, and one of my favorite persons."—Littleton P. Mitchell, former NAACP leader.

"He was one of the most beautiful people I ever met * * * He made me feel really good about myself, that I had something special to offer."—Richard A. Strunk, fellow Kiwanian and Legionnaire.

"We were longtime friends and political opponents. I'm going to miss Cale—there aren't many Cale Boggses around this state, or anywhere else."—Elbert N. Carvel, former Democratic governor.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business?

The time for morning business has expired.

The Senator from West Virginia is recognized.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask that the Senate resume consideration of the pending measure under the order.

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is the regular order.

The Senate will resume consideration of H.R. 1335.

The clerk will report the bill.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1335) making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1993, and for other purposes.

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill.

Pending:

(1) Byrd amendment No. 271, to reduce funds for the information systems of the Internal Revenue Service, to delete funding for the General Services Administration Building Fund, and to clarify that none of the funds may be used for low priority programs, projects or activities.

(2) Byrd amendment No. 272 (to amendment No. 271), in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I understand that the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania wishes to speak as in morning business. How long, may I ask my friend, does he think he would like to speak?

Mr. SPECTER. I thank the distinguished President pro tempore. I expect to speak not in excess of 5 minutes.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator may use more if he needs it.

Mr. SPECTER. Then I expect to speak not more than 10 minutes.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania may address the Senate as in morning business for not to exceed 10 minutes, after which I again be recognized.

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

The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. SPECTER. I thank the Chair.

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

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I understand that the Senate, under the previous order, will recess from 1 o'clock to 1:45 to allow the Republican conference to meet.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. There was a request for a recess from 1 o'clock to 1:45. However, the order has not been entered.

Mr. BYRD. It has not been entered.

I am informed that the majority leader still wants that order entered.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I therefore ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess from the hour of 1 p.m. today to the hour of 1:45 p.m. this day to allow for the Republican conference and that, upon reaching the hour of 1:45 p.m. today, the Senate resume consideration of the now-pending measure; provided further that my remarks which will continue in the afternoon not show an interruption in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; and ordered further that upon the Senate's resumption of the pending measure at 1:45 p.m. today, I again be recognized and that my speech not be counted as a second speech.

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

RECESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate now stands in recess.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 1:01 p.m., recessed until 1:45 p.m., whereupon the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer [Mr. DORGAN].

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the Senate is now into its third day of consider-

ation of H.R. 1335, the economic stimulus appropriations bill. The pending Byrd amendment is a substitute for the substitute for the committee-reported substitute. It contains the President's proposal with the following exceptions:

First, the formulas for the \$1 billion distribution to the States of the summer jobs program in the pending substitute is in accordance with the existing formula contained in the Joint Training Partnership Act. The President requested, and the House bill contained a legislative change in that formula. The Senate Labor Committee, chaired by the very able Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] requested that the Senate Appropriations Committee amend the House bill so that these summer job funds would be distributed to the States according to the current formulas contained in the JTPA.

Second, during earlier Senate action on the committee-reported substitute, the Senate adopted the Byrd-Hatfield amendment. This amendment is also contained in the pending Byrd substitute. It is intended to provide the administration with sufficient authority to ensure that some of the funds in the act cannot be used for low-priority, wasteful programs or projects. The President and OMB Director Panetta have assured us that no such projects or programs were intended to be funded, and I am certain that is the case. However, Senator HATFIELD and I included in our amendment the authority for the Secretary of HUD to publish criteria in the Federal Register to ensure that only worthwhile requests will qualify for CDBG funds.

Senator HOLLINGS, at the meeting of the full committee, when the full committee reported the bill and the committee substitute therefor, expressed a great concern about this subject matter.

He provided language to be included in the statement, and this bill further assures that that language will be followed. Without this authority, the administration may not have been able to refuse funding for questionable programs or projects.

Third, the pending Byrd substitute reduces funding for the IRS from \$148,397,000 to \$43,600,000; and deletes funding of \$4,696,000 for the GSA Federal Building Fund. These changes were made at the request of the distinguished chairman of the Treasury-Postal Appropriations Subcommittee, Senator DECONCINI.

Other than these changes, Mr. President, the pending substitute contains the President's proposals as passed by the House.

Mr. President, this measure contains the funding requested by the President for the first priority of his economic plan. Along with long-term investment and deficit reduction, President Clinton identified immediate job creation

as a critical component of economic recovery.

During his campaign across America, he saw, firsthand, the devastating effects of the recession on millions of unemployed and underemployed men and women. He campaigned on a promise of change and he recognized that before we embark on the long and painful road toward budget balance, we must first put people back to work. Before undertaking the major surgery that will be required under the House and Senate-passed budget resolution to reduce the deficit some \$500 billion over the coming 5 years, the President has asked us to enact the job-creating stimulus contained in the pending measure. The American people, as I stated in my remarks last Thursday, agree with the President, by large majorities in several recent surveys, namely that creating jobs should be our first priority.

On last Thursday, I also explained the details of the package—\$4 billion to continue unemployment benefits for 1.8 million unemployed workers who will otherwise lose their benefits by the first week in April; \$3 billion to fully fund the Federal-aid housing program and put thousands of people to work this summer on authorized highway projects that are ready to go; \$2.5 billion for community development projects that will get underway immediately upon enactment of this bill; \$1 billion for summer jobs for an additional 683,000 disadvantaged youth; about \$1.2 billion for mass transit, airport, and rail projects that will increase capacity, improve safety, and decrease congestion in our public transportation systems; SBA loan authority for an additional \$2.6 billion to enable the Small Business Administration to continue making loans to small businesses—without these funds we are told that SBA will cease making loans in May; \$236 million to make repairs and to better maintain our Veterans' hospitals and cemeteries; \$1.9 billion for Pell grants for low-income students; \$500 million for Head Start; \$300 million to immunize more of our children against disease; \$845 million for State and local communities to construct wastewater treatment facilities—we are told that the backlog, nationwide, for such sewage treatment facilities is in excess of \$100 billion; additional EDA grants of \$74 million—of which \$15 million is to be targeted to assist victims of Hurricanes Andrew and Iniki and \$15 million is to go to assist communities impacted by military base closures and defense cutbacks; and \$735 million for a one-time \$500 million expansion of summer school programs for educationally disadvantaged children and a one-time \$235 million adjustment for local school districts whose funds are being drastically cut back due to the 1990 census.

These are the President's recommendations to put Americans to

work now, as well as to meet the health and educational needs of the disadvantaged and to continue unemployment benefits for 1.8 million unemployed workers whose benefits will expire next week unless we enact the President's economic stimulus plan.

Mr. President, there has been criticism of this package by a number of Senators. Those criticisms generally fall into four categories: First, this package will generate a small number of jobs; second, the cost of the package should be offset so that we won't increase the deficit; third, we should defer certain portions of the package until after we have enacted the reconciliation bill so that we can be certain that the deficit will be reduced by approximately \$500 billion over the next 5 years; and finally, a General Accounting Office report has been cited which states that a similar 1983 stimulus package was not very successful.

Now I will respond, as best I can, to each of these general criticisms:

First, as to the criticism that this package will provide but few jobs, that there will be little job creation as a result of the President's economic stimulus package, which I prefer to call a jobs bill—several Senators have stated that this package, according to the President's own figures, will generate only 219,000 jobs. I have not been able to confirm that figure, but let us assume that it is correct. However, I say to my colleagues, there is an important distinction between the jobs estimated by the Clinton administration for this package compared to job estimates used by previous administrations. This President chose not to count the number of jobs that will be created indirectly throughout the economy as a result of this bill. In the past, for example, we have been told by the Department of Transportation that approximately 42,000 total jobs—both direct jobs and ripple-effect jobs—are created by \$1 billion of highway spending. This President chose to count only approximately 20,000 jobs per \$1 billion of highway spending. That is less than one-half the number of jobs that the previous administration would have counted. Therefore, if we accepted or assumed the figure of 219,000 jobs that Senators who have criticized the package have said will be created, we could easily justify at least double that number of jobs by using the criteria of the previous administration.

But, Mr. President, we should not accept the figure of 219,000 jobs in the first place. According to data provided by OMB, the President's package will create 683,000 jobs this summer for disadvantaged youth. From that one program, we will put 683,000 14- to 21-year-olds to work this summer in communities across the Nation who otherwise would have no jobs. We all recognize that these are temporary jobs for the summer only, but they are vitally im-

portant for disadvantaged youth. Furthermore, if Senators wish to know how many jobs are estimated by the administration to be created, they can find that information on page 3 of House Document 103-50, entitled "Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Request *** Communication from the President of the United States." Page 3 contains a letter from OMB Director Panetta. The fourth paragraph of that letter reads, in part, as follows: "The supplemental requests, together with the tax stimulus proposals, will create an estimated 500,000 new jobs by the end of 1994." So, even using the conservative methodology of the President in estimating the number of jobs that will be created by this bill and the tax stimulus, we will get 500,000 jobs. If we count the ripple effects on the economy—much like tossing a pebble in the water and watching the ripples go on and on and on and on until they reach the banks of the pool—if we count the ripple effects on the economy, that number would be over 1 million jobs.

Furthermore, if we use the logic of those who have downplayed this number of jobs, perhaps we should appropriate a much larger number of dollars. The needs are certainly there to justify a stimulus package—as was stated during the campaign and after the campaign—the needs are there to justify a stimulus package of \$50 to \$60 billion. That is the level that was talked about by a number of respected economists as being a prudent stimulus package.

During the debate on the fiscal year 1993 budget, the Appropriations Committee conducted hearings, hearings in the full committee, and economists appearing before my committee stated very clearly the need for that kind of stimulus and some said even higher.

But, the President recognized, and the Appropriations Committee has agreed, that the \$16.3 billion contained in this stimulus supplemental, this emergency stimulus supplemental, is a good effort when one considers the need to cut the deficit in the coming years.

Alternatively, would those who have downplayed the number of jobs that will be created by the President's stimulus package recommend that we do nothing? Well, Mr. President, we had an election last November and the President made his intentions very clear. The people voted to elect this President and his economic program—a first priority of which is to enact this jobs stimulus package. The American people still, by large margins, support enactment of a job-creating stimulus package.

Mr. President, I see my friend, the senior Senator from Mississippi, on the floor. Does he wish to address the Senate?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I do not. I was here to listen to the remarks of the Senator. I appreciate very much his inquiry.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the distinguished Senator.

Mr. President, the stimulus bill should be offset. This is the number two criticism. There were four general criticisms that we gleaned from the debate last week, and I have enumerated those four. Just now I am attempting to take a swat at the second one, the second one being that the stimulus bill should be offset.

The second area, as I have indicated, of criticism about this package is that its cost should be offset in order to avoid an increase in the deficit. The President has directly responded that such offsets would cancel out the benefits. It does not take a mathematical genius to figure that out. If one intends to spend \$16.3 billion from one pocket to create jobs, and yet he takes away \$16.3 billion in spending from his other pocket, he has no net increase—he robs Peter's pocket to pay Paul's pocket—no stimulus at all. The one pocket wipes out the other, the effect of the other.

In addition, as I have explained in previously delivered remarks, and as the chairman of the Budget Committee, the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee, Mr. SASSER, has confirmed, the Senate-passed budget resolution included the 1994 through 1998 cost of this stimulus package in it and will still reduce the deficit by \$502 billion over the next 5 years. That is nearly \$30 billion greater deficit reduction than requested by the President. To pay for the cost of this bill, on top of the \$502 billion in deficit reduction, would not only cancel the job-creating benefits of this package, it would also bring the Nation perilously close to a triple-dip recession. We would bear full responsibility for such a third relapse and for the increase in the deficit that would surely result. We would have even higher unemployment, higher record numbers of people with no choice but to go on food stamps, AFDC, and Medicaid. Is that what the American people want?

The third general criticism that has been expressed toward the pending jobs package: defer portions of this package until after enactment of reconciliation.

Mr. President, if we defer the obligation of these funds until after enactment of reconciliation, we may never see these funds at all. The reconciliation conferees, as was so well explained by the Senator from Oklahoma during his very well delivered and lengthy remarks last Thursday, often do not meet the deficit reduction targets called for in their reconciliation instructions. The Budget Committees cannot insist that the Finance Committee, on which both Senators BOREN and BREAUX serve, meet the deficit re-

duction target that is called for in the Senate-passed budget resolution. That would be most unfortunate, and I certainly urge both Senators BOREN and BREAUX to do their level best to achieve the deficit reduction target assigned to the Finance Committee; nevertheless, we cannot be sure, as Senator BOREN has said, that the target will be reached.

As proof of this possible result, I have firsthand experience. For fiscal year 1990, the Finance and Ways and Means Committees could not come up with the necessary revenues and mandatory spending cuts to meet their reconciliation target. So what happened? The Appropriations Committee was asked to contribute. Even though the appropriations bills for fiscal year 1990 stayed within their caps—and, I might add, have always kept their part of deficit reduction targets every year, and must do so or suffer across-the-board cuts called sequesters—even though we had stayed within the fiscal year 1990 caps, we appropriators were called upon to take a further cut in order to make up for the shortfall by the Finance and Ways and Means Committees in meeting their deficit reduction target. So, we did that—I suggest there is a job to be done and we will do this—so we did it. We took an across-the-board cut of \$3.7 billion in budget authority and \$2.5 billion in outlays in fiscal year 1990 to make up for the reconciliation shortfall. That cut not only affected discretionary spending for fiscal year 1990, it also cut the baseline for each year thereafter. So, the cuts in fiscal year 1990 carried over and will result in lower baselines totaling almost \$25 billion in budget authority and \$23.4 billion in outlays over the 6-year period, fiscal years 1990–95.

So when I suggest the appropriators will take an across-the-board cut of \$3.7 billion in budget authority and \$2.5 billion in outlays in fiscal year 1990, that was not the end of it, Mr. President.

As it extended through the subsequent years, the fiscal year 1990 cuts carried over and, as I say, instead of \$3.7 billion in budget authority and \$2.5 billion in outlays, what the Appropriations Committees have given up as result of lower baselines is almost \$25 billion in budget authority and \$23.4 billion in outlays over that 6-year period. This meant that, on top of the drastic cuts below inflation suffered by discretionary programs during the decade of the 1980's, we locked in place these further cuts below baseline because the reconciliation conferees could not meet their deficit reduction targets.

This is a real danger in the upcoming reconciliation conference. That is another reason why I oppose any delay or fencing of any of the funds in this stimulus package. History has shown, and the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. BOREN] has warned us that

the reconciliation conference may not achieve the level of deficit reduction that the conference will be called upon to make.

The Appropriations Committee will meet its deficit reduction target. It always has met its deficit reduction target, and it will meet its deficit reduction target, not because there are not going to be pressures to exceed the caps placed on discretionary spending, and not because the Appropriations Committee is more virtuous than other committees, but because we will have across-the-board cuts if we do not meet our targets. So, I urge Senators not to jeopardize portions of this stimulus package until after enactment of reconciliation. Do not do it. To do so will jeopardize the delayed funds. It will create a tempting source for the reconciliation conferees to tax in meeting their own targets. We should, instead, insist that the reconciliation bill meet its target from sources within the jurisdiction of those committees and not, once again, look to discretionary spending to bail them out, because we are not going to bail them out.

The fourth general criticism went to the GAO report stating that the GAO report says that the 1983 stimulus did not work well. Finally, the criticism has been raised by Senators BOREN, BREAUX, and HATFIELD that, according to GAO, the 1983 jobs bill was not very successful, the funds were not obligated long after they were appropriated and, therefore, we should not enact this stimulus bill at all.

In response, Mr. President, with all due respect, this is not the Reagan administration. President Clinton believes in a responsive and efficient Federal role in solving the Nation's economic woes.

He has studied the Federal bureaucracy and decided it should tighten its belt; that we should reorganize the Federal Government to avoid duplication; we should eliminate programs that do not work; we should wean ourselves from programs that consume our resources and, instead, put our resources into public investments that can help increase economic growth and secure a future for the coming generations. As part of that program, the President has studied which programs will do the most good in this limited stimulus package and he and his Cabinet have assured us that the funds in this bill can be spent quickly and efficiently on worthwhile investments. I should like to read the relevant portions of the testimony given by members of President Clinton's Cabinet before the House Appropriations Committee in support of this economic stimulus package:

First, Housing and Urban Development Secretary Cisneros stated, in part:

I have met with the mayors, I have met with the county officials, I have met with

the governors and told them just how critical it is that they pick projects that are not going to be waiting a long time for engineering or design permits. *** I would predict that the vast majority of these funds, and indeed I have made this commitment to the President, would result in dirt flying and people at work by this summer.

Second, Secretary Espy of the Department of Agriculture made these comments with regard to rural water and sewer grants:

I will do everything within my power to obligate the funds as quickly as possible. The fact that the funding will go to projects that have been planned for some time should expedite the spent-out once the projects are approved. As you know, the word is already spreading that additional funds will be available for this fiscal year, so communities will be ready to move as soon as funds are available.

Third, Labor Secretary Reich, when talking about the summer jobs program, stated:

*** the primary reason that money was not spent in previous summers is that the program got off to such a late start. I believe that last year it wasn't until late June that mayors even knew that they would have funds for this particular program. *** We have talked with the mayors, we have talked with the cities, administrators and we have received assurance that with enough time, they can do an extraordinary good job providing the jobs for kids, but also providing academic enrichment, the kind of tutoring programs we have also been urging. *** April 1st would allow six weeks of planning, which is adequate.

Fourth, energy Secretary O'Leary, in reviewing proposals for R&D funds and lab funds, said:

We are capable, available and stand ready to obligate them all, and that was really—that is the point of the decision to recommend both the supplemental and the reprogramming.

Fifth, Mr. Dickey, the Acting Assistant Secretary of the Army on Corps of Engineers Infrastructure Projects stated:

In putting together this program, we of course limit ourselves to authorized work and work that can be gotten under way quite quickly. The projects all meet our normal budgetary criteria, which means they are engineeringly sound, they are economically sound, they are environmentally sound; and they address high-priority outputs, including navigation, flood control, hydroelectric power and environmental protection.

Mr. President, I am prepared to speak quite at length this afternoon, but I see some other Senators wishing to address the Senate. If they will indulge me for just a few minutes, then I will seek to yield the floor to them while retaining my rights to the floor.

Mr. President, the pending amendment is a complete substitute to a complete substitute to a complete committee substitute for the House bill. The House bill is open to further amendment. The committee substitute is open to amendment.

But, in the final analysis, the adoption of the pending substitute for the

substitute for the substitute would have the effect of wiping out any amendments that had been adopted theretofore, either to the bill or to the committee substitute.

Now, why did I do this? Why did I set up this so-called tree? There are some other trees that can be planted and nurtured and brought to full strength.

I have sought to protect the President's package. I believe in it. He believes in it. He had previously indicated to me by letter that that package—that stimulus package, that emergency stimulus package, that emergency jobs package—was needed and he was not willing to encourage the amendment of it by fencing off a portion of it or by requiring offsets.

So, therefore, the President, having informed me as to where he wanted to stand—he did this by request last Tuesday, I believe it was—I took him at his word; he wrote me a letter—and that is precisely what I have attempted to do; namely, protect the package as he wants it and, hopefully, get it passed in that form.

Now, there has been a little bit of crying in the beer about my having taken this approach.

But I have encouraged Senators, or tried to encourage Senators, to offer amendments—offer amendments to the bill, offer amendments to the committee substitute.

A Senator on the Republican side of the aisle indicated that it would not be meaningful to offer amendments in this kind of parliamentary situation.

I have indicated that one should not be faint of heart; that he should be courageous, like Caesar. When he was crossing the water on a boat during a storm and the pilot felt that the boat should turn back, Caesar arose and made himself known. He said, "Fear not. Brave the tempest. You carry with you Caesar and Caesar's fortunes."

Well, I sought to encourage Senators, by referring to Caesar, to go ahead and offer their amendments. Because if the Senate will not adopt the amendments, then they have nothing to complain about. Though the tree is closed up, they have nothing to complain about, because the Senate would not have adopted their amendments anyhow. That makes sense, it seems to me.

But, as I say, one of my good friends on the Republican side said it would not be very meaningful to offer amendments at this point, because we could not get them adopted; we could not get them added to the bill.

Now, I should say, as I said a little earlier, there are other trees. As I indicated on Friday, I believe it was, there is another way or other ways—where there is a will, there is a way—to still get amendments adopted.

One of the ways in which this could be done would be by way of a motion to recommit with instructions to report back. And there is an even better way,

which I will not tell anyone about right now. There is a better way, a better way than that.

But I will reveal that much. I will reveal that much, Mr. President. With a motion to recommit with instructions to report back forthwith the following, we can work just about anything that needs to be worked into this package.

So, there is a way wide open, if Senators would simply offer their amendments and let us see how many votes there are for their amendments. Then it might be time to ask whether or not the amendment could be included—may be included in this package. If the Senate votes up an amendment, if the Senate adopts an amendment, then that indicates that there is some justification for including the amendment. Perhaps the justification will not be strong enough, but it may very well be strong enough.

So, I say again to Senators on the other side of the aisle: Take heart. The rule book on procedure, the book on "Senate Procedure," provides ways around even this tree that has presently been erected here.

And, as I say, there are even better ways. At least I can think of one or two better ways. But I will not go into that now.

But it is sufficient to say at this point that Senators should not lose heart. If they have amendments, call them up. Let us get a vote on them.

Mr. President, I will yield to the Senator from Vermont momentarily, but I had promised, first, to yield to the Senator from Texas [Mr. GRAMM].

Mr. GRAMM. I hoped to get 10 minutes.

Mr. BYRD. He was on the floor and on his feet. May I, before yielding to the Senator from Texas, inquire of the distinguished Senator from Vermont what his wishes are?

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, my wishes were to be recognized not to amend the package. I kind of like it the way it is. But as the Senator from West Virginia had already told the Senator from Texas he would yield to him, obviously I do not want to interfere with that.

I know that he will ask unanimous consent to yield to the Senator from Texas without losing his own right to regain the floor. I wonder if he might be willing to, in propounding that request, include that he might be able to yield under the same circumstances to me, subsequent to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. BYRD. How much time does the Senator wish?

Mr. LEAHY. Ten minutes.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may now yield to the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. GRAMM] for the purpose only of his making a statement. And I understand in talking with him that that is the only purpose he seeks. I ask further

unanimous consent that following the remarks by the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. GRAMM] that I be permitted to yield to the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. LEAHY] for not to exceed 10 minutes for the purpose only of treating my friends on this side the same as I defer to my friends on the other side—I note he has already stated that his purpose is the purpose only of making a statement—after which I be recognized again.

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

Mr. BYRD. And that my speech not be counted as a second speech. I do not mean to leave the impression that I am filibustering, but I simply want to have my guard up.

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

The Chair recognizes the Senator from Texas.

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, I thank our dear colleague from West Virginia for yielding. I don't know if the oarsmen were comforted when they were reminded that it was the life of the great Caesar that hung on their efforts. But I think it was a good reminder to give them, and I would just remind my colleagues that it is the life of America that hangs on our efforts and that is why this debate is so very important.

One of the things I will have an opportunity someday, I hope, to share with my grandchildren, is a discussion of Senator ROBERT C. BYRD and his great command of the rules of the Senate. I know he believes very strongly in this bill and I know he is very sincere in that belief. But I am strongly opposed to this bill and I believe that I am equally sincere in that opposition. I would like to begin today to explain to my colleagues and to the American people why I oppose this bill.

First of all, I think we have to remember that just last week we claimed to have adopted a dramatic budget. We claimed to have made dramatic changes in our Government. We claimed to have taken dramatic action to reduce the deficit. Time will tell if any of these things are true, but at least we claimed to have done something about the fiscal problems of the Nation. And all over the country, over the weekend, our Members who are Democrats—both in the Senate and the House—and our President talked about action on the deficit.

What a dramatic paradox it is, that we stand on the floor of the Senate today, debating a measure that raises the deficit by \$16 billion. What is even more interesting is there is a clause in this bill that designates all the spending as an emergency, so that despite the fact that we spend \$16 billion it does not count as deficit spending. Despite the fact that the deficit goes up by \$16 billion, by this little trick of legislative language this bill does not count as additional deficit.

We have a spending limit that is part of the law of the land, adopted in 1990, and without this parliamentary gimmick this bill would be subject to a 60-vote point of order because it violates that law of the land. But following a weekend where many of our colleagues touted the fact that we had done something about the deficit, we find ourselves here today not to lower the deficit, but to raise it. We are here to increase spending by another \$16 billion before any spending cut is made, before any change in permanent policy is made.

I was on a television program on Thursday and I was asked by some Wall Street people: Well, what difference does \$16 billion make? We are looking at a huge Federal debt, we are looking at a huge Federal deficit, why are you complaining so much about another \$16 billion?

Let me try to put it in an analogy. On Thursday we went on the wagon. On Thursday we passed a budget that said we were going to give up the devil's brew. It is true that we already drank an ocean; it is true that this is simply a small glass. But here it is—today is Monday, we have been on the wagon since Thursday when we adopted this much-touted budget, and yet as our thirst has grown, our first action is to take this glass of whiskey and—gulp.

I say to my colleague, how serious were we on Thursday in talking about deficit reduction when we are talking about raising the deficit by \$16 billion today and we are not counting it as spending and we are not counting it as deficit, because to do those things is a violation of the law of the land.

I think that we expose to the world that we were not very serious on Thursday and that we are not very serious on Monday about deficit reduction. We have, from the administration, a letter, from OMB Director Pannetta, that tells us that the administration does not support funding for any of the types of projects that opponents of the legislation speculated would be funded.

Let me, first of all, thank our distinguished chairman and ranking member for an amendment that they introduced on Thursday which protects us against some of these projects. I think people might be somewhat surprised—maybe amused, maybe amazed—that we found it necessary to adopt an amendment that prohibited funds provided in this emergency economic growth bill that is supposed to rebuild the American economy from being spent on such projects. The amendment says: None of the funds in this act may be used to assist a golf course or a cemetery project; none of the funds may be used for white water canoeing facilities on the Ocoee River. I do not know whether you can support white water canoeing facilities on some other river, but you cannot do it on the Ocoee River.

We said in this amendment that none of these funds can be used for fisheries atlases, nor can they be used to study the sicklefin chub. Now, whether we can study the humpback chub, I do not know. But our chairman and our ranking member have protected us from these things.

But let me go over a list of what we are not protected from. In a list of ready-to-go projects where the Secretary of Transportation and the Secretary of HUD said to our cities: Put together your projects that are ready to go under the community development block grants because we are about to give you \$2.5 billion to spend. And when that list was put together, let me just read to you from "States," going A through C. Listen to these projects. These are the projects that are supposedly going to rebuild America; that we are told are going to make us a great and powerful and rich country; that are going to make us competitive again and that will fuel the engines of industry and agriculture:

A new gym; pathways in various parks; building phase I of a sports park; graffiti abatement; build a parking garage; build a bike path; build a senior citizens center; build a youth sports complex; build an amphitheater and softball field; build three bike paths; expand and restore senior citizens center; build bike paths; staffing for projects; graffiti removal; outreach programs; mall renovation; construct a bike path; a boathouse restoration; build a soccer field; build a community park; fund an art ark; recreation buildings; youth shelters. And the list goes on and on and on.

Madam President, it seems to me that our problem here is that we are not talking about a jobs bill, we are not talking about an economic stimulus package; we are talking about a political stimulus package. We are talking about all the old projects that all the cities have that they have decided not to fund with their own money because they were not high enough in their level of priority and now we are going to come in and borrow \$16 billion and we are going to fund those projects.

We have an estimate by the OMB Director that this bill will create 219,000 jobs. That is not taking into account the negative impact of borrowing all this money. But I just ask my colleagues to note, even if it did not affect the economy to take this \$16 billion that we are going to borrow away from the uses it would have gone to—to build new homes, new farms, new factories, to generate real jobs—according to the OMB figures, we are paying \$89,041 for every job we are creating.

I ask my colleagues, is it worth \$89,041 a job to create jobs that pay a quarter or a third that amount? I answer my question by saying I do not think so. In fact, I think what this

shows, once again, is that Government is not an instrument for economic growth. Government is not an effective engine for promoting prosperity.

Now, what is the debate about? People are going to be confused, I guess, for the rest of the day—and I hope not the next couple days, but I am fearful they are—about why people keep on talking here and what is going on. The distinguished Senator from West Virginia has offered a series of amendments that guarantee that if any other Member offers an amendment to the underlying bill, that whether that amendment is adopted or is not adopted, that when the vote comes on the amendments of the distinguished Senator from West Virginia, that if they are adopted that none of those other amendments will stand; they will all fall.

My own opinion is that if we are going to vote, we ought to vote for real. I had hoped that we would have an opportunity to have genuine bipartisan input. I think we ought to vote, for example, on the emergency designation in this bill. I do not know that I could win on the amendment. I would like to see it voted on, but I would like to see it voted on for real so if it is adopted, it is going to become part of the bill. If we are going to take out golf courses and cemeteries and white water canoeing, maybe we ought to take out swimming pools and parking garages and bike paths and jogging paths. Maybe we ought to set very high standards for spending this money. I would like to have an opportunity to vote on those things.

Basically, what people are saying on my side of the aisle is this: Let us have votes that are meaningful. I learned my rules not from reading these big, thick green and red books, but by watching and listening to Senator BYRD. And I know that we could offer a motion to recommit, but I also know that Senator BYRD has already figured that out and that he could, with second-degree amendments, take over that tree as well. In fact, I discovered long ago that I am not smart enough and I cannot get recognition quick enough—I just notice that people in the chair always see our distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee before they see me—I am not smart enough nor am I quick enough to figure out how to get around Senator BYRD in terms of parliamentary procedure.

But I have also learned one little lesson from no other source than Senator BYRD which is: When you take all the rules of the Senate and you take all these amendment trees—and this is on one piece of paper as to where we are; people cannot see it but it is a bunch of fancy boxes and circles—that the one thing I know about the Senate rules is that when the Senate rules were established, they were meant to impose

order in a system, but they also were meant to protect the rights of the minority. And if the minority is determined, if the minority is unwilling to relent, then ultimately the rules work for them.

I believe, in this case, that the minority is determined; that the minority is not willing to relent. I am hopeful that we can sit down and negotiate out a procedure to have real votes on these amendments. I think that there are a certain number of amendments that people feel strongly about, and I think our objective will be served better if we come up with a procedure whereby people on this side of the aisle can offer amendments, and amendments that will be part of the bill if they are adopted, rather than simply going through an exercise where we go through a long debate and we get excited and the amendment is adopted, but then when the final vote is taken, those amendments fall away.

So I thank our dear chairman from West Virginia for allowing me to intervene during his speech and to make these points. I thank him very much for yielding the floor.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the distinguished Senator.

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

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I will note we will hear a lot of talk about the stimulus package; how we would like to change this little piece, we would like to change that little piece, and so on. Invariably, the people who are standing up here, Madam President, are the people who do not want the stimulus package at all, they do not want the President to succeed in stimulating our economy. And they are the people who voted for a number of things that got us into the problem we are in right now.

What I am concerned about when I look at any stimulus package is the question of how it is going to affect rural States. I represent one of the most rural States in this country.

I know there is no future in rural America if there are no jobs. And if we want jobs for our children and our children's children, then we are going to have to invest in rural America. That is why, as chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition and Forestry—the committee responsible for rural development—I rise in support of the President's economic stimulus package.

I have heard media reports that Members of Congress from rural areas are not interested in this bill, that some feel it is just an urban bill. Madam President, that is simply not the case. In fact, over \$2.6 billion of these funds will go to build water systems and rural housing and investment in rural communities. These investments will assist rural communities in

attracting and retaining industries and jobs.

Madam President, too often when we talk about improving the economy in this country, we speak only of urban America. Too often when we talk about creating jobs, we talk only of urban America. We want the qualities of rural life: the low crime, the neighborliness, the helpfulness of each other, the honesty, integrity, the work ethics that we so often see in rural America, but our focus is on urban America. It should not be an either/or. The fact is that rural America exists. It does not have the votes of urban America, but it certainly has so many of the problems, especially joblessness and poverty.

I am glad we have a President who understands rural America and who has sent us legislation which shows he believes in rural America. In fact, the President's bill funds some of the same programs that were funded in the Rural Jobs and Investment Act of 1993. That was a bill I wrote, and it was co-sponsored by 15 of my colleagues in this body. The bill was based on the premise that we have to provide the capital that new and expanding businesses need to create jobs and revitalize rural America. We have to invest in our infrastructure to attract businesses and investment. We have to make rural America more competitive in the future.

Rural America has suffered from a decade of neglect. I see it in my own State where the gains of the 1970's in combating rural unemployment and population loss were turned around in the 1980's, and as a result, because of the neglect of rural America, in 1992, 1 in 10 rural Americans was unemployed; 1 out of 4 rural children lived in poverty. Rural children in the 1980's were neglected in education, hungry, without adequate medical care, and lived with a very, very dim future ahead of them.

While economic reports show improvement in our economy, large layoffs continue. In fact, the adjusted unemployment rate number remains at over 10 percent.

Now, many of those Americans are back to work but in part-time jobs. That is nothing new for rural communities. Persistent unemployment is a serious problem for our rural areas.

In my own State of Vermont, we see that in February unemployment numbers again increased. In 10 out of our 12 labor markets, unemployment was higher than in February 1992 when the recession was just ending. While some economists concluded this latest increase represents new found optimism that there are jobs to be found, we are really not out of the woods until these people find work. The bill the distinguished chairman from West Virginia has before the Senate is designed to create jobs and do it quickly.

Declining population is an alarming problem for rural America as well.

Nearly half of all rural counties lost population during the mid-1980's—nearly half. That is one of the saddest statistics we have heard about rural America since the dust bowl days. Too often the best and brightest of our young people leave rural America, not because they want to but because they have to. There is no future in rural America if our children are forced to move away in search of economic opportunity.

Our children are our future. What future do we have if we drive them out of rural America?

During the 1980's, while we spent billions of taxpayers' dollars in defense and savings and loan bailouts and foreign aid, the needs of rural America were too often ignored.

President Clinton recognizes the importance of investing in our future. This bill is a clear message that rural America will be a partner in our Nation's economic future, as it should be. Let us not forget rural America. When we have Presidential campaigns as well as senatorial campaigns, we all love the photographs and the campaign stops in rural America. We see hard-working people and the beautiful scenery. It evokes some kind of Norman Rockwell sense of well-being, but, Madam President, there is not well-being in rural America because it has been ignored. It has been ignored. But it is not ignored in this stimulus package. It has not been ignored by President Clinton. So many of the root values of this Nation are embodied in rural America.

Speaking as a Senator from rural America, I would hate to think that because of mistakes made by our Federal Government, the great promise of those values is diminished or lost.

Some have questioned the need for the stimulus package in light of the slight improvements reported in our economy. We need only look at the rural conditions. I just presented to see the need. We need to turn this around. I believe we can.

Some say passage of this bill constitutes having dessert before our vegetables. I say this bill simply means jobs for rural Americans. If you have jobs, you have promise. If you have promise, these young people who now leave rural America will stay, holding to the values that their parents and their parents' parents have instilled in them and instilled in rural America. The future of rural America should bring promises of knowing each other, the promises of a low crime rate, the promises of an honest day's pay for an honest day's work, promises of helping each other when you are in need.

I think of my own home in Vermont. I drive down a couple miles of dirt road to get to it. The thing I look forward to the most every week is the idea of getting back to my home, where I know everybody, where I am apt to come

home and find a window repaired that had been broken in a storm, probably some cookies left on the table by the neighbor who repaired it. They know they can just walk in there and they know I would do the same for them, the way I was brought up, the way all of us in rural America were brought up.

But it also concerns me when I see the son or daughter of those same neighbors wondering if they will have to move from rural America to an urban center for the promise of their own future. They wonder if perhaps they will have to move to a place where they will not have the quality of life and where they will not feel as secure in their homes or have the same sense of responsibility to their neighbors. That it is a choice made not because they want to, but a choice forced on them.

So I hope that we will keep rural America also in mind when we vote on this package. The distinguished chairman comes from one of the most beautiful rural States in this country. I know that he has that in mind. I know from my own discussions with President Clinton when I talked to him, coming from a small rural State—I say thank God he does—for those of us who also live in small rural States, we have somebody who does care. There is talk about whether we are funding canoe launchings or something. Baloney. This package provides funds that, in my home State are desperately needed. The bill means \$1,255,000 for Vermont's rural housing program, \$1,603,000 for Vermont's rural water and waste disposal loan program, \$4 million for Vermont's EPA construction grants and State revolving loan fund. These are good things.

Madam President, I thank the distinguished chairman for yielding his time to me. I am proud to stand with him on the floor on this package as we have stood on the floor before on similar things. I wish him well. I am ready to vote on the package. I do not have any amendments, I tell my distinguished chairman. I am back here from Vermont.

I am ready to vote. I am ready to move this forward. I am ready to start creating jobs in rural America.

I yield the floor.

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

MR. BYRD. Madam President, I thank the distinguished senior Senator from Vermont for his fine statement. I am sure that he is ready to vote on the package. I am equally sure, even if he had not assured me, that he has no amendments thereto. But if he had, he would be entitled to call them up, and have a vote on them.

I again thank him for his service to his State and for his statement today.

May I ask my very able colleague on the other side of the aisle, Senator

HATFIELD, if he wishes to make any statement at this point?

Madam President, I understand that consultations are going on with respect to the Boren-Breaux amendment, and have been going on over the weekend. I shall await the outcome of those consultations.

Madam President, we continue to hear the refrain with respect to meaningful amendments, beginning to hear that under the present parliamentary situation meaningful amendments cannot be called up, meaningful votes cannot be had.

Let me remind Senators about the situation that obtained here last Wednesday evening and last Thursday morning. When the time, the 50 hours, ran out on the budget resolution, Senators had the right to call up amendments but without any debate on these amendments to go to a vote.

I remind my good friends on the other side of the aisle that time after time they called up amendments without debate, had votes on those amendments, and knowing full well that with the kind of momentum that was behind that bill and while they could indeed get votes the likelihood of the amendments being adopted was not very great. But they did not hesitate nevertheless to call up their amendments. They called up amendment after amendment after amendment, it got a vote, and it went down in almost all cases. And we proceeded to the next amendment.

So we were here until around midnight, give or take a little bit, on Wednesday night. And we came back, voting on amendments, sight unseen, like a pig in the poke, not knowing what is in the amendment. As long as that situation obtained, Senators on the other side of the aisle were quite willing to call up those amendments even though it was in almost all cases a futile exercise.

They probably succeeded in calling up some amendments that put Democrats on record. And that was all. That was about all it did. The amendments died. The amendments were rejected.

So I do not understand what was meaningful about all of that unless it was meaningful just to get Democrats on record, and voting on amendments on which there was no debate, on which no debate occurred, just getting the Democrats on record.

So I searched the RECORD and found the following amendments. Let me just cite the amendments that were called up on that occasion and voted on. In almost all instances they were voted down.

I believe the first amendment that was called up following the expiration of time on the budget resolution was amendment No. 190 called up at 9:26 p.m. on March 24. That was an amendment that was offered by Mr. BURNS reducing the revenues of the Finance

Committee report of \$2.2 billion over 5 years. And so on and so on. Mr. SASSER moved to table that amendment. The amendment was tabled by a vote of 54 to 44.

The next amendment was amendment No. 197 by Mr. CRAIG and it was called up at 9:48 p.m. The amendment by Mr. CRAIG was tabled by motion offered by Mr. SASSER by a vote of 69 to 29. I do not know how meaningful that was. But that was not a very impressive vote for the amendment, 69 to 29. By 69 to 29 it was tabled.

Then there was an amendment called up by Mr. DURENBERGER, amendment No. 222. And Mr. SASSER moved to table the Durenberger amendment. The amendment was tabled by a vote of 55 to 43. There was a majority of 12 votes with two Senators not voting. That vote occurred at 10:05 p.m.

Then at 10:22 p.m., a vote occurred on amendment No. 234. This was an amendment referred to as the Stevens-Kassebaum-Lugar amendment, and Senator SASSER moved to table that amendment. That amendment was tabled by a vote of 54 to 44.

At 10:40 p.m., on last Wednesday, a vote started on a motion to table by Mr. SASSER on an amendment offered by Mr. MURKOWSKI and others. That amendment was rejected by a vote of 52 to 46.

At 10:57 p.m., a vote began on an amendment offered by Mr. WARNER. Senator SASSER having moved to table the amendment. The vote was 50 to 48 to table.

At 11:17 p.m., a vote occurred on an amendment numbered 233, an amendment by Mr. MCCAIN and others, Senator SASSER having moved to table the amendment. The vote was 54-44 to table the amendment. At 11:34 p.m., a vote occurred on a Sasser motion to table the Thurmond amendment. The vote to table was agreed to 55-42. At 11:59 p.m., 1 minute before midnight, Senator SASSER moved to table an amendment by Senator KASSEBAUM, and the motion was agreed to 51-47.

Therefore, Madam President, on last Wednesday, after all time had expired on the budget resolution, nine amendments were called up by my friends on the other side of the aisle, and all of the nine amendments were tabled. Were they meaningful amendments? They were all rejected. They might have been meaningful amendments had they been agreed to, but they were all rejected. And Senators pretty well knew, I think, what was going to happen and know what the outcomes would be. Certainly, after one or two of these amendments had been rejected and it kept on and on and on, it was obvious that it was not going to be a very good evening for those offering amendments, even though no debate was to be had on the amendments.

The distinguished majority leader pointed out the fact that all time had

expired on the resolution itself, and the only thing to do under those circumstances, since we were all flying blind in the fog, not knowing what was in the amendments, flying into the darkness, was just to vote to table the amendments. Everybody understood that.

But, nevertheless, the amendments continued to come. Then on the following morning, it being Thursday, at 9:31 a.m., Senator BRADLEY and Senator HOLLINGS had an amendment which expressed the sense of the Senate that the President should be granted line-item veto authority over items of appropriation and tax expenditures that, first, provided that each item of appropriations for tax expenditures is enrolled separately for presentation to the President; and, second, expired at the conclusion of the 103d Congress.

I voted for the Bradley-Hollings amendment. It was agreed to 73-24. But, Madam President, while there was a vote on the amendment, in a real sense it was not meaningful. In the first place, it was a sense-of-the-Senate amendment, which meant that it had no legal binding authority. It was simply a sense-of-the-Senate taken on a given amendment at a given hour on a given day, without debate. And I saw in Roll Call this morning, the fine little paper that is printed here at the Capitol, buzzing about my having voted for line-item veto.

Well, let not those enthusiasts for line-item veto or enhanced rescissions gain heart. I have not changed my viewpoint one bit. But I voted for the amendment because, in the first place, it was a sense-of-the-Senate amendment. But more importantly, it sent a shot across the bow of committees other than the Appropriations Committee. It was the sense of the Senate, according to the amendment by Mr. BRADLEY and Mr. HOLLINGS, that if there is going to be line-item veto authority, it should extend also to tax expenditures.

In other words, in view of the fact—and it is a fact—that the Appropriations Committee continues to be the target of those who talk about the budget deficits, while the Appropriations Committee is not contributing to the deficit, the Appropriations Committee continues to work within the caps and hews to the mark that was laid at the budget summit in 1990. The Appropriations Committee is not the culprit; but all these line-item veto amendments, enhanced rescission amendments, and expedited rescission amendments, continue to be directed at the appropriations.

Well, Mr. BRADLEY and Mr. HOLLINGS expanded the concept between the two tax-writing committees so the tax expenditures would be included if there is going to be line-item veto or enhanced rescissions. So I thought it might be a good idea to send a little shot across

the bow that if the Congress ever takes on this business of adopting a line-item veto or enhanced rescissions, it might just go beyond the Appropriations Committee, to Finance, Ways and Means, and other authorizing committees that are responsible for programs that result in back door spending.

As to providing that each item of appropriations or tax expenditure be enrolled separately for presentation to the President, I think that would be unconstitutional and have so said in the past, and I have not changed my viewpoint on that.

But then at 9:55 a.m., Mr. SASSER moved to table the Brown amendment, and the Senate tabled the amendment by a vote of 53 to 46. At 10:13 a.m., Mr. SASSER moved to table the Kempthorne amendment, and that was tabled by a vote of 56 to 43. At 10:31 a.m., a motion by Mr. SASSER to table the Cohen-Campbell amendment was defeated by a vote of 65 to 34. Again, that was a sense-of-the-Senate amendment dealing with line-item veto authority over items of appropriations and tax expenditures. The Senate rejected the tabling motion, and that amendment was subsequently agreed to by voice vote.

I voted to table that amendment. That was one amendment that was not tabled. As I say, it was a sense-of-the-Senate amendment and has no binding effect.

At 10:51 a.m., Mr. SASSER moved to table an amendment by Mr. GRAMM, and the tabling motion prevailed by a vote of 54 to 45.

At 11:09 a.m., Mr. SASSER moved to table the Bond amendment No. 253. The tabling motion was agreed to by a vote of 57 to 42.

An amendment, No. 250, by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SPECTER] and the Senator from California [Mrs. FEINSTEIN] was agreed to. That amendment was agreed to by voice.

At 11:29 a.m., Senator SASSER moved to table the Murkowski amendment, and the Senate tabled the amendment by a vote of 61 to 38.

At 11:48 a.m., the Senate voted to table an amendment by Mr. CRAIG, the tabling motion having been offered by Mr. SASSER. The amendment was tabled by a vote of 57 to 41.

Madam President, we see that amendments were offered in a situation there by our friends on the other side of the aisle when about all that was meaningful about the exercise was that the Republicans were able to put the Democrats on record on eight amendments on Thursday morning and nine amendments, I think it was, on Wednesday night.

Therefore, I say to my friends again who have amendments, offer them. Amendments can be offered now to the bill and can be offered to the committee substitute.

Walter Malone wrote a bit of verse that I would offer here because I think

it is pertinent to what I have been suggesting, namely, that Senators take heart, offer their amendments.

They do me wrong who say I come no more
When once I knock and fail to find you in,
For every day I stand outside your door,
And bid you wake, and rise to fight and win.
Wail not for precious chances passed away,
Weep not for golden ages on the wane!
Each night I burn the records of the day;
At sunrise every soul is born again.

So the opportunity is here and Senators should not hide behind the excuse that there is no opportunity to offer an amendment. Offer the amendment. Let us see whether or not the votes are here to support those amendments.

And if the amendments are adopted, then it will be time to discuss whether or not they should go in the bill.

As I have said just a little earlier today, rule XXII provides for a motion to recommit. If Senators will turn to rule XXII, they will find several preferential motions there and the very bottom preferential motion is a motion to amend the amendment. That is the amendment stage. Then just above that is the committal stage or the recommitment stage. So the motion to recommit has preference. It has precedence over a motion to amend.

So while there are amendments before the Senate today, a certain hierarchy of amendments, the motion to recommit has preference over amendments. There is that opportunity. If Senators really have amendments that their dedication and purpose lead them to want to have in this bill, let them prove by a vote on the Senate floor that the amendment or amendments have the support of the Senate. Otherwise, they are just crying over their beer, weeping over spilt milk. That is rule XXII. All Senators are familiar with the rule.

Incidentally, talking about rules of the Senate, during a heated argument back in the 1920's, one Senator said to a colleague "Go to hell," and the astonished Senator questioned the Chair as to whether or not that remark could be said with propriety. Vice President Coolidge, who was presiding and who had been leafing through a book, looked up and said, "I have just been looking at the rules manual, and you do not have to go."

I would suggest, therefore, that Senators study the rules manual a little more, and I will continue to try to keep up on it as well.

(Mr. MATHEWS assumed the chair.)

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the distinguished Republican leader has said some few days ago that upon the adoption of the budget resolution we were going to see some real bullets, that we had just been fighting with paper bullets up to that point, and from now on it was going to be a fight with real bullets.

My amendment is a real bullet. It is the only real bullet that I have noted

zinging down this aisle and up to the desk. No other real bullets. But these amendments that have been offered are real bullets. I have been wearing my flak jacket every day expecting the real bullets to start flying. But there have not been any that I know of. There have been some very light artillery echoes over on this side of the Chamber and some sniper fire, very light sniper fire, over on the right. No hand grenades. Numidian cavalry. No Balearic slingers.

Last Friday, I say to my friend from Montana, last Friday, there was artillery, a heavy artillery regiment, that suddenly came onto the field, set up positions over here on my right. And from the menacing and fierce visages of the group, I came to the conclusion that I might be in some dire peril all of the sudden.

But, they just came to get the yeas and nays on my amendment. So when that little popgun went off—it was just a paper bullet—they disappeared in the bushes just as rapidly as they had earlier emerged out of nowhere.

Mr. President, I welcome those live bullets whenever they start flying. I have urged Senators to start using those heavy artillery pieces. Let us have some live bullets. Let us have some amendments. Perhaps the Senator from Arizona would like to shoot a live bullet. The way is open to call up an amendment.

Otherwise, let me proceed now with these charts.

While I am speaking to the package, I know that there are those who are continuing to try to work out the Boren-Breaux amendment, and I would be delighted to hear from them as to what has happened.

Let me briefly go through this package once again.

H.R. 1335, the economic stimulus supplemental, the major provisions thereof are as follows:

Extended unemployment benefits, \$4 billion.

Mr. President, the Department of Labor says it will exhaust its ability to pay benefits to 1.8 million jobless people in early April, absent this appropriation.

Now, do Senators want to stay here and not offer their amendments and not get a final resolution of this matter in time for those workers to know that they are going to be able to continue to receive unemployment benefits?

I have heard some say that they would be willing to stay all week next week. They are so determined that they will oppose this package, they will stay around here all week next week.

I wonder if the Senator from Montana has heard such a rumor; that there are Senators who are determined to oppose this package to the extent they would stay here all next week. I have heard that.

Mr. President, I have never been concerned about such proposals or suggestions. I am going to be here, anyhow. I certainly do not want to see other Senators discommoded, but, more importantly, I do not want to see those 1.8 million workers out there—1.8 million jobless people—do without their benefits.

So if Senators want to hold up this bill for the rest of this week and next week, well, let those Senators who are holding up the bill take the blame for the jobless benefits not being appropriated.

May I inquire of the Senator from Montana if he wishes to speak?

Mr. BURNS. I thank the chairman, but I am not desiring to speak.

I have a colleague that wants some time on the floor.

Might I inquire of my colleague from Arizona how much time he would need?

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I would be glad to wait until the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee is finished with his remarks, and be glad to be patient.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I would be very happy to yield the floor to the Senator from Arizona if he wishes to speak. It is not my desire to hold the floor all afternoon. I simply thought, inasmuch as we have no Senators who, apparently, want to call up their amendments to this bill, that I would continue to try to educate the viewers, who are out there watching through that electronic eye, and try to inform them as to what is in this bill, so that if there are Senators who are determined not to let this bill pass, then the people out there will know whom to blame for the gridlock.

Now, the next item in this bill is Federal-aid highways, \$2,976,250,000. This provides full funding of ISTEA, funds concentrated on ready-to-go projects, creating 58,000 direct jobs in 1993 and 1994. ISTEA is the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act.

The next item is mass transit capital grants, \$736,490,000; airport grants, \$250 million; Amtrak capital grants \$187,844,000. These funds will be spent on fast-spending transportation projects, to improve safety—what is more important than safety?—and would create 13,875 direct and indirect jobs in 1993 and 1994.

The community development block grants, \$2.536 billion, would provide communities the grants for improving neighborhood facilities and services, creating 60,000 direct jobs.

The SBA loan guarantees, \$2,575,558,000.

Due to the credit crunch, SBA loans have increased dramatically. Current SBA credit will run out in May, shutting down the SBA loan program. This will create 12,000 direct jobs in 1993 and 1994.

The Pell grant unfunded shortfall is funded in this bill. The dollar amount

is \$2,023,730,000. It would eliminate a shortfall in funding for 4.4 million students for 1993-94 and prior academic years.

There is a billion dollars in this package for summer youth employment. This would create an additional 683,000 summer jobs for the disadvantaged youth in the Nation, raising the total to 1.4 million jobs for the summer of 1993.

There is \$892,261,000 in the bill for sewage treatment construction. This would enable States to capitalize their loan funds for sewage treatment construction. Nationwide needs are estimated at more than \$100 billion. This would create 50,000 direct jobs. That is EPA sewage treatment construction.

Head Start, \$500 million. This summer Head Start program will enroll 350,000 children and create 50,000 direct jobs.

There are \$470 million in the bill for waste and waste disposal loans and grants. These funds are for rural communities with populations under 10,000 to improve the safety, to provide basic services, and promote economic development.

For the Department of Veterans Affairs, this package contains \$235,557,000. It will double the VA's funding for maintenance and construction projects at VA hospitals and cemeteries, creating 4,700 direct jobs.

For the National Science Foundation, \$270,662,000. These funds would be for research and facilities to create 2,400 direct jobs at the National Science Foundation.

Economic Development grants, \$93,900,000. This money would fund ready-to-go infrastructure projects by States and local governments as well as assist victims of Hurricanes Iniki and Andrew. So, here is money in this package to assist the victims of those two hurricanes.

Mr. President, I am not going to hold the floor to speak longer because I do not want to discommode other Senators who have something they wish to say. But it is my suggestion that amendments be offered and let us have votes on them and see if they are meaningful votes. My colleagues on the right here seem to be rather downcast and morose.

Mr. BURNS. It is Monday.

Mr. BYRD. Oh, it is Monday. It is Monday. That is true. If Senators will momentarily allow me?

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the distinguished Senator from Arizona, and I will be happy to yield as long as he wishes—10 minutes, 20 minutes, 30 minutes, 45 or whatever?

Mr. President, I am informed that Senator McCain does not wish to address the Senate at the moment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield the floor and that no motions to table the amendment—

the amendments, any of the amendments—no motion to commit be made until after I am again recognized.

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

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I yield the floor with the understanding that now there be no motions to table the amendments in the tree and that no motion to recommit would be made until I am again recognized. I hope to hear something during the afternoon about the progress on the amendment by Mr. BREAUX and by Mr. BOREN. I also would expect to hear if the Republicans have any amendments that they want to call up, and they are serious amendments. I would suggest that they indicate the number of amendments they have and what the titles of the amendments are, what the amendments would do, and perhaps we can work out something where the Republicans will be able to call up a few amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object and I shall not object to the unanimous consent that was just put forward by the chairman of the Appropriations Committee—

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, that request has already been agreed to.

Mr. BURNS. I thought the Senator had a second one?

Mr. BYRD. I did not have a second one.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator was just restating it.

Mr. BYRD. I yield the floor.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I think it might be well to explain, if we could, the parliamentary situation as we face it. It is my understanding that there is a parliamentary situation such that, if amendments were proposed and voted in the affirmative by this body, that following that, when there is a vote on the substitute of the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, then those previous amendments that are voted on would no longer be operative.

Is that a correct depiction of the parliamentary situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The adoption of a substitute amendment would wipe out anything that happens previously.

Mr. MCCAIN. I thank the Chair, because I am sure there are people around America who may be wondering what the U.S. Senate has been doing for the last several days. It had the privilege of listening to the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, whose eloquent historical fashion it is to provide us with a lot of information, but the fact is that his urging the Republicans to

bring forward amendments is a bit disingenuous in light of the parliamentary situation.

It is well acknowledged that the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the President pro tempore of the Senate, is the most knowledgeable Parliamentarian in this body. I say that with the utmost respect. The reality is that he has placed this side of the aisle in a parliamentary situation that basically renders meaningless any amendments that we may propose and may be voted on in the affirmative, given the reality that his substitute will most likely, in fact almost certainly, be adopted by this body, which would then render any amendments that were brought forward for the approval of the Senate, any of those that were passed, basically irrelevant—certainly inoperative.

So I believe the situation that we in the minority here are faced with is that, if we propose amendments and they are voted on, they will be meaningless. I believe now the situation renders the minority to be in a position where we are faced, frankly, with one option and that option is to extend debate until such time as we are given our rights to have meaningful amendments brought up for a vote.

It still requires—Mr. President, I would appreciate it if the Parliamentarian would correct me if I am wrong—it still requires 60 votes to cut off debate to bring up final passage.

Most of us here are not as knowledgeable as to parliamentary procedures as is the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee. But I can assure him that—I cannot speak for all 43 on this side; only the Republican leader speaks for all 43 of us—but speaking for this Member, it is my sincere and devout hope that we will exercise our right to keep at least 41 Members from cutting off debate until such time as we are allowed the right to bring forward amendments, meaningful amendments that will be voted on either up or down, depending on the will of this body, and they would not be rendered meaningless by a vote on a substitute.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MCCAIN. May I ask for what purpose?

Mr. BYRD. For a question.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, the distinguished chairman—

Mr. BYRD. For a question.

Mr. MCCAIN. I will be glad to yield for a question.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I preface the question by saying, as I said the other day and last Thursday I believe it was or Friday, I said that I like to think this Senator is a reasonable man and if the Republicans have amendments that they want to call up, I suggested that they call them up.

Now, would the Senator be in a position to ask his leader to let the Senator from West Virginia know what Senators, what amendments he has that Senators would like to call up? Perhaps we can reach an agreement on calling up a limited number of amendments. I do not want to agree to calling up amendments ad infinitum, as was the situation we were in last Wednesday night and Thursday morning. But if the Republicans have some amendments—6, 8, 10, whatever it is—that they wish to call up and get votes on, I will be agreeable to making it possible for those amendments to be meaningful, if the Senate will agree to them, if the Senate adopts those amendments.

I indicated earlier today that the way is open for a motion to recommit with instructions, and Senators can get amendments agreed to in that way, if the Senate will adopt the amendments. But I stand here today not knowing what amendments are going to be offered or whether any amendments are going to be offered. I want to see this package voted on. If the votes are here to amend it, then that is another matter.

Would the Senator be able to indicate or have the Republican leader come to the floor and indicate what amendments he has in mind? What Senators want to offer amendments? I have been in the Senate a long, long time. I try to be a reasonable Senator. And I am probably as strong as anyone here in wanting to protect the rights of the minority.

But I do not know what amendments we are talking about. I do not know how many amendments we are talking about. I do not want to get into a situation in which I give up my rights—I have exercised my rights according to the rules—and I do not want to give up my rights and say, "Well, we'll just vote on any old amendment sight unseen."

Would the Senator try to accommodate this Senator and the Senate by bringing that matter to a head in the fashion that I have suggested? Nobody has come to me—the Republican leader has not been here—to say he has some amendments, 6 or 8 or 10 he would like to have votes on.

I have a motion to recommit available to offer at some point or any point, and as the manager of the bill I certainly would exercise that right to move to recommit. But I want to know, I want to have some understanding how many amendments the other side wants to call up. Nobody has approached me on that point.

I have heard some vague—I am not talking about the Senator from Arizona—but I have heard some vague rumors and whisperings and warnings Senators might be prepared to stay all week, all next week. Well, that does not bother me one bit. If Senators want

to filibuster \$4 billion for retirement benefits in this package all next week, that is up to them. It does not bother me.

But I want to be cognizant of the desires of Senators to call up meaningful amendments. Let me see; let me see what the amendments are. Let me see. If there are half a dozen or 10 or 12, let me see what they are so that I know how many there are and maybe perhaps we can get an agreement on a time agreement on a number of amendments.

I do not want to vex the Senator. I will not impose on him further.

Mr. President, I have been in this position right here at this desk for many years, and I have always tried to work out reasonable solutions to problems when they arise. I have had a great deal of experience in that and have always tried to be conscious of the rights of the other Senators and am still conscious of the rights. But I have also wanted to protect this President's package from mutilation, and I have taken him at his word as to what he wants in the package, and I have sought to protect that.

I exercise my rights. Nobody can accuse me of having done something that I do not have a right to do and that the rule book does not allow. So I am very experienced standing right here at this desk, and any threats to filibuster do not bother me at all. They do not bother me a bit. We ought to stay here next week. We ought to stay here the following week if it requires us to get the work done. This is our post of duty. This is our place of duty. Let us stay.

Now, if the Republican leader or anybody else wants to come out here and indicate what they have in mind, I will sit down and talk with them, but there is nobody here to talk with me now. I have yielded the floor, and I have indicated that I am ready to hear what my friends on the other side have.

So if they think that I can understand these long-range wireless messages, under the present circumstances I cannot. Let them come and tell me what they have. The Republican leader and I are good friends. I will be glad to listen to what he wants by way of amendments. Perhaps, as I say, we can work out something. I can offer a motion to recommit, report back forthwith and we have an agreement beforehand how many amendments would be called up. I do not know of any on this side, if Mr. BOREN, Mr. BREAUX, and Mr. KOHL do not call up theirs. But I would like to find out what happens on their amendment first before I agree to anything. I would like to know what is going to happen on their amendment.

Mr. President, I thank the Senator for yielding. My question is: Will he continue to carry his very warm friendship for me in the future, as he has in the past, under the circumstances, and forgive me if I have committed any

trespasses and love me as a friend and fellow American, as he always has? Mr. President, that is my question. I would like to get an answer.

[Laughter.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. I thank very much my friend from West Virginia. Before I answer that question, can I say, the Senator from California is waiting to speak. I will be about 10 minutes and then I will be through. I know she has been waiting to speak. I will not take too much time.

Obviously, I would like to say, Mr. President, that our friend and colleague, the distinguished chairman and President pro tempore who has been so active for so many years, would never lose the friendship and the respect and affection in which we hold him. I will say that from time to time there is a certain degree of frustration, but that, of course, is due to the normal give and take of the parliamentary process. And as the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee has said many times, those of us who are not happy with the parliamentary procedures, that we should learn those procedures ourselves. I have learned a great deal from the distinguished Senator from West Virginia who has, over the last 7 years now, taught me a great deal. And we have had very spirited debate on issues such as the line-item veto and others. He will always have my love and respect, no matter what the circumstances are, even in the heat of battle.

I say again, Mr. President, the Senator from West Virginia described very well the parliamentary situation and his control over the parliamentary situation and his assertion of his parliamentary rights, and I understand those rights and I understand the present situation.

My response is that I know the Republican leader is very interested in moving forward, as all of us are, and I am sure, although I cannot speak specifically for Senator DOLE, he wants to move forward with this process, and I know he would like to sit down with the Senator from West Virginia under any circumstances, especially these, so that we can work out a compromise and move forward.

In the meantime, Mr. President, I believe we have only one recourse, those in the minority, and that is to exercise our rights, and our rights are that if we can maintain 41 votes, then we will be able to prevent the passage of this legislation. And the reason why I believe—and I cannot speak, as I say, for the Republican leader—we will maintain at least 41 votes is that we are not being given the opportunity—even though the Senator from West Virginia is exercising his rights, his exercising of those rights is preventing the Republican side from being able to pro-

pose meaningful amendments to a \$16 billion package.

Although \$16 billion is not a great deal of money to some, it is to others—\$16.26 billion in new spending. So I believe this impasse should be broken and, as happens quite frequently in this body, we will move forward. I would like to point out that there are many of us who feel as if this kind of spending is certainly not necessary at this time, at least the majority of it.

I should like to make a few comments about the line-item veto, which the Senator from West Virginia discussed a few minutes ago.

Mr. President, there was a sense-of-the-Senate resolution which was passed, and was passed overwhelmingly, that stated support for a line-item veto plus a line item, if that is what one would want to call it, for lack of better words, that would close tax loopholes, would give the President of the United States authority to close tax loopholes.

The distinguished Senator from West Virginia was quoted in the press and again on the floor as saying the vote was meaningless because it was a sense-of-the-Senate resolution.

I have a different view of sense-of-the-Senate resolutions. I believe sense-of-the-Senate resolutions are exactly what the words say, and that is what the Senate intends to do. I intend at the earliest opportunity to see if that was, indeed, the sense-of-the-Senate as 70-some Members of this body voted, or was it, frankly, in all candor, a bit of hypocrisy. I do not see how you can vote for a sense-of-the-Senate resolution, meaning that is what the Senate intends to do, and then when it comes around to the real vote, vote against it.

So I know that I and others will intend to try to get a non-sense-of-the-Senate resolution passed that, indeed, puts that sense-of-the-Senate resolution into law. I am pleased to note that as far as I know the President of the United States still supports a line-item veto, and I hope we could hear from the White House at a fairly early time.

Mr. President, again, in response to the question of my friend from West Virginia, yes, we continue to love and respect him, but we also do believe that it is time to move forward. We do believe that we should be able to assert our rights, which means prevention of the passage of this bill in return for the ability by us to have our amendments considered and voted up or down, amendments that are meaningful and amendments that will not be literally wiped out by the passage of the substitute amendment which is the matter pending before the Senate.

Mr. President, I should also like to express my appreciation to the Senator from Oregon, who has shown enormous patience over the last few days and has attempted, along with the Senator from West Virginia, to move forward so

that we can get this done. I do not need to remind my colleagues that we also have a debt limit extension of some kind that is facing this body, and I understand the sentiment of the Senator from West Virginia that we could stay next week and the week after, and that probably is our primary duty.

But I have also noticed that when recesses are scheduled in this body, there is a certain reluctance to remain here during those recesses. In fact, as I say, I am only going on my seventh year but perhaps my friend from West Virginia and my friend from Oregon can remember a time when a recess was scheduled and we did not go into that recess. I am sure it may have happened in the 34 years' experience of the Senator from West Virginia, but not in my recent experience. I hope we can move forward, and relay this message, as I know has already been done, to Senator DOLE in hopes we can propose some amendments with the assurance of the Senator from West Virginia they would have meaningful consideration.

I thank my friend from West Virginia and I yield the floor.

Mrs. BOXER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California [Mrs. BOXER.]

Mrs. BOXER. I thank the Chair for recognizing me, and I thank the Senator from Arizona for his kind assistance in helping to make sure I did receive recognition in due course.

I want to say to the Senator from West Virginia how much I admire him for what he has been doing these last several days, on his feet hour after hour, trying to move the President's economic package forward, using the rules that are there to be used so that we can move the President's economic package forward. I hope in perhaps the next 10 or 15 minutes I can speak as clearly as I can on behalf of that goal, as forcefully as I can on behalf of that goal, and as convincingly as I can on behalf of that goal—of moving this President's stimulus package forward.

Mr. President, we must feel a sense of urgency. As the Senator from West Virginia has repeated throughout the last several legislative days, unemployment benefits are running out. We are still in a jobs recession. We have seen the President act very quickly to put his plan together and this stimulus package is part of that plan.

We have seen the House of Representatives, a body in which I served very proudly for 10 years, act on that package. Yes, there was acrimony and debate. Yes, there was. But in the end they moved the package forward, so all eyes are on the Senate.

We were sent here to do a job, and what could be more important than getting this economy moving?

So I want to see the stimulus package pass not just because I want to give this President a chance, which I do—not just because the stimulus package

is an integral part of a larger economic program, which it is—not just because the stimulus package together with the budget resolution will give us the momentum for change, which it will, but because this stimulus package and everything in it is needed by America, is needed by the people of America.

There are those on the other side of the aisle who say we do not need this package. It is unnecessary. They do not like this package. They will use the rules to stop us from voting on this package.

So I ask the question and will endeavor to answer the question: Why is this stimulus package needed by America and by the American people?

I think there are three reasons, Mr. President. One, we need jobs in America—jobs; two, we need investments in America—investments; and three, we need deficit reduction in America. We need jobs, we need investment, and we need deficit reduction.

So you might wonder, Mr. President, how does a stimulus program bring about deficit reduction? I think that is a very fine question, but it has a ready answer; that is, when our people are working, our deficit goes down. According to OMB, Leon Panetta, a man that I served with in the Congress who was the chairman of the Budget Committee, believes this stimulus package will create 500,000 new jobs. I know there are other numbers around, but I am going to use Mr. Panetta's numbers because he has always been, in my opinion, conservative in his numbers.

So there you have it—500,000 people taken off the unemployment lines. And that is good. And they will be working. They will be paying taxes. They will not be drawing down on Federal benefits. So the deficit will go down. Specifically, we know every 1 percent increase in unemployment adds between \$30 to \$50 billion to the deficit. So when you create jobs, you lower the deficit.

I want to talk about my home State, California. We expect 50,000 new jobs created from this stimulus package. And we are suffering with 1.57 million people unemployed in California. We have been battered. We have been bruised—1.57 million people unemployed in California. This recession hit us hard. And it hit us late. And we are having trouble rebounding. Construction is down. State spending is down. Our State government is very strapped. Aerospace is down. And now we have a chairman, Mr. President, of the Base Closure Commission who wants to hit us even harder, he wants to add more bases that will be closed in California.

And we will fight—the senior Senator from California, DIANNE FEINSTEIN and I, will fight that with fairness. We are ready to take a fair hit but not an unfair hit. But with or without the base closures, we are hurting in California. And this stimulus package will help.

But the cynics and the critics, many of whom are on the other side of the

aisle, will come up to me and they will say, "Senator, what good are 50,000 jobs to a State as large as California with 30 million people? What is the point? Why not forget about it and just see what happens?" I call those people, what some of my colleagues have dubbed the "guardians of gridlock," the "trickle-down guys," it will all "get well." We tried that for 12 years and we are paying the price.

But let me talk about 50,000 workers getting jobs, getting important jobs—building highways, teaching summer school, building houses, starting small businesses, helping local government, paving roads, community policing.

So now you have these 50,000 people who are unemployed working and they get paid. And that helps others. It helps thousands of children and family members and community.

So it is not just 50,000 people who are helped, Mr. President. It is probably more like 100,000 people helped. And it is not just 500,000 people helped in America when you figure out all the people that rely on these workers. It is more like a million people helped.

So jobs lead to deficit reduction, they lead to families who can be at peace because they know that they have a paycheck coming in.

So the 500,000 new jobs that Mr. Pannetta says will be created should be enough reason to support this package.

It is important to note, Mr. President, that right now the unemployment rate is higher in America than what it was when the recession started.

My colleague from Maryland, Senator SARBANES, calls this a jobs recession, and indeed that is what it is. This stimulus program is going to help us get past this jobs recession.

My concluding argument for this stimulus program, Mr. President, is the issue of investment. That is the third leg of this package—deficit reduction, jobs, and investment. We must begin to invest in the civilian side of our economy or we will never be able to compete in a global economy. Our competitors are spending far more than we are now on infrastructure.

For example, in 1989, the gross public investment as a percentage of GDP for Japan was 5 percent. That is the percentage that they invested in public investment. For Italy, it was 3.4 percent; for France, it was 3.2 percent; but in America, we only spent 1.6 percent of GDP for those same investments. No wonder we are falling behind.

How can we compete if our highways and our bridges are falling down and are in disrepair? How can we compete when our children are not getting the healthy start they need, and the Head Start that they need? How can we compete when our young people cannot go to college? How can we compete when our world-class cities are going broke from the AIDS crisis?

I have letters from all over this country, almost every State in the Union,

from local governments and State governments saying they are hurting by this AIDS crisis. They need our help. That help is in this stimulus package.

How can we compete when we waste energy? How can we compete when too many of our people spend as much as one-half of their income each month to pay the rent?

This stimulus package in a start of a long-term investment strategy which is going to lift us up and make us strong.

Sure, we can find things wrong with it. I can find things wrong with it. Mr. President, you can, my colleagues all can. We would each write it differently, spend a little more here, a little less there. But we have one President and he ran on this agenda. He said he was going to give this Nation a short-term stimulus and long-term deficit reduction. We owe it to him and the country and the voters of this country to move this package along.

My friends, we are very late in this package. We are not just 5 days late as my friend, the Senator from West Virginia, has been discussing. We are 12 years late, Mr. President, with this package—12 years late because it was 12 years ago the Republican administrations began leading us away from these investments and we fell behind.

For the life of me, I do not understand why there are those today who want to take this package and delay it. The whole country is looking on the U.S. Senate, the best debating body in the land. We have to mount a common body of action. The President acted. The House of Representatives acted. And we must act.

We voted for the budget resolution. There were those who said it would never be done. We did it. Now let us vote for the follow on piece, the stimulus piece. It is essential that we do it. We will start investments, we will create jobs, we will lift up our people, and soon be able to say that this U.S. Senate with all the various personalities in it, all the various ideologies in it, were able to put that aside, and for a couple of shining, bright moments, because this is going to be a very long administration, came together and we gave this President a chance.

Thank you very much, Mr. President. Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. BOXER). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. DODD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the Senate as if in morning business.

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

THE KIDS COUNT REPORT

Mr. DODD. Madam President, today the Annie Casey Foundation in my home State of Connecticut, and the Center for the Study of Social Policy, which is a nationally recognized study group, released their annual profile of American children, Kids Count.

It will not come as a great surprise to many people that the report paints a disturbing portrait of the conditions of American children, as we enter 1993.

As we now know from a variety of sources, all over America children and their families are in crisis. Whether they be rich or poor, black or white, inner-city or in our rural areas, the children of our Nation are living lives of desperation, and it is not quiet desperation.

The particulars of the study are very alarming. Between 1986 and 1991, the juvenile violent crime arrest rate rose by 48 percent in the United States of America. Although young males are seven times more likely than their female counterparts to be arrested for these types of crime, the female youth arrest rate has increased by an astounding 56 percent in that same period of time.

The teen violent death rate has also increased in those 4 or 5 years by 13 percent. Here in the District of Columbia, the rate went up 363 percent from 1985 to 1990.

Other areas examined in this study, which has great credibility, are equally disturbing. From 1985 to 1990, there was a 16 percent increase in births to single mothers and a 9 percent increase in the number of children living in single-parent homes.

The percentage of high school graduates declined by 4 percent. Five percent of the American teenagers between the ages of 16 and 19 are not in school, not in the labor force, not in the military, and are not homemakers.

Who are these missing American youth and what is their potential for a productive life?

My home State of Connecticut ranks sixth best, Madam President, overall, among the 50 States and the District of Columbia. But there is little solace in that news, for in the State of Connecticut, this means that there are still over 25,000 children who are not living with a parent; 6.8 percent of Connecticut's youth have no health insurance; and Connecticut ranked 38th overall in its juvenile violent crime arrest rate.

But, Madam President, we all know that statistics give us only a vague sense of the crisis at hand. The real story is that of the individual children behind those numbers—children who live lives of despair, children who now sit in the classrooms of America hungry and ill-clothed, and children who did not even go to school today, but whose absence was never questioned or even noticed.

Madam President, let me just point out—I have said this before on other

days here—by 3 o'clock, east coast time, every single day, some 2,000 children in this country drop out of school and never, ever go back. So by 3 o'clock this afternoon, our educational system, roughly, loses 2,000 more kids in this country, somewhere between 1,400 and 2,000.

I might point out, for those who say, "Well, that does not seem like a very big number," if you start thinking of that 5 days a week, 4 weeks a month, and for an entire year, it really mounts up.

But it also puts us substantially behind what is occurring in our major competitive nations, where the dropout rates are less than 1 percent of the equivalent age population.

And you start talking about this country's position economically in the 21st century, with dropout rates of that level, here we are now, knowing what we have to do, knowing we have to keep kids in school, knowing they have to be the best educated generation this Nation has ever produced, and yet between 1985 and 1990, we have watched a 4 percent decline in the number of students actually completing high school. That is exactly the wrong direction of the trend lines in terms of where we need to be by the 21st century.

At any rate, this Kids Count report, as it is called, notes that the most recent poverty rate among children, 19.8 percent, is an improvement over the 1985 rate, which was 20.5 percent. Imagine in America today one out of five children living in poverty. Not much of an improvement at all, I might add, from 1985.

We are losing ground, Madam President, in our Nation. There is no other way to describe what these statistics tell us. And every single day gets worse; it gets worse.

We are losing our youth; we are losing these kids. We cannot continue to turn our backs on the issues that affect their lives most directly. The problems of our children are the problems of our families, and the problems of our families are central to the future of our Nation. For too long we have wasted precious energy arguing about who is responsible for our children's problems and who is to blame. We are all responsible, every single one of us. And we must all join together if we are to solve this terrible crisis.

I will continue with my efforts to make America a better place for children. Recently I introduced the Child and Family Services and Law Enforcement Partnership Act. This measure creates partnerships between police departments and child mental health professionals to provide immediate assistance to children exposed to violence. This is only one aspect of what must be done. To address the problems of poverty, educational deprivation, and violence, we must work both quickly and creatively. I urge my colleagues to join

me in this legislation and other efforts to ensure that next year's Kids Count report will show far greater improvement than the one that is before us today.

Let me point out we are dealing here today with the stimulus package. While I am speaking in morning business, not directly a part of the stimulus package which the Senator from West Virginia is managing on the floor, it is worthwhile pointing out that a good part of that stimulus package is directed at our youth: The Head Start Program and summer jobs programs, even the issues involving jobs.

I am not going to take a lot of time here this afternoon, but people ask what can be done, how do you begin to make a difference? Again, I am maybe saying things I know my colleagues have heard me say repeatedly in the past, but there is no better social program anywhere than a job. That is the best social program I know of. Nothing does more for an individual or a family or a community than work—a decent job with a decent salary or wages.

So the stimulus package is directly targeted to trying to get this country moving again, to putting people back to work. We absolutely know today there is an increase in rates of spousal abuse, child abuse, and substance abuse in areas of high unemployment. I am not suggesting that a job necessarily cures all of those problems, but we clearly know without any question whatsoever that people who have jobs, in families that have decent incomes, and in neighbors and communities that are working, you see a significant decline in these problems that affect these children and affect these families. Certainly, you see a far higher rate of children staying in school, in their performance level, in their health care and related issues.

While the Kids Count report was not designed to be released at the time when we would be considering the stimulus package, I think there is linkage here. I think exactly what Senator BYRD is talking about—trying to do something in the area of early childhood education, improved health care opportunities for children, seeing to it that we have summer jobs for these kids when June and July and August arrive, to give them some opportunity and some hope—I think relates directly to the report that came out today from Kids Count, showing an alarming crisis in this country affecting our children.

I hope for those who are arguing about whether or not this is necessary, whether or not this makes any sense, they might just take a look at the wire service stories about the data and statistics accumulated by this very reputable organization that has tracked the condition of America's children for years. One out of every four Americans is under the age of 18; one-quarter of our population. We are the only indus-

trialized nation in the world that has, as the poorest sector of its population, its children. No other industrialized nation has that unique distinction. America's poorest are its kids. The next time you hear someone get up and give a speech about America being No. 1—not supporting, of course, the basic elements to strengthen America's children—then you have every right to question the sincerity of the remarks, to try and keep this Nation strong and vibrant for the 21st century.

I hope we will pass the stimulus package, and I hope when people do so they will take into account the Kids Count report that came out today.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed as if in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator may proceed.

Mr. SIMPSON. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. SIMPSON pertaining to the introduction of S. 667 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam President, just let me say a few words about the situation we are in regarding the supplemental appropriations bill. We hear a great deal in this Chamber about gridlock and about obstructionism. I would like to offer some of my own perspectives regarding these highly charged terms.

I suggest, Madam President, that obstruction is, like beauty—"In the eye of the beholder." Right now there is before the Senate an appropriations bill which many thoughtful Republicans and Democrats alike have indicated an intent to amend. I do not think that any attempt to amend the contents of a bill should be termed "obstructionism."

The distinguished and respected President pro tempore has pointed out that Senators in this Chamber are at liberty to offer amendments to this legislation and he has called for them to come forward, and they certainly are at liberty to do that. However, we are also fully aware that any substantive amending of this bill can ultimately be wiped out by the contents of the Senator's amendment, which is the final amendment, which could then be adopted as a substitute. It would displace the underlying language, however amended by us in the Senate.

I would not venture to call any player in this process an obstructionist.

The President pro tempore has achieved some extraordinary acknowledgment from members of the fourth estate who have called this an adroit parliamentary maneuver. He, of all of us here, knows the rules of the Senate to a greater and extraordinary degree. He has a deep love for the Senate and constantly demonstrates his extraordinary fealty and respect for this institution.

So with what has been described as an adroit parliamentary maneuver, the Senator has used the rules of the Senate to preserve the whole of the President's supplemental appropriations program and to protect it from amendment. I do find it interesting, whimsically so, that when Republicans avail ourselves of the Senate rules, we are often not treated so kindly in terms of media characterization. That apparently goes with the territory.

It certainly perplexes me, though, to see why it would be obstruction to try to amend legislation, but it is not obstruction to set up a parliamentary procedure by which the efficacy of any such amending can be thwarted. This maneuver has led us to a state of affairs now where Senators who otherwise would like to amend this bill—and have their amendments voted on up or down and see what happens to them—are not coming to the floor. They know full well that their amendments will not ultimately affect the contents of the legislation in any way.

So the distinguished chair of the Appropriations Committee is correct in saying that "the rules are the rules" and that no one should be condemned for using them to advance the policies that they favor.

The President pro tempore will do that, and he will do it with all of the adroitness for which he is highly regarded and famed, and I say that with great respect. He has taught me much and assisted me in my course of service in this body.

But we, on the Republican side, have the right and responsibility to do that, too. So I hope we can hear perhaps just a little bit less discussion about Republican obstructionism whenever we attempt to use our magic number of 41 votes to influence policy. For the general public, that is simply a number of votes we must have in order to avoid being cut off and to stop us from debating an issue. To curtail debate, the opposing party, the majority party, must produce 60 votes. So it is not just that the Republicans will do well here by delivering 41 votes. The fact is that the majority party really has to deliver 60 votes. It is a nuance of language, surely, but it is nevertheless worthy of distinction.

So this current situation did not come about because of anything Republicans did. We were ready to press forward to amend this bill, as Senators BREAUX and BOREN and other Demo-

cratic Senators, such as Senators FEINSTEIN and KOHL, were anxious to do. So when it becomes necessary for Republicans to make full use of the rules to try to influence legislation coming from this Chamber, I hope we will all agree with the President pro tempore when he said, in essence, that there should surely be no reason to carp or complain just because someone has used the rules to press one's agenda.

We will do that. Indeed, we will. The majority is certainly doing it on this bill. That is the way that that is going to be. If it is obstruction from the one side, it is most assuredly obstruction from the other.

And so, Madam President, I hope we can work through this impasse. And please recall that we have not done this before on our side of the aisle. When a similar tactic was used before, it was done by the leadership, the majority leader or the minority leader. It is my experience—and my memory could certainly be refreshed—that I have not seen it done by a committee chairman in the past. I believe it has generally been a leadership prerogative, and certainly in any case it now stalls us. Hopefully, with good faith, the majority leader and the President pro tempore and our fine and remarkable ranking member, Senator HATFIELD, and of course our respected leader, Senator DOLE, the leader of the Republican minority, will be able to resolve this. If not, there will be a great solidarity from our side to use the rules to protect ourselves.

I thank the Chair.

Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll. The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, beginning on last Thursday and continuing through today I have had a number of discussions with Senators BOREN, BREAUX, BRYAN, BYRD, and others, and they have had numerous discussions among themselves outside of my presence, in an effort to reach agreement on how best to proceed with respect to the pending supplemental appropriations bill.

I commend all of my colleagues who have been involved in these discussions for their constructive and positive attitudes and suggestions. We share a common agreement in the Senate—Democrats and Republicans alike—in our desire to achieve economic growth and job creation, and we recognize that to achieve that goal there must be a combination of economic stimulus and deficit reduction.

The disagreements we have had have not been over ends, but rather over the

means best suited to achieve those ends.

As a result of these discussions, which continue throughout the day today, I am pleased to announce that Senators BREAUX, BOREN, and BRYAN, have received a letter from the President, which I believe satisfies their intentions in this matter. I will, shortly, yield to permit them to address the matter in more detail. But I thank them very much for their positive and constructive contribution.

I also take note of the special effort made on behalf of this legislation and in these discussions by the distinguished chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee and the manager of the bill, Senator BYRD, who has, as always, assisted in our achieving a satisfactory and, I believe, a desirable resolution of this matter.

I am heartened by this result. I believe it significantly enhances the prospects for early enactment of this important element of the President's economic recovery program, and all of those who have contributed to that end deserve to be commended, and I do so commend them.

Mr. President, I note the presence of the distinguished Republican leader here on the Senate floor. I wish to state also that I have had a number of discussions with the distinguished Republican leader throughout the last few days in an effort to determine or devise a way to permit us to proceed on the pending bill, and those discussions are still ongoing. We are making some good progress, and I hope we will be able to make an announcement in that regard in the near future. I will be pleased to yield to the distinguished Republican leader at this time.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, as has been indicated, I have had discussions with the majority leader, and we are in the process of determining how many amendments might be offered on this side. I must say that some of our people are frustrated because we are sort of locked out of the process. It is sort of a one-Senator lockout.

We are trying to see what we might work out, but it is very difficult when the floor is controlled by the distinguished President pro tempore, and the farming out of the floor. So some of our Members are not particularly excited about that prospect. But we are trying to put together a list of amendments, and we hope to be able to get back to the majority leader soon.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I thank my colleague for his comments and look forward to further discussions with him in the near future.

Mr. President, I want to repeat just briefly what I said earlier. This legislation is a very important part of the President's overall economic program. It is essential that we act, and that we act soon. The American people have made clear their support for the Presi-

dent's program and their desire that the Congress act expeditiously on that program.

I believe what has just occurred with respect to the matter raised by Senators BOREN, BREAUX, and BRYAN, will enable us to reach that objective significantly sooner than might otherwise have been the case.

So I thank my colleagues. I am prepared to yield to my colleagues for such comments as they may wish to make.

Mr. BREAUX. Mr. President, I want to, first of all, start by acknowledging the good work of the majority leader and the patience of the majority leader, as well as the patience of all of our colleagues, as the past few days have gone before use. The work that was being done on this effort, much of which was being done off the floor of the Senate, and the patience of our colleagues while action on the floor was delayed, is something that I apologize for.

Let me say at this point that, initially, when I raised the possibility of a Breaux-Boren amendment, my concern in doing so was that I wanted to make absolutely certain that we were embarked on a process that would lead us to a goal and a goal that I feel very strongly about. I think many of our colleagues share that goal completely, which is that we in this body were not going to start off this year by appropriating new funds, many for new programs, without an absolute and complete commitment to be very serious about the budget reduction process, the budget reconciliation process, which is going to bring about some real reductions in Federal spending.

As I indicated on the floor, people in my State of Louisiana have told me: Senator, we think you and the President indeed are on the right track but, quite frankly, we just do not trust you to make the real cuts in Federal spending that is necessary as part of the overall package. My effort was to try and put a greater degree of assurance that we in this body would actually take the tough medicine with the medicine that was not so difficult to swallow.

What we have today is an agreement from this administration—which I happen to support very strongly—that I think clearly spells out their commitment to the entire package. By that, I mean, yes, the stimulus package, but also the long-term investment, as well as their commitment to real, significant, and honest budget reductions in Federal spending, which we will achieve through the budget reconciliation process.

I, along with Senator BOREN and Senator BRYAN, who have been very active in this effort, have received a letter, which we will make part of the RECORD at the appropriate time, which does some very significant things with re-

gard to what this President is committing to do.

The President clearly points out in the letter, speaking of the congressional budget resolution for fiscal year 1994, that "If that legislation falls short of the deficit reduction goal, I will send a proposal to the Congress to make up the budgetary shortfalls from the committees that fail to meet their targets."

Mr. President, that is very significant, and that is putting the President on record as being committed to this. It is that, instead of sitting back and perhaps letting Congress pass by a 60-vote margin a budget act that does not meet the targets and programs, that do not meet that target, this President is saying,

I will submit specific legislation to this Congress that makes the cuts in those programs and with those committees that have failed in their effort to meet that target.

I think that is significant, and I think that is appropriate. I think that is a major provision of this letter which makes me feel a lot better about what we are talking about doing.

The President also says that in part because of the criteria that we have requested that he consider criteria of creating additional jobs that are needed on an emergency basis. He says,

In part because of the criteria * * * a substantial amount of the outlays from these obligations will not occur until after the expected enactment of budget reconciliation. Therefore, I will be in a position to insist that the deficit reduction goals are met.

Mr. President, I think that is real progress. I think that is a very clear statement on behalf of this administration of their dedication to the concerns that I was voicing during the debate on the floor last week.

So I think the letter goes a very long way to giving me the confidence and I hope the American people the confidence that they need, that this is not business as usual, that this is a different administration which is truly committed to stimulating the economy, while at the same time reaching real budget deficit reductions through the budget reconciliation process.

With this assurance and with assurance of the President and our colleagues, I do not plan to offer an amendment. I think that what we have is a commitment and I trust, Mr. President, it will be followed through completely and unequivocally.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. President, I associate myself with the remarks just made by my colleague from Louisiana.

I join him in thanking the majority leader for his participation in the discussions which have led to this agreement, also the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee who has worked with us and who has ex-

changed ideas with us during this process.

I also thank the President of the United States, who has been open to our suggestions, who has heard us with respect, who has engaged in a real interchange with us.

Several days ago, about 15 of us had the opportunity to sit down and personally visit with the President. We visited with him at length about our concerns. He listened to us. I am convinced he heard us. I think this letter reflects the fact that he understands our concerns very thoroughly and he has responded to them.

I am very pleased by the outcome and by what is represented in this letter.

When we began, we began with a point that I think the American people understand very well. In fact, it is exactly what Senator BREAUX was saying and what they were saying to us.

My constituents have been saying to me, and I heard it from those in other States as well: We are ready to sacrifice. We are concerned about the future. We are concerned about our children and our grandchildren. We do not want them burdened by continued increases in the national debt. We want them to have the kind of opportunity that we have had. It if means we have to pay a little more in taxes or if we have to have some benefit cut which we received, we are ready for that kind of sacrifice to be made.

But our constituents have been saying to us: Make sure that you really get the deficit reduced, and those of you in Congress just do not go out and spend the money after we have been asked to make this sacrifice.

So the people have been watching us. They want to make certain that we do not fall back to the old ways of the past of spend now and put off indefinitely, but make those budget cuts that are necessary to bring down the budget deficit.

That is why Senator BREAUX, Senator BRYAN, and I, with support of others in this Chamber and considerable number of others, particularly on our side of the aisle, crafted this amendment.

What we were saying in this amendment is that some of the spending under the \$16 billion supplemental stimulus package would simply not take effect until the budget reconciliation agreement was passed. The idea was that that would keep the pressure on, that would be a statement by Congress to the administration that we want to make sure that before we can complete all the spending or before we consider other spending we meet those targets for real deficit reduction.

Mr. President, the letter which we have received says exactly that. As Senator BREAUX has quoted the part where the President says: "In part because of the criteria stated above,"—

that is the kind of spending that should occur now versus the kind of spending that can occur later—"a substantial amount of the outlays from these obligations will not occur until after the expected enactment of budget reconciliation."

He goes on to say, "Therefore, I will be in a position to insist that deficit reduction goals are met."

That accomplishes, as far as I am concerned, exactly what we hoped to accomplish in our original amendment. The letter in many ways goes even further because the President then explicitly says:

*** I will insist that the reconciliation bill meet the 5-year deficit reduction targets contained in the congressional budget resolution for fiscal year 1994. If that legislation falls short of the deficit reduction goal, I will send a proposal to Congress to make up the budgetary shortfalls from the committees that failed to meet their targets.

This is real accountability, and it means that the President is going to force those committees of Congress one by one to meet their individual responsibilities, and whether the Finance Committee, the Appropriations Committee, the Agriculture Committee, or any other committee of Congress, whatever committee that is, he is going to hold us accountable, and he will send proposals forward for those committees to meet those targets if any committee falls short.

To me that is a very, very important commitment of leadership by the President. I think it is the kind of signal that we wanted sent to the American people, a signal that we are simply not going back to our old ways. We are only going to spend if we can afford to spend by continuing to meet our deficit reduction goals.

So I commend the President for this letter. I appreciate it. As far as I am concerned, it accomplishes the goals that we had when we began with the crafting of our amendment. In fact, I think it does it even more effectively.

Some have said to me: Is not the matter that you are arguing about really a symbolic matter? Is it not more symbolic than real? While it is true that \$16 billion out of many hundreds of billions of dollars in a budget is a relatively small amount, it is still a large amount in the eyes of the American people who do not want to see us waste a single dollar. That is one point.

But, second, I think that the message is important and the precedent, the expression from the President and the expression from the Congress is important because what we are really saying here is there are a lot of things we would like to do and if indeed we can get the budget deficit really reduced we also do need to have a stimulus package that goes along with it to make sure that the economy remains strong while we are reducing the deficit. But the President is also saying,

Above all else, I am not going to let these deficit reduction targets slip and slide. I am going to keep the pressure on and I am going to make sure that those targets are accomplished.

I think that is extremely important. It does say what we were trying to say. Let us make sure we do not eat the dessert without eating the spinach, as we have done all too often in the past. And I think it does say, as Senator BREAUX has said, that this is a President who takes deficit reduction seriously and is not simply giving lip-service to it.

I feel very good about the result that has been reached here in light of this commitment from the President, and I take the President completely at his word. I certainly am prepared to join with Senator BREAUX in withdrawing our amendment and in supporting the package with full confidence that it will in no way diminish our commitment to deficit reduction.

No sooner had the House, for example, acted on the budget resolution there were some voices raised that said, we are not sure we can cut as much as we said in the budget resolution.

What this really does is reaffirm our commitment, and we all feel it was very important that we have that kind of reaffirmation, that while we go ahead to take care of the short-term emergency needs for the unemployed and create jobs for students this summer, and for others, that we in no way are going to let up on the commitment to deficit reduction. We will make it sure it happens.

Again, I thank my colleagues for their understanding and their understanding of the importance of the point that we have been trying to make. Most of all I thank the President for this forthright statement which he has sent to us. In light of this statement, I plan to vote for the supplemental appropriations bill, this stimulus bill, and I do so with great confidence that the entire package, including the deficit reduction, will ultimately be enacted into law.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, I endorse the statements made by my distinguished colleagues from Louisiana and Oklahoma. I wanted to make it clear that in joining with them in this amendment, it was never our intention to be obstructive in terms of getting the stimulus package approved. I supported the package then, and I support it now.

But the stimulus package is only one piece of the President's economic program. Another very important piece of that is the deficit reduction piece. Like my distinguished colleague from Oklahoma, in talking with my fellow Nevadans most Nevadans are supportive of the President. They want him to

have success with this package as do I for the benefit of the entire country.

I must say that there is a nagging skepticism, based perhaps on the ways of the past, that we will be all too forthcoming in approving supplemental appropriations, the stimulus, the additional money but when the time comes to make the tough judgments as to the deficit reduction piece somehow that part of the overall message or package will be lost.

It was in that spirit that I joined with my colleagues in offering this amendment to make sure that that occurs.

Let me say that I, too, have had occasion to read the President's message to us. I compliment the President on his leadership, because he has made it clear in reaffirming his support for the deficit reduction goals and has gone an extra step by indicating that if legislation falls short of the deficit reduction goal, he expresses himself by saying: "I will send a proposal to Congress to make up the budgetary shortfalls in the committees that failed to meet their targets."

That, Mr. President, in my judgment, is real leadership. I commend and praise the President of the United States for that leadership and for the good work that our distinguished majority leader has performed in working us through this process.

I am satisfied by this letter. I express my support for the package and join with my colleagues in withdrawing the Breaux-Boren-Bryan amendment.

I yield the floor.

Mr. DOLE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican leader.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I think we ought to first understand the Breaux-Boren-Bryan amendment does not cut any spending. If you listen to the speeches, you would think, "Boy, they really had a tough amendment out there."

It did not cut spending at all—not one dime. It delayed the spending for awhile until we got reconciliation, but there was not any reductions in spending in that package.

I have not read the letter in full, but what I heard quoted on the floor is not very reassuring to this Senator. Again, it does not say how we are going to meet the deficit targets. And I assume they mean, by meeting it, more taxes. That is not going to be widely accepted by the American people.

So I think precisely what the letter does—and it is not unusual around here—it says, in effect, "Well, we will do our best. If the President does not get what he wants in reconciliation, he will send another request to the Congress."

That does not mean Congress is going to do anything. So we should not be under any illusion that by writing a letter we are, in effect, going to reduce

spending or not raise taxes. And I do not know what the mix is, either.

There is such a thing as the Anti-Impositionment Act which was passed in the 1970's. I do not think the President talks about withholding funds.

So I just suggest that there never was much to start with in the Breaux-Boren-Bryan amendment, as far as it did not cut one dime in spending. So the fact we have a letter saying, "Well, we are not going to cut any spending, either," is not very reassuring, should not be very reassuring to the American taxpayers.

So I am certain, from the standpoint of moving the legislation along, it is good to have a letter from the President of the United States saying that he, in effect, agrees with those who did not want to cut spending in the first place. That may move it along. But it does not change the fact that we are not cutting spending. That is the problem that we have on this side of the aisle.

We do not need this stimulus package. I think the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. KOHL] if he offers his amendment, at least it would not let us spend the second phase of money until it went back into the budget and went through the regular process. That certainly has more merit than the so-called Breaux-Boren-Bryan amendment.

But, above and beyond that, this package is not necessary. We ought to have a right to debate it fully and freely on the Senate floor, which we do not have at this point. We, in effect, have a House Rules Committee or traffic cop who tells us what we can do and when we can do it.

I must say, in fairness to my friend from West Virginia, this is very frustrating on this side of the aisle. There is no similarity, or very little similarity, to this effort and what happened in 1985 when I happened to be the majority leader. We did allow perfecting amendments. Many were adopted.

It seems to me we are, in effect, shut out, locked out, of the process on this side of the aisle. Maybe it is a precedent for what we may have the next time we have an appropriations bill or some other bill from some other committee.

It is hard for our Republicans to accept. We had a conference today and I must say they were very, very frustrated, I guess, would not be an exaggeration.

We do not see any reason we should be offering amendments if they can be wiped out by a later vote on the substitute of the distinguished Senator from West Virginia.

We do not know what will finally happen. But I must say, the amendment that is being withdrawn never did anything in the first place, so it probably does not make much difference.

Mr. BOREN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. President, I would like at this time to send up a copy of the letter from the President, addressed to Senator BREAUX, Senator BRYAN, and myself, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

Hon. JOHN B. BREAUX,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATORS BREAUX, BOREN, AND BRYAN: As you know, I share your concerns that the deficit reduction goals which I called for, as well as those that are contained in the fiscal year 1994 budget resolutions of the House and Senate, are a key to economic recovery. I appreciate the support that you have given to our deficit reduction efforts. Immediate enactment of my short-term economic stimulus package, together with long-term investments, is also an integral and essential element of our total plan.

I assure you that I will insist that the reconciliation bill meet the five-year deficit reduction targets contained in the congressional budget resolution for fiscal year 1994. If that legislation falls short of the deficit reduction goal, I will send a proposal to Congress to make up the budgetary shortfalls from the committees that failed to meet their targets.

I will also ensure prudent expenditure of the funds in the supplemental appropriations bill now before Congress. I believe that these expenditures should be primarily targeted at programs that create a substantial number of jobs per dollar expended, programs that are needed immediately, and programs that meet significant human needs, especially with regard to health, education, and housing.

As I told Senator Byrd, I must oppose undue delay in obligating funds for essential programs. In part because of the criteria stated above, a substantial amount of the outlays from these obligations will not occur until after the expected enactment of budget reconciliation. Therefore, I will be in a position to insist that the deficit reduction goals are met.

With these assurances I hope that I can count on your assistance in achieving expeditious completion of congressional action on the economic stimulus appropriations bill as well as on the budget resolution and the reconciliation bill.

Sincerely,

BILL CLINTON.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. President, let me simply say that I, of course, do not fully subscribe to the interpretation just made by my good friend, the distinguished minority leader. We are dealing with cuts in spending and cuts in the deficit.

The President's plan cuts the deficit by \$502 billion. We are dealing with real figures. Probably half of that, almost half of that, comes from spending cuts.

That is why this Senator feels so strongly about it. For the first time in many, many years, we have honestly faced up to what the deficit will do to destroy this country if we do not do something to change it, if we do not do something to reduce that deficit, so

that we will not be spending more and more of the total budget each year to pay interest on the national debt.

So I do think that what is going forward is important. I do think the President's commitment to stay the course is a very important commitment. I do think that the timing of the spending and the fact that the President has shown sensitivity in his letter to us, as we tried to show in our original amendment, that it is very important that we understand that we send a signal to the American people that we are not sliding back into our old ways of spend now and reduce the deficit later, but that we are moving forward with a comprehensive package.

So I do hope that, when the distinguished minority leader reads the letter, he will understand why we feel it is a very important and significant statement.

I do feel, with all due respect, that our original proposal was an important one. Sensitivity to timing, in terms of spending and deficit reduction, is an important issue that we have tried to address.

I see the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee seeking recognition, so I will yield the floor.

But I simply wanted to make that point. Again, I commend the President for what I think is a real program with real numbers to get the deficit reduced. That is what the American people want. They understand the need for it. I believe that, because of his leadership, we have created in this country the greatest opportunity to really reduce the budget deficit than we have had in at least two decades. I commend him for it.

It is my hope that Congress will continue to work with him to really get the deficit reduced.

Mr. BYRD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The President pro tempore.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I think that the Senators have performed a constructive job. I think they have done something that is very pleasing to this Senator and to the appropriators.

The appropriators have stayed within the caps. The appropriators have not been the budget busters. We have kept within the caps. We have kept within our allocations. Every subcommittee on my committee—13 subcommittees—has kept within its allocations every year that I have been chairman.

But the appropriators are the targets, always, of those who want to have the line-item veto and enhanced rescissions. It is always the appropriators.

The three Senators have done, in a nonlegislative way, what they were seeking to do through an amendment. They have encountered a lot of the pressures that the President has on the other side, philosophically, ideologically, and otherwise. And the President has indicated that he will insist on the

reconciliation bill meeting its targets, meeting its deficit reduction targets.

I am very pleased that the President has done that because those committees ought to meet their targets. We meet our targets on appropriations. We meet our targets. And I say let the other committees, the Finance Committee, other committees that devise programs that result in back-door spending over which the Appropriations Committee has no control—let them meet their targets as well. That is what the President is saying he is going to do and that is what the three Senators, and others with them, sought to accomplish. So I congratulate them. I congratulate the President as well.

Now, the distinguished Republican leader has made several comments here about being locked out, farming out the floor, traffic cop, frustrations, shutouts, and so on.

Mr. President, I am the manager of this bill. I am doing my job. What am I supposed to do? Turn this job over to somebody else? The President, in no uncertain terms, in his letter indicated where he stood on this package. And as he says in this letter, "As I told Senator BYRD, I must oppose undue delay in obligating funds for essential programs."

Now, I believe in this President's programs. It is only the 68th day of his Presidency and I want to see him succeed, because if the President succeeds, the country is better off. If he succeeds we all succeed, because he is trying to do the right thing. He is trying to make investments in infrastructure, he is trying to reduce the budget deficit, and he is trying to put people to work, immediately and in the long run.

I believe in this package. It fell to my lot to protect his package because I am the chairman of the Appropriations Committee. If Senator BREAUX had been the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, that would have been his job. If Senator DOLE, my good friend Senator DOLE, the Republican leader, had been the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, that would have been his job—his job. But this was my job and I did my job. And I am rather proud of the way I protected the President's package.

Now we have this—very dangerous amendment, in my judgment—have it resolved, and resolved in a non-legislative way. Now we are ready to do business on the rest of the amendments.

I have not sought to lock anybody out without good reason. This Senator is no dummy. He may have a plum-biferous cranium, but he knows what he is doing. I have been around here a long time. I have been frustrated many times and there are times when I will be frustrated again, so I might as well just get used to it from time to time. I felt my good friend, the Republican leader, had gotten used to frustrations

around here. He can dish them out pretty well. I have been on the receiving end of them. I have laughed about it. I did not like it but I knew that he was doing his job, doing what he felt he ought to do for his President. Now I am doing my job.

Now, why did I act as traffic cop? Very simply this, may I say to the Republican leader. Had I walked off this floor, the Republican leader might have walked in and moved to table my amendment.

Mr. DOLE. I had that in mind.

Mr. BYRD. We have Senators absent today. And until this matter was resolved, I did not know whether we would be able to weather a tabling motion or not. I did not want to take a chance. That is exactly why I did that. So I hope that he will explain to his frustrated colleagues why I did this. I did my job. And I am ready, now, to work with the minority if they have their amendments and can identify them and can give us those, the identification of amendments, and we will get a time agreement on them so we do not have any open-ended situation because we, if we are going to do it in an open-ended way, we may be here next week. But let us have a reasonable number of amendments. I have always felt that I—at least I considered myself to be a reasonable man, whether other people did or not. And I want to be reasonable.

So, if the Republican leader has his amendments ready, and my colleague on the other side, Mr. HATFIELD, if he is prepared to agree to a certain number of amendments and to time limitations on them, and to a final time for a vote tomorrow—this Senator is prepared. I have accomplished what I set out to do, and I am sorry if it jangled the Republican leader's nerves or anyone else's.

Mr. DOLE. My nerves are pretty steady.

Mr. BYRD. I am not a bit sorry for what I did. I did what I thought was the right thing. I did what I told the President I was going to do. I did what I told the majority leader I was going to do.

Mr. DOLE. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. Yes, I will be glad to yield.

Mr. DOLE. Would these be amendments that would not be wiped out later with a vote on the Senator's substitute?

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I said as long ago as last Friday—and we only put this bill down about 2 o'clock on Thursday—I said as long ago as last Friday that I knew a way to provide for the offering of amendments. I did not say what it was on that day. But today I indicated I could move to recommit with instructions to report back. Someone approached me and asked if I would take the tree down and I said, "No, never." But I want to give

the Senators a chance to offer their amendments. My plan is—and I have the amendment here on my desk—rather, the motion to instruct. I will move to recommit and instruct the committee to report back forthwith the House bill and the committee substitute that was included in the committee, together with the amendments that have been attached since that time, the amendment by Mr. HATFIELD and myself, the amendment that I offered reducing the IRS by something like \$105 million. And that will be the base. And that will be open to amendment. And Senators can offer amendments and they can offer them in two degrees.

It will still be an amendment that I could erect a tree on if I wanted to, but I want to give the Senators a chance, now, to offer their amendments. And this amendment that Mr. BREAUX and Mr. BOREN and Mr. BRYAN had waiting in the wings, now that it has been resolved, it clears the way, I should hope. They ought to have a pretty solid Democratic side over here, Democratic vote.

But I am prepared, now, to take on the Republican amendments, and they could be offered to the substitute or to the bill—the committee substitute I am talking about. That committee substitute is a freebie. It is a complete substitute so it is open to amendments in two degrees. And just as soon as the distinguished Republican leader supplies me with the number of amendments that he wants to call up, we will try to work out an agreement on it as to time and to final passage.

So, there it is. The only thing I ask, that I offer the motion to recommit with instructions and nobody try to amend those instructions. Because I am coming back with a package that is wide open for amendments in two degrees. There is no tree. But I think it is reasonable to ask that I know how many amendments we are going to get. I do not want it to be open-ended, as I say; whatever the amendments the Republican leader and his colleagues and my colleague here, who is the ranking manager, agree on—I hope there will be a reasonable number of amendments. I hope there will not be too many—6 or 8 or 10 or 12. We hope to get this bill passed by sometime tomorrow.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further?

We are in the process now of trying to determine which amendments. I guess the thing I need to resolve is whether or not there is going to be any flexibility or whether everything is going to be under the total control of the distinguished chairman of the committee. Is there going to be free and open debate on the amendments, or you are going to determine which amendments can be offered? We cannot accept that on this side.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I am not sure the Republican leader had been listening.

Mr. DOLE. I have been listening very carefully.

Mr. BYRD. I am not sure he listened. I have not said anything about closing down debate. I have not said anything about controlling amendments.

Mr. DOLE. You said to give you a list and time agreement.

Mr. BYRD. I am entitled to see a list of amendments, surely, because I am opening up the way now. I do not have to do what I am doing, you understand.

Mr. DOLE. You do if you want the bill passed.

Mr. BYRD. Well, I do not know about that.

Mr. DOLE. In any event, we are trying to put together a list of amendments. I guess, after discussion with the majority leader, we will see how many there are. We are trying to condense some where there are three or four different Members who have almost identical amendments. There is no use having four amendments. So we are working on that process now.

Mr. BYRD. I just hope, may I say to the Republican leader, that we can narrow the amendments down to a reasonable number so that they can be disposed of today and tomorrow. I did not say anything about shutting off debate. I thought I indicated it was my hope that we could reach a time agreement on amendments, which means that there be an equal amount of time on each side. Does that sound like anything that is unusual around here? I have worked out many time agreements on this floor and worked a lot of them out with the distinguished Republican leader. And in a time agreement, each side has a certain amount of time. That is what I am hoping we can arrange. The traffic cop job is over. I have accomplished my purpose. I have protected the President's program now until we could get our own side with its act together. Now we are ready to play ball with the other side.

Mr. DOLE. I do not think that amendment had many votes on this side anyway, the amendment you just helped with.

Mr. BYRD. But it has some on this side.

Mr. MITCHELL addressed the Chair. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I hope we can reach an agreement, and it is my expectation that we will. Both sides are working in good faith on that.

There has been a great deal of discussion about the current parliamentary situation, a lot of words to describe it. I would like to make one point that I think may have been lost in all of this discussion.

Under the rules, any Senator can come in at any time in the proceedings and offer a complete substitute which has the effect of wiping out previous amendments, if that is what the substitute proposes. Everybody here un-

derstands that. Any suggestion or implication that once an amendment is adopted by the Senate it is somehow engraved in stone and, therefore, must be a part of the final action is, of course, completely false and erroneous.

The only difference between the current status is that the amendment proposed by the chairman is the pending amendment. He could just as easily, I could just as easily, the Senator from Oregon could just as easily, the Senator from Missouri, the Senator from New Mexico, or anyone else wait until 5, 10, 15, 20 other amendments were considered and, if they were adopted, propose then a substitute amendment which, if so drafted, would have the effect of wiping out all the previous amendments. That is ordinary and accepted and a regular part of the Senate's rules.

So I hope we can resolve this now in a manner that everyone agrees is acceptable. But I do not want there to be left any erroneous impression as to the effect of what was occurring. There is no process by which a Senator can assure that once an amendment is adopted, that amendment can withstand a later amendment to the contrary if the Senate so chooses. The opportunity to offer a complete substitute amendment which wipes out all previously adopted amendments exists right there in the rule for every Senator on every bill we take up, including this one.

My hope is that we can now reach agreement that we can proceed to vote on and dispose of amendments. But everyone should understand that reaching an agreement, unless the amendments are specified, does not preclude that possibility in anything. So I hope we can get this going, have some debate, some votes this evening and tomorrow, and that we can pass this bill at the earliest possible time.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mrs. FEINSTEIN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOMENICI. Madam President, I would like to be advised when I have used 5 minutes.

Madam President, I rise not to engage myself in the discussion that is going on with reference to amendments or the status of the bill and the underlying amendments and the substitute amendments; I am sure that is being dealt with by others.

I rise to talk tonight a little bit about the budget game that is taking place. I am not sure that this evening I will even address the issue of specifics in the package because I think before

we are finished, the American people are going to understand that a very large package of new spending is being called a stimulus when, as a matter of fact, the overwhelming proportion of it is not stimulus at all, unless you call Government spending a stimulus. It is not as if this package is laden with activities that are going to generate jobs, other than the highway and transit jobs, summer jobs, etc., which are interesting in and of themselves. I notice the occupant of the Chair is from a State where that portion of it is not even going to work, because California has more unemployed than anyone else. But as to even the highway and mass transit part, California, by a quirk of the formulas, ends up getting one of the lowest ratios of money from those programs of any State in the Union.

So it is rather a patchwork of things, under the heading of stimulus. Before we are finished, I am sure that the people of the country are going to be tired of hearing what kind of stimulus this is, because this funding is for the kind of things they would not believe should come on the heels of a much heralded deficit reduction package, which essentially is all new taxes and defense cuts and a little, tiny \$7 billion net reduction in all of the domestic programs of the Nation.

It is, however, a heralded deficit reduction package that requires sacrifice of everyone, and obviously I am, in a sense, trying to say I do not believe it is much of that. It is not sacrificing because everybody has to remember that the President of the United States says he is cutting a lot in that package, but he is asking for almost an equal amount of new spending. I give you those two numbers: \$131 billion in so-called domestic cuts; \$124 billion in new programs, add-ons, new dollars. That is a real domestic cut of only \$7 billion net. I mean, we could almost do that without going through any of this. We could probably have done that just asking the Appropriations Committee chairman to make those savings in committee and probably get that done.

Now, what they are doing is playing a giant budget game so we can spend more money in the appropriations process of the country. Frankly, I am not here arguing against appropriating money for American needs, be it educational, the National Institutes of Health, or whatever. I am here arguing that to try to tell the American people that we have just gone through this onerous deficit reduction exercise, and then come right around when the ink is hardly dry and put \$16 billion into an appropriations bill to spend, and call it stimulus, is disingenuous when it has things like—maybe I will just read a few items. I think everybody knows that before we finish, an effort will be made to talk about what will be funded under this bill. Here are just a couple:

\$28 million for new alternative fueled Government vehicles, at a time when the administration is trying to cut down on cars and drivers in the Federal fleet; restoring \$197 million for the National Science Foundation for research grants, overturning Congress' decision last fall not to provide in full, a \$352 million increase requested by the Bush administration because of tight budgetary times.

I am not against the National Science Foundation and their new grant program. But believe me, I cannot understand how we can try to tell the American people that this ongoing program, which has been increasing rather dramatically, ought to be funded with an additional \$197 million under the guise of being a stimulative package.

There are many more that are even far more egregious than that. How about \$148 million for IRS tax system modernization? The Department of the Treasury responded that 16 percent of this work will be subcontracted to Japanese firms. The House leadership refused to allow "Buy American" amendments. I do not know if they should have or not, but that is just a fact. I am pleased to see that the distinguished chairman has reduced the funding for this item in his substitute amendment.

There are scores more. There are millions of dollars put into the Interior Department because, even though we have been increasing the funding, we have a backlog of facilities needs and maintenance of some of our parks units. Frankly, those are wonderful things. But do the American people really believe that we have gone through an exercise in deficit reduction that is so tough and so onerous that we ought to come right back within 48 hours and fill that vacuum with \$16 billion in new spending?

I do not want to repeat numbers, but I tried my best to look at previous stimulus packages of this country. We had almost gotten out of the habit of passing stimulus bills. We almost got out of the habit because they work so poorly. We have history books full of analyses of so-called stimulus packages that did not work, because do you know what generally happens? You do not spend the money in the year you think you will. You spend it 2 years later, and whatever you were trying to cure has already been fixed. Our history of experience with stimulus packages is that when we try to spend the money in a recessionary period, even on highways, it turns out you do not get the money into the system until 2 years later, when there is no longer a recession.

Some might ask, get to the point. Is that what is occurring here? Leave it to others than myself. What I find is that in the first year, the rest of this year, when stimulus is being sought,

and jobs are supposed to be created by this Federal Government money, other than the unemployment checks, only \$2.9 billion of it, Madam President, will be literally spent in the remainder of this year—a big, big stimulus for America, \$2.9 billion. The rest will be spent in other years. Why would we even do that? Why would we today spend money in 1994, 1995, and 1996 under the guise of it being stimulus? It is absolutely without any rationale.

One reason I think it is being done—and it was not the original intention and I certainly hope it is not going to work out this way, is because it is a budget game. Let me repeat—this is a budget game because the Congress of the United States has adopted a law of the land that said: Here is a cap for domestic spending in the year of 1993, and you cannot breach that cap. And lo and behold, we did a very good thing. We said: If you do not spend what is allocated for defense or other discretionary spending what is left over in 1993 goes to reduce the deficit—not so bad.

What have we been running around trying to do? We have been trying to get the deficit down.

So we decided that if we did not spend all that money on defense, the law said you cannot spend it anywhere else. So it goes to deficit reduction. If you did not spend all the money on foreign aid, it goes to deficit reduction. Guess what is going to happen in this budget game. There is a little provision in this 1990 budget agreement which is very simply, very profound. It says these these caps are no longer operative if you have an emergency, and the emergency designation for the recession has never, never been adopted by the Congress or President heretofore. You would think if Congress wanted to do this, it would have adopted the emergency 2 years ago. No. On this one, the President and the Congress say we have an emergency when the recession is essentially behind us.

Madam President, I say to my fellow Senators that what that means is that those legal binding spending caps are no longer in existence for all of the money provided here. This spending is outside the caps, and you do not have to worry about deficit reduction. Spend the money.

I have to admit that when we put that together, that budget agreement with the caps, we had no better way to define emergency than that it must be declared by the President and the Congress. But under almost any common-sense definition, we are not in an emergency. But this Senator admits that under the 1990 budget agreement, if the President and the Congress say there is an emergency, there is. In this case, the reason for the emergency is to allow us to spend money we could not otherwise spend. And guess what that is going to do? That money is all going to get spent without any accounting

under the caps. And, Madam President, we still have a little money left over under the caps because we underspent in the 1993 appropriations bills.

Guess what? In about 1 month or 6 weeks, there will be another appropriations bill coming through. It will be the second urgent supplemental, or some such thing. And because this did not count, this \$16 billion did not count, we can probably fit some new spending in under those caps. In a sense, the American taxpayer is going to get it on both sides. We are going to pay taxes, supposedly 295 billion dollars' worth, to reduce the deficit. We have in place a congressionally adopted law that would apply a substantial number of billions of dollars against the deficit because we have underspent the caps. We will come along now, however, and say this new \$16 billion is not subject to any of that. It is an emergency and thus we will leave open room under the discretionary caps—although it may be a strain because most of that saving is in defense.

Surely some can come to the floor and say, "Let us use the extra defense money within that cap to spend on this next urgent supplemental," which will come running through here and which will probably have to do with the disaster relief for farmers and others.

So, point No. 1, there is no emergency. This should not have been declared an emergency. It is a budget game to permit Congress and the President to spend more money; money they would not spend under the existing law of the land because they would need 60 votes here and a majority of the votes in the House for it to be in order. But it is going to get spent anyway.

And that Budget Act point of order that keeps us from just throwing money away is wiped out, so that we can come along and spend even some more money, while the taxpayers of the United States are out there being Mr. and Mrs. Sucker. They kind of think we have a grand plan, but they are beginning to wonder: What grand plan? Looks like a grand plan to tax us. And we are not so sure that Btu tax—that energy tax—we are not so sure that is so very good. Some are saying Btu means big time unemployment, which it very well could be.

So, from this point on, I am hopeful that, under our leader here on the Republican side, we can eventually have a number of votes to make our case.

My friend, the Senator from Oklahoma, has an excellent amendment regarding this emergency designation clause, which will take this right to the American people. They will understand, hopefully with this statement tonight and the debate on that amendment, what a budget charade this is.

There will be others to point out programs here that are just good Federal programs that everybody loves. We are going to love them so much that we are

going to say, even if it requires that we declare an emergency and use a phony name "stimulus," we are going to put more money into those good programs.

Well, how does that stack up against this hue and cry from the American people that we ought to be reducing the deficit?

So, from my standpoint, sooner or later it will be determined that this is not a stimulus package. It is close to porkbarrel. If it is stimulus, it is going to be the most expensive production of jobs by the Federal Government that we have ever seen. One estimate is \$89,000 a job. That is incredible.

What it really means is that this is not a jobs bill. It is a bill to put out more money in Federal programs, some of which are very popular. If we do it this way, we have more to spend next year because the caps that are in existence are going to give us more room this year to spend on supplementals. Then next year, this ongoing spending will be outside of the cap again, the overall cap on discretionary spending, and we will be able to spend more money on top of this for other programs because we will have already taken care of some of these programs with the new funding in this bill.

With that I thank the Chair, I thank the Senate, and I yield the floor.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska has suggested the absence of a quorum. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. MITCHELL. Madam President and Members of the Senate, earlier I stated that discussions were underway among the managers, interested Senators, the distinguished Republican leader, and myself, in an effort to reach an agreement on how best to proceed with consideration of the pending bill. It now appears that no agreement is possible at this time. However, I have been advised by the Republican leader that Republican Senators are prepared to offer Amendments in the current procedural framework and accordingly it is my judgment, absent any agreement at this time, that we should proceed in that regard.

Senators should be aware now that amendments will shortly be offered, that there may well be—indeed I expect that there will be—a vote or votes this evening, depending upon how lengthy the debate on the first and subsequent amendments. I do not know what the amendments will be so we will obviously have to review them and consider them after their being offered.

Madam President, I yield the floor and invite any comment the distin-

guished Republican leader wishes to make.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican leader.

Mr. DOLE. Madam President, I think the Senate majority leader has accurately stated the present circumstances. I think it is fair to say there are some on this side who are prepared to offer amendments, even though they know in this case they would be eliminated if later on we adopted the substitute by the distinguished Senator from West Virginia. Frankly I must say on this side of the aisle there is almost a unanimous feeling that we should not pass this stimulus package and that we have the votes to prevent that from happening. So I do not know how the leadership will proceed, but while we are trying to determine which avenue to pursue, at least we would be offering an amendment.

Senator BROWN from Colorado is prepared to do that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. Madam President, let me just reiterate that in accordance with the earlier understanding that I think was had here among the distinguished Republican leader, the distinguished majority leader, and myself and others, I was prepared and am prepared to offer a motion to recommit with instruction to report back the House bill together with the Appropriations Committee substitute, including the amendments that have been adopted. And that would be open to amendments.

That is the simplest chart in the rule book. That would be open to amendments, open in two degrees: No three. So that would give Senators an opportunity to offer their amendments and in accordance with the understanding that I thought we were trying to work out—and I fully understand the Republican leader's inability at this point to achieve that objective for reasons over which he has no control—that would have enabled us, if we could have gotten time agreements on the amendments, to have completed work on the bill at a reasonable hour.

Another of the objectives that I have sought from the beginning on this bill is to act on a package that the House will accept and that will avoid having to go to a conference. And I have a good reason to believe, after some discussions I have had through my staff with some people on the other side, that the House would probably agree, and without any problem at all, to the amendment the committee agreed to having to do with retaining the current law in connection with the formulas in respect to summer jobs, and would agree to the amendment that Senator HATFIELD and I had joined in offering that would eliminate some of the what I refer to as kooky items, and would also agree to the reduction by \$105 million in the IRS and the GSA accounts.

So I do not think we have any problem in the House with those amendments. We probably would not even have to go to conference. That was one of the objectives that I sought, as I tried to protect this jobs package from attack. Having accomplished what I think was a major step when the President, and the Senator from Louisiana, and the Senator from Oklahoma, and the Senator from Arizona, agreed upon a nonlegislative approach to the problems that those Senators had raised—having achieved that step I felt that we were well on our way toward acting on this bill and, hopefully, of protecting it against further attack.

I was willing to go to the extent that I suggested, that of offering a motion to recommit which would give all Senators—all Senators—an opportunity to offer their amendments. They would not have to worry about any tree wiping them out, at least early on. And if I could get an agreement on the amendments I would only want to protect myself fully against any line-item veto and enhanced rescission amendment.

But it appears that approach cannot be taken at this time. So Senators will call up their amendments, there will not be any time agreements with respect to amendments, no points of order are waived so they can call up their amendments to the bill and to the committee substitute and, in the final analysis, if this is the road we are going to proceed on, there will come a time when the Senate will vote up or down on the committee substitute.

I say to my friends on the other side, the way is still open. If they really want the opportunity that they have been talking about on the floor, the opportunity that I have been hearing about, that they want to offer amendments and feel that they are offering amendments that will be adopted to the underlying, basic measure, I am willing to proceed in that fashion if we can agree on the number of amendments, so we will have some identification on them and can work out some time agreements.

I close by saying to the distinguished Republican leader, if he is still able to achieve this, he and the majority leader go down the road and work out a time agreement, fine; I will be happy to work with them. I yield the floor.

Mr. KERREY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FEINGOLD). The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. KERREY. Mr. President, may I inquire what the order is? I ask the distinguished President pro tempore to answer the question. I had earlier discussed speaking, and at the time we were considering a unanimous-consent request. Seeing there is not going to be one at the moment, I assume now is an appropriate time to speak.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator would be well within his rights to proceed. I had

hoped if we were able to work out a time agreement to include in the time agreement some time for the distinguished Senator from Nebraska to speak. But no time agreement has been achieved at this point. The Senator has the floor and he may proceed.

Mr. KERREY. I thank the President pro tempore.

Mr. President, I rise this evening in opposition to H.R. 1335, the emergency supplemental appropriations bill for fiscal year 1993, also known as the President's stimulus package.

I do so with great regret because of my respect for what President Clinton is trying to do: avoid a triple-dip recession. And I do so, with considerable regret, as a consequence of my respect for the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the President pro tempore of the Senate.

I do so knowing that the stimulus package would provide some money for the State of Nebraska; that we are not going to receive some Federal money if this stimulus package is not approved that otherwise we would receive. The department and agencies of the Federal Government have been very quick to supply me with a list of \$66 million that Nebraska would receive under this spending bill.

There is no question that Nebraska could quickly obligate additional funding for highways, mass transit, community development, rural housing, water, sewer projects, the so-called traditional stimulus areas. There is also no question that we have human needs that beg to be addressed. Head Start, Chapter 1, immunization programs, Pell grants are high priorities, as are the proposals to renovate and modernize our veterans hospitals. Finally, it is difficult for me to oppose funding for programs designed to advance technology and particularly the application of technology and networking in the classroom.

Mr. President, I choose to vote against this stimulus package because I believe it has been given a stature that it does not deserve. Its economic significance is at best marginal in that it generates a net 200,000 temporary jobs. At worst, it puts us and interest groups that call upon us in a mood to spend more money.

Thus, I choose to vote against this new spending because I have concluded that the risk is not worth the gain. The risk is that by voting for this new spending, we lose the edge that we need as representatives to say no, and as a result, fail to reduce our fiscal deficit.

Proponents of the stimulus package point out that investing in these areas would give us a jump on the process of altering our spending to place a higher priority on human needs and begin to invest in the technologies which promise to make our Nation more competitive and prosperous in the years ahead.

Mr. President, this stimulus package is not the best vehicle to begin this ef-

fort. Instead, I believe we took the most important step in restructuring those priorities last week, with the adoption of the budget resolution, and we did so in a way that reduces the deficit by \$502 billion over the next 5 years.

This was much more than a budget resolution, Mr. President. It is the beginning of a fundamental change in the way our Federal Government spends money and the way the Federal Government operates. The central and powerful idea behind the message of President Bill Clinton is this: The economic status quo is unacceptable.

It is unacceptable because too often the Federal Government has been an opponent rather than a partner to the urgent need to create new jobs in an extremely competitive workplace. While American businesses and workers have been struggling mightily to increase their productivity, while delivering quality and value to their customers, Federal policies have been only occasionally supportive, and more often than not have stood in the way.

Mr. President, we all know where we need to change. The deficit is piling debt upon debt. Health care costs are driving workers on to welfare, jobs out the window, and businesses done the drain. Lobbyists have their hands at our throats while we have our hands in their pockets. Our public institutions, especially schools and social service agencies, are being crushed by paperwork and regulation.

In the midst of this chaos, we have been distracted and have not seen what is going on in the American workplace. The facts are we have around 100 million private sector jobs in America. These taxpaying workers support a lot of Government effort. Their taxes pay the wages of 18.5 million Government workers. Their taxes support the incomes of 46 million retirees.

Mr. President, our No. 1 concern as we debate the economic stimulus package is the lack of job creation in America. Our No. 1 goal is more American jobs. We share this objective because we all know the value of a job. A job is much more than just a paycheck. A job is a source of income, of pride, and of self-reliance.

To see how difficult job creation is today, we must look at the world from the vantage of the American workplace. From this vantage we see two dramatic and interrelated phenomenon.

The first is a very sharp and impressive improvement in the growth of productivity in manufacturing and services. In 1992, U.S. productivity grew 2.8 percent, our best performance since 1971. If we are able to sustain this rate, Americans will double their standard of living in a generation, and grow at a rate that we have not matched since the early 1970's.

There is no short cut to achieving gains in productivity. Skills, personal

preparedness, attention to the detail that becomes total quality, the desire to improve and satisfy the needs of customers, organizational efficiency, and a finished product or service that can be sold for a profit, all of these and more are needed.

Economic success occurs only when we are individually and collectively becoming more productive. This is not the rhetoric of applause lines, but applause lines will not put food on the table or jobs in our country.

For human beings to excel—and make no mistake we rise and fall as a Nation according to our capacity to achieve excellence—there must be a willingness to toil long and hard for a purpose. All the special programs designed to make it possible for people to learn and achieve greatness is no substitute for individual initiative. Without courage, a good plan is just words.

And there is a lot of courage out there in the American workplace right now, Mr. President. The United States still produces more output per worker than any Nation on Earth. Because we do, our collective standard of living is still the highest. One follows the other as surely as night follows day. But there is no short cut.

The hard truth of politicians trying to satisfy the demand of audiences who want us to do something is that very often the best course of action is for us to do nothing. The less we yield to the temptation of protecting individuals or industries from the rigorous requirements of competition, the more our economy will prosper. Subsidies and protection must be the exception and not the rule.

So the first phenomenon, Mr. President, tells us we are winning the most important battle of all. While I believe there is much to be done, let us not make the mistake of striving to use Government to improve things only to find out once again that we have made things worse.

This does not mean we should stand around the job site idly leaning on our shovels. There is much work to do. It does not mean we should be blind or insensitive to the painful consequences of a competitive marketplace. Nor does it mean I am proposing to trust the invisible hand of the market to perform all good and wonderful things. It only means that if our goal is good jobs and good wages, then we must create an environment that allows America's entrepreneurs—those individuals who create the jobs that support the economy and our Government—to innovate, grow, and prosper.

The second phenomena which is evident in the American workplace is an unusually high level of anxiety about the permanence of employment. American workers fear their job could be gone tomorrow. Only 15 percent of today's laid off workers believe they will get their job back.

The culprits generating this fear are four trends which we have alternately ignored or made worse with foolish tax, trade, and regulatory policies. The four are large corporate downsizing; global competition in services and manufacturing; automation, again in services as well as manufacturing; and the tendency of cost-conscious managers to use temporary, contract, and part-time help. Dubbed the four horsemen of the workplace, they have generated apocalyptic change challenging our concepts of job security and stability.

For this second phenomena, Mr. President, help is unquestionably needed, and just as unquestionably we are fortunate to have a President who is prepared to do just that.

The old ways of helping will no longer work. We have erected a complicated and porous safety net that has institutionalized poverty. We have built-in disincentives to work. We penalize people when their incomes rise. We punish students who try to enter the workplace prior to graduating from high school.

I believe the best way to help Americans compete and succeed in today's workplace is through radical reform of our education and our health care institutions.

Every year, Mr. President, we spend hundreds of billions of dollars for education and health care. In this budget resolution, we will increase health care spending at the Federal level from \$284 to \$318 billion.

I have heard many of my colleagues, particularly on the other side of the aisle, come to the floor and say Democrats are proposing a Government takeover of health care. Then I have heard them stand and oppose reasonable efforts to constrain the growth of Federal spending. Mr. President, Federal spending on health care of \$318 billion next year is an awful lot of money, especially when considered together with \$145 billion in spending at the State and local level.

In fact, Federal, State, and local governments already account for nearly two-thirds of all of the non-out-of-pocket expenditures for health care.

What is needed is more competition in both areas. Health care and education are two of our least competitive environments. We need more accountability for outcome so we as purchasers of the services compare results. But we also, Mr. President—and this is much more difficult—need personal responsibility so that we as consumers of the services have incentives to excel academically and to stay healthy as well. President Clinton, fortunately for us, recognizes that health care costs threaten to undo constructive work in every other area.

Mr. President, I believe we should extend the right of health care access to all Americans. I do not want a single American to have to prove they are

poor enough, or to prove they are old enough, or to get blown up in a war before they are deemed worthy of health care. I do not want a single American to discover that after paying for a policy for 25 years they are not eligible when they finally need care.

In short, Mr. President, I believe we will fail in our effort to get health care costs under control in a manner which will encourage job growth unless we eliminate all doubt about access to health care. But as we extend this right, let us make it clear to Americans that responsibilities accompany that right, responsibilities to make a contribution, both in money and in health in controlling costs.

We need to recognize we can no longer afford to give out free lunches anymore. Whether the generosity is extended to a hospital that underbids and overexamines, or a doctor who extracts more from the system than even his colleagues believe is justified, or a lawyer who attempts to do the same, or an insurance company crying out for more tax subsidies while ignoring the cries of their beneficiaries, or a wealthy American who can pay his own way, or a poor American who can pay a little, or finally a politician on election day who wants to spend just a little more in some favorite area of the health care system: we must face reality; the hour of truth has finally arrived.

Fortunately, we have a President who has faced that reality and told us and the American people that it is time to change.

But change is frightening to some. They want the old days back again. They prefer the quiet days of the status quo. Milton, seeing democracy spread through Europe, observed the change. He said:

"In dim eclipse disastrous twilight sheds
On half the nations, and with fear of change
Perplexes monarchs."

Well, let the monarchs shake their head in fits of nostalgia for the old order, Mr. President. I am ready to shake out the dust and make way for the new.

But, Mr. President, it is the budget resolution we passed last week, and not this stimulus package, which represents the beginning of this change. Not only does it reduce the deficit by \$502 billion over the next 5 years, it also calls for focusing our attention on the human skills and talents needed for a high-wage economy. With this budget, we start to invest in our people, an investment that is long overdue.

But at the same time, Mr. President, we must with certainty slay this deficit which, like Freddy Krueger, of the dreadful series "Nightmare on Elm Street," keeps coming back to haunt us. This stimulus package sends a message that we prefer the easy course of more spending rather than the difficult course of real change.

As attractive as it would be to issue a series of press releases taking credit

for this borrowed money, I cannot do it. This is \$16.2 billion plus interest of money we do not have to spend. We will borrow in order to finance the spending. In doing so, we weaken our resolve to resist all those friends who are opposing the spending cuts in the budget resolution just passed.

Mr. President, the simple and difficult truth for us and America is that our most difficult problems will not be solved with increased Federal spending. Press releases announcing more money cannot paper over deep problems in the American workplace, frightening deterioration of the American family, and difficult structural problems with America's Federal Government.

Mr. President, if we want to create jobs with our action, then we must do some things that do not involve new spending.

First, we must acknowledge up front and without apology that for working American families of all incomes the price of Government has gotten too high. The very people we want to help with new spending are the ones who are paying the bulk of the bills.

Second, we should affirm that if new jobs are our goal, then our policies should embrace the spirit of entrepreneurial capitalism. Those who need the least amount of help will do the most good. Not only should we pay particular attention to taxes and regulation which can choke the breadth of U.S. entrepreneurs, but we should take care that we do not kill with words the goose that lays the golden eggs of jobs.

Third, we should declare that wage and price controls are poor policy no matter what the objective. These are not the best ways to get health care costs under control. These actions would simply and unnecessarily damage one of America's leading institutions. A better solution, which I intend to talk about at greater length at another time, would be to establish a Federal health care trust fund and agree that the Federal Government must use this fund and not borrowed money to pay all its health care bills. This would create the fiscal discipline that we need to control costs and would produce immediate deficit reduction.

Fourth, we should do more to face the bitter truth that growth in mandatory spending programs is unacceptably high. I was a cosponsor of the Nunn-Domenici amendment to cap entitlements because I fear for our country when I look at the 20-year trend lines of these programs. Mandatory spending represents over 60 percent of total Federal spending. The top five entitlement programs—Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, other retirement programs, and unemployment compensation—totaled \$587 billion this fiscal year.

And next year, do not let any one think that we are not being generous.

Next year, those programs will increase by \$44 billion. These facts are why the President is right when he says all deficit reduction is overwhelmed by the increases that we see in health care alone.

While I believe strongly that Social Security recipients, particularly low-income Social Security recipients, should never have to fear cuts in their benefits, we must take care that we do not stand down here and simply pander to the audience of older Americans. I tell you that American seniors know better than most of us what America can accomplish if we are willing to sacrifice. Mr. President, to simply fund a \$225 increase per recipient in annual retirement payments this year will cost American taxpayers \$50 billion over the next 5 years. It is a double whammy for Americans paid by the hour to have to shoulder such a large share of the burden for deficit reduction as a result of higher than necessary payroll taxes as well as the greatest number of jobs lost due to budget cuts.

Fifth, we have to overcome our fear of being criticized by our friends in education and say the truth out loud: American schools are a mess. Most perform below the rigorous requirements of today's workplace. I am prepared to spend more money—particularly in poor districts—but I need to see comparable reductions in administrative expenses, and I need to see a lot more competition as well.

Those who think I am standing here school bashing, I recommend you look at what Thomas Sobol, the commissioner of education for the State of New York, did this past Wednesday. He asked the regents to endorse a broad policy change to include work in the school day and as a prerequisite for a diploma. According to the New York Times, he said:

The proposal would in the most basic sense, change the way schools teach, refocusing education to include work experience and lessons about work skills in all curriculums.

Dr. Sobol's critique of our schools is on target:

We have reached a point in history when social and economic trends create a crisis for many young people in the transition from education to workplace. Research, our constituents, and the public tell us our students are not prepared for this new workplace as well as they should be.

Mr. President, in another 5 or 6 weeks, about 2 million young Americans will be given high school diplomas. They will wear their caps and gowns in graduation ceremonies. In my State of Nebraska some 20,000 to 22,000 will graduate. I venture to say that of the 70 percent or so that are going into the workplace, half of those young people are not prepared. They do not have the skills they need today, let alone the capacity over the course of their lives, to adjust to the demands of the workplace.

Mr. President, I want to present one fact which tells me that not all education problems can be solved with new Federal money. Indeed, I must tell you, this one fact is as chilling a fact as I ever heard. In 1972, 116,630 American students scored over 600 on the Scholastic Aptitude Test on the verbal side. But in 1992, with more students taking the test, the number of students that scored over 600 on the SAT verbal fell to 75,243.

Mr. President, that is a 50 percent decline in the performance of our best students on the verbal side.

I am prepared to argue that this decline has little to do with what is going on in schools and a lot more to do with what is not going on in our homes. We simply, as adult parents, are not making the effort needed to learn.

To those who believe we are, I want to share the conclusion of another educator, Daniel Singal, noting the 50 to 60 point drop in the verbal SAT scores of students going to selective colleges, he concludes:

These kids are less able to understand what they read than students a generation ago, so they need shorter and easier assignments. They are less able to write or think or carry on a coherent argument. And, because they have read less and understand less, they also know less.

Mr. President, I must tell you that despite President Clinton's effort to turn this country around, despite whatever else we do at the Federal level, unless we address that deterioration of our children's reading and writing skills, their capacity to persuade will deteriorate, their capacity to earn a living in the marketplace will deteriorate, their ability to participate in democracy as informed citizens will deteriorate, their ability to be parents will deteriorate. Everything rests, in my judgment, upon the quality of education we provide our young people.

At this hour I believe we are very fortunate to be led by President Clinton, who has demonstrated that he has the courage to tell the American people the truth. He has begun the process of change, which Americans in large numbers desire.

However, Mr. President, the changes we are fighting for this year must not be change for change's sake. In an essay called, "Defining Deviancy Down" in the winter, 1993 issue of American Scholar, Senator DANIEL PATRICK MOYNIHAN accurately describes the dangers of morally blind political correctness.

We do not only have economic troubles in America. All of us who have observed the statistics of teenage pregnancy, who have looked at rising violence by teenagers in the United States who have examined the numbers surrounding our families, know that we have been making some terrible mistakes. No health care or education programs done at the Federal level will

make our children healthier or better educated unless America's most powerful institution, the American family, is strengthened. No crime bill will turn back the tide of violence in America unless adults set the example and provide the role models young boys and girls need in a difficult world.

In short, Mr. President, some things should not change. They should be our foundation, our rock. They should guide us through the dark and stormy waters of our lives. The hymn, "Abide with Me" carries the message well:

Change and decay in all around I see;
O Thou, who changest not, abide with me!

I believe in the need for a secular Government, Mr. President, but its reach must and will always be limited. It cannot change the hearts of men and women who have not acquired the ability to tell right from wrong. The quiet battles by Americans to teach themselves and their children, their battles to set an example with their personal behavior. These will determine the shape of tomorrow.

Out of respect for the poetic preferences of the senior Senator from West Virginia I close with an early Emily Dickinson poem, which describes the internal battles so crucial for our country.

To fight aloud, is very brave—
But gallanter, I know
Who charge within the bosom
The Cavalry of Woe—
Who win, and nations do not see—
Who fall—and none observe—
Whose dying eyes, no County
Regards with patriotic love—
We trust, in plumed procession
For such the Angels go—
Rank after Rank, with even feet—
And Uniforms of Snow.

Mr. President, again, with great respect and great regret, I urge my colleagues not to support this stimulus package, and instead to focus their support on the efforts to change our spending priorities contained in the budget resolution and to do the difficult work of making sure not only that we create new jobs in America, but that we create a higher moral standard, as well.

I yield the floor.

Mr. CHAFEE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I want to commend the distinguished Senator from Nebraska for that very, very fine statement. I think he was right on in deploring this stimulus package, which I think is overweighted items that certainly are not of an emergency nature; overweighted with items that are clearly not of an economic stimulus nature.

What we have here in this stimulus package, Mr. President, is the old story, just as the Senator from Nebraska said. We can all have press re-

leases out in our home States talking about the wonderful things that are in the stimulus package, but there is never one mention that we do not pay for it. It is the old story. We once again increase the deficit of the United States of America by, in this case, \$16 billion and send the bill to our children and our grandchildren.

Mr. President, that is wrong. There was a great Governor in California named Earl Warren. I will never forget when he said to the people in California, he said: The people of California can have anything they want, anything they want, as long as they are willing to pay for it.

What this stimulus package is saying: The people of the United States can have 16 billion dollars' worth of goodies, but of course you do not have to pay for it. Your children, or somebody else—your great grandchildren, your grandchildren—will pay for it.

Mr. President, the most important single thing we can do for this country of ours is not to pass some ersatz stimulus package; it is to reduce these deficits.

That is not me speaking. That is the Chairman of the Federal Reserve.

And let me quote from Dr. Alan Greenspan's testimony before the Finance Committee on March 24, 5 days ago. This is what he said, Mr. President:

The deficit is a corrosive force that already has begun to eat away at the foundations of our economic strength.

Later, he goes on to say, as he winds up this message—and 11 pages were totally devoted to the dangers of the deficit to the United States of America—"Let me conclude by reiterating my central message: The deficit is a malignant force in our economy."

That is pretty strong language, Mr. President—"*** a malignant force in our economy. How the deficit is reduced is very important. That it be done is crucial."

In other words, he discusses taxes and reduced spending. But he comes to the conclusion that how you do it is important. Indeed, he thinks that increased taxes is not the way to go. But "the crucial thing," he said, "is that the deficit be reduced, and allowing it to fester"—these are the words he uses: malignant, fester, corrosive—"would court a dangerous erosion of our economic strength and a potentially significant deterioration in our real standard of living."

That is not a Republican Senator speaking, Mr. President. That is not John Chafee speaking. That is the Chairman of the Federal Reserve, Dr. Alan Greenspan.

Mr. President, of course, whoever designed this stimulus package had a wild imagination that these things were going to be of an emergency nature, that they are going to do something to foster the very name of the

package—stimulus, to the economy. It has such things as \$37 million for agricultural research buildings. Come on, is that going to stimulate the economy, \$37 million for agricultural research buildings?

How about this one: \$64 million for something that has the longest name in the United States of America; it sounds like a British lord's name: National Telecommunications and Information Administration Public Telecommunication Facilities Planning and Construction Program to Promote the Development and Use of Broad Band Interactive Telecommunication Networks.

How is that for a mouthful? And this is emergency money, borrowed, meant to stimulate the economy. We cannot pay for it, oh, no. We have to rush and get it, to promote the development and use of broad band interactive telecommunication networks. If the proponents of this legislation could tell me how that will stimulate the economy, I would be delighted to hear it.

Here are some other ones: \$48 million for the Department of Energy supply, research, and development activities; \$28 million to purchase 10,000 alternative fuel vehicles.

I yield to no one with my support for efforts to prevent deterioration of our environment. But to say that to purchase 10,000 alternative fuel vehicles is an economic stimulus, or is an emergency, or is going to do something about unemployment in the Nation, I think we will all agree that just is not accurate.

Here is \$197 million for strategic research initiatives at the National Science Foundation. Mr. President, of course, there are some good things in this package we are all for. There are lots of good things. There are summer jobs. There are opportunities for increased immunization of our young people. There are improvements in the Head Start Program. These are good programs. But why do the proponents not suggest that we pay for them? Why do they not suggest a tax? This came out as a spending program only. That is the way it went through the House. That was part of the budget resolution that we had here. Now it is coming forward in the Senate in this way. I think it is wrong what we are doing to our children and grandchildren by foisting upon them \$16 billion of additional money that they have to pay for so that we can do some wonderful things that we would like to do.

So, Mr. President, am I opposed to raising taxes? No. I have supported tax increases on this floor many a time. But what I want to see the money go for, Mr. President, is a reduction of this deficit that is a corrosive, malignant, that is festering, and it is destroying the economic fabric of our Nation. I thank the Chair.

AMENDMENT NO. 279

(Purpose: To prevent funds from being used to assist certain projects through Community Development Grants)

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. BROWN] proposes an amendment numbered 279.

On page 56, line 7, strike "\$2,536,000,000" and insert "\$2,432,486,654".

On page 56, line 24, strike the period, and insert a colon and the following: "Provided further, That none of the foregoing amount may be used to assist the following projects:

"(1) Foster Park tennis and basketball court resurfacing and color coating in Evanston, Illinois.

"(2) Anthony Oats Park and pool renovation in Evansville, Indiana.

"(3) Expansion of shopping center at 165th Street, in Hammond, Indiana.

"(4) Miscellaneous pool repairs in Birmingham, Alabama.

"(5) Tennis court resurfacing in Florence, Alabama.

"(6) Orpheum Theatre renovation in Phoenix, Arizona.

"(7) Alan Witt Park aquatics facility and ball fields in Fairfield, California.

"(8) MLK Park, construction of 27,000 square foot community recreation center with indoor pool, in Los Angeles, California.

"(9) Fairmount Park boathouse restoration in Riverside, California.

"(10) Villegas Park soccer field in Riverside, California.

"(11) Ocean Beach commercial revitalization project in San Diego, California.

"(12) Art Ark, 29-unit new construction live and work unit, in San Francisco, California.

"(13) Swimming Pool refurbishment in Thornton, Colorado.

"(14) Poli/Majestic Theatres in Bridgeport, Connecticut.

"(15) Northwood Cemetery drainage system and roadway in cemetery in Hartford, Connecticut.

"(16) Facade improvement, renovation of 47 commercial building facades in Hartford, Connecticut.

"(17) Construct ice skating warming hut at Union Pond Park in Manchester, Connecticut.

"(18) Greens Harbor Beach in New London, Connecticut.

"(19) Capitol Theater in New London, Connecticut.

"(20) Golf course, parks, recreation, in Daytona Beach, Florida.

"(21) Key West Bight Marina development in Key West, Florida.

"(22) Whispering Pines Park, recreation center, in Port St. Lucie, Florida.

"(23) New Jersey Performing Arts Center in Newark, New Jersey.

"(24) West Las Vegas Arts Center in Las Vegas, Nevada.

"(25) Basketball court at Fox Hill Park in St. Charles, Missouri.

"(26) Inkster Community Shopping Center, 50,000-60,000 commerce shopping center project in Inkster, Michigan.

"(27) Northwest Family Center, with two gymnasiums, indoor pool and outside ball fields, in Huntsville, Alabama.

"(28) Optimist Park athletic facility (indoor and outdoor) baseball field, gymnasium and soccer field in Huntsville, Alabama.

"(29) Desert West Park in Phoenix, Arizona.

"(30) Construction of youth park project to include baseball, soccer, tennis, gymnasium, roads, utilities, and lighting in Jonesboro, Arkansas.

"(31) Soccer field improvements in Bell Gardens, California.

"(32) Agua Mansa Cemetery, historical site restoration work, in Colton, California.

"(33) Fairfield Sports Park, in Fairfield, California.

"(34) Construct youth sports complex, including baseball, soccer, softball, and other athletic fields in Merced, California.

"(35) Tuolumne River Regional Park, amphitheater and softball complex in Modesto, California.

"(36) Improvements to Barnes Park (tennis court relocation, infrastructure) in Monterey Park, California.

"(37) Improvements to Elder Park (tennis courts, bathrooms, picnic areas, ADA compliance) in Monterey Park, California.

"(38) Reconstruct swimming pool in CDBG area in South Gate, Georgia.

"(39) Playground renovations, 35th Street Ballfield, Loveland Playground, Hil-Dar/Housing Authority in Wheeling, West Virginia.

"(40) Storefront Rehabilitation, rehabilitation of storefronts in central business district in Grand Forks, North Dakota.

"(41) Renovation of historic mill for sports shop complex in Central Falls, Rhode Island.

"(42) Construction of an alpine slide and restaurant at Parque del Turabo recreational facility in Gaguas, Puerto Rico.

"(43) Marketplace and art craft center in Adjuntas, Puerto Rico.

"(44) Brewery District Theater, construction of a new movie theater, in Columbus, Ohio.

"(45) Falcon Park Baseball Stadium Redevelopment Project in Auburn, New York.

"(46) Proctors Theater, roofing, completion of roof repair on historic downtown theater in Troy, New York.

"(47) Constitution Soccer Field, grade field and construct 6 adult and 4 youth soccer fields, construct parking lots, restroom structure and concession stand in Salinas, California.

"(48) Civic center expansion in San Leandro, California.

"(49) Downing Neighborhood Shopping Center, a 25,000 square foot retail strip located in an inner-city neighborhood in Denver, Colorado.

"(50) HCO/Hi-Ho site work in Bridgeport, Connecticut.

"(51) Boykin Community Center, construction of a new gymnasium and reroofing the building in Auburn, Alabama.

"(52) Gymnasium lighting, North Birmingham Recreation Center, Howze-Sanford Recreation Center, and Ft. Heights Recreation Center in Birmingham, Alabama.

"(53) Miscellaneous park improvements, shelter repairs (picnic) in Birmingham, Alabama.

"(54) Buffalo Ridge Park in Phoenix, Arizona."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I took the liberty of not going ahead with our customary waiving of the reading so that Members who may be listening would have a chance to know the specific projects to which this amendment relates.

It is a pretty straightforward amendment. It simply outlines projects that

will not be funded or should not be funded under this measure and deletes the amount of money that had been earmarked for those projects.

Mr. President, this debate over this bill embodies an honest and a sincere difference of philosophy. One side has a sincere interest in increasing jobs in this country and of improving our economy just as the other side does. The difference is how you get there—how you do it.

One side sincerely believes that to improve the efficiency in Government, reduce the deficit, and eliminate waste, is the way to improve our economy, to provide more meaningful good jobs, to stimulate the private sector by having lower interest rates, reducing the government deficit, and providing more capital for investment in new jobs and opportunities.

The other side sincerely believes the way to increase job opportunity in America and prosperity is to increase Federal spending and to increase the Federal deficit, and thus by that higher deficit stimulate economic activity in the private sector, and perhaps the public sector, and to provide a better way of life for Americans.

This is not about one side being good and the other side being bad. It is about a difference of philosophy, of how you get to a commonly shared objective and goal, that is a stronger, more viable, better economy for America and more meaningful, good paying jobs for the men and women of this country. It is a sincere difference of philosophy.

I come here tonight as one who believes that the best way to get America on track, to make us productive and creative and efficient, is to make Government more efficient, and most of all eliminate waste on the Federal level. That is what I have attempted to do in the amendment that is before this body.

The amendment lays out specifically so that Members can make their own judgment about the value of projects that this bill proposes to do. Let me hasten to add that the bill does not name those projects. The nature of the amendment is to specifically indicate projects which should not be funded and to take out an appropriate amount of money.

I think a reasonable and a fair question that can be offered by those who see the answer in higher Federal spending and higher deficits is what sort of indication do you have that indeed these projects are ones that are contemplated by the community development block grants?

Mr. President, for those who ask that question, let me emphasize that I think it is a reasonable question. Let me refer them to the statement of Secretary Cisneros when he spoke before the VA-HUD subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee in the House

of Representatives. The statement was on February 23 of this year. It addresses this specific bill and this specific subject.

Let me read from his remarks, from the verbatim transcript, from page 983. The Secretary is speaking, saying:

I have in front of me a listing, from the U.S. Conference of Mayors, of projects ready to go under the community development block grant program.

Mr. President, that is the listing from which I have come up with this amendment.

The Secretary continues:

Normally, communities have 5 or 6 times as many documented needs for CDBG's as they can fund with annual appropriations. The annual appropriation has been about \$4 billion in the last 4 years, so \$2.5 billion in additional funding obligated at one lump sum is a very significant amount. It comes to about 60 percent of what any community would receive. They will get it in a lump sum obligation.

As you will be able to see by perusing this information city by city, State by State, these are projects that can go forward immediately; streets, drainage, sidewalks, school improvements, municipal facilities, recreational facilities, things that are needed, things that will create jobs.

Mr. President, again this is the list that he spoke from. The project sheets included that the Secretary referred to are verbatim or at least summarizations of what he had offered to that committee. The sheets look exactly like this. They are simply a listing of the project and the amount of money.

So the source of the amendment is projects which the Secretary himself had identified as available for funding under this bill in which he had an interest in funding, and the amount of money that has been deducted from the bill is the amount of money related to the projects that the clerk just read.

The Secretary continues:

The distributional channels are well set. The communities know how to use the money. These projects, the Mayors tell me, and I have had them come in now repeatedly, including 30 Mayors of larger cities of America, to visit with the President, and they tell me projects are designed, engineered, environmentally cleared, permitted, and ready to go. So from a perspective of stimulus purposes, there is not a better program than the CDBG program.

Mr. President, that is the statement of Secretary Cisneros in indicating that the administration was ready to move on it and spend the money on the projects which were outlined by him, including the ones that are included in the amendment.

Now, it should be clear that this amendment does not include all of the projects that the Secretary laid out. It only includes some of the projects that at least this Member feels, upon reading the list, are the least deserving of Federal money and least match the purpose of this legislation. It does reduce the appropriations amount in this bill by a little over \$103 million, which

is no small savings for any taxpayer. The amount is \$103,513,346.

Mr. President, I thought it appropriate to offer an amendment that dealt specifically with projects that Members could evaluate and their own judgment as to whether that is worth breaking the budget agreement for, whether it is worth overspending the budget, and whether truly these kinds of projects fit in with the definition of "emergency." I think by having the specifics we give people the opportunity in this Chamber to make their own judgments.

I think a fair question at this point, Mr. President, would indeed be, what is an emergency for the purposes of Congress?

Some Americans who listen in and read our deliberations will wonder why it is that this has become an issue. In this Senator's view, this has become an issue because what is proposed to us is not only just additional spending, but it is quite importantly spending that breaks the budget agreements of past years.

In other words, Congress, by its own action in a budget resolution, set a cap on spending for each consecutive year. This measure comes to us not within that cap, the agreed upon amendment that we would spend or the limit on the amendment we would spend, but under an emergency declaration that implies that this matter is so important, of such great emergency value, that you have to throw aside the caps and the limits on deficit spending.

I might say, my view on this is also influenced by the fact that Congress has not stayed within the total spending for that appropriated year. Let me be specific. We are talking about the overall spending limits. I think some Members may point out that, indeed, much of the problem with regard to our overall spending limits are in the entitlement areas. Let me say, I think that is a fair observation and an accurate one.

But the reality is, this stimulus package, this overspending of the budget, comes in a year when we have already had a deficit soar far higher than anyone contemplated.

Last year, the deficit reached \$290 billion. It will be higher in this fiscal year. And so this proposal for additional spending comes to us not as something to increase spending in a year in which we have had a surplus, because we have not; it does not come to us as a way of increasing spending that get us up to the limit of the deficit which we planned for, because we have already exceeded it; it comes to us as a waiver of the spending limits that Congress has already set through the declaration of an emergency.

Now what is an emergency? If this spending is a problem because it does not truly fit the definition of an emergency, surely it is fair to ask whether

it is an emergency that we are talking about.

Well, there does not appear to be a specific definition in the statute. The dictionary, though, defines emergency this way:

A sudden and unexpected turn of events calling for immediate action.

Well, is breaking the budget agreement unexpected? Hardly. This Congress has seemed to have done it on a rather consistent basis.

Is this an immediate action? No, this has been under contemplation for some period of time.

The closest that I have been able to find for a true definition of what an emergency is comes in a report on the cost of domestic and international emergencies that was put out by the Executive Office of the President, Office of Management and Budget. This report dates from June 1991, but it is the closest thing we could find to an attempt by the executive branch to define emergency.

Here is what it says:

"For the purposes of defining spending provisions that qualify for an exemption, the President uses the definition of an emergency requirement that includes the following elements: the requirement is a necessary expenditure"—golf courses, necessary—"that is sudden"—ice skating rinks?—"urgent"—tennis courts?—"and unforeseen."

It is not permanent. These elements defined as follows; what follows is the definition included in this document.

"Necessary expenditures. An essential or vital expenditure, not one that is merely useful or beneficial."

Are the things included in this measure essential and vital? Are the golf courses essential for America's future? Are the swimming pools vital? My guess is this has far more to do with domestic politics and the rewarding of partisans than it has to do with anything that is essential or anything vital.

The definition continues:

"No. 2, it should be sudden. Sudden is defined as quickly coming into being, not building up over time."

Sudden ice skating rinks? Well, perhaps the water freezes overnight. But, beyond that, the warming of the ice skating rink hardly seems sudden.

"Urgent," the definition continues, "pressing, compelling, requiring immediate action."

When was the last time you saw a compelling tennis court?

Mr. President, this measure, this so-called emergency measure that is before this body, says a great deal more about this Congress' sense of humor than it does with regard to emergencies.

"Unforeseen," the definition continues, "not predictable or seen beforehand as a coming need. An emergency that is part of an aggregate level of an-

ticipated emergencies, particularly when normally estimated in advance would not be unforeseen."

Mr. President, how could anyone claim that the items that are listed in this amendment fit into that definition?

"Not permanent. The need is temporary in nature."

Mr. President, it is hard to imagine that these items come under the normal definitions.

Mr. President, I have further observations that I hope will refine the issue, but at this moment, I would like to yield to the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GREGG. I want to thank the Senator from Colorado for bringing forward this amendment, because it highlights the problems which this bill has.

We are a nation which is running—

Ms. MIKULSKI. Point of order, Mr. President.

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

Ms. MIKULSKI. I always thought, under the rules of the Senate, when a Senator yielded to another Senator, it was for a question and not for an additional speech.

Would the Chair clarify that?

If I am out of order, then I would withdraw my objection. If not, I wonder if the Senator from New Hampshire would state his question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognized the Senator in his own right. My understanding was, he was to take the floor in his own right and not yielded to for a question.

Ms. MIKULSKI. If I may continue my question of the Chair, has the Senator from Colorado yielded to the Senator or yielded the floor? And when one yields to a Senator, is it not normally for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. My understanding was that the Senator from Colorado had yielded the floor and that the Senator from New Hampshire had sought recognition.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Well, this Senator—continuing my parliamentary inquiry—this Senator has been standing for some time.

Had the Senator said "I yield the floor," this Senator would have claimed, along with the Senator from New Hampshire, the right for the Chair's attention, but I do not believe it happened quite that way.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, certainly my intention was that Senators here would have an opportunity to speak. I will certainly complete my remarks at another time.

I would be happy to yield the floor.

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

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, regular order. I believe the Chair had already recognized me in my own right, if I interpret the Chair's statement correctly.

Now, I do not really know that we need to have an extended parliamentary discussion here.

Ms. MILKULSKI. I would like the Reporter to read back what the Senator from Colorado said. He said, "I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire" before yielding the floor.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I believe—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order, please.

The Chair's understanding was that the Senator from Colorado yielded the floor, and I did recognize the Senator from New Hampshire.

The Senator from Maryland now asks to be recognized, and I am recognizing the Senator from Maryland—

Mr. GREGG addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the event the Senator is asking a point of order or some other consideration.

The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, regular order. Parliamentary inquiry. I believe I was recognized and have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GREGG. Thank you Mr. President.

Again, I wish to rise in support of the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado, who has, I think, done this body a service by bringing forward an amendment which clearly highlights the problem with this supplemental appropriation, which has been called an economic stimulus package. We are, as a nation, running approximately a \$300 billion deficit, something which the people of this country are extremely concerned about.

Those of us who stood for election in the last electoral cycle heard a great deal about the deficit and talked a great deal about the deficit. Yet, as one of the first major items for legislation before this body, we find that we are confronted with a \$16 billion-plus supplemental which will aggravate the deficit by that amount of dollars. It is able to avoid the traditional rules relative to the budget process by being cited as an emergency event. And what the amendment of the Senator from Colorado does so clearly is point out that there is nothing about this supplemental, or at least about the items that are affected by this amendment, which have in their nature anything to do with an emergency.

There are 24 projects for bike paths in this supplemental, representing \$40 million—24 bike path projects. As the Senator from Colorado so aptly pointed out, that is not an emergency.

Within those bike path proposals which will be funded, according to the

mayors' list of what the projects are, as was outlined by the Senator from Colorado, they are not only building bike paths but there is \$800,000 for research on bike paths. There are \$450,000 for widening existing bike paths. And there is \$165,000 for something called the Ice-age trail. One does not know whether you can go on the Ice-age trail on a bicycle or not. But let us assume that you can and therefore we will put it under the bike path list—24 projects which are represented as maybe funded by this proposal dealing with bike paths. There are 13 projects which are represented that may be funded which involve parking lots. That is 17 million dollars' worth of parking lots. I am sure this Nation is in great need of parking lots. But we do not happen to have the money right now to declare an emergency to go out and build a lot of parking lots. There are 15 projects which are represented that may be funded involving baseball fields and tennis courts—21 million dollars worth of baseball fields and tennis courts.

What is the emergency that we need baseball fields and tennis courts? None of them will get built by this spring anyway when the baseball season starts, so it is not for this baseball season, if that were the emergency, and I doubt if that falls under the term "emergency," even the most elastic application of that word.

The problem here is that what we have is a classic piece of legislation, it is going to spend a lot of money on a lot of projects which a lot of community leaders may want but which are not necessarily needed and which we clearly cannot afford and which are obviously not an emergency. And it is totally appropriate that these funding mechanisms which would fund these items, as they have been proposed or requested by the mayors and leaders of these various communities, should be deleted from the bill.

Thus, the Senator from Colorado has done us a considerable service by bringing forward this amendment to strike from the bill what I believe is somewhere in the vicinity of \$100 million of funding, with specific reference to these titles and these projects so that we will not have this sort of spending occurring at this time.

Now, it may be that these projects make sense. But they do not qualify as an emergency. And if they do make sense, they need to be paid for. That is the problem we have here with this whole piece of legislation. These are just examples, egregious ones I believe, but they are examples of the fundamental flaw that this legislation represents, which is that it is spending that is not paid for. It is spending which will aggravate the deficit, and it is spending, as a result of which, it will not generate economic growth but will generate economic contraction.

Because the American people are smart enough to understand that, you

are not going to expand this economy by continuing to expand this deficit. In fact, their message was very clear on that point, I believe, last November. They want the deficit brought under control. They want cuts in spending to occur. They do not want us to undertake new spending without paying for it. What they would really like us to do is reduce the deficit, not aggravate the deficit as this proposal does.

That is what they have asked for. Yet in this piece of legislation we get just the opposite. This section of this bill could best be called, not an economic stimulus bill, but a bill to promote baseball and bicycling in America. We can call it the bike path bill. Or we could call it the parking lot bill. Or we could call it the baseball field bill. But let us not call it the economic stimulus bill, because it is not. It is a bill to take care of community interests which may be in order at some point to address but at this time are not. It is a bill which has in it a lot of items which simply are not an emergency. That is regrettable.

Therefore, I strongly endorse the efforts of the Senator from Colorado, first, to highlight this failure of this bill and point out that there is nothing in the nature of an emergency about it, especially as it applies to these items; and, second, to point out that these items are not going to energize economic activity. In fact, a number of them ironically create no jobs at all.

There is the building of three bike paths in Modesto, CA, which are identified as creating no jobs. There are a group of projects in San Luis Obispo, CA, which cost \$1 million which create no jobs. There are a group of projects representing \$8 million in Fort Pierce, FL, which create no jobs. There are a series of projects in Atlanta, GA, totaling almost \$10 million, which create no jobs. They involve replacing a gym and restoring a historic cemetery, but they are represented as creating no jobs.

There is a project in Maui, CA, for \$1.3 million, which creates no jobs. There are four projects in Gary, IN, representing \$1.1 million, which create no jobs. There is a playground in Cedar Rapids, IA, which creates no jobs. And on and on the list goes.

It is not a jobs promotion effort. It is not an emergency effort. It is your classic "let us go out there and spend some dollars from the taxpayers' wallets" effort. It is a baseball bill, and a parking lot bill, and a bike path bill. And it should be called that. Let us apply none of these euphemisms to it. And it is inappropriate because the American people have to pay for it. And the next generation has to pay for it because the dollars are not here to pay for it. This is a deficit bill and, as such, it aggravates and puts weight upon the future opportunity for prosperity of our children. And it is a mistake.

Therefore, I again congratulate the Senator from Colorado for having brought forward this amendment which so targets and points out the fundamental flaw of the theory behind this bill with some very specific points—24 bike path projects, \$40 million; 1 parking lot, \$17 million; 5 bus stops, \$3 million; 15 baseball fields or tennis courts, \$21 million. How do we explain that to the folks back home?

Mr. BYRD. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. GREGG. Is the question put to the Chair?

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. GREGG. Yes, I will yield to the Senator for a question. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LAUTENBERG). The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. Can the Senator point to these items in this bill? Can he find a single one of these items that he has been talking about in this bill?

Mr. GREGG. As the Senator from West Virginia knows, those items are not specifically listed in the bill. The dollars that fund those items are in the bill. As I would point out to you, Secretary Peña has said those items will be spent—

Mr. BROWN. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. GREGG. I yield to the Senator from Colorado to read a statement which reflects the answer to the question.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the Senator—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is a question about yielding the floor. The Senator has no right to yield the floor to another Senator for a statement. The Senator has a right to respond to a question if he so chooses, but that is the extent of the Senator's right to yield the floor.

Mr. GREGG. I thank the President for that point. I believe the Senator from Colorado has a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Hampshire respond to the question of the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. GREGG. I believe I did. I will be happy to respond further, Mr. President, by stating the dollar figure for this spending is in this bill. The specific projects are not listed in the bill, but the process by which the administration intends to fund projects has been clearly outlined by the administration leadership and the Cabinet Secretaries, who are responsible for the community development block grant, and we have the list from the mayors.

In fact, the President said he wants projects that are ready to go, and he has asked for that list of the specific proposals we talked about.

Mr. BYRD. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BROWN. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. GREGG. I yield to the Senator from Colorado for a question, and I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BROWN. Does the Senator believe that the statement of Secretary Cisneros of February 23, 1993, to the Veterans, HUD Subcommittee of the Committee of Appropriations in the House in which he says, "I have in front of me a list from the United States Conference of Mayors of projects ready to go under the Community Development Block Grant Program," does the Senator believe that that statement is an affirmation that that is how the administration intends to spend the money?

Mr. GREGG. I thank the Senator from Colorado for his question. And I will say that, yes, I do, and in fact believe the President has also made that clear when stating that he wanted these projects to be ready to go and he asked the mayors and the Governors to come forward with a list of projects. The projects which we have been citing in this discussion have been projects which were excerpted from the mayors' list of ready-to-go projects. And the amendment which the Senator from Colorado has offered specifically addresses those projects so that there can be no doubt but that those projects will not be funded.

Mr. GRAMM. Will the distinguished Senator yield?

Mr. GREGG. I believe I said I would yield to the Senator from West Virginia first for a question, and then I will yield to the Senator from Texas for a question. But the Senator from Maryland wishes to get the floor, so it is not a question of—

Ms. MIKULSKI. The Senator from Maryland is very patient, and I will be happy to yield to the Senator from West Virginia for any questions he might have for the next hour and a half.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, does the Senator from New Hampshire realize that Mr. Panetta has written a letter, which I have placed in the RECORD, a letter that was addressed to me, in which he says, "Let me assure you that the administration does not support funding for any of the types of projects that the opponents of the legislation speculated would be funded"? Is the Senator aware of that letter?

Mr. GREGG. Yes, I have seen this letter you are referring to, and I presume—well, I yield further to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. Is the Senator aware of the statement that the President stated to the effect that those who talk about these fictitious projects could look for years and they would never find them in this bill? Can the Senator point to these items in this bill?

Mr. GREGG. Reclaiming my time, I appreciate the question of the Senator from West Virginia. I believe I addressed that.

The point is that in this bill, there are not specific projects listed. However, the funding for the community development block grant is as a gross figure in the bill.

What the Senator from Colorado is offering his amendment for is to make sure that the specific list, which has been referred to as the list we believe will be the funded list—and I think it has been in the public domain for quite a while; certainly, Secretary Cisneros was aware of it when he made his statement, as a mayors' list, and the President specifically asked for such a list from Governors and mayors of projects that are ready to go—that that is the list that I think is logically going to be the list that is funded off of, because that is the ready-to-go list, and the President already said he wants to get things going now.

Of course, on that list are these items, and that is what we are talking about deleting.

Mr. GRAMM. Will the distinguished Senator yield?

Mr. GREGG. For a question.

Mr. GRAMM. Yes.

Is the distinguished Senator aware that on the first amendment adopted to this bill the distinguished Senator from West Virginia, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, listed by name projects from the same list that you speak of when he specifically forbade funds being used from this act to pay for white water canoeing facilities on the Ocoee River? Is the Senator aware of that?

Mr. GREGG. I thank the Senator from Texas for pointing that out. I believe that to be an accurate statement.

Mr. BYRD. Will the Senator yield for a question from the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. GREGG. I will follow up with the Senator from Texas for a question, and then I will be happy to yield for a question.

Mr. GRAMM. Is the Senator aware, in an amendment previously offered, that none of the funds in the bill would be allowed to be spent on golf courses and cemeteries?

Mr. GREGG. Yes, I believe the Senator from West Virginia made that his first amendment to the bill.

Mr. GRAMM. Is the Senator aware that fisheries atlases and studies of the sicklefin chub were also specifically excluded?

Mr. GREGG. Yes, I believe the Senator from West Virginia made that as part of his first amendment.

Mr. GRAMM. Is the Senator aware that there was a major difference, however, between the amendment offered by the distinguished chairman of the committee and the ranking member and the amendment offered by Senator BROWN?

Mr. GREGG. Yes, there is a significant difference because, as the Senator from Texas knows, Senator BROWN's

amendment specifically defunds those projects or makes it inappropriate to fund those projects which are listed on the mayor's list, which include baseball parks, the swimming holes, and the bike paths, and the art ark, which is a project in San Francisco. I am not sure what it is. It sort of sounds interesting, actually, but probably is not necessary at this time, whatever an art ark is. And some of the other items which have been listed by the Senator from Colorado and myself.

Mr. GRAMM. I want to thank the Senator for yielding because it seems to me it is very important to understand that this is an amendment which has already been adopted, and it seeks to do exactly the same thing except with one fundamental difference; and that is, Senator BROWN's amendment deletes the money, whereas the earlier amendment simply requires that it be shifted to another project.

I thank the distinguished Senator for yielding.

Mr. GREGG. I thank the Senator from Texas. And I yield the floor.

Ms. MIKULSKI addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I rise to oppose the Brown amendment, and I do it on the basis that this is the heavy hand of the Federal Government at its absolute worst. It will turn the U.S. Senate into a Federal city council making microdecisions about what community development block grant projects would be funded and what would not be funded. It violates the basic principle of the statute as established under the administration of President Gerald Ford and his very able Secretary of HUD, Carla Hills.

President Ford and Carla Hills knew that it was time to break through the way the Federal Government handled housing projects and wanted to follow the principles of self-determination, the belief that people who are the most affected should have the most to say, and to empower local communities on how to fight back and raise the level of employment and help our communities revitalize. That is when they came in with the Community Development Block Grant Program that did not go into categorical funding, did not go on to a long list of mandates, but gave block grants to local government so that government, the city council, and the mayor closest to the people could decide what they needed to do in order to create affordable housing, to eliminate poverty, and to bring about neighborhood revitalization.

Now we come in with this very specific, microamendment eliminating these 54 projects that do not even exist in terms of the law, but recommending that funding be eliminated. That is not what the community development block grant was created to do. I chair the subcommittee. I know the purpose

of the law. But it is not what Senator MIKULSKI thinks. It goes back to what Gerald Ford and Carla Hills thought, and what they said was this: That we needed to give maximum flexibility to our communities, and their job to give maximum flexibility was Federal funds to provide decent housing, suitable living environment by expanding economic opportunities for low- to moderate-income persons.

And that we would give money on the basis of a formula, and the formula would be the extent of the poverty in a community, its population, its overcrowding, how old the housing was, and its population growth lag in relationship to the other metropolitan statistical areas; and the whole purpose of the idea was that communities develop their own programs, their own funding priorities but limited to those that would be eligible, that would benefit low- to moderate-income families, eliminate or prevent slums, and meet other development needs.

Now, I know a lot about these programs, having been in the Baltimore City Council, and therefore I know the difference between being a councilwoman and being a Senator. But often these minimum or small items will leverage a tremendous amount of private sector money. What might seem to be a small item, or even a frivolous item here, in a local community can mean the life or death of a community, could mean the leverage of private sector funds, or could be that funding that anchors and acts as a magnet for other funding to come in from other sources.

What I believe we should be doing is not speculating about these 54 items but passing President Bill Clinton's package so that whether you are a Democratic mayor or whether you are a Republican mayor, you are, first of all, the mayor of your city and you decide with your city council and the mandated consultation with your community groups about what you need and not have Senators tell you what you should have and what you should not have.

We go through legislation after legislation and we hear about how we need flexibility, how the Federal Government should not be coming up with mandates, how we should not micromanage the Federal budget, and yet this is exactly what this does. The Senator from Colorado, who offered this amendment, I recall in last year's debate on my appropriation led the charge about too many Federal mandates and too many resources over the safe drinking water laws in my EPA account. The Senator made excellent points, because we do know that we have too many mandates with too few resources.

But now they would turn this principle on its head by restricting Federal money for projects that will go through a mayor, a city council or a

county council, and a local hearing process. This amendment defies the very principle of self-determination. That was the purpose of the bill. We are the United States of America. We travel around the world. We are for freedom. We are for democracy. We are for self-determination of nations and local communities. Why should we not be for self-determination of the community development block grant? We are for freedom of choice. We want to give freedom of choice for vouchers in our public schools. If we want freedom of choice for vouchers in our public schools, should we not give freedom of choice to mayors and local governments who know how to spend for their own priorities?

I stand here to defend the principle of the community development block grant. I stand here with the legacy of Gerald Ford, Jimmy Carter, Ronald Reagan, and George Bush that says the local people have the most to say, and therefore I urge the Senate to reject this heavy-handed intrusion of the Federal Government into local decision-making.

Mr. BYRD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, this amendment would delete a specific amount of money for a fictitious list of projects that never would have been funded in the first place, and the amendment which Senator HATFIELD and I added earlier provides that "the Secretary" of HUD "shall, by notice published in the Federal Register, establish such requirements as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of the appropriation under this heading."

Mr. President, this is much ado about nothing, and I am going to move to table shortly, but I understand that the distinguished Senator from Texas wishes me to yield to him first. How much time does the Senator wish?

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, what I had hoped to do was to get recognized to speak for about 10 minutes.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I would yield to the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. GRAMM] for not to exceed 10 minutes. I ask unanimous consent that I retain my rights to the floor, after which I expect to move to table the amendment.

Mr. BROWN. Reserving the right to object.

Mr. HATFIELD. Reserving the right to—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. BROWN. Reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I had yielded the floor as a courtesy to other Senators who did not want to wait until the end of my statement introducing the amendment, and I would simply prevail on the distinguished Senator from West Virginia my hope

that he might allow me 5 minutes to finish my statement before he might move to table this amendment. I withdraw my objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further objection?

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I understand that there is no objection.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I reserve the right to object.

Mr. President, at this moment I do object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, then I could move to table now, but I hesitate to do that because we have Senators out on both sides. I did not want to move to table at this point. I was going to yield to the distinguished Senator for 10 minutes and would like to accommodate the Senator. That would give some time for Senators to be notified that there is a motion to table about to be made.

Does the distinguished Senator from Oregon wish to have some time also?

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I objected because 10 minutes to go directly to a vote is not sufficient time to gather back the Members who are now off the Hill. That was the only reason I objected. The Senator indicated he would have 10 minutes extended here to the Senator from Texas, at the end of which he would make the motion to table. I am only saying that 10 minutes is not sufficient.

Mr. BYRD. Very well. Mr. President, I make the request that I may yield 10 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. GRAMM], and that I be protected in my rights to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The Senator from Texas is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator for allowing me to speak for 10 minutes before he moves to table the amendment.

I would like to try very briefly to define where we are, what the underlying bill is about, what the amendment is about, and then raise a couple of questions that hopefully the distinguished author of the amendment can answer. And I have one question that I would pose to others.

But let me begin by saying that we have before us a \$16 billion spending bill. It is being considered under a special provision whereby this bill is being deemed an emergency, which creates a loophole through which \$16 billion can be spent and not one penny of it will count as spending, not one penny of it will count as deficit, and yet it is real money being spent on real things, that we are going to have to go out and borrow and that we are going to have to pay interest on and that we are going to have to pay back.

The reason this extraordinary provision is in the bill is that without it,

under the current law of the land, it would be illegal to consider President Clinton's economic stimulus package because it violates the law. The law sets out a level of spending above which we cannot go in this fiscal year and next fiscal year. This was part of an agreement whereby the American taxpayer paid \$152 billion of new taxes in 1990 to get this constraint imposed on spending; but, by calling this bill an emergency, we are going to sweep all of that aside and spend \$16 billion the week after we passed a budget that we claimed would reduce the deficit.

I suggest, Mr. President, that to pass this bill, to spend \$16 billion and say it is not spending, to borrow \$16 billion and say it is not deficit, and not to count any of it on the official books of the Federal Government and comply with existing law, places in doubt our credibility about our commitment to deal with the deficit.

I bet I have had 100 people come up to me in the last 2 weeks and say, "Are they going to cut spending before they raise taxes, before they fund these new programs?" I am sure many of my colleagues on the floor have had many questions similar to that posed to them.

We have our answer tonight. Our first action tonight is to increase spending by \$16 billion.

Let me try to define what it is we are talking about, in case someone is watching this debate, Mr. President, and is confused. We have \$16 billion of new spending in this bill; \$2.5 billion of it comes from the community development block grants; another large chunk of money comes from the Transportation Department; and what those two departments have done is they have gone to mayors all over the country and said, put together a ready list of projects that you would like to spend money on, because we are going to make some money available and we can fund these projects. What the distinguished Senator from Colorado has done is, he has taken the ready list that lists the spending that would be undertaken by the cities with these grant funds.

We have heard tonight from our colleagues on the Democratic side of the aisle that these lists are not real. That is a strange statement, given that the first amendment that was adopted on this bill was an amendment that specifically said none of the funds would be spent on golf courses, and cemeteries, that none of the funds would support white water canoeing facilities on the Ocoee River, that we would have no fisheries atlases printed with this money, and that there would be no studies of the sicklefin chub with this money.

Where did these names come from? These names came out of the list, the ready list, that our distinguished colleague from Colorado is trying to strip provisions from.

Why is it that it is OK not to fund the sicklefin chub, but it is OK to fund all of these other projects that the distinguished Senator from Colorado has identified and wishes to strike? Did the earlier amendment adopted by the Senate contain the entire list of potential pork that could be funded with this borrowed \$16 billion?

Well, the distinguished Senator from Colorado does not think so. He has other provisions. But I will tell you something. One of the things he does is he takes out the money as well as the projects. Quite frankly, I think if the American people could vote on it, probably 99 percent of them would do the same thing.

I would like to ask some questions of the distinguished Senator from Colorado.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the Senator cannot ask a question. He can yield the floor. The Senator has the floor.

Mr. BROWN. Would the Senator from Texas yield for a question?

Mr. GRAMM. The distinguished chairman is saying that I cannot ask him a question.

Mr. BYRD. That is according to the rules. Another Senator can ask the Senator from Texas a question.

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, let me—I can make my points without going through the asking of the question.

Our distinguished colleague has listed a lot of pork, bacon, sausage, pigs knuckles, but there is a lot left in here that he has not yet scratched. Throughout this bill we have graffiti abatement, we have bike paths that are not touched by this amendment, we have an ice skating warming hut in Manchester, CT. We construct a casino building in West Haven, CT.

I was wondering—I cannot pose a question under the rules and under the 10 minutes I have by unanimous consent—I notice that the chairman and the ranking member prohibit expenditures on cemeteries, but I notice a provision in Atlanta, GA, \$2.5 million to repair a historic wall around a cemetery. I was wondering—maybe I should make a parliamentary inquiry, which I can do on my time.

Mr. President, with the amendment adopted earlier which prohibited funds under the community development block grant in this act to be used for a golf course or a cemetery project, in the opinion of the Parliamentarian, would that prohibition include the repair of a historic wall around a cemetery?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair cannot speculate as to the legal effect of that.

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, if I could pose a question to my colleague from Colorado, in Niles, IL, we have a water tank that is going to be painted. And I wonder, Mr. President, if anybody really believes that we will pro-

mote jobs, growth, and opportunity in America, that we will promote competitiveness, that we will put our people back to work by painting water tanks in Niles, IL. I am sure that they want to paint that water tank. But I am also sure if they have been wanting to paint that water tank for a long time, when these two new Cabinet secretaries said we want to spend money, send us ways to spend money, somebody in Niles, IL, said you know, we have been wanting to paint this water tank for a long time, and we never thought it was worth it. But there is somebody in Washington, DC, that honest to goodness believes that it might be worth it and we are going to put in on this list if they provide the money.

Sure enough, we are going to get it out and we are going to send in this proposal. We are going to paint that water tank.

Mr. President, we do not have \$16 billion. We are going to have to borrow every single penny of it. If Niles, IL, is not willing to paint their own water tank, if they think it is such a low priority that they do not want to do it, why in the world would we want to do it?

If they are not willing to put up money to build casinos in Connecticut, why in the world would we want to do it?

If they will not build trolleys in Pensacola, FL, with their own money, why should we do it?

That is the question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's 10 minutes is up.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, this is a fictitious list that we are hearing read tonight.

This so-called list comes from a 1,700-page report which was a bipartisan survey, overseen by a Republican mayor. It is over \$7.2 billion in community development and transportation projects that are capable of immediate startup. Not one of these items is in this bill. The distinguished Senator from Texas, the items that he mentioned, water tank, is it in the bill? No.

Mr. GRAMM. Would the distinguished Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. The casinos? No? None.

He says "throughout this bill," and he went on to name a long list of items that he says would be funded with the moneys in this bill. "Throughout this bill," those are his exact words. "Throughout this bill." Those items are not throughout this bill. They are not included in the bill at all.

Mr. GRAMM. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. Well, in a moment.

The Appropriations Committee, when it marked up the bill, included a statement that Senator HOLLINGS suggested, and it is as follows:

"During House of Representatives debate on H.R. 1335, numerous assertions were made * * * Several Senators have asked, 'Where did Senator HATFIELD and Senator BYRD get the items that they included in their amendment?' Well, this answers that question, the statement itself, which accompanies the emergency supplemental appropriations bill. It says,

During House of Representatives debate on H.R. 1335, numerous assertions were made that the President's economic stimulus program earmarked funds for lower priority projects. Included were such items as, one, community development grants for golf courses and cemeteries; two, fisheries, atlases, and studies of the Sicklefin chub; three, construction of white water canoeing facilities; four, payments for a National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration class 6 computer.

On March 22, 1993, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget wrote to assure the committee that these types of low priority projects were not proposed in the legislation submitted by the President and would not be funded. The Director committed to work with Cabinet members and the Appropriations Committees to ensure that economic stimulus funding is used only for programs of merit and not for the types of projects discussed during House debate.

These items, then, were discussed during the House debate. Senator HOLLINGS proposed that we include in our statement language that clearly points out that these types of items are not to be funded, and indicates in the statement that the Director of OMB had written to the committee to assure that these items were not proposed in the legislation, not submitted by the President, and would not be funded.

Furthermore, Mr. President, Senator HATFIELD and I offered an amendment—and it was agreed to—and it is in the substitute before the Senate, which reads as follows, and I will read an excerpt: " * * * provided that the Secretary shall, by notice published in the Federal Register, establish such requirements as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of the appropriation under this heading."

So Senator HATFIELD and I are requiring—and the Senate adopted this amendment—that the Secretary of HUD publish in the Federal Register such requirement necessary to carry out the provisions of the appropriation under this heading.

That is protection for all Senators, and for the people, against the use of funds for such items. Mr. Panetta, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget stated in a letter addressed to me on March 22, 1993, as follows:

Let me assure you that the administration does not support funding for any of the types of projects that the opponents of the legislation speculated would be funded.

So there you have it, Mr. President. You have the President of the United

States saying that you can search in this bill for years and you will not find these items. He is exactly right. You have the Director of OMB stating succinctly that the administration does not support funding for any of the types of projects that the opponents of the legislation speculated—would be funded. You have a statement by the committee itself, which I have already read.

So, Mr. President, this is a list, as I say, a 1,700-page report, and it identifies over \$7.2 billion of community development and transportation projects that are capable of immediate startup. So we could go into that list and we can pick hundreds; anyone can select hundreds of additional items, I am sure, from the list and say, look, these are the items that are going to be funded; and they could say, it has been said here that, throughout this bill, "throughout this bill" can be found these items.

They are not in the bill—not in the bill. And so from the standpoint of what is actually being voted on here, it is a fictitious list. It is a fictitious list that would not ever be funded under the conditions that are in the statement in the amendment offered by Mr. HATFIELD and myself, and in accordance with the assurances of the President and the OMB Director.

Mr. President, I think that Mr. HATFIELD and I have provided a guarantee that such items would not be funded with our provision that the Secretary shall, by notice published in the Federal Register, establish such requirements as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of the appropriation under this heading.

Mr. GRAMM. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BROWN. Will the distinguished Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I promised to yield to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico. I understand that another 8 minutes are needed for Senators to be put on notice and given a time in which to arrive.

So I ask unanimous consent that I may yield 3 minutes to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. DOMENICI] without losing my right to the floor.

Mr. DOMENICI. May I make an observation?

Mr. BROWN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request?

Mr. BROWN. Reserving the right to object. I say to the distinguished Senator from West Virginia that I would also like to request 3 minutes in a similar fashion.

Mr. BYRD. Yes. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico 3 minutes and the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. BROWN],

the author of the amendment, 3 minutes, and that I may be protected in my rights to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any objections?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from New Mexico is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, first, I want to thank the distinguished Senator from Colorado for this amendment, because I think it truly points up what this stimulus package is all about. There can be all kinds of discussions here on the floor as to what list of projects is governing, but I think it is obvious to anybody that attended the National League of Cities convention here in this town that what is really intended is to help mayors by giving them projects that they want in their communities. That is what this list is.

To say that we do not know which part of that list is going to be funded, and therefore, your amendment, somehow or another misses the mark, is to ignore the reality that a substantial portion of that list is for these various projects that the American people would, under no condition, believe to be an emergency, much less a stimulus. It just happens that some of them are going to be funded, unless amendments like this, or even subsequent amendments, take more and more out of that wish list, that pork barrel list promised to the mayors of America, if they would help the President of the United States. I happened to go to that convention, so I know of what I am speaking.

Having said that, I want to tell the Senate what we are going to do when we finally adopt the stimulus package. We have gone through 10 days of debate about a deficit reduction package. Listen to me carefully, fellow Senators. The sum total of domestic cuts in the President's package in the next 5 years is a net of \$7 billion.

We are tomorrow sometime going to pass a spending package that, if my appropriations staff is correct, totals more than \$16 billion. Actually, it is \$16 billion in spending authority for ordinary programs and \$3.2 billion additional money out of the highway trust fund.

So we are going to spend \$19.3 billion and wipe out all the savings we got in the President's deficit reduction package because it only has a net \$7 billion in domestic savings.

Believe you me, the American people ought to understand that, on the one hand, we cut a net \$7 billion over 5 years, and 2 days later we come to the floor wringing our hands about the deficit and about jobs and we spend over \$19 billion. This bill more than wipes out the entire domestic savings that are in that big multi-year deficit reduction package that we are waiting to be reconciled to control the deficit. I

do not believe we really ought to do any of this package, but the Senator from Colorado is on the right track pointing out what is in it.

I thank the distinguished chairman for yielding, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado is recognized for 3 minutes.

The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to add Senator COVERDELL as cosponsor of this amendment.

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

Mr. BROWN. And I ask unanimous consent to add Senator GRAMM from Texas as a cosponsor.

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

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, let me also thank the distinguished Senator from West Virginia. He certainly has a right to offer a motion to table at any time, and I appreciate his willingness to give me 3 minutes to wind up my additional arguments on this amendment.

Mr. President, part of the discussion has been how in the world we got this list of projects. I did not come up with this list of projects. This list of projects I got from a Member of the House of Representatives who sat in on the session where Secretary Cisneros told the committee what they were going to spend the money on. I have read into the RECORD the verbatim statement from the transcript of the committee hearing where he said that. This is not invented. This is the verbatim transcript out of his testimony.

This is a copy of the document he put his hands on when he says, "I have in front of me a list from the U.S. Conference of Mayors." That is this list. This is the list that he handed out.

Now, some of my friends have said that this is just speculation. This is not speculation. This is what the Secretary said, and this is what the Secretary put his hand on in terms of a list.

Some have said, "Well, we do not mean to fund those." If they feel that way, I hope they will vote for this amendment because this is what this amendment accomplishes. This amendment makes sure they do not fund them because it names them specifically and it takes the money out of the bill. If you do not want swimming pools funded under the guise of an emergency, vote "yes."

The question we have is: Are golf courses urgent? Are swimming pools vital? Are tennis courts emergencies? Are skating rinks essential? If you really think they are essential and vital emergencies, then by all means vote "no."

The fundamental difference that is here in this bill is this. Some people honestly and sincerely believe the way

to build a strong economy is with a high deficit and more Federal spending and make-work projects such as laid out here that do not contribute to the productiveness of this Nation.

If you think a \$290 billion deficit is not enough, or \$300 billion is not enough to provide a stimulus, the crying need of America is more deficit spending, then vote against the amendment. If you think making America competitive again depends on efficiency, productivity, and investment, if you think eliminating silly, nonsensical, wasteful Government spending is wrong, then vote for this amendment. This gives you a chance. This amendment has teeth in it. This amendment shoots real bullets. It shoots \$103½ million of bullets because that is what it cuts out of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's 3 minutes are up.

Pursuant to the unanimous-consent request, the Senator from West Virginia is now recognized.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I yield to the majority leader such time as he may require without losing my right to the floor.

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

The majority leader.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, this amendment could be called Broadway Comes to the Senate. One of the most popular Broadway shows of recent years was the "Phantom of the Opera." This is a phantom amendment which takes items that are not in the bill and says we should eliminate them from the bill. Not one of these specific projects is in the nature that we are debating, not one.

We could make up an amendment that took 23 pages out of the encyclopedia and say those should be stricken from the bill. We could make up an amendment that took three pages out of the phone book and say those should be stricken from the bill.

These measures are not in the bill. So no one should think when we vote to eliminate these projects that we are voting to eliminate them from the bill because they are not there.

One related point: Throughout the past decade, over and over again in this Senate the debate raged over what level of government should be responsible for what measures. And we were told over and over again that the proper level of government for making decisions ought to be the Senate and the local governments.

I recall very clearly when the debate involved revenue sharing in this Chamber. That debate said that it is not up to us at the Federal level to make these decisions. We should be leaving them to the Governors and the mayors because they know their areas best.

This, of course, reverses that argument. This simply says that we are to preclude any judgment, any decision-

making, any input by Governors and mayors in this process. So let us be clear about what is involved here.

This amendment does not involve these projects. They are not in the bill. This amendment is part of a continuing assault on President Clinton and President Clinton's economic program. We had dozens of such amendments on the budget resolution. They did not succeed and now the effort resumes again.

Stop the President's program. That is what this amendment is about. Do not let President Clinton have a chance to get started. Do whatever is necessary to undermine the President's program—anything that President Clinton proposes. And everything that President Clinton proposes our colleagues want to prevent. That is what this is about.

This is an effort to continue the policies of the past 4 years as opposed to having a change in policy—as opposed to having a new economic policy. The American people said in November they wanted change in policies, and they changed Presidents to accomplish that change in policies.

So the question here is not on some list of projects that is not in the bill. The question here, as it has been for the past few weeks, is whether they are going to support or oppose the President, whether we want to undermine the President's program before it gets started, or whether we want to give President Clinton a chance. That is the issue here.

Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, I would like to join with my colleague from Tennessee and take this opportunity to set the record straight with regard to a project that is of importance to our State.

There has been much controversy in recent days regarding certain projects that some have speculated would be funded by this bill. The bill and report do not include the projects. Nevertheless, critics have complained that the money to be appropriated could be used for purposes that are not directly related to economic stimulus and job creation. The committee's report and the amendment passed last Thursday by voice vote, make clear that the money provided in this bill, cannot be used for programs or projects that are not directly related to economic stimulus, or are of low priority.

One project cited by critics and in the report and amendment is Forest Service funding for whitewater canoeing. This cryptic reference fails to describe adequately the project at issue, and I believe it is necessary to provide additional background to ensure that this funding is properly evaluated in the future.

The Atlanta Committee for the Olympic Games has chosen the Ocoee River in Polk County, TN, as the site for the 1996 Olympic games whitewater

slalom events. Since 1977, the Ocoee has been the site for extensive recreational and commercial whitewater rafting activities. The river's challenging rapids and its proximity to Atlanta make it an ideal site for the whitewater events. The State of Tennessee has worked closely with the Atlanta Olympic Organizing Committee and pledged its support for holding the events in Polk County.

As the Senator is aware, the Ocoee River and surrounding lands are owned and managed by the Federal Government. Facilities to improve access to the site, and to support increased visitation to the area, are crucial if the events are to be staged successfully and without a negative impact on these Federal lands. Those facilities will be permanent improvements under the jurisdiction and control of the Forest Service. In fact, language in the Senate report accompanying the fiscal year 1993 Interior appropriations bill (S. Rpt. 102-345, p. 82) specifies that any funds provided for this purpose be used only for public-use improvements that will extend to the post-Olympic years.

The Forest Service has provided initial funding for design and concept work on the project, with assistance from the Tennessee Valley Authority and the Economic Development Administration. In addition, the State of Tennessee has provided \$200,000 for the project and is prepared to contribute several million dollars in addition. The project will also depend on substantial private funding, and a structure for private fundraising efforts is being put in place.

There is ample precedent for the Federal Government providing financial assistance to international athletic events, even in cases where the event is not being held on Federal lands. More than \$110 million was given in support of the 1980 Winter Olympics in Lake Placid. In 1987, the Pan-American games received more than \$34 million in Federal funds and in-kind assistance. There are numerous other examples of such Federal help, including assistance provided to the 1990 Goodwill games and the 1993 World University games. I believe that the 1996 Olympic whitewater events—which will be held entirely on Federal lands—deserve the same kind of support.

Mr. President, my colleague from Tennessee and I have not sought and do not seek to designate any of the emergency funding provided in this bill for the Ocoee project. We agree that while funding for the project is time sensitive, it does not warrant funding in the President's economic stimulus package. Our concern is that this project may be deemed wasteful or without merit simply because of its mention among the types of projects that are singled out for exclusion. Many of those projects may indeed be wasteful, but others, like the Ocoee

project, should be excluded only because they do not qualify as an emergency under the terms of this bill. I am hopeful that the Senator from West Virginia will work with us during the normal budget and appropriations process to see that this project is adequately funded.

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. President, my colleague from Tennessee, Senator SASSER, raises a very important point with the chairman of the Appropriations Committee. Discussions in the House of Representatives and here in the Senate have stipulated that funding support for the Olympic whitewater events on the Ocoee River does not constitute emergency spending. While Senator SASSER and I agree that such funding should not be categorized as emergency spending, and thus should not be included in the stimulus package, we disagree with those that categorize such funds as wasteful.

The area surrounding the Ocoee River is almost entirely owned by the Federal Government and depends greatly upon the activities managed by the U.S. Forest Service and the Tennessee Valley Authority. Having come recently from the Governor's office in Tennessee, I realize how much the area has come to depend upon recreation activities as a source for local income. For this reason, I hope that we will not jump to the conclusion that future funds for the whitewater events of the Olympic games of 1996 are wasteful spending.

Future funds appropriated through the Forest Service will be supplemental to those provided by the Atlanta Committee for the Olympic Games, the State of Tennessee, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and private sponsors. These moneys will be used for developments along the river corridor that will support the Olympic events, but also will provide economic benefits to the community long after the Olympics events are over. I view these moneys as an economic investment in a rural community which is as much in need of Federal assistance as any part of the country.

Mr. President, 54 percent of the land in Polk County, through which the Ocoee River runs, belongs to the Federal Government. The local government derives over 25 percent of its annual income from recreation associated with these Federal lands. This is a community which is struggling to survive, and the opportunity which the Olympics will provide will assist Polk County and the entire region in becoming more self sufficient. Future appropriations will be investments in these communities, not wasteful spending.

I join Senator SASSER in this effort to clear up any misunderstandings that funds were being appropriated for whitewater canoeing under emergency appropriations. However, I feel that future funds should be available to the

Forest Service so that they might support completion of the whitewater venue for the 1996 Olympics. This is a time-sensitive matter that I plan to pursue with Senator BYRD and other members of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado would be attractive if the amendment only said that none of the community development block grant funds in this bill could be spent on the projects he enumerated. I, too, question whether those projects are emergencies which justify new spending without offsetting spending cuts.

However, the Brown amendment goes beyond just limiting projects for which funds cannot be spent. It also actually cuts from the bill \$100 million, which is the amount equivalent to the cost of those projects. The flaw in this amendment is that there may well be other projects which would still qualify for community development block grant funding even after the Brown amendment is adopted which could utilize the full \$2.5 billion that the President has proposed in his stimulus package. However, because the Brown amendment would have stricken \$100 million from the bill, those other legitimate projects would not be fully funded. So, although the Brown amendment is headed in the right direction, it overshoots the mark.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I believe that all Senators have had sufficient notice now. There is going to be a motion to table.

Mr. LEAHY. Let us vote.

Mr. BYRD. We will vote in just a minute.

I announced that such a motion would be made about 25 minutes ago.

I move to table the amendment and ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN). Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. DOLE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican leader.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] to table the amendment of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. BROWN].

The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BIDEN], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CAMPBELL], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. DECONCINI], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUE], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. JOHNSTON], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] are necessarily absent.

Mr. SIMPSON. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. GORTON] is necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 44, nays 48, as follows:

(Rollcall Vote No. 84 Leg.)

YEAS—44

Akaka	Ford	Moseley-Braun
Baucus	Glenn	Moynihan
Bingaman	Harkin	Murray
Boren	Hollings	Pell
Boxer	Kerry	Pryor
Bradley	Kohl	Reid
Breaux	Krueger	Riegle
Bryan	Lautenberg	Robb
Bumpers	Leahy	Rockefeller
Conrad	Levin	Sarbanes
Daschle	Lieberman	Sasser
Dodd	Mathews	Simon
Dorgan	Metzenbaum	Wellstone
Feingold	Mikulski	Wofford
Feinstein	Mitchell	

NAYS—48

Bennett	Exon	McCain
Bond	Faircloth	McConnell
Brown	Graham	Murkowski
Burns	Gramm	Nickles
Byrd	Grassley	Nunn
Chafee	Gregg	Packwood
Coats	Hatch	Pressler
Cochran	Hatfield	Roth
Cohen	Helms	Shelby
Coverdell	Jeffords	Simpson
Craig	Kassebaum	Smith
D'Aмато	Kempthorne	Specter
Danforth	Kerrey	Stevens
Dole	Lott	Thurmond
Domenici	Lugar	Wallop
Durenberger	Mack	Warner

NOT VOTING—8

Biden	Gorton	Johnston
Campbell	Hefflin	Kennedy
DeConcini	Inouye	

So, the motion to lay on the table the amendment (No. 279) was rejected.

Mr. BYRD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. Madam President, I qualify to move to reconsider. I make such a motion and am prepared to go out and have the vote tomorrow morning. I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the leader for the purposes of his moving to go out.

Mr. GRAMM. Reserving the right to object.

Mr. BYRD. Madam President, I can move if the leader will tell me what time he wants to go out.

Mr. GRAMM. Parliamentary inquiry, Madam President.

Mr. BYRD. I have the floor. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. GRAMM. Is it in order on a motion to reconsider to debate that motion or to yield the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Would you restate the question?

Mr. GRAMM. Is it in order on a motion to reconsider to debate that motion or to yield the floor to someone else?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia made a motion to reconsider the vote, having voted on the prevailing side. The motion to reconsider is—

Mr. GRAMM. Madam President, I guess I should state it more precisely. Is the motion to reconsider debatable?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Because the underlying question is nondebatable, the motion to reconsider in this case is similarly nondebatable.

Mr. MITCHELL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Mr. MITCHELL. Madam President, the Senator from West Virginia has made a motion to reconsider. That is not a debatable motion. At the request of a very large number of Senators on both sides of the aisle, I agreed that this would be the last vote today. Therefore, I believe it would be most unfortunate were we now to proceed to a vote on the motion to reconsider.

I therefore suggest that the best course of action under the circumstances, with a large number of Senators having left, is to proceed to a vote on the motion to reconsider tomorrow.

Mr. GRAMM. Will the Senator yield.

Mr. MITCHELL. Yes, I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. GRAMM. Would it be the objective of the Senator, since this is not debatable, that we would set a time in the morning when we could vote on it again?

Mr. MITCHELL. Yes, that is my intention. I always discuss that with the distinguished Republican leader and members of the staff.

Mr. GRAMM. I thank the distinguished leader, and on that basis I am happy with the decision.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

MORNING BUSINESS

FOOD STAMP ACT OF 1977 AMENDMENTS

Mr. MITCHELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry be discharged from further consideration of S. 284 and the Senate

proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 284) to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1977.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

AMENDMENT NO. 280

(Purpose: To provide a complete substitute.)

Mr. HATFIELD. Madam President, I send a substitute amendment to the desk on behalf of Senator PRESSLER and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD], for Mr. PRESSLER, proposes an amendment numbered 280.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. REPORTING AND STAGGERED ISSUANCE FOR HOUSEHOLDS ON RESERVATIONS.

Section 908(a) of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act Amendments of 1991 (Public Law 102-237; 7 U.S.C. 2015 note and 7 U.S.C. 2016 note) is amended by striking "April 1, 1993" both places it appears and inserting "January 31, 1994."

Mr. PRESSLER. Madam President, I rise today to offer a substitute amendment to S. 284. I am pleased to report that this substitute represents an agreement worked out between all parties involved in this legislation. As a result, I am hopeful that this legislation will be passed by Congress and signed by the President very soon.

The substitute to S. 284 addresses two provisions in the law that address State administration of the Food Stamp Program. Specifically, this substitute delays implementation of a provision enacted as part of the 1990 farm bill requiring States to stagger food stamp issuance for families living on reservations. This provision has never been implemented. It is set to take effect on April 1, 1993. Therefore, the legislation we are passing today would delay until January 31, 1994, this provision and enable current practices to be maintained.

In addition, this substitute would delay implementation until January 31, 1994, of another 1990 farm bill provision. This provision exempts reservation households from the Food Stamp Program's State option of monthly income reporting. Again, this provision also is scheduled to take effect on April 1 within the estimated 13 State pro-

grams serving native Americans who live on reservations. My legislation would delay the effective date until January 31, 1994.

During the time before January 31, 1994, a joint congressional hearing—involving the Committees on Agriculture and Indian Affairs—would be held. This joint hearing would, among other things, look closely at the American Indian and Alaskan Native participation in the Food Stamp Program. This is an important program for them. It is essential all eligible individuals, in each State, participate in the most effective manner possible.

In short, Mr. President, the purpose of this legislation is to ensure that the individual States have the flexibility to administer the Food Stamp Program in a manner that best meets the unique needs of their citizens who receive food stamps. This flexibility is crucial in States like South Dakota that have a significant number of American Indian food stamp recipients. This legislation is an important step toward preserving State flexibility in Food Stamp Program administration.

Madam President, it was imperative that a bipartisan agreement be reached and enacted into law before April 1, 1993. Fortunately, with the passage of S. 284 as amended, it will be possible to reach that goal. I am pleased that the interested parties were able to come together to achieve the agreement reflected in the substitute offered here today. I wish to extend my thanks for the cooperation and leadership of the distinguished chairman and ranking member of the Agriculture Committee, Senator LEAHY and Senator LUGAR; the chairman and ranking member of the Indian Affairs Committee, Senator INOUE and Senator MCCAIN; and the staffs of both committees.

Finally, Madam President, I would like to extend a special thank you to Julie Osnes, administrator of the Family Independence Program and the Food Stamp Program of the Department of Social Services in my home State of South Dakota. Julie's knowledge, gained from 14 years of administering South Dakota's exemplary Food Stamp Program, has been invaluable to all parties involved in this process. In addition, her leadership, as president of the American Association of Food Stamp Directors, an affiliate of the American Public Welfare Association, has been instrumental in reaching this compromise.

Madam President, I am pleased to be able to offer this substitute to S. 284. I understand it has been cleared on both sides of the aisle and therefore urge its immediate adoption.

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

The amendment (No. 280) was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 284

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

SECTION 1. REPORTING AND STAGGERED ISSUANCE FOR HOUSEHOLDS ON RESERVATIONS.

Section 908(a) of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act Amendments of 1991 (Public Law 102-237; 7 U.S.C. 2015 note and 7 U.S.C. 2016 note) is amended by striking "April 1, 1993" both places it appears and inserting "January 31, 1994".

The title was amended so as to read: "To extend the suspended implementation of certain requirements of the Food Stamp Program on Indian reservations, and for other purposes."

Mr. MITCHELL. Madam President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

Mr. MITCHELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order for the Senate to consider en bloc messages from the House on Senate Joint Resolution 27, Senate Joint Resolution 28, Senate Joint Resolution 29, and Senate Concurrent Resolution 13; that the messages be deemed to have been laid before the Senate; and that the Senate concur en bloc to the amendments of the House; further that the motions to reconsider be tabled en bloc.

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

HANNA HOLBORN GRAY APPOINTMENT TO THE BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the House of Representatives:

Resolved, That the resolution from the Senate (S.J. Res. 27) entitled "Joint resolution providing for the appointment of Hanna Holborn Gray as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution," do pass with the following amendments:

Strike out all after the resolving clause and insert:

That, in accordance with section 5581 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (20 U.S.C. 43), the vacancy on the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, in the class other than members of Congress, occurring by reason of the expiration of the term of William G. Gowen of New Jersey on March 12, 1992, is filled by the appointment of Hanna Holborn Gray of Illinois. The appointment is for a term of 6 years and shall take effect on the date on which this joint resolution becomes law.

Amend the title so as to read: "Joint resolution providing for the appointment of Hanna Holborn Gray as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution."

BARBER B. CONABLE, JR. APPOINTMENT TO THE BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the House of Representatives:

Resolved, That the resolution from the Senate (S.J. Res. 28) entitled "Joint resolution to provide for the appointment of Barber B. Conable, Jr., as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution," do pass with the following amendments:

Strike out all after the resolving clause and insert:

That, in accordance with section 5581 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (20 U.S.C. 43), the vacancy on the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, in the class other than members of Congress, occurring by reason of the expiration of the term of Barnabas McHenry of New York on July 21, 1991, is filled by the appointment of Barber B. Conable, Jr. of New York. The appointment is for a term of 6 years and shall take effect on the date on which this joint resolution becomes law.

Amend the title so as to read: "Joint resolution providing for the appointment of Barber B. Conable, Jr., as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution."

WESLEY SAMUEL WILLIAMS, JR. APPOINTMENT TO THE BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the House of Representatives:

Resolved, That the resolution from the Senate (S.J. Res. 29) entitled "Joint resolution providing for the appointment of Wesley Samuel Williams, Jr., as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution," do pass with the following amendments:

Strike out all after the resolving clause and insert:

That, in accordance with the section 5581 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (20 U.S.C. 43), the vacancy on the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, in the class other than Members of Congress, occurring by reason of the expiration of the term of David C. Acheson of the District of Columbia on December 21, 1992, is filled by the appointment of Wesley S. Williams, Jr. of the District of Columbia. The appointment is for a term of 6 years and shall take effect on the date on which this joint resolution becomes law.

Amend the title so as to read: "Joint resolution providing for the appointment of Wesley S. Williams, Jr. as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution."

PERMITTING USE OF THE CAPITOL ROTUNDA FOR A CEREMONY TO COMMEMORATE THE DAYS OF REMEMBRANCE OF VICTIMS OF THE HOLOCAUST

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the House of Representatives:

Resolved, That the resolution from the Senate (S. Con. Res. 13) entitled "Concurrent resolution permitting the use of the rotunda of the Capitol for a ceremony to commemorate the days of remembrance of victims of the Holocaust," do pass with the following amendments:

Strike out all after the resolving clause and insert:

That the rotunda of the Capitol is authorized to be used from 8 o'clock ante meridiem until 3 o'clock post meridiem on April 20, 1993, and from 8 o'clock ante meridiem until 3 o'clock post meridiem on April 6, 1994, for ceremonies as part of the commemoration of the days of remembrance of victims of the Holocaust. Physical preparations for the ceremonies shall be carried out in accordance with such conditions as the Architect of the Capitol may prescribe.

Amend the preamble so as to read: "Whereas the United States Holocaust Memorial Council has designated April 18 through April 25, 1993, and April 3 through April 10, 1994, as "Days of Remembrance of Victims of the Holocaust"; Now, therefore, be it"

Amend the title so as to read: "Concurrent resolution permitting the use of the rotunda of the Capitol for ceremonies as part of the commemoration of the days of remembrance of victims of the Holocaust."

AUTHORIZATION FOR THE USE OF THE HART BUILDING ATRIUM

Mr. MITCHELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Senate Resolution 83 submitted earlier today by Senator BAUCUS, a resolution to authorize the use of the atrium of the Hart Building by the Congressional Chorus; that the resolution be agreed to, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

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

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

Mr. BAUCUS. I am submitting a resolution today which will bring culture to our own Hart atrium. The resolution grants the Congressional Chorus authority to perform a spring and a winter concert for each session of the 103d Congress. The chorus would perform from 12 noon to 1 p.m. on a day in coordination with the Rules Committee.

The Congressional Chorus, founded, in 1987, is composed of over 50 volunteer members from the legislative branch, including the Senate, the House of Representatives, the Library of Congress, and the Congressional Budget Office. Under the musical direction of Dr. Michael Patterson, the chorus serves as a showcase for American music. Its repertoire includes classical compositions, traditional folksongs

and spirituals, jazz, classics, and Broadway show tunes. The members meet to rehearse during their lunch hours one day a week.

The chorus presented its first concert in the atrium of the Hart Senate Office Building in December 1987, and went on to sing at the inauguration of President Bush in January 1989. They have performed for a wide variety of occasions on and around Capitol Hill, including the lighting of the Capitol Christmas tree, the gala benefit for the U.S. Capitol Building, and most notably at the inauguration of President Clinton.

Madam President, I commend the Congressional Chorus members for providing us with this fine music and look forward to their concerts.

The resolution (S. Res. 83) was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the atrium of the Senate Hart Office Building may be used from 12:00 noon until 1:00 p.m. on one day during the spring and one day during the winter of each session of the One Hundred Third Congress, for a concert of American music to be presented by the Congressional Chorus.

NATIONAL CRIME VICTIMS RIGHTS WEEK

NATIONAL PUBLIC SAFETY TELECOMMUNICATORS WEEK

WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

Mr. MITCHELL. I ask unanimous consent that the Judiciary Committee be discharged, en bloc, from consideration of the following joint resolutions: Senate Joint Resolution 53, designating "Women's History Month;" Senate Joint Resolution 56, designating "National Public Safety Telecommunicators Week;" Senate Joint Resolution 62, designating "National Crime Victims Rights Week;" that the Senate then proceed en bloc to their immediate consideration; that the joint resolutions be deemed read three times, passed, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, en bloc; that the preambles be agreed to, en bloc; further that any statements relative to the passage of these joint resolutions be placed in the RECORD at the appropriate place, and the consideration of these items appear individually in the RECORD.

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

The joint resolutions were deemed read three times and passed.

The preambles were agreed to.

The joint resolutions (S.J. Res. 53, S.J. Res. 56, and S.J. Res. 62) with their preambles, are as follows:

S.J. RES. 53

Whereas American women of every race, class, and ethnic background have made historical contributions to the growth and strength of our Nation in countless recorded and unrecorded ways;

Whereas American women have played and continue to play a critical economic, cultural, and social role in every sphere of the life of the Nation by constituting a significant portion of the labor force working inside and outside of the home;

Whereas American women have played a unique role throughout the history of the Nation by providing the majority of the volunteer labor force of the Nation;

Whereas American women were particularly important in the establishment of early charitable, philanthropic and cultural institutions in our Nation;

Whereas American women of every race, class, and ethnic background served as early leaders in the forefront of every major progressive social change movement;

Whereas American women have been leaders not only in securing their own rights of suffrage and equal opportunity, but also in the abolitionist movement, the emancipation movement, the industrial labor movement, the civil rights movement, and other movements, especially the peace movement, which create a more fair and just society for all; and

Whereas despite these contributions, the role of American women in history has been consistently overlooked and undervalued in the literature, teaching, and study of American history; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That March 1993 and March 1994 are designated both as "Women's History Month", and the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe that month with appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities.

S.J. RES. 56

Whereas over one-half million dedicated men and women are engaged in the operation of emergency response systems for Federal, State, and local governmental entities throughout the United States;

Whereas these individuals are responsible for responding to the telephone calls of the general public for police, fire and emergency medical assistance and for dispatching such assistance to help save the lives and property of our citizens;

Whereas such calls include not only police, fire and emergency medical service calls but those governmental communications related to forestry and conservation operations, highway safety and maintenance activities, and all of the other operations which modern governmental agencies must conduct; and

Whereas America's public safety telecommunications daily serve the public in countless ways without due recognition by the beneficiaries of their services: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the week beginning April 12, 1993, is hereby designated as "National Public Safety Telecommunicators Week". The President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe that week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

S.J. RES. 62

Whereas there were over thirty-five million crimes committed last year in America, with one violent crime occurring every seventeen seconds;

Whereas victims of crime across America deserve respect and assistance not only from the criminal justice system, but from society as well;

Whereas there is a crucial need to provide crime victims with quality programs and services to help them recover from the devastating psychological, physical, emotional, and financial hardships resulting from their victimization;

Whereas there are ten thousand public and private agencies and organizations in the United States that are dedicated to improving the plight of crime victims;

Whereas the Nation's victims' rights movement and allied professions deserve recognition for their tireless efforts on behalf of victims of crime and to reduce senseless violence in America; and

Whereas it is essential for all Americans to join together and commit their individual and collective resources to victim assistance and violence reduction: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the week beginning April 25, 1993, is hereby designated as "National Crime Victims' Rights Week". The President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe the week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Edwin R. Thomas, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session, the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 5 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives delivered by Mr. Hays, one of its reading clerks, announced that pursuant to the provisions of section 4 of the Congressional Award Act, the Speaker appoints Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey to the Congressional Award Board on the part of the House; and from private life Mr. Michael A. Reza, Hacienda Heights, CA; Ms. Mary L. Howell, Arlington, VA; and Ms. LaBrenda Garrett Stodghill, Washington, DC.

The message also announced that pursuant to the provisions of section 2501 of title 44, United States Code, the Speaker appoints Mr. SHARP of Indiana to the National Historical Publications and Records Commission on the part of the House.

The message further announced that pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 96-388, as amended by Public Law 97-84 (36 U.S.C. 1402(a)), the Speaker appoints the following Members to the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Council on the part of the House: Mr. YATES, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. NADLER, Mr. FROST, and Mr. GILMAN.

The message also announced that pursuant to the provisions of section 5(a)(2) of Public Law 101-363, the Speaker appoints Mr. MCCLOSKEY to the National Advisory Council on the Public Service on the part of the House.

The message further announced that pursuant to the provisions of section 194(a) of title 14, United States Code, the Speaker appoints Mr. GEJDENSON and Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Coast Guard Academy on the part of the House.

The message also announced that pursuant to the provisions of section 2 of the Migratory Bird Conservation Act (16 U.S.C. 715a), the Speaker appoints Mr. DINGELL and Mr. WELDON to the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission on the part of the House.

The message further announced that pursuant to the provisions of section 1505 of Public Law 99-498 (20 U.S.C. 4412), the Speaker appoints Mr. KILDEE and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska to the Board of Trustees of the Institute of American Indian and Alaska Native Culture and Arts Development on the part of the House.

The message also announced that pursuant to section 103, Public Law 99-371 (20 U.S.C. 4303), the Speaker appoints Mr. BONIOR and Mr. GUNDERSON as members of the Board of Trustees of Gallaudet University on the part of the House.

The message further announced that pursuant to the provisions of section 1295B(h) of title 46, United States Code, the Speaker appoints Mr. MANTON and Mr. KING as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy on the part of the House.

The message also announced that pursuant to the provisions of section 1424(b)(1) of Public Law 102-325, the Speaker appoints Sister Maureen A. Fay of Detroit, MI, and Mr. Philip M. Phibbs of Tacoma, WA, both from private life, as members of the National Commission on Independent Higher Education on the part of the House.

The message further announced that pursuant to the provisions of section 2(a) of the National Cultural Center Act (20 U.S.C. 76H(a)), the Speaker appoints as members of the Board of Trustees of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. YATES, Mr. WILSON, and Mr. MCDADE.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, which were referred as indicated:

EC-687. A communication from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to

law, a report on the assignment of special operations forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-688. A communication from the Chairman of the United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the administration of the Sunshine Act for calendar year 1992; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-689. A communication from the Chairman of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, notice of documentation of certified material relative to the Navy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-690. A communication from the Chairman of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, notice of documentation of certified material relative to the Air Force; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-691. A communication from the Chairman of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, notice of documentation of certified material relative to naval stations; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-692. A communication from the Chairman of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, notice of documentation of certified material relative to "Standards for Review of Base Closure Recommendations"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-693. A communication from the Chairman of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, notice of documentation of certified material relative to the Department of the Navy's Base Structure Data; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-694. A communication from the Administrator of the Panama Canal Commission, transmitting, a draft of proposed legislation entitled "Panama Canal Commission Authorization Act, fiscal years 1994 and 1995"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-695. A communication from the Assistant Legal Adviser (Treaty Affairs), Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, notice of international agreements; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-696. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of D.C. Act 10-15 adopted by the Council on March 2, 1993; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petitions and memorials were laid before the Senate and were referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM-51. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of New Hampshire relative to examining federal banking laws and regulations; to the Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs.

"HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 10

"Resolved, by the House of Representatives, the Senate concurring:

"That the Congress is encouraged to examine federal laws and regulations which relate to the regulatory and paperwork burden of commercial banks and to repeal those laws and regulations which are unfairly restrictive and burdensome; and

"That President Clinton is urged to issue an executive order to alleviate the unneces-

sary burdens and restrictions of these laws and regulations; and

"That copies of this resolution shall be transmitted by the clerk of the house of representatives to the President of the United States, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, and the New Hampshire Congressional delegation."

POM-52. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of New Hampshire relative to cable television operators; to the Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation.

"HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 13

"Whereas, the Federal Communications Commission is currently working on regulations to preclude cable television operators from charging for more than one cable connection per residence; and

"Whereas, the Commission should establish rates for the installation and monthly use of cable connections based upon the actual cost; and

"Whereas, cable operators should be required to use the same cost methodology which they use for the installation of other cable equipment to calculate the rates for installation of connections for additional receivers; and

"Whereas, if additional connections are installed at the same time that a subscriber's initial service is installed, cable operators should recover only the incremental cost of the additional installation; and

"Whereas, the costs of cabling used for additional connections should be recovered through one-time charges or charges that will end when the operator has recovered those costs; and

"Whereas, the New Hampshire house of representatives currently has legislation pending to preclude cable operators from charging for more than one cable connection per residence; now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives;

"That the New Hampshire house of representatives hereby urges the Federal Communications Commission to enact regulations to preclude cable television operators from charging for more than one cable connection per residence unless the cable operators can justify additional incremental costs directly associated with providing additional connections; and

"That the general court of New Hampshire should refrain from enacting legislation on the costs of cable connections until such time as the federal regulations are in place, so that the general court can enact legislation that reflects the changes in the federal law; and

"That copies of this resolution, signed by the speaker of the house be forwarded by the house clerk to the President of the United States, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, the chairperson of the Federal Communications Commission and to each member of the New Hampshire Congressional delegation."

POM-53. A resolution adopted by the Committee on Public Lands of the Legislature of the State of Nevada relative to the Spring Mountain National Recreation Area; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

"RESOLUTION OF THE NEVADA LEGISLATURE'S COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS SUPPORTING THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE SPRING MOUNTAIN NATIONAL RECREATION AREA

"Whereas, The Spring Mountain area in Southern Nevada is one of the State's most scenic locations; and

"Whereas, The area includes popular recreational spots at Mt. Charleston; Carpenter, Kyle and Lee Canyons; and Yellow Plug; and

"Whereas, Nevada Representative James H. Bilbray has introduced a bill to designate 316,000 acres in the Spring Mountains as the First National Recreation Area in Nevada; and

"Whereas, Nevada Senator Richard H. Bryan has introduced a companion bill in the United States Senate; and

"Whereas, Designation as a National Recreation Area would qualify the Spring Mountains for more Federal management funding and as a higher priority item in the budget of the United States Forest Service; and

"Resolved by the Nevada Legislature's Committee on Public Lands, That the committee gives its unqualified support for the designation of the Spring Mountains as a National Recreation Area and for the Congressional legislation, H.R. 63 and S. 172, creating the National Recreation Area; and be it further

"Resolved, That this resolution replaces the committee's resolution approved on October 23, 1992; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the Vice President of the United States as the presiding officer of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, each member of the Nevada Congressional Delegation, Citizens for a Spring Mountain National Recreation Area and the Nevada Mining Association."

POM-54. A resolution adopted by the Municipal Utilities Board of Albertville, Alabama relative to the Tennessee Valley Authority Board; to the Committee on the Environment and Public Works.

POM-55. A resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Niagara Falls, New York relative to Social Security benefits; to the Committee on Finance.

RESOLUTION 1993-37

"Whereas, the City of Niagara Falls is composed of many senior citizens whose primary income is the monthly Social Security check they receive; and

"Whereas, for most seniors, this is a check that they or their spouses earned over many years; and

"Whereas, this Council is mindful of the sacrifices that our senior citizens have made for many years by paying in earnest into the Social Security system, so that in their golden years they would have this small pension to rely on; and

"Whereas, President Clinton has stated that his administration is considering cutting the cost of living adjustments for 41 million social security recipients; and

"Whereas, twenty-five percent (25%) of those over 65 years of age rely solely on Social Security for their income; and

"Whereas, the President's budget director Leon Panetta has been orchestrating this proposal which will inflict a tremendous burden on many senior citizens who live in Niagara Falls.

"Now, therefore, be it resolved by the city Council of Niagara Falls, New York that this Council calls upon President William Clinton and Senators Patrick Moynihan and Alfonse D'Amato to reject any proposal to cut living

adjustments in Social Security benefits for seniors, and be it further

"Resolved, that the City Clerk is directed to forward certified copies of this resolution to President Clinton, Vice President Gore, Senator Moynihan and Senator D'Amato."

POM-56. A resolution adopted by the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania relative to Social Security benefits; to the Committee on Finance.

"RESOLUTION OF THE SENATE OF PENNSYLVANIA"

"Whereas, Recent newspaper accounts have stated that the President's administration has proposed a limitation on the cost-of-living increase calculation for Social Security recipients; and

"Whereas, Many senior citizens of the United States and of this Commonwealth are having trouble making ends meet while trying to live on a fixed income; therefore be it

"Resolved, That the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania memorialize the President and Congress of the United States to oppose limiting Social Security cost-of-living increases; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the presiding officers of each house of Congress and to each member of Congress from Pennsylvania."

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. SIMPSON (for himself, Mr. BYRD, Mr. D'AMATO, Mr. SHELBY, Mrs. KASSEBAUM, Mr. NICKLES, Mr. REID, Mr. LOTT, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. ROTH, Mr. WARNER, Mr. GRAMM, and Mr. THURMOND):

S. 667. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to improve procedures for the exclusion of aliens seeking to enter the United States by fraud; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPECTER (for himself, Mr. SIMON, Mr. DECONCINI, Mr. HATCH, and Mr. BROWN):

S. 668. A bill to amend title IX of the Civil Rights Act of 1968 to increase the penalties for violating the fair housing provisions of the Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. SIMPSON (for himself, Mr. BYRD, Mr. D'AMATO, Mr. SHELBY, Mrs. KASSEBAUM, Mr. NICKLES, Mr. REID, Mr. LOTT, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. ROTH, Mr. WARNER, Mr. GRAMM, and Mr. THURMOND):

S. 667. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to improve procedures for the exclusion of aliens seeking to enter the United States by fraud; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PORT OF ENTRY INSPECTIONS ACT OF 1993

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce legislation to address a very serious immigration prob-

lem at our Nation's international ports of entry. Because of the loopholes that exist in current immigration law, large numbers of illegal aliens are entering the United States at our major points of entry, claiming asylum and then disappearing into the interior of our country.

The problem is particularly acute in international airports. During fiscal year 1991, the latest year for which we have figures, approximately 37,000 aliens sought illegal entry, either with fraudulent documents or no documents. These aliens have discovered a certainty. Given our Government's limited detention space, they will likely be paroled into the community at large with a work permit—which, of course, is the most valuable of documents—if they can simply indicate a desire to apply for asylum in the United States. Although these aliens are directed by the Immigration Service to return on a particular date to pursue an asylum application, the majority simply fail to do so.

At New York's John F. Kennedy Airport for the last 6 months of 1991, 1,855 out of 3,100 aliens who were paroled—that means allowed to enter the country temporarily—failed to appear for any hearing on their claim of asylum status. The problem is a growing one. The Immigration Service has advised us that asylum cases at JFK this year are 300 percent above the number in 1991.

The amendment we offer today would address this problem while at the same time preserving and protecting the rights of those aliens who present legitimate, good-faith applications for asylum. This amendment provides that any alien who uses a fraudulent document to enter the United States or who uses a document to board an airplane overseas but fails to present that document upon arrival in the United States would be subject to an immediate order of exclusion by an immigration officer.

What is happening is that persons will board the aircraft with documents, arrive at the port of entry and say, "I have no documents." Some have actually ingested their documents. Some have flushed them, literally. And then they step off the aircraft and say, "I am an asylee." Because we have limited detention facilities at JFK for example, then they are simply released into the community with a document that says: Be sure and come back for your hearing in 14 or 18 months. And they say: "Yes, of course, I will."

I will say that the Los Angeles International Airport acquired more detention space, and once they did that, it relieved that problem immeasurably because the aliens knew they would have to wait, and they would not be able to simply go out into the community. I think that is something that must also be addressed here.

By enabling the Immigration Service to immediately remove these illegal

aliens, we will deter those abroad who seek a free pass into the United States from inundating our airports, and we will spare U.S. communities the burden and potential risks of persons on whom we have no background information whatsoever, no health records, no criminal checks, no nothing—a truly weird way to run the country's immigration system.

The bill would still protect those aliens who have legitimate claims to refugee status but who attempt to enter the country without proper documents—we do understand due process in this magnificent country; the problem is so many know how to misuse our due process. The legislation would prevent the Immigration Service from immediately removing any alien who has a credible fear of persecution in the country to which he or she would be returned. This determination of a credible fear of persecution would be made by a specially trained asylum officer at the port of entry. If an alien had such a fear, he or she would be paroled in the United States, and a hearing on the merits of the asylum on his or her asylum claim would be held.

Similar legislation was passed by the Senate in 1982 and 1984 and passed by the House in 1984 as part of the Immigration Reform and Control Act. As the occupant of the chair knows, there has been a lot of thoughtful work by many Republicans and Democrats for many years on these issues. I consider some of my finest allies in this cause to be some of the Democratic Party in the U.S. House of Representatives.

Unfortunately, the summary exclusion provision was not included in the final version of that legislation which was enacted in 1986. Nonetheless, previous support for this important enforcement tool is noteworthy. This is not some extreme, harsh or radical proposal, but rather one with broad public and bipartisan support. I share with my colleagues the names of the cosponsors of the bill: myself, of course, as sponsor; Senators BYRD, D'AMATO, SHELBY, KASSEBAUM, NICKLES, REID, LOTT, HOLLINGS, ROTH, WARNER, GRAMM, and THURMOND.

While the legislation I introduce today is more specific than the 1984 version, the intent and the effect is quite similar. It is quite simply put thusly: Legitimate seekers of political asylum should not be turned away at international ports of entry, but those who seek to abuse our very generous immigration and refugee laws to enter this country illegally should swiftly, surely and certainly be removed.

This legislation is urgently needed. It addresses a problem that has become more critical over these past years, the past 2 years especially. It is important to close this all too convenient loophole for illegal aliens to enter our country under the guise of a frivolous claim of persecution—a serious misuse

of the cherished grant of asylum, and it must stop. We believe that this is a very valid method to attempt to do just that.

Madam President, I expect that some of the cosponsors of the measure may come to the floor and speak on behalf of this bill today or tomorrow, and I will certainly welcome their comments. I felt it appropriate to proceed at this time.

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. 667

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 "Port of Entry Inspections Improvement Act of 1993".

SEC. 2. ADMISSIONS FRAUD.

(a) EXCLUSION FOR FRAUDULENT DOCUMENTS OR FAILURE TO PRESENT DOCUMENTS.—Section 212(a)(6)(C) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(6)(C)) is amended—

(1) by striking "(C) MISREPRESENTATION" and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(C) FRAUD, MISREPRESENTATION, AND FAILURE TO PRESENT DOCUMENTS";

(2) by adding at the end the following new clause:

"(iii) FRAUDULENT DOCUMENTS AND FAILURE TO PRESENT DOCUMENTS.—

"(I) Any alien who, in seeking entry to the United States or boarding a common carrier for the purpose of coming to the United States, presents any document which, in the determination of the immigration officer to whom the document is presented, is forged, counterfeit, altered, falsely made, stolen, or inapplicable to the alien presenting the document, or otherwise contains a misrepresentation of a material fact, is excludable.

"(II) Any alien who, in boarding a common carrier for the purpose of coming to the United States, presents a document which relates or purports to relate to the alien's eligibility to enter the United States, and fails to present such document to an immigration officer upon arrival at a port of entry into the United States, is excludable."

(b) PROVISION FOR ASYLUM AND OTHER DISCRETIONARY RELIEF.—

(1) Section 208 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1158) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsections:

"(e)(1) Notwithstanding subsection (a), any alien who, in seeking entry to the United States or boarding a common carrier pursuant to direct departure to the United States, presents any document which, in the determination of the immigration officer to whom the document is presented, is fraudulent, forged, stolen, or inapplicable to the person presenting the document, or otherwise contains a misrepresentation of a material fact, may not apply for or be granted asylum, unless presentation of the document was pursuant to direct departure from—

"(A) a country in which the alien has a credible fear of persecution; or

"(B) a country in which there is a significant danger that the alien would be returned to a country in which the alien would have a credible fear of persecution.

"(2) Notwithstanding subsection (a), an alien who, in boarding a common carrier pursuant to direct departure to the United States, presents any document which relates or purports to relate to the alien's eligibility to enter the United States, and who fails to present such document to an immigration official upon arrival at a port of entry into the United States, may not apply for or be granted asylum, unless presentation of such document was pursuant to direct departure from—

"(A) a country in which the alien has a credible fear of persecution; or

"(B) a country in which there is a significant danger that the alien would be returned to a country in which the alien would have a credible fear of persecution.

"(3)(A) Whenever an immigration officer determines that an alien seeks entry to the United States as described in paragraph (1) or (2) and that the alien has indicated a desire to apply for asylum, the immigration officer shall refer the matter to an immigration officer specially trained to conduct interviews and to make determinations bearing on eligibility for asylum, who shall interview the alien to determine whether presentation of the document was pursuant to direct departure from—

"(i) a country in which the alien has a credible fear of persecution; or

"(ii) which there is a significant danger that the alien would be returned to a country in which the alien would have a credible fear of persecution.

"(B) If the immigration officer determines that the alien does not have a credible fear of persecution in the country from which the alien was last present before attempting entry into the United States, and that there is no significant danger that the alien would be returned from such country to a country in which the alien would have a credible fear of persecution, the alien may be specially excluded and deported in accordance with section 235(e). The alien may not appeal such determination.

"(4) As used in this subsection, the term 'credible fear of persecution' means—

"(A) it is more probable than not that the statements made by the alien in support of his or her claim are true; and

"(B) there is a significant possibility, in light of such statements and of such other facts as are known to the officer about country conditions, that the alien could establish eligibility as a refugee within the meaning of section 101(a)(42)(A)."

(2) Section 212(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(c)) is amended in the third sentence by inserting before the period "or to any alien who is excludable pursuant to section 212(a)(6)(C)(iii)".

(3) Section 235 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1225) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(d)(1) Subject to paragraph (2), any alien, who has not been admitted to the United States and who is excludable under section 212(a)(6)(C)(iii), is ineligible for withholding of deportation pursuant to section 243(h), and may not apply for withholding of deportation or for any other relief under this Act, except as provided in section 208(e) with respect to asylum.

"(2) An alien under paragraph (1) who has been found ineligible to apply for asylum under section 208(e) may be returned only—

"(A) to a country in which, in the judgment of an immigration officer specially trained to conduct interviews and to make determinations bearing on eligibility for

asylum, the alien has no credible fear of persecution upon return; and

"(B) to a country from which, in the judgment of such officer, there is no significant danger that the alien would be returned to a country in which the alien would have a credible fear of persecution."

(4) Section 237(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1227(a)) is amended—

(A) in the second sentence of paragraph (1) by striking out "Deportation" and inserting in lieu thereof "Subject to section 235(d)(2), deportation"; and

(B) in the first sentence of paragraph (2) by striking out "If" and inserting in lieu thereof "Subject to section 235(d)(2), if".

SEC. 3. SPECIAL PORT OF ENTRY EXCLUSION FOR ADMISSIONS FRAUD.

Section 235 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1225) (as amended by section 2(b)(3) of this Act) is amended by adding after subsection (d) the following new subsection:

"(e)(1) Subject to paragraph (2), any alien (including an alien crewman) who may appear to the examining immigration officer or to the special inquiry officer during the examination before either of such officers to be excludable under section 212(a)(6)(C)(iii) may be ordered specially excluded and deported by the Attorney General, either by a special inquiry officer or otherwise.

"(2)(A) An alien who has been found ineligible to apply for asylum under section 208(e) may be returned only—

"(i) to a country in which, in the judgment of an immigration officer specially trained to conduct interviews and to make determinations bearing on eligibility for asylum, the alien has no credible fear of persecution upon return; and

"(ii) to a country from which, in the judgment of such officer, there is no significant danger that the alien would be returned to a country in which the alien would have a credible fear of persecution.

"(B) Such special exclusion order is not subject to administrative appeal and shall have the same effect as if the alien has been ordered excluded and deported pursuant to section 236, except that judicial review of such an order shall not be available under section 106 or, except by habeas corpus as herein provided, under any other provision of law.

"(C) Nothing in this subsection may be construed as requiring an inquiry before a special inquiry officer in the case of an alien crewman."

SEC. 4. RESTRICTIONS ON JUDICIAL REVIEW.

Section 235 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1225) (as amended by section 3 of this Act) is amended by adding after subsection (e) the following new subsections:

"(f) ALIENS EXCLUDABLE FOR ADMISSIONS FRAUD.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no court shall have jurisdiction to review, except by petition for habeas corpus, any determination made with respect to an alien found excludable for admissions fraud pursuant to section 212(a)(6)(C)(iii). In any such case, review by habeas corpus shall be limited to examination of whether the petitioner (1) is an alien, and (2) was ordered specially excluded from the United States pursuant to sections 212(a)(6)(C)(iii) and 235(e).

"(g) INTERVIEWS AND SPECIAL EXCLUSION.—(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no court shall have jurisdiction—

"(A) to review the procedures established by the Attorney General for the determination of admissions fraud pursuant to section 212(a)(6)(C)(iii); or

"(B) to enter declaratory or injunctive relief with respect to the implementation of subsection (d) or (e).

"(2) Notwithstanding the nature of the suit or claim, no court shall have jurisdiction (except by habeas corpus petition as provided in subsection (f)) to consider the validity of any adjudication or determination of special exclusion or to provide declaratory or injunctive relief with respect to the special exclusion of any alien.

"(h) COLLATERAL ENFORCEMENT PROCEEDINGS.—In any action brought for the assessment of penalties for improper entry or re-entry of an alien under sections 275 and 276, no court shall have jurisdiction to hear claims collaterally attacking the validity of orders of exclusion, special exclusion, or deportation entered under sections 235, 236, and 242."

SEC. 5. ENHANCED PENALTIES FOR CERTAIN ALIEN SMUGGLING.

Section 274(a)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1324(a)(1)) is amended—

(1) by striking "five years" and inserting "ten years"; and

(2) by inserting before the period at the end of paragraph (1) ", except that in any case in which a person causes serious bodily injury to, or places in jeopardy the life of, any alien involved in the offense, such person shall be fined in accordance with the provisions of title 18, United States Code, or imprisoned not more than 20 years for each alien with respect to whom any violation of this paragraph occurs, or both."

SEC. 6. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act and the amendments made by this Act shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act, and such amendments shall apply to aliens who arrive in or seek admission to the United States on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

Mr. ROTH. Today, Mr. President, I rise to cosponsor the Port of Entry Inspections Improvement Act of 1993, which Senator SIMPSON is introducing today. This legislation will help remedy serious deficiencies in America's immigration system. These deficiencies have been linked to recent acts of terrorism within our borders, including the bombing of the World Trade Center and the shootings outside the CIA.

For example, Mir Aimal Kansi, who is suspected of shooting five people outside CIA headquarters last month, demonstrated the ease by which illegal aliens can enter our country, stay for extended periods of time and even legally work. Did Kansi sneak into our country in the dead of night? No, he simply flew into New York, presented what is believed to be a phony business visa, overstayed his visa and a year later, applied for political asylum. Upon applying for asylum, Kansi was issued a work permit and used this permit to get a Social Security number and a Virginia driver's license, which allowed him to purchase the AK-47 he used to kill two innocent people and wound three others. Although almost a year had passed between the time Kansi's asylum petition was filed and the date of the shootings, no immigration hearing had taken place. Kansi

has since fled the country, and is the subject of a worldwide manhunt.

The American people are calling on the Congress to take a serious look at the impact of our immigration procedures. The legislation I join in introducing today is directed at the tens of thousands of illegal aliens who arrive at United States ports of entry every year with fraudulent documents or no documents whatsoever, but are nevertheless allowed into the United States by making phony asylum claims.

Under current law, while undocumented or fraudulently documented illegal aliens are subject to exclusion, few are actually excluded. Such aliens simply take advantage of our overburdened asylum system. Any illegal alien arriving at a U.S. airport today who asks for political asylum, whatever the merit of the claim, will be released into the general population within a minimum of a few hours and a maximum of a few days. Due to a severe shortage of detention space, and a serious backlog of asylum cases, those who come to the United States asserting an asylum claim generally cannot be detained until their asylum hearing. In the interim period, the Immigration and Naturalization Service has no means of tracking the asylum applicants, and as a result, thousands of aliens never appear for their asylum hearings.

Since passage of the Refugee Act of 1980, over 100,000 asylum cases have been administratively closed by INS, primarily due to the applicant's failure to appear for the asylum interview. It is clear that the system is being exploited, and that the word is out around the globe that anyone can gain immediate access into the United States, at virtually no risk.

Under the legislation introduced today, those who arrive in the United States lacking legitimate documentation, and claim asylum, will immediately go before a special immigration officer, who will seek to determine if such an alien possesses a credible fear of persecution in the country from which the alien departed. Those who have such a credible fear will be granted access to the full asylum application process. Those who clearly lack a legitimate claim will immediately be excluded from the United States.

Further, Mr. President, this legislation takes aim at the spread of international alien smuggling networks, which are taking advantage of our immigration system to earn enormous profits. The business of alien smuggling was the subject of an investigation I initiated in June of 1991 into Asian organized crime. The 15-month investigation conducted by the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations found that Chinese alien smuggling groups, many of which are run by Chinese organized crime figures, have successfully smuggled thousands of illegal

Chinese aliens into the United States over the past several years.

These smuggling organizations charge up to \$30,000 per person for travel and entry into the United States. The smugglees are generally poor residents of China who cannot afford to pay the entire smuggling fee up front. As a result, when these aliens arrive in the United States, they often must choose between paying the smuggling fee by working in low-wage jobs in so-called sweat shops or by committing crimes on behalf of organized street gangs with ties to the smuggling organizations. Those who refuse these options face the possibility of kidnapping or even torture.

While the total size of the Chinese alien smuggling industry is not easily quantified, one recent study includes information on a total of 108,975 aliens smuggled from China to the United States between 1983 and 1992, and concludes that smuggling entities are currently collecting more than \$250 million per month.

Current penalties available for use against organized alien smuggling enterprises are grossly inadequate. The average sentence is currently less than 6 months in prison. Given the lucrative profits currently being earned by alien smugglers, such penalties do not provide an adequate deterrent. The legislation introduced today would double the maximum penalty for alien smuggling from 5 to 10 years, and would allow for sentences of up to 20 years in cases in which the defendant causes serious bodily injury or puts the life of an alien in jeopardy in the course of the offense.

I urge my colleagues to support the legislation introduced today, which offers a common sense approach to the currently widespread abuse of our immigration system.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Mr. President, the public was shocked by reports that the shooting at the CIA headquarters and the bombing of the World Trade Center were carried out by people who were in this country by claiming political asylum. In many cases, the public saw on primetime television how easy it is to enter the United States through our international airports and other points of entry by claiming asylum.

Not only is it easy to enter the country, but also to remain for years, working legally while asylum claims are adjudicated.

There is no question that our asylum process is severely strained and undermined by this abuse. Originally, when the law was passed in 1980, fewer than 5,000 persons per year, who were current residents of the United States, were expected to seek asylum. The claims were to be handled on an individual basis.

Today, that number has increased to about 8,000 claims a month, and the system is swamped. The backlog of

cases is now over 200,000, assuring years of waiting for asylum seekers. Even then, most people do not even show up for their asylum hearings, having disappeared into the general population.

Swelling the ranks of asylum seekers are throngs of people whose passage is arranged by smugglers. The people who are smuggled into the United States often find themselves indentured servants, having to work off the cost of the passage by prostitution, pornography, drug dealing, sweat shop labor, and other illegal activities.

Until decisive steps are taken to stop it, this abuse of our generous asylum laws will only worsen. This has been a growing problem for years. The shooting at the CIA headquarters and the bombing of the World Trade Center were wake up calls. Now is the time for corrective action.

I urge prompt consideration of a proposal that has been thought through very carefully, the Port of Entry Inspection and Improvement Act of 1993. This legislation would correct the current abuses and at the same time protect those aliens who present legitimate asylum claims.

By Mr. SPECTER (for himself, Mr. SIMON, Mr. DECONCINI, Mr. HATCH, and Mr. BROWN):

S. 668: A bill to amend title IX of the Civil Rights Act of 1968 to increase the penalties for violating the fair housing provisions of the act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

FAIR HOUSING RIGHTS AMENDMENTS ACT OF 1993

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I came over a little earlier, Mr. President, because I wanted to introduce legislation known as the Fair Housing Rights Amendments of 1993 and did not have a change to secure the floor until the distinguished Senator from South Dakota finished. I had a brief conversation with the Senator from West Virginia. So I appreciate this time.

Mr. President, I am again introducing a bill I have introduced in both the 101st Congress as S. 2966 and the 102d Congress as S. 1697, the Fair Housing Rights Amendments Act. The legislation, drafted at the behest of the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice, has enjoyed the support of a bipartisan group of cosponsors, and I hope that the new administration will support it. The bill is designed to close a gap in the provisions of the Fair Housing Act, title IX of the Civil Rights Act of 1968, prohibiting criminal intimidation or interference with the exercise of fair housing rights.

In the 101st Congress, the bill was unanimously polled out of the Subcommittee on the Constitution of the Judiciary Committee, but there was not sufficient time for its consideration by the full Committee. In the last Congress, S. 1697 was passed by the Senate by unanimous consent near the

close of the second session, but the House failed to act on the bill. Therefore, I am introducing the legislation once more. This year, I hope the bill receives prompt consideration and approval by both bodies.

Current law proscribes the use of intimidation, force, or threat of force to willfully injure, intimidate, or interfere with a person's exercise of rights secured by Federal fair housing laws. Unless acting as part of a conspiracy, a person who violates this provision may not be prosecuted for a felony under Federal law unless death or injury results. Thus, the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice has been presented with cases in which homes were firebombed and destroyed for the purpose of intimidating the residents, but because, thankfully, no deaths or injuries resulted, these crimes could not be prosecuted as felonies under the fair housing laws. Of course, these acts do violate current Federal law, but only as misdemeanors.

Clearly, there is a loophole of injustice that must be closed. It is beyond discussion that firebombings or the commission of some similar intimidating crimes should be punished as felonies—whether or not someone is killed or injured. It is equally irrelevant that the perpetrator is acting alone.

Closing this gap in felony coverage under the current Fair Housing Act is all that this legislation is designed to accomplish. The bill would make it a felony for an individual acting alone to use force, or the threat of force to intimidate or interfere with the exercise of rights guaranteed by the Fair Housing Act if the defendant's action results in property damage exceeding \$100 or if the defendant uses or carries a firearm in the commission of the offense. If these conditions are not satisfied, then the violation would remain a misdemeanor. The bill creates no new Federal crime; it merely makes an act that is currently a misdemeanor and subjects it to the more stringent penalties for commission of a felony.

In addition, the legislation would conform the penalties available for criminal intimidation under the fair housing laws to those mandated by section 3571(b) of title 18 of the United States Code. Thus, the bill works no change in currently applicable fines and jail sentences, except to the extent that the bill establishes a sentence of up to 5 years for the new substantive violation established in the legislation.

Mr. President, this legislation is not controversial. It is needed to close a gap in the criminal provisions of the fair housing laws. The Senate passed identical legislation last year, and I hope we can act quickly to do so this year.

I ask for unanimous consent that a copy of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 668

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 "Fair Housing Rights Amendments Act of 1993".

SEC. 2. PENALTIES FOR ACTS OF VIOLENCE OR INTIMIDATION.

Section 901 of the Act entitled "An Act to prescribe penalties for certain acts of violence or intimidation, and for other purposes", approved April 11, 1968 (known as the "Civil Rights Act of 1968"; Public Law 90-284; 42 U.S.C. 3631), is amended to read as follows: "SEC. 901. PREVENTION OF INTIMIDATION IN FAIR HOUSING CASES.

"(a) UNLAWFUL ACTS.—It shall be unlawful to use force or threat of force, whether or not acting under color of law, to willfully injure, intimidate, or interfere with, or attempt to injure, intimidate, or interfere with—

"(1) any person because of the race, color, religion, sex, handicap, familial status, or national origin of the person and because the person is or has been selling, purchasing, renting, financing, occupying, or contracting or negotiating for the sale, purchase, rental, financing, or occupation of any dwelling, or applying for or participating in any service, organization, or facility relating to the business of selling or renting dwellings; or

"(2) any person because the person is, or has been, or in order to intimidate the person or any other person or any class of persons from—

"(A) participating, without discrimination on account of race, color, religion, sex, handicap, familial status, or national origin, in any of the activities, services, organizations, or facilities described in paragraph (1) of this section; or

"(B) affording another person or class of persons opportunity or protection so to participate; or

"(3) any citizen because the citizen is, or has been, or in order to discourage the citizen or any other citizen from lawfully aiding or encouraging other persons to participate, without discrimination on account of race, color, religion, sex, handicap, familial status, or national origin, in any of the activities, services, organizations, or facilities described in paragraph (1), or participating lawfully in speech or peaceful assembly opposing any denial of the opportunity so to participate.

"(b) PENALTIES.—Whoever commits an act described in subsection (a)—

"(1) shall be fined not more than \$100,000, or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both;

"(2) that results in bodily injury shall be fined not more than \$250,000, or imprisoned not more than 10 years, or both;

"(3) that results in death shall be subject to imprisonment for any term of years or for life; and

"(4) that results in property damage exceeding the sum of \$100, or uses or attempts to use fire in committing the act, or uses or carries a firearm while committing the act, shall be fined not more than \$250,000, or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both.

"(c) DEFINITIONS.—As used in this section: "(1) FAMILIAL STATUS.—The term 'familial status' has the meaning given the term in section 802.

"(2) FIREARM.—The term 'firearm' has the meaning given the term in section 921(a)(3) of title 18, United States Code.

"(3) HANDICAP.—The term 'handicap' has the meaning given the term in section 802.

"(4) BODILY INJURY.—The term 'bodily injury' has the meaning given the term in section 1515(a)(5) of title 18, United States Code."

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 183

At the request of Mr. REID, the names of the Senator from Utah [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. WARNER], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CRAIG], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. GORTON] were added as cosponsors of S. 183, a bill to authorize the President to award a gold medal on behalf of the Congress to Richard "Red" Skelton, and to provide for the production of bronze duplicates of such medal for sale to the public.

S. 208

At the request of Mr. BUMPERS, the names of the Senator from Kansas [Mrs. KASSEBAUM], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. CHAFEE] were added as cosponsors of S. 208, a bill to reform the concessions policies of the National Park Service, and for other purposes.

S. 216

At the request of Mr. D'AMATO, the names of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HELMS], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SHELBY], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. LUGAR], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. FAIRCLOTH], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. DOLE] were added as cosponsors of S. 216, a bill to provide for the minting of coins to commemorate the World University Games.

S. 317

At the request of Mr. DECONCINI, the name of the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUE] was added as a cosponsor of S. 317, a bill to reform Customs Service operations, and for other purposes.

S. 359

At the request of Mr. DECONCINI, the name of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. LIEBERMAN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 359, a bill to require the Secretary of Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial, and for other purposes.

S. 412

At the request of Mr. EXON, the name of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. COCHRAN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 412, a bill to amend title 49, United States Code, regarding the collection of certain payments for shipments via motor common carriers of property and nonhousehold goods freight forwarders, and for other purposes.

S. 487

At the request of Mr. DANFORTH, the names of the Senator from Montana [Mr. BAUCUS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. FAIRCLOTH], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL]

were added as cosponsors of S. 487, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend and modify the low-income housing tax credit.

S. 573

At the request of Mr. BREAUX, the name of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. COCHRAN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 573, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a credit for the portion of employer Social Security taxes paid with respect to employee cash tips.

S. 585

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Utah [Mr. HATCH] was added as a cosponsor of S. 585, a bill to provide greater access to civil justice by reducing costs and delay, and for other purposes.

S. 636

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the names of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. PACKWOOD], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. KRUEGER] were added as cosponsors of S. 636, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to permit individuals to have freedom of access to certain medical clinics and facilities, and for other purposes.

S. 657

At the request of Mr. CHAFEE, the name of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. CONRAD] was added as a cosponsor of S. 657, a bill to reauthorize the Indoor Radon Abatement Act of 1988, and for other purposes.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 53

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the names of the Senator from California [Mrs. FEINSTEIN], the Senator from Florida [Mr. MACK], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GREGG], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CRAIG] were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 53, a joint resolution designating March 1993 and March 1994 both as "Women's History Month".

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 56

At the request of Mr. BIDEN, the names of the Senator from New York [Mr. D'AMATO], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. CONRAD] were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 56, a joint resolution to designate the week beginning April 12, 1993, as "National Public Safety Telecommunications Week".

SENATE RESOLUTION 24

At the request of Mr. DANFORTH, the name of the Senator from Illinois [Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Resolution 24, a resolution urging the criminal prosecution of persons committing crimes against humanity, including participation in mass rapes, in Bosnia-Herzegovina.

SENATE RESOLUTION 83—RELATIVE AUTHORIZING USE OF THE HART BUILDING ATRIUM FOR A CONCERT BY THE CONGRESSIONAL CHORUS

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

S. RES. 83

Resolved, That the atrium of the Senate Hart Office Building May be used from 12:00 noon until 1:00 p.m. On one day during the spring and one day during the winter of each session of the One Hundred Third Congress, for a concert of American music to be presented by the Congressional Chorus.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS

COHEN AMENDMENT NO. 278

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. COHEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H.R. 1335) making emergency supplemental appropriations for fiscal year ending September 30, 1993, and for other purposes, as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following new section:

SEC. . REFORM OF THE DAVIS-BACON ACT.

(a) AMENDMENT.—Section 1(a) of the Act of March 3, 1931, as amended (46 Stat. 1494; 40 U.S.C. 276a(a)), commonly known as the Davis-Bacon Act) is amended by striking "\$2,000" and inserting "\$1,000,000".

(b) PROHIBITION ON DIVISION OF CONTRACTS.—Section 1 of the Act of March 3, 1931, as amended (46 Stat. 1494; 40 U.S.C. 276a), commonly known as the Davis-Bacon Act) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections.

"(c) Any person entering into a contract under which wages are to be determined in accordance with this Act shall not divide the contract into contracts of \$1,000,000 or less if the contract would not have been so divided but for the purpose of avoiding the application of this Act.

"(d) If the Secretary of Labor determines that a division of a contract has occurred for the purpose described in subsection (c), the Secretary may—

"(1) require that the contract (or grant, or other instrument providing Federal financing or assistance related to the contract) be amended so as to incorporate retroactively all the provisions and stipulations that would have been required under this Act, or under other provisions of law governing the applicable prevailing wage, if the contract had not been so divided; and

"(2) require the contracting or assisting agency (or the recipient of Federal financing or assistance related to the contract) or any other entity that awarded the contract (or the instrument providing Federal financing or assistance related to the contract) in violation of this section, to compensate the contractor (grantee, or other recipient of Federal assistance, as appropriate) for payment to each affected laborer or mechanic, or—

"(A) the amount equal to the difference between—

"(i) the rate received by the laborer or mechanic; and

"(ii) the applicable prevailing wage rate; and

"(B) the interest on such amount, calculated at the rate payable under section 6621(c)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 for an underpayment referred to in such section, from the date the work was performed by such laborer or mechanic.

"(e) The Secretary shall make no determination that a division of a contract for a project has occurred for the purpose described in subsection (c) unless the Secretary has notified the agency or entity in question not later than 180 days after completion of construction on the project that an investigation will be conducted concerning an alleged violation of this section."

(c) APPLICATION TO RELATED LAWS.—The Act of March 3, 1991, as amended (46 Stat. 1494; 40 U.S.C. 276a(a), commonly known as the Davis-Bacon Act) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 7. APPLICATION TO RELATED LAWS.

"No provision of law requiring the payment of prevailing wage rates determined by the Secretary in accordance with this Act shall apply—

"(1) to contracts for construction, alteration, or repair involving not more than \$1,000,000; or

"(2) in the case of rent supplements or other assistance for which the method of Federal financing or assistance does not have an aggregate dollar amount, where the assisted project is in the amount of not more than \$1,000,000."

(d) CONFORMING AMENDMENT TO THE COPELAND ACT.—The Act of June 13, 1934, as amended (48 Stat. 948; 40 U.S.C. 276c, commonly known as the Copeland Act) shall not be applicable to contracts that are not subject to coverage under the Act of March 3, 1931, as amended (46 Stat. 1494; 40 U.S.C. 276a(a), commonly known as the Davis-Bacon Act), as amended by subsections (a) and (b).

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) APPLICATION TO CERTAIN CONTRACTS.—The amendments made by this section shall not apply with respect to any contract—

(A) in existence on the date of enactment of this Act; or

(B) made pursuant to an invitation for bids outstanding on such date.

**BROWN (AND OTHERS)
AMENDMENT NO. 279**

Mr. BROWN (for himself, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. COVERDELL, Mr. GRAMM, Mr. NICKLES, and Mr. GRASSLEY) proposed an amendment to the bill (H.R. 1335), *supra*, as follows:

On page 56, line 7, strike "\$2,536,000,000" and insert "\$2,432,486,654".

On page 56, line 24, strike the period, and insert a colon and the following: "Provided further, That none of the foregoing amount may be used to assist the following projects:

"(1) Foster Park tennis and basketball court resurfacing and color coating in Evanston, Illinois.

"(2) Anthony Oats Park and pool renovation in Evansville, Indiana.

"(3) Expansion of shopping center at 165th Street, in Hammond, Indiana.

"(4) Miscellaneous pool repairs in Birmingham, Alabama.

"(5) Tennis court resurfacing in Florence, Alabama.

"(6) Orpheum Theatre renovation in Phoenix, Arizona.

"(7) Alan Witt Park aquatics facility and ball fields in Fairfield, California.

"(8) MLK Park, construction of 27,000 square foot community recreation center with indoor pool, in Los Angeles, California.

"(9) Fairmount Park boathouse restoration in Riverside, California.

"(10) Villegas Park soccer field in Riverside, California.

"(11) Ocean Beach commercial revitalization project in San Diego, California.

"(12) Art Ark, 29-unit new construction live and work unit, in San Francisco, California.

"(13) Swimming Pool refurbishment in Thornton, Colorado.

"(14) Poli/Majestic Theatres in Bridgeport, Connecticut.

"(15) Northwood Cemetery drainage system and roadway in cemetery in Hartford, Connecticut.

"(16) Facade improvement, renovation of 47 commercial building facades in Hartford, Connecticut.

"(17) Construct ice skating warming hut at Union Pond Park in Manchester, Connecticut.

"(18) Greens Harbor Beach in New London, Connecticut.

"(19) Capitol Theater in New London, Connecticut;

"(20) Golf course, parks, recreation, in Daytona Beach, Florida.

"(21) Key West Bight Marina development in Key West, Florida.

"(22) Whispering Pines Park, recreation center, in Port St. Lucie, Florida.

"(23) New Jersey Performing Arts Center in Newark, New Jersey.

"(24) West Las Vegas Arts Center in Las Vegas, Nevada.

"(25) Basketball court at Fox Hill Park in St. Charles, Missouri.

"(26) Inkster Community Shopping Center, 50,000-60,000 commerce shopping center project in Inkster, Michigan.

"(27) Northwest Family Center, with two gymnasiums, indoor pool and outside ball fields, in Huntsville, Alabama.

"(28) Optimist Park athletic facility (indoor and outdoor) baseball field, gymnasium and soccer field in Huntsville, Alabama.

"(29) Desert West Park in Phoenix, Arizona.

"(30) Construction of youth park project to include baseball, soccer, tennis, gymnasium, roads, utilities, and lighting in Jonesboro, Arkansas.

"(31) Soccer field improvements in Bell Gardens, California.

"(32) Agua Mansa Cemetery, historical site restoration work, in Colton, California.

"(33) Fairfield Sports Park, in Fairfield, California.

"(34) Construct youth sports complex, including baseball, soccer, softball, and other athletic fields in Merced, California.

"(35) Tuolumne River Regional Park, amphitheater and softball complex in Modesto, California.

"(36) Improvements to Barnes Park (tennis court relocation, infrastructure) in Monterey Park, California.

"(37) Improvements to Elder Park (tennis courts, bathrooms, picnic areas, ADA compliance) in Monterey Park, California.

"(38) Reconstruct swimming pool in CDBG area in South Gate, Georgia.

"(39) Playground renovations, 35th Street Ballfield, Loveland Playground, Hil-Dar/Housing Authority in Wheeling, West Virginia.

"(40) Storefront Rehabilitation, rehabilitation of storefronts in central business district in Grand Forks, North Dakota.

"(41) Renovation of historic mill for sports shop complex in Central Falls, Rhode Island.

"(42) Construction of an alpine slide and restaurant at Parque del Turabo recreational facility in Gaguas, Puerto Rico.

"(43) Marketplace and art craft center in Adjuntas, Puerto Rico.

"(44) Brewery District Theater, construction of a new movie theater, in Columbus, Ohio.

"(45) Falcon Park Baseball Stadium Redevelopment Project in Auburn, New York.

"(46) Proctors Theater, roofing, completion of roof repair on historic downtown theater in Troy, New York.

"(47) Constitution Soccer Field, grade field and construct 6 adult and 4 youth soccer fields, construct parking lots, restroom structure and concession stand in Salinas, California.

"(48) Civic center expansion in San Leandro, California.

"(49) Downing Neighborhood Shopping Center, a 25,000 square foot retail strip located in an inner-city neighborhood in Denver, Colorado.

"(50) HCO/Hi-Ho site work in Bridgeport, Connecticut.

"(51) Boykin Community Center, construction of a new gymnasium and reroofing the building in Auburn, Alabama.

"(52) Gymnasium lighting, North Birmingham Recreation Center, Howze-Sanford Recreation Center, and Ft. Heights Recreation Center in Birmingham, Alabama.

"(53) Miscellaneous park improvements, shelter repairs (picnic) in Birmingham, Alabama.

"(54) Buffalo Ridge Park in Phoenix, Arizona."

**FOOD STAMP ACT OF 1977
AMENDMENT ACT OF 1993**

PRESSLER AMENDMENT NO. 280

Mr. HATFIELD (for Mr. PRESSLER) proposed an amendment to the bill (S. 284) to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1977 to permit a State agency to require households residing on reservations to file periodic reports of income and household circumstances, and to remove the requirement that a State agency establish a procedure for staggered issuance of coupons for eligible households residing on reservations, and for other purposes, as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. REPORTING AND STAGGERED ISSUANCE FOR HOUSEHOLDS ON RESERVATIONS.

Section 908(a) of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act Amendments of 1991 (Public Law 102-237; 7 U.S.C. 2015 note and 7 U.S.C. 2016 note) is amended by striking "April 1, 1993" both places it appears and inserting "January 31, 1994".

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Commit-

tee on Armed Services be authorized to meet on Monday, March 29, 1993, at 9:30 a.m., in open session, to receive testimony on the military policy concerning the service of gay men and lesbians in the Armed Forces: The historical and legal background.

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

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Monday, March 29, at 3:30 p.m. to hold nomination hearings on George E. Moose, to be Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs.

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

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO DONALD EPLEY AND CHARLIE WILKINSON FOR THEIR 115 YEARS OF SERVICE TO THE HARTLAND TOWNSHIP COMMUNITY

• Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I want to honor Don Epley and Charlie Wilkinson today, two men who between them have dedicated more than 100 years of service to the Hartland Township community.

Hartland Township, located 45 miles northwest of my hometown of Detroit, MI, is a close-knit community of 7,000 people. Don and Charlie, at 87 and 84 years young respectively, have dedicated themselves to serving their neighbors over the years.

Active in Scouting, health, and welfare issues and taking leadership roles in activities helping seniors and the young people in Hartland, Don and Charlie have exemplified the best kind of community involvement. Most notably, however, since retiring they have given 100 percent of their time to volunteer firefighting activities, and both remain active today.

Don Epley, with 65 years of very active duty, holds the title of the longest, active duty firefighter in Michigan. In fact, it is quite possible Don holds that title for the entire United States. With 50 years of volunteer service, Charlie Wilkinson is Michigan's second longest active duty firefighter.

It is clear to see, Mr. President, why Don and Charlie's friends, families, and neighbors view them as part of the heart of Hartland Township. Hartland is truly fortunate to have two such unselfish and giving individuals. Every community should be so blessed.●

TRIBUTE TO LARRY WOODARD

• Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to an outstanding citizen of my home State of New Mexico. I am very proud to honor Mr.

Larry Woodard, who has devoted 35 years of his life to public service in the Bureau of Land Management of the Department of the Interior.

Mr. Woodard began his distinguished career with the Bureau of Land Management in 1957 after completing his education at Oregon State University. Larry's first assignment with BLM was in Roseburg, OR. Shortly after that he was assigned to the Bureau office in Portland, OR, where he served until 1964. Larry then transferred to Washington, DC until 1969. Following additional appointments in the field he assumed the State director's position in New Mexico in 1987.

Larry has skillfully met the difficult challenges that come with managing the checkerboard and multiple-use lands of the West. He has earned the respect of ranchers, conservationists, wildlife enthusiasts and other groups who do not always agree on the appropriate use and management of public lands. Larry deserves our profound respect for the way he has managed the BLM in New Mexico. He has implemented many changes in his agency that will benefit all New Mexicans for decades to come.

Larry is a recipient of the Department of Interior's Distinguished Service Award, and has over the years represented the Department on many task forces and commissions. He is a trustee of the New Mexico Nature Conservancy and has been selected for inclusion in "Who's Who in the West."

Larry will retire from the Bureau in April of this year. He and his wife Bette have three children and five grandchildren and plan to make their home in Idaho. New Mexicans will miss him and his distinguished record of achievement.●

HONORING THE HEBREW FREE LOAN SOCIETY

• Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, I rise today to honor the Hebrew Free Loan Society of New York for its contribution to the financial security of the city of New York and its surrounding counties for the past 100 years. I wish to commend the work that this society is doing to restore dignity to their less fortunate neighbors.

The Hebrew Free Loan Society, during its century of service, has extended more than \$1 million in loans to immigrants of all races and creeds. The society has based its organization on the central principle that we must help others to help themselves. In this way, one is ensuring not only the financial stability of the other, but also preserving one's self-respect and self-dependency.

In a rapidly changing society, increasing numbers of people are emigrating to the United States every year. Each seeks the American dream. Organizations like the Hebrew Free

Loan Society help immigrants in America, the land of opportunity. The United States was founded by men and women seeking the same opportunities as immigrants do today. They work hard to fulfill their dreams but they need a helping hand from those that have already accomplished their goals. These struggling individuals deserve the same opportunities that our ancestors had over the decades and the Hebrew Free Loan Society has understood this. As the grandson of immigrants, I know the value of having friends to lend a hand when someone is in need.

I have always been a firm believer in the principle of helping others to help themselves, so I am particularly appreciative and supportive of the work that the Hebrew Free Loan Society is doing. It is important for new immigrants in the United States to know that they are not alone. The receipt of interest-free loans from this unique organization enables people to start new lives with dignity. This country was built through the hard work of immigrants and we must not forget that.

It is important to recognize the Hebrew Free Loan Society as an organization that seeks to provide assistance in a spirit of dignity through loans and service. Thus, I am honored to have this opportunity to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the Hebrew Free Loan Society and to recognize the important work that they are doing for the people of New York.●

TRIBUTE TO DUPONT MANUAL HIGH SCHOOL AND OTHER PARTICIPANTS IN THE KENTUCKY SPEECH FESTIVAL

• Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, it is with a great sense of pride that I rise today in order to inform my colleagues of the winners of the Kentucky Speech Festival.

The winner of the overall team title was Dupont Manual High School. Mr. President, I take particular pride in announcing this honor because I was a graduate of Manual High School.

There were many other participants and winners in the competition, among them Andy Spears of South Oldham High School, who won the Gifford Blyton Book Award for outstanding contributions to his school and community. In addition, B.J. Tinsley of Crittenden County High and Lynda Jeffries of Pleasure Ridge Park High were recipients of \$1,000 scholarships.

Mr. President, I ask my colleagues to join me in the pleasant task of saluting my alma mater as well as the other winners. I ask that an article from the Courier Journal be inserted in the RECORD.

The article follows:

MANUAL WINS SWEEPSTAKES AT SPEECH FESTIVAL

DuPont Manual High School captured first place in the team-debate sweepstakes of the

Kentucky Speech Festival held at Western Kentucky University over the weekend.

Manual had 52 points, South Oldham High School took second place with 39 points, and Covington Latin was third with 38 points.

The Gifford Blyton Book Award, named after the retired director of speech and debate at the University of Kentucky, went to Andy Spears of South Oldham for outstanding contributions to his school and community.

Blyton also established two \$1000 scholarships for the winners of an essay contest on the value of speech and debate.

This year's recipients were Lynda Jeffries of Pleasure Ridge Park High and B.J. Tinsley of Crittenden County High.

Ellen Lord and Dalton Lyon of Lexington's Henry Clay High were the top varsity debate team. Second place went to Elishia Cohen and Amanda Walker of Manual, and Pleasure Ridge Park's Jeffries and Leslie Smith took third.

Individual varsity debate awards went to Leslie Smith of Pleasure Ridge Park, Aaron Whaley of Jeffersonton High, Jennifer Smith of Manual and Ellen Lord of Henry Clay.

In the novice debate-team category, Holly King and Sarah Reece of Eastern High took first place, and Joey LaMere and Fiona Mack of Manual finished second.

Chris Miller and Sarah Leong of Covington Latin placed third, and Becca Byrd and Tom Hearn of Ballard were fourth.

Covington Latin High captured the top three places in novice policy speech.

The Kentucky High School Speech League and Western's departments of communications and broadcasting sponsored the event. Eight of the 12 debate teams were from Jefferson County. •

VERMONT DECLARED A WORLD WISE SCHOOLS STATE

• Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, as chairman of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee, I have the pleasure and responsibility of working quite closely with the Peace Corps. It is a matter of great personal pride that Vermont has provided more Peace Corps volunteers per capita than any other State in the Nation.

Vermont's special relationship with the Peace Corps took on an added dimension today with the proclamation of Vermont as a World Wise Schools State. I'd like to congratulate and commend the Peace Corps, Governor Dean, Commissioner of Education Richard Mills, and most importantly, the Green Mountain Returned Peace Corps Volunteers for their hard work and dedication to add Vermont to the States benefiting from this program.

Our returned volunteers have been effectively sharing their Peace Corps experience with Vermonters for many years. Now they are enhancing their efforts by bringing the World Wise Schools Program to Vermont youths. They have brought to this project the same zeal and energy that made them terrific Peace Corps volunteers, and I would like to salute them on this important achievement.

The World Wise Schools Program, established by the Peace Corps in 1989, is

a global education program serving American students in grades 3 through 12. The goals of the program are threefold: To encourage the study of geography, promote cultural understanding, and to help our Nation's youth recognize the importance of volunteer service. To achieve these goals the program provides correspondence matches between American classes and Peace Corps volunteers serving overseas, resource packets consisting of videos and study guides with information on the countries where Peace Corps volunteers serve, and classroom visits by returned volunteers to share their Peace Corps experiences.

The World Wise Schools Program has been endorsed by the National Geographic Society. In its short 3-year history, the program has reached some 140,000 American students. In my State, 32 schools are participating to the benefit of 800 young Vermonters.

Anyone who has looked at education studies in the last two decades knows that many American students have a very poor grasp of geography. In today's world, that puts our Nation at a serious competitive disadvantage. The Peace Corps World Wise Schools Program provides an innovative way to enhance cultural and geography awareness while reinforcing good citizenship. In our changing world, one that is more interdependent and interactive than ever, it is very important that our students learn all they can about the people and countries outside our borders.

I am delighted that Vermont has become the 17th State to officially proclaim itself a World Wise Schools State. I again congratulate the Green Mountain Returned Peace Corps Volunteers for their excellent work on this project. I highly recommend the World Wise Schools Program to all my colleagues. •

TRIBUTE TO DR. JOHN LOGAN

• Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I would like to take a moment from today's debate to recognize the accomplishments of Dr. John Logan, the medical director at Community Methodist Hospital in Henderson, KY.

Dr. Logan has long been an active member in his community. A medical school graduate of Vanderbilt University, he returned to Kentucky following his postgraduate training at Toledo Hospital in Ohio. Over the years, Dr. Logan has provided more than medical care to his fellow Kentuckians; his chairmanship of various fund raising efforts successfully led to State funding of a new civic auditorium and technical building at Henderson Community College.

Recently, Dr. Logan was honored by the Henderson Chamber of Commerce by being selected as its distinguished citizen of the year. In noting his work

with a wide variety of organizations and associations, he was recognized as a model volunteer, and ideal patron, an enthusiastic, cheerful supporter of this area and its inhabitants.

Dr. Logan revealed his deep appreciation for his community and fellow citizens when he remarked that, "[t]his is a great place. It's not a great place because we have buildings. It's not a great place because we have technology. It's a great place because we have great people."

Mr. President, I know my colleagues join me in honoring this great Kentuckian and in extending our heartfelt congratulations on his many achievements. So that my colleagues may learn more of Henderson's distinguished citizen of the year, I ask that a copy of an article that appeared in the *Gleaner* be included in the *RECORD* following my remarks.

The article follows:

[From the Henderson (KY) *Gleaner*, Mar. 17, 1993]

CHAMBER NAMES LOGAN CITIZEN OF YEAR (By Frank Boyett)

Longtime resident Dr. John Logan got what he called his "citizenship papers" Tuesday night when the Henderson Chamber of Commerce honored him as its distinguished citizen of the year.

A litany of his public service was recited by Marianne Walker, who nominated him for the honor.

"He is a model volunteer, an ideal patron, an enthusiastic, cheerful supporter of this area and its inhabitants," she said.

Logan has helped a wide variety of organizations and causes, but she said she first became acquainted with him in 1979 when he volunteered to help organize a hospice program, which eventually evolved into St. Anthony's Hospice 10 years ago.

More recently, she said, Logan served as chairman of two important fund-raising projects: One that led to state funding of the new civic auditorium and technical building at Henderson Community College and the other provided computer laboratories in every school in Henderson County.

A native of Brownsville, in Edmondson County, Logan attended high school and college in Bowling Green, and medical school at Vanderbilt University. He came here shortly after completing his post-graduate training at Toledo Hospital in Toledo, Ohio.

Logan, 55, resigned from his family practice in 1986 to become medical director at Community Methodist Hospital, a post he still holds.

An old professor told him "to be a good doctor you've got to be a good citizen," Logan said. He apparently took that advice to heart.

"I'm thankful tonight that after 30 years here I've finally gotten my citizenship papers," he said. "I hope over the next 30 years we can leave this community a better place. * * *

"This is a great place. It's not a great place because we have buildings. It's not a great place because we have technology. It's a great place because we have good people."

During the many fund-raising campaigns he has been involved in, he said, "I've leaned hard on a lot of people * * * for the benefit of the community. The list is long."

But he said he always got a good response to his "leaning" and always reminded those

who gave: "It's not for me—you're honoring your community."*

THE ANNIVERSARY OF THE IMPRISONMENT OF WEI JINGSHENG

• Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. President, I rise on this the 14th anniversary of the imprisonment of Wei Jingsheng, China's longest serving political prisoner, to celebrate a great honor bestowed upon him today by the Gleitsman Foundation. As a recipient of the Gleitsman Foundation's International Activist Award, Wei Jingsheng is being recognized for his leadership in the fight for democracy in China.

I also rise, Mr. President, to report that Wei Jingsheng's jailer, the People's Republic of China, continues to violate basic principles of human rights with reckless abandon, especially in regard to its political prisoners.

Wei Jingsheng has been confined in a Chinese prison for the last 14 years because he dared to speak his mind. Despite his imprisonment, he has inspired a whole generation of democracy advocates to challenge the repressive status quo in China.

Wei Jingsheng came to the attention of the human rights community in China, and around the world, as the founder of a magazine dedicated to the exploration of a variety of political views. In his journal, *Explorations*, he called attention to the plight of China's political prisoners and published several articles on democracy which were critical of the Chinese Government. His writings and his prescient words that Deng Xiaoping was becoming a new autocrat got him arrested and sentenced to a 15-year prison term in 1979. Throughout his prison term, he has been monitored by a team of special security personnel and has been repeatedly subjected to solitary confinement. Wei Jingsheng is now reportedly imprisoned on a salt farm, where he is confined to a tiny cell and permitted to speak only to his guards.

During the period of his imprisonment, Wei Jingsheng's health has deteriorated. He is reported to suffer mental disorders and has lost almost all his teeth, due to the lack of access to medical attention. This mistreatment is not due to any lack of attention by higher authorities. Indeed, Mr. President, Deng Xiaoping has reportedly taken a personal interest in his imprisonment and has his office regularly kept informed of his condition.

Chinese authorities have gone so far as to pressure his parents to shun Wei Jingsheng. Still, he remains unrepentant in his view and has not renounced his commitment to freedom of expression. He remains a popular figure among democracy activists and free thinkers in China. In fact, a petition for Wei Jingsheng's release signed by dozens of China's intellectuals marked

the beginning of the peaceful, prodemocracy movement in the spring of 1989 which was so brutally crushed in June.

Mr. President, one of the basic principles of international law is respect for the national sovereignty, territorial integrity, and political independence of other nations. Consistent with this principle, the nations of the world have been encouraged to refrain from interfering in the domestic affairs of their fellow nations. The principle of noninterference was a cornerstone of international relations when the United Nations first came into existence almost 50 years ago. But another principle that has gained stature over the years is the obligation of states to respect the human rights of their own citizens. The principles of national sovereignty and respect for human rights sometimes conflict. One stark example of this conflict is China's inhumane treatment of political prisoners.

The leaders of China urge noninterference in their internal affairs, but they should no longer be allowed to hide behind the shield of national sovereignty and assault the human rights of their own people. It is our duty to speak out for civility, decency, and respect for free thought and liberty. We cannot continue to let the principle of respect for national sovereignty keep us from forcefully challenging China's human rights practices.

China has imprisoned people simply for organizing prodemocracy groups. Once imprisoned, they have been brutally beaten and tortured, treatment far worse than that afforded the common criminal. Though the Chinese penal system expressly seeks to help all its prisoners to become useful members of society, it only serves retributive, deterrent, and vindictive ends when dealing with political prisoners.

What is clear, Mr. President, is the contrast between official descriptions of how prisoners are reformed and the autobiographical accounts of that process by individual prisoners. The official version claims that prisoners improve their situation through technical schools and recreational activities. Prisoners' accounts include chilling tales of beatings by policemen and common criminals, foul living conditions, torture, and daily deprivation.

In response to growing international criticism and pressure, the People's Republic of China has issued a white paper on "Human Rights in China." It has also improved the treatment of a few well-known dissidents held in Beijing. However, the treatment of many dissidents held in other places has not improved, and in some cases, it has even worsened.

In the preamble of the white paper, the People's Republic of China claims that no person will be subjected to criminal punishment merely because he holds divergent political opinions. It

even asserts that there are no political prisoners in China. Mr. President, this is obviously not the case. Organizing a peaceful prodemocracy movement is not an act of treason, but people in China have been jailed for doing so.

The white paper also suggests that as long as people do not incite an armed rebellion or engage in espionage activities they will not be punished. In practice, however, the Chinese Government is extremely intolerant of dissenting political views and there have been countless instances where the Chinese Government has violated its own standards.

One former political prisoner, Liu Qing, was convicted on charges that were fabricated by the Government. The prosecution dismembered his writings and created a text to convict him on. He was imprisoned merely because the Government saw him as a threat to the political status quo. The white paper states that courts employ a system of public trials. However, at Liu Qing's trial, only Government officials were present; no ordinary citizens, family, or friends were allowed to attend.

The treatment political prisoners receive in Chinese prisons is reprehensible. In the United States penal system a person convicted of treason would not be treated differently from a common criminal. However, in China the treatment of political prisoners is often worse. The white paper says torture is forbidden. Yet political prisoners are subject to frequent beatings and torture from the minute they arrive at the prison.

Political prisoners are often not permitted to exercise or work; that is, forced to sit completely still for 12 hours a day or forced to work more than 12 hours a day. Performance quotas for political prisoners are often set higher than those set for other prisoners. If these quotas are not met, then political prisoners are often forced to work on Sundays. In contrast, non-political criminals who work more than 8 hours a day receive overtime privileges which are not available to political prisoners.

The Chinese Government claims that it allows all prisoners to read newspapers and magazines, watch television, listen to the radio, and take part in recreational activities. This is just not the case for political prisoners. They are often placed in solitary confinement where they have no access to these amenities. The Government also claims that political prisoners have the right to contact and remain in correspondence with family members. However, family members are not allowed to visit or correspond with prisoners when the authorities do not want the outside world to know how they are being treated. Like the pressure it exerted on the family of Wei Jingsheng, the Chinese Government often at-

tempts to intimidate a political prisoner's family into shunning or denouncing him.

Mr. President, the Chinese penal system supposedly guarantees medical treatment to its prisoners. Not so for political prisoners. Ren Wanding, a leading dissident, is in danger of losing his eyesight, yet nothing is being done to help him. Others have heart conditions and other ailments that remain untreated. The Chinese claim to have an ideal criminal justice system, but that claim in no way reflect reality.

The United States must not turn a blind eye to these human rights abuses. Nor should it tactfully condone them. It must instead call them as it sees them, and press for their cessation.

Economic sanctions are among the possible means to induce compliance with international standards of human rights. Diplomacy, both public and quiet, is another. The pressure of public opinion is a third. The United States should press for guaranteed access by humanitarian organizations to China's prisons and labor reform enterprises. When abuses are found, the Chinese Government should have to acknowledge and explain them, and either change its ways or continue to come under international pressure. The United States should also seek verifiable commitments by China to abide by international standards of respect for human rights.

Mr. President, five dissidents, Wang Dan, Guo Haifeng, Wang Xizhe, Li Guiren, and Zhu Hongsheng, were recently released early from prison, indicating that China might respond to further international pressure and change its policies. But there are still many hundreds, maybe even thousands of political prisoners in China. Though the releases appear encouraging, 40 or more arrests have also been made just since June 1992. So, it is premature, at best, to conclude that any fundamental change in Chinese policy has occurred.

Mr. President, as we approach the 21st century, the United States will be looked to, more and more, as a defender of human rights. Operating as a standard-bearer of human rights is a daunting task, but it is not one from which we as a Nation should shrink, especially when the need is so compelling. I urge my colleagues to mark this anniversary of Wei Jingsheng's imprisonment with a renewed commitment of vigilance toward human rights abuses in China. The amazing courage demonstrated by Wei Jingsheng and others shows that our vigilance provides sustenance for those who continue to struggle against repression in China. Let us not forget them as we seek ways to deal with, and influence, the People's Republic of China. •

TRIBUTE TO THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CHILDREN'S DAY NURSERY IN PASSAIC, NJ

• Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. President, the Children's Day Nursery, in Passaic, NJ, is among an elite group of day care centers in America that can claim a century of service to over four generations of disadvantaged families within its community. I would ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating the Children's Day Nursery as it commemorates its centennial anniversary today.

Quality day care is a priority in our modern world. So many, many families must seek dependable child care arrangements, and we all know there just are not enough qualified resources. Yet the Children's Day Nursery has been a safe, nurturing haven for hundreds of thousands of inner-city children from diverse ethnic origins for a remarkable 100 continuous years. The center is an invaluable support for the city of Passaic, a well-known source of pride in the State of New Jersey, and an outstanding model for the rest of the country.

I applaud the impressive history and important future of the Children's Day Nursery. On behalf of our Nation, I send best wishes for continued growth, service, and leadership. •

ORDERS FOR TOMORROW

Mr. MITCHELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in recess until 10:30 a.m. on Tuesday, March 30; that following the prayer, the Journal of proceedings be deemed approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that there then be a period for morning business not to extend beyond 11 a.m. with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 5 minutes each, with Senator GRAMM of Texas recognized for up to 10 minutes; that at 11 a.m., the Senate resume consideration of H.R. 1335, the emergency supplemental appropriations bill; and that on Tuesday, the Senate stand in recess from 12:30 p.m. until 2:15 p.m. in order to accommodate the regular party conferences.

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

PROGRAM

Mr. MITCHELL. Madam President, so that Senators may be aware, a vote will occur at 11 a.m. when the Senate resumes consideration of the pending bill. The Senate will vote on a motion to reconsider the vote by which the Senate failed to table the pending Brown amendment. That vote will occur at 11 a.m. Senators should be

present and ready to vote at that time.

RECESS UNTIL TOMORROW AT 10:30 A.M.

Mr. MITCHELL. Madam President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate today, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess as previously ordered.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 9:42 p.m. recessed until Tuesday, March 30, 1993, at 10:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 29, 1993:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

THOMAS R. PICKERING, OF NEW JERSEY, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, WITH THE PERSONAL RANK OF CAREER AMBASSADOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

RONALD K. NOBLE, OF NEW YORK, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY, VICE PETER K. NUNEZ, RESIGNED.

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER TO BE PLACED ON THE RETIRED LIST IN THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 1370:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. ROBERT D. CHELBERG, **xxx-xx-x...** U.S. ARMY.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER TO BE PLACED ON THE RETIRED LIST IN THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 1370:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. JOSEPH S. LAPOSATA, **xxx-xx-x...** U.S. ARMY.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE OF LIEUTENANT GENERAL WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 601(A):

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. MARVIN L. COVAULT, **xxx-xx-x...** U.S. ARMY.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE OF LIEUTENANT GENERAL WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 601(A):

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. RICHARD F. KELLER, **xxx-xx-x...** U.S. ARMY.

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER TO BE PLACED ON THE RETIRED LIST IN THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 1370:

To be vice admiral

VICE ADM. ROGER F. BACON, **xxx-xx-x...** U.S. NAVY.

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR PERMANENT PROMOTION IN THE U.S. AIR FORCE, UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 628, TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, AS AMENDED, WITH DATES OF RANK TO BE DETERMINED BY THE SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE.

MEDICAL CORPS

To be lieutenant colonel

ROOSEVELT GREEN, **xxx-xx-x...**
SANFORD D. ZELNICK, **xxx-xx-x...**

MEDICAL CORPS

To be major

YVONNE D. CAGLE, **xxx-xx-x...**
RICHARD J. MONTMINT, **xxx-xx-x...**

DENTAL CORPS

To be lieutenant colonel

GARDNER G. BASSETT, **xxx-xx-x...**

THE FOLLOWING CADETS, U.S. MILITARY ACADEMY, FOR APPOINTMENT AS SECOND LIEUTENANT IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE, UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF SECTIONS 541 AND 531, TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, WITH DATES OF RANK TO BE DETERMINED BY THE SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE.

LORI L. BROWN xxx-xx-x-
CHARLES A. COOK xxx-xx-x-
JOHN W. DABERKOW xxx-xx-x-
STEPHEN M. GEORGIAN xxx-xx-x-
SCOTT E. HAYFORD xxx-xx-x-
KRAIG M. HILL xxx-xx-x-
ALEX B. MCKINDRA, JR. xxx-xx-x-
JEREMY M. SLAGLEY xxx-xx-x-
AMIT Y. YORAN xxx-xx-x-

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS, ON THE ACTIVE DUTY LIST, FOR PROMOTION TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE U.S. ARMY IN ACCORDANCE WITH SECTIONS 624 AND 628, TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE. THE OFFICERS IDENTIFIED WITH AN ASTERISK ARE ALSO BEING NOMINATED FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE REGULAR ARMY IN ACCORDANCE WITH SECTION 531, TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE.

MEDICAL CORPS

To be colonel

*GARY D. DAVIS xxx-xx-x-

MEDICAL CORPS

To be lieutenant colonel

*JOHN A. RICHMOND xxx-xx-x-

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

To be lieutenant colonel

RONALD C. HARRISON xxx-xx-x-

MEDICAL CORPS

To be major

*BRIAN J. O'HEA xxx-xx-x-
*MICHAEL SZKRYBALO xxx-xx-x-

ARMY NURSE CORPS

To be major

*DONALD W. GILMORE xxx-xx-x-

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS, ON THE ACTIVE DUTY LIST, FOR PROMOTION TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY IN ACCORDANCE WITH SECTION 624, TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE. THE OFFICERS IDENTIFIED BY ASTERISK ARE ALSO NOMINATED FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE REGULAR ARMY IN ACCORDANCE WITH SECTION 531, TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE:

DENTAL CORPS

To be colonel

RUFUS Y. BANDY xxx-xx-x-
E. J. BELFGLIG xxx-xx-x-
RONALD W. BICE xxx-xx-x-
CONRAD F. BODAI xxx-xx-x-
PAUL A. CANNAVA xxx-xx-x-
MICHAEL J. CARINO xxx-xx-x-
DAVID L. CARR xxx-xx-x-
GERALD D. COX xxx-xx-x-
JOHN W. DAVIS xxx-xx-x-
ELADIO DELBON, JR. xxx-xx-x-
NORMAN B. FARRAR xxx-xx-x-
LINCOLN D. FRETWELL xxx-xx-x-
STEVEN C. GUY xxx-xx-x-
BENJAMIN S. * HANSON xxx-xx-x-
BRADFORD W. HARPEL xxx-xx-x-
JOHN C. HARRELL xxx-xx-x-
KARL K. HARRIS xxx-xx-x-
GENOUS S. HODGES xxx-xx-x-
TIMOTHY K. JONES xxx-xx-x-
MARK G. KOCH xxx-xx-x-
RONALD J. LAMBERT xxx-xx-x-
MICHAEL J. LECLAIR xxx-xx-x-
ROBERT J. LOUSHINE xxx-xx-x-
JACK B. MEYER xxx-xx-x-
SCOTT G. MINNICH xxx-xx-x-
JOHN R. ONEAL xxx-xx-x-
CHARLES W. PALLAN xxx-xx-x-
MERLE H. PARKER xxx-xx-x-
RICHARD L. PARSONS xxx-xx-x-
JAMES M. PODNAR xxx-xx-x-
PHILIP K. RADTKI xxx-xx-x-
THOMAS RICHARDSON xxx-xx-x-
CHARLES L. RINGGOLD xxx-xx-x-
ROY A. ROCKMAN xxx-xx-x-
JOHN J. ROSS xxx-xx-x-
DENNIS A. RUNYAN xxx-xx-x-
GRETCHEN A. SCHAUB xxx-xx-x-
DENNIS L. SLOPEY xxx-xx-x-
DAVID W. SMITH xxx-xx-x-
JAMES W. * STRIDER xxx-xx-x-
BRUCE H. THOMPSON xxx-xx-x-
EDWIN A. TRIP xxx-xx-x-
ROBERT H. * VANDRE xxx-xx-x-
JOHN E. VOLZ xxx-xx-x-
ANDREW A. VORONO xxx-xx-x-
RICHARD WARRINGTON xxx-xx-x-
DAVID A. WITWER xxx-xx-x-

MEDICAL CORPS

To be colonel

RICHARD L. * ALLEN xxx-xx-x-
THOMAS R. BABONIS xxx-xx-x-
VICTOR C. BELL xxx-xx-x-
JOHN M. BLOUGH xxx-xx-x-
JAMES H. BRIEN xxx-xx-x-
ALFRED B. * BROOKS xxx-xx-x-
RICHARD L. BROYLES xxx-xx-x-
JOHN F. * BRUNDAGE xxx-xx-x-
ARTHUR B. * BUCKNER xxx-xx-x-
TONY CARTER xxx-xx-x-
BRUCE A. COOK xxx-xx-x-
GERALD M. CROSS xxx-xx-x-
VIRGIL T. * DEAL xxx-xx-x-
DAVID P. DETEN xxx-xx-x-
CALVIN B. * DELAPLAN xxx-xx-x-
ALBERT C. * DIDDAMS xxx-xx-x-
BENEDICT M. * DINIEN xxx-xx-x-
WILLIAM E. * DUNCAN xxx-xx-x-
JOSEPH E. DYER xxx-xx-x-
JOSEPH E. * DIAZ xxx-xx-x-
EUGENE T. * ETZKORN xxx-xx-x-
HENRY G. FEIN xxx-xx-x-
JOSEPH FITZHARRIS xxx-xx-x-
JAMES L. FLEMING xxx-xx-x-
GARY L. FRANCIS xxx-xx-x-
EDWARD B. FREYFELDER xxx-xx-x-
JOHN W. * GARDNER xxx-xx-x-
JOHNNIE B. * HALL xxx-xx-x-
MYRON * HARASYM xxx-xx-x-
JAMES T. * HARDY xxx-xx-x-
RICHARD T. * HARPER xxx-xx-x-
CHARLES E. * HENLEY xxx-xx-x-
DEBORAH L. HICKEY xxx-xx-x-
CHARLES B. * HICKS xxx-xx-x-
CHI K. HO xxx-xx-x-
JOHN C. HOLLAND xxx-xx-x-
DAVID L. * HOOVER xxx-xx-x-
JERRY W. * HOPE xxx-xx-x-
BRUCE L. INNIS xxx-xx-x-
DARRELL C. JEWETT xxx-xx-x-
GAIL M. * JOHNSON xxx-xx-x-
ROBERT V. * JONES xxx-xx-x-
RONALD J. JONES xxx-xx-x-
DONALD J. KASPER xxx-xx-x-
PATRICK C. * KELLY xxx-xx-x-
HOWARD M. * KIMES xxx-xx-x-
CHA O. * KOO xxx-xx-x-
KURT K. KROENKE xxx-xx-x-
JOHN P. * KUGLER xxx-xx-x-
WILLIAM N. LANE xxx-xx-x-
DAVID H. LEEPER xxx-xx-x-
PHILIP G. * LISAGOR xxx-xx-x-
THOMAS V. MAROLDI xxx-xx-x-
ARTHUR S. * MASLOW xxx-xx-x-
ALLAN R. * MAYER xxx-xx-x-
MICHAEL H. MAYER xxx-xx-x-
MICHAEL * MCCAFFERTY xxx-xx-x-
MICHAEL * MCDERMOTT xxx-xx-x-
THEODORE R. * MCNITT xxx-xx-x-
HERNANDO MENA xxx-xx-x-
FRANK M. * MOSES xxx-xx-x-
EVERETT W. * NEWCOM xxx-xx-x-
JOHN C. * NORBECK xxx-xx-x-
STEPHEN G. * OSWALD xxx-xx-x-
ALLAN L. PARKER xxx-xx-x-
RICHARD H. * PEARMAN xxx-xx-x-
STEVE E. PHURROUGH xxx-xx-x-
JAMES L. * PITTMAN xxx-xx-x-
CAROLYN D. RANDLE xxx-xx-x-
ROBERT R. * REDFIELD xxx-xx-x-
MATTHEW M. * RICE xxx-xx-x-
ROBERT * SOLENBERG xxx-xx-x-
KWEON I. * STAMBAUGH xxx-xx-x-
DONALD L. * STEINWEG xxx-xx-x-
ANDREW M. * THOMPSON xxx-xx-x-
OYEWOLE M. TONEY xxx-xx-x-
KENNETH * TORRINGTON xxx-xx-x-
FRANK T. WARD xxx-xx-x-
JOHN M. * WESLEY xxx-xx-x-
THOMAS E. WISWELL xxx-xx-x-
JEREL M. * ZOLTICH xxx-xx-x-

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR PROMOTION IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE, UNDER THE APPROPRIATE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 624, TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, AS AMENDED, WITH DATES OF RANK TO BE DETERMINED BY THE SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE, AND THOSE OFFICERS IDENTIFIED BY AN ASTERISK FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 531, TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, WITH A VIEW TO DESIGNATION UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 8067, TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, TO PERFORM DUTIES IDENTIFIED PROVIDED THAT IN NO CASE SHALL THE FOLLOWING OFFICERS BE APPOINTED IN A GRADE HIGHER THAN INDICATED.

DENTAL CORPS

To be colonel

ALAN M. AKERS xxx-xx-x-
JAMES D. ALLMAN xxx-xx-x-
LARRY D. ANDERSON xxx-xx-x-
BARRY J. BAIORUNOS xxx-xx-x-
MARVIN D. BELL xxx-xx-x-
THOMAS E. BOYTIM xxx-xx-x-
WILLIAM P. CALDON xxx-xx-x-
DAVID F. CLAP xxx-xx-x-

TERRELL COHEN xxx-xx-x-
JOHN M. CORLEY xxx-xx-x-
WILLIAM E. CROOKS xxx-xx-x-
RICHARD H. DAY xxx-xx-x-
DENNIS C. DIXON xxx-xx-x-
GEORGE B. DOUGLAS xxx-xx-x-
JOHN R. EAST, III xxx-xx-x-
RICHARD S. FINLAYSON xxx-xx-x-
STEVEN A. FORSYTHE xxx-xx-x-
JAMES H. FOSTER xxx-xx-x-
GARY J. GOLDEN xxx-xx-x-
GARRETH S. GRAHAM xxx-xx-x-
FREDERICK G. GUERRA, JR. xxx-xx-x-
MARK S. HAGGE xxx-xx-x-
BRUCE K. HALL xxx-xx-x-
RAYMOND G. KOEPPEN xxx-xx-x-
NICHOLAS J. LEVERING xxx-xx-x-
MICHAEL W. MCDUFFIE xxx-xx-x-
THOMAS R. MENG, JR. xxx-xx-x-
MARION L. MESSERSMITH xxx-xx-x-
SHANNON E. MILLS xxx-xx-x-
TIMOTHY B. NEWLAND xxx-xx-x-
KENNETH C. PINKERTON xxx-xx-x-
LAWRENCE D. SCHMELTZER xxx-xx-x-
TYLER H. SLOCUMB, JR. xxx-xx-x-
DONALD M. SPRAGUE xxx-xx-x-
CLIFFORD B. STARR xxx-xx-x-
ALEXANDER J. WARSCHAW xxx-xx-x-
WILLIAM W. WILSON, JR. xxx-xx-x-
EDWARD F. WRIGHT xxx-xx-x-

MEDICAL CORPS

To be colonel

JAY S. ADAMS xxx-xx-x-
RUDOLPH P. ARNOLD xxx-xx-x-
MELVIN A. BAYNE xxx-xx-x-
DAVID M. BEAR xxx-xx-x-
ROBERT L. BECKMAN xxx-xx-x-
JAMES M. BENGE xxx-xx-x-
WINSTON H. BLAKE xxx-xx-x-
JAMES W. BOST xxx-xx-x-
DAVID M. BROWN xxx-xx-x-
JOSE B. BUENO xxx-xx-x-
MILDRED * CALERY xxx-xx-x-
JULIETA M. CALZADA xxx-xx-x-
HORACE R. CARSON xxx-xx-x-
GLENN A. CARTER xxx-xx-x-
CHUN C. CHOY xxx-xx-x-
PAUL B. CHRISTIANSON xxx-xx-x-
TOMMIE G. CHURCH xxx-xx-x-
TIMOTHY G. CLOONAN xxx-xx-x-
JEAN C. COMEAU xxx-xx-x-
FRANK J. CRIDDLE xxx-xx-x-
WADE A. CROWDER xxx-xx-x-
MARTIN E. EVANS xxx-xx-x-
MARC A. FRITZ xxx-xx-x-
CHARLES B. GREEN xxx-xx-x-
LILIANA Q. HALIM xxx-xx-x-
CHARLES R. HARRISON xxx-xx-x-
ROBERT A. HAWKINS xxx-xx-x-
BERNARD F. HEARON xxx-xx-x-
KENNETH D. HIRSCH xxx-xx-x-
BRENT M. HJERMSTAL xxx-xx-x-
RONALD K. HOYT xxx-xx-x-
JAY P. JACOB xxx-xx-x-
GREGORY J. JAFFERS xxx-xx-x-
SUDDHIR A. JAITUNI xxx-xx-x-
RENE G. JASO xxx-xx-x-
KIRBY E. KNOX xxx-xx-x-
DANIEL F. KOSLOFF xxx-xx-x-
MICHAEL R. KUSKIE xxx-xx-x-
CHRISTINE I. KWIK xxx-xx-x-
DON A. LAWRENCE xxx-xx-x-
PAUL H. LILLY, JR. xxx-xx-x-
WILLIAM I. LUNDEN xxx-xx-x-
ROGER L. MEHL xxx-xx-x-
WILLIAM L. MICHELE xxx-xx-x-
THOMAS H. NELSON xxx-xx-x-
BRUCE A. OKSOL xxx-xx-x-
RELPHORD E. PATTERSON xxx-xx-x-
HUBERT O. PLATTI xxx-xx-x-
GARY C. PRECHTER xxx-xx-x-
KENNETH D. RASHIL xxx-xx-x-
JAMES A. RUFFER xxx-xx-x-
MONIQUE A. RYSER xxx-xx-x-
DAVID G. SCHALL xxx-xx-x-
DAVID A. SCHENK xxx-xx-x-
KRIS M. SHEKITKA xxx-xx-x-
CHARLES L. SIMPSON xxx-xx-x-
KURT A. STONE xxx-xx-x-
FRANCIS A. STRATFORD, JR. xxx-xx-x-
GEORGE P. TAYLOR, JR. xxx-xx-x-
ROBERT J. THORPE xxx-xx-x-
EARL E. WALKER xxx-xx-x-
JAI C. WHANG xxx-xx-x-
RICHARD A. WILLIAMS xxx-xx-x-
HENRY S. K. WILLIS, II xxx-xx-x-
LAWRENCE W. WILSON xxx-xx-x-
NELSON T. YAP xxx-xx-x-
GLADYS E. YOUNG xxx-xx-x-

DENTAL CORPS

To be lieutenant colonel

STEVEN W. ABBOT xxx-xx-x-
JOHN L. ALONGE xxx-xx-x-
PETER C. ANTINOPOULOS xxx-xx-x-
JEFFERY F. BAKER xxx-xx-x-
SCOTT G. BERGH xxx-xx-x-
JOHN R. BETTINESCHI, JR. xxx-xx-x-
KEVIN F. BLAIR xxx-xx-x-

ROBERT F. BLODGETT, JR. xxx-xx-x-
 IRENE G. BOBERMOKEN xxx-xx-x-
 GARY A. BRAUN xxx-xx-x-
 GREGORY C. BROWNING xxx-xx-x-
 ORSON P. CARDON xxx-xx-x-
 THOMAS B. CARTER xxx-xx-x-
 DAVID G. CHARLTON xxx-xx-x-
 CEDRIC C. CHENET xxx-xx-x-
 JAMES L. COCKLIN xxx-xx-x-
 MICHAEL J. CONLAN xxx-xx-x-
 KEVIN A. CONNOR xxx-xx-x-
 DAVID E. CORMAN xxx-xx-x-
 CHRISTOPHER R. CULLITON xxx-xx-x-
 CARY J. GUNNINGHAM xxx-xx-x-
 CHARLES F. DEFREES xxx-xx-x-
 SCOTT S. DICKSON xxx-xx-x-
 EDWARD O. ERKE xxx-xx-x-
 MARK ESSICH xxx-xx-x-
 STEPHEN J. EFTERKAM xxx-xx-x-
 STEVEN C. FENZL xxx-xx-x-
 WILLIAM L. FOLEN xxx-xx-x-
 MELVIN L. FORT xxx-xx-x-
 ROBERT Q. FRAZER xxx-xx-x-
 DENNIS C. FUREY xxx-xx-x-
 MARTHA L. GARI xxx-xx-x-
 JAMES R. GILL xxx-xx-x-
 ROBERT J. GILLEN, II xxx-xx-x-
 BRENT L. GILLILAN xxx-xx-x-
 THOMAS A. GILLMAN xxx-xx-x-
 DAVID R. GORE xxx-xx-x-
 SCOTT E. GRAY xxx-xx-x-
 MARK R. GUILDER xxx-xx-x-
 JUDITH G. HILL xxx-xx-x-
 GEORGE C. HLUDZIN xxx-xx-x-
 SPENCER N. HOPKINS, JR. xxx-xx-x-
 WILLIAM G. HUGHES xxx-xx-x-
 MICHAEL L. HUTCHINGS xxx-xx-x-
 BRUCE A. JOHNSON xxx-xx-x-
 RAYMOND W. KAERCHER xxx-xx-x-
 ANTHONY A. KAMP xxx-xx-x-
 TERENCE J. KINYON xxx-xx-x-
 ANDREW R. KIOUS xxx-xx-x-
 JOHN KUSSMAUL, JR. xxx-xx-x-
 MAUREEN E. LANG xxx-xx-x-
 JOSEPH A. MARCHESE, JR. xxx-xx-x-
 HOWARD T. McDONNELL xxx-xx-x-
 ANDREW J. MESAROS, JR. xxx-xx-x-
 CRAIG E. MILLER xxx-xx-x-
 MARK D. MILLER xxx-xx-x-
 NICHOLAS J. MINIOTIS xxx-xx-x-
 RICHARD W. MORGAN xxx-xx-x-
 ELLIS J. NARCISSE, JR. xxx-xx-x-
 RONALD G. NELSON xxx-xx-x-
 ALAN E. PALMER xxx-xx-x-
 ROBERT C. PARKER xxx-xx-x-
 DIANE S. PAXTON xxx-xx-x-
 JON E. PICH xxx-xx-x-
 WILLIAM F. PIERCE xxx-xx-x-
 RONALD C. PRATT xxx-xx-x-
 RHETT M. QUISH xxx-xx-x-
 LISA D. RACKLEY xxx-xx-x-
 JASON M. RAMPTON xxx-xx-x-
 ODES B. ROBERTSON, JR. xxx-xx-x-
 RIDLEY O. ROSS xxx-xx-x-
 ROBERT SABATIN xxx-xx-x-
 SCOTT A. SCHWARTZ xxx-xx-x-
 ROSS E. SETHMAN xxx-xx-x-
 RANDY A. SHAFER xxx-xx-x-
 ALAN T. SMITH xxx-xx-x-
 JAY C. SMITH xxx-xx-x-
 KARL A. SMITH xxx-xx-x-
 OTHA L. SOLOMON, JR. xxx-xx-x-
 EMIL W. TETZNER xxx-xx-x-
 DALE C. THAMES, JR. xxx-xx-x-
 STEVEN J. THOMSON xxx-xx-x-
 ERIK M. TJELMELAND xxx-xx-x-
 LONDON K. TROIANI xxx-xx-x-
 THOMAS N. WANAT, JR. xxx-xx-x-
 STEVEN J. WHITNEY xxx-xx-x-
 GREGORY P. WILLIAMS xxx-xx-x-

MEDICAL CORPS

To be lieutenant colonel

LAURENCE J. ADAMS, JR. xxx-xx-x-
 RICARDO E. ALVILLAN xxx-xx-x-
 JOHN D. ANGSTADT xxx-xx-x-
 RAMON A. ARROYO PADR xxx-xx-x-
 DAVID P. ASCHER xxx-xx-x-
 THOMAS F. BABSON xxx-xx-x-
 MARK F. BARNETT xxx-xx-x-
 CHARLES W. BEADLING xxx-xx-x-
 CARL T. BERGREN xxx-xx-x-
 DANIEL K. BERRY xxx-xx-x-
 ROBERT N. BERTOLDI xxx-xx-x-
 ALAN F. BITNER xxx-xx-x-
 JAMES C. BLOOM xxx-xx-x-
 WILLIAM H. BOBBI xxx-xx-x-
 BRYAN C. BOMBERG xxx-xx-x-
 STEPHEN A. BRIETZ xxx-xx-x-
 ROBERT M. BUCHSBAUM, II xxx-xx-x-
 JAMES E. BURTON, II xxx-xx-x-
 ROBERT H. CAMPBELL xxx-xx-x-
 CAREY M. CAPELL xxx-xx-x-
 FRANCISCO CARRION TORRES xxx-xx-x-
 RONALD D. CATES xxx-xx-x-
 WALTER R. CAYCE xxx-xx-x-
 STEVEN L. CHAMBERS xxx-xx-x-
 GEORGE W. CHRISTOPHER xxx-xx-x-
 HAROLD E. COOK, III xxx-xx-x-
 CLARENCE E. COTTON, JR. xxx-xx-x-
 FRANK S. DAVIS xxx-xx-x-

BRADLEY J. DAWKINS xxx-xx-x-
 DEAN DEBENEDICTIS xxx-xx-x-
 KAREN C. H. DEERING xxx-xx-x-
 JAMES A. DERBY xxx-xx-x-
 GLENN E. DICKBY xxx-xx-x-
 ROBERT M. DIXON xxx-xx-x-
 WILLIAM E. DREW xxx-xx-x-
 JAY S. ELLIS, JR. xxx-xx-x-
 FREDERICK K. EMGE xxx-xx-x-
 MARC I. EPSTEIN xxx-xx-x-
 DAVID B. ETHIER xxx-xx-x-
 HAROLD H. FAIN, JR. xxx-xx-x-
 TIMOTHY E. FARLEY xxx-xx-x-
 JOSEPH C. FARMER xxx-xx-x-
 DOUGLAS K. FERNANDEZ xxx-xx-x-
 BRIAN J. FINLEY xxx-xx-x-
 MARK D. FORTE xxx-xx-x-
 CLIFFORD D. FRIEDMAN xxx-xx-x-
 DOUGLAS C. FULLER xxx-xx-x-
 MARY E. GABRIEL xxx-xx-x-
 CONLEY B. GAINER xxx-xx-x-
 ROBERT A. GARDNER xxx-xx-x-
 THOMAS E. GARRISON xxx-xx-x-
 GEORGE J. GIBBILY xxx-xx-x-
 PAUL R. GLOWIENKA xxx-xx-x-
 CHARLES D. GOLDMAN xxx-xx-x-
 JAMES S. GREEN xxx-xx-x-
 SPENCER D. GREENDYKI xxx-xx-x-
 MARY L. GREENE xxx-xx-x-
 ROLAND A. GRIEB xxx-xx-x-
 LINDA J. GRIFFITH xxx-xx-x-
 GARY S. GRONSETH xxx-xx-x-
 RANDAL L. HAMRIC xxx-xx-x-
 J. ALISON HANSON xxx-xx-x-
 CHARLES K. HARDIN xxx-xx-x-
 DONALD G. HILL xxx-xx-x-
 ALFRED J. HOCKLEY, III xxx-xx-x-
 BARBARA A. HOLCK xxx-xx-x-
 ARNOLD B. HONICK xxx-xx-x-
 MARK D. HOPKINS xxx-xx-x-
 GARY M. HOROWITZ xxx-xx-x-
 ROGERS G. HOWELL, II xxx-xx-x-
 EDWARD H. ILLIONS xxx-xx-x-
 MARK G. JANCZEWSKI xxx-xx-x-
 DANIEL J. JANIS xxx-xx-x-
 GEORGE P. JOHNSON xxx-xx-x-
 JOE S. JONES xxx-xx-x-
 DIANE L. JORDANWAGNER xxx-xx-x-
 RICHARD E. KARULF xxx-xx-x-
 KENNETH L. KAYLOR xxx-xx-x-
 MICHAEL P. KELLER xxx-xx-x-
 KENNETH S. KIM xxx-xx-x-
 STEPHEN M. KINNE xxx-xx-x-
 DAVID P. KISSINGER xxx-xx-x-
 PHILIP T. KLIZYNSKI xxx-xx-x-
 VICTOR R. KNAPP xxx-xx-x-
 TRISTAN E. KORU xxx-xx-x-
 THOMAS M. KOROSCHI xxx-xx-x-
 KIT D. KUSS xxx-xx-x-
 PHILIP A. LARKE xxx-xx-x-
 DAVID A. LAURENCE xxx-xx-x-
 JANICE L. LEH xxx-xx-x-
 JULIAN C. LEVIN xxx-xx-x-
 ERNEST B. LINDE xxx-xx-x-
 JUDITH A. LOMBEIDA xxx-xx-x-
 CHARLES W. MACKETT xxx-xx-x-
 STEPHEN F. MANCHESTER xxx-xx-x-
 MARY L. MAROHN xxx-xx-x-
 ALFRED W. MAZUR xxx-xx-x-
 JUDITH E. MCGHEE xxx-xx-x-
 JEFFREY J. McPHEE xxx-xx-xxxx
 FRANK W. MEISSNER xxx-xx-x-
 MICHAEL C. MERWIN xxx-xx-x-
 CATHERINE T. MILBOURN xxx-xx-x-
 GERHARD MOELLER xxx-xx-x-
 RAMON G. MONTESGARCES xxx-xx-x-
 RANDALL J. MOORE xxx-xx-x-
 ROBERT A. MUNSON xxx-xx-x-
 KIM D. MURPHY xxx-xx-x-
 PATRICIA L. MURRAYZARZOUR xxx-xx-x-
 JOHN C. MYERS xxx-xx-x-
 MARK T. NADEAU xxx-xx-x-
 MICHAEL J. NASH xxx-xx-x-
 WILLIAM D. NEAL xxx-xx-x-
 RICHARD L. NEEL xxx-xx-x-
 GUY M. NEWLAND xxx-xx-x-
 PETER J. NIGRO xxx-xx-x-
 DAVID S. NOLL xxx-xx-x-
 KEITH D. NORD xxx-xx-x-
 MARY A. ORZEC xxx-xx-x-
 ROBERT OSTERICHEN xxx-xx-x-
 LAWRENCE V. PAGE xxx-xx-x-
 WILLIAM A. PARKER, JR. xxx-xx-x-
 SUBHASH R. PATE xxx-xx-x-
 DOUGLAS E. PAULL xxx-xx-x-
 JON R. PEARSE xxx-xx-x-
 ROBERTO A. PENNECASANOVA xxx-xx-x-
 VAN E. PERRY xxx-xx-x-
 ALTON W. POWELL, III xxx-xx-x-
 MIGUEL A. RAMIREZ COLON xxx-xx-x-
 BRIAN H. REED xxx-xx-x-
 GREGORY T. REHE xxx-xx-x-
 MICHAEL W. RESTA xxx-xx-x-
 LAWRENCE M. RIDDLE xxx-xx-x-
 DANNY R. ROBINETTE xxx-xx-x-
 LUIS R. RODRIGUEZ COLON xxx-xx-x-
 ROBERT J. ROSS xxx-xx-x-
 FRANK J. ROWAN, III xxx-xx-x-
 JANICE M. RUSNAN xxx-xx-x-
 DAVID K. SCALES xxx-xx-x-
 KIM M. SCHOFFEL xxx-xx-x-
 JORGINA S. SCHREIBER xxx-xx-x-

LEIGH A. SCHWIETZ xxx-xx-x-
 JAY T. SEGARRA xxx-xx-x-
 CHARLES W. SHAPARD xxx-xx-x-
 GARY H. SHARP xxx-xx-x-
 NAOMI N. SHIELDS xxx-xx-x-
 DANIEL F. SHREEVE xxx-xx-x-
 SCOTT D. SHUMAKER xxx-xx-x-
 ANTONIA SILVAHALE xxx-xx-x-
 BRUCE D. SMITH xxx-xx-x-
 SANDRA E. SMITHFOLING xxx-xx-x-
 TERESA J. SOMMES xxx-xx-x-
 WOO K. SONG xxx-xx-x-
 MARVIN L. STANCHI xxx-xx-x-
 STANLEY H. STANGL xxx-xx-x-
 PAUL S. STONER, JR. xxx-xx-x-
 DIANE C. STROLLO xxx-xx-x-
 JOHN F. SWARTZ, III xxx-xx-x-
 WILLIAM S. SYKORA xxx-xx-x-
 EDWIN C. TELFER xxx-xx-x-
 BRUCE L. TJADEN xxx-xx-x-
 THOMAS W. TRAVIS xxx-xx-x-
 HOWARD R. UNGER, JR. xxx-xx-x-
 ANTHONY J. VANGOOR xxx-xx-x-
 DONALD R. VARNER, JR. xxx-xx-x-
 JOHN H. WAGONER xxx-xx-x-
 GARY M. WALKER xxx-xx-x-
 JANET M. WALKER xxx-xx-x-
 JAMES M. WATSON xxx-xx-x-
 KAREN K. WIES xxx-xx-x-
 JOHN E. WILLIAMS xxx-xx-x-
 DEBORAH A. WINGET xxx-xx-x-
 MARSHALL L. WONG xxx-xx-xxxx
 MICHAEL J. YASZEMSKI xxx-xx-x-
 RAUL YORDANJOVET xxx-xx-x-
 NANCY ZEFO xxx-xx-x-
 PAUL R. ZIAYA xxx-xx-x-

DENTAL CORPS

To be major

JOEL J. AIMONE xxx-xx-x-
 KIRBY D. AMONSON xxx-xx-x-
 STEVEN R. ARMSTRONG xxx-xx-x-
 BRET A. AVRA xxx-xx-x-
 STEVEN L. BARTEL xxx-xx-x-
 RICHARD M. BEDINGHAUS xxx-xx-x-
 TAMARA E. BLOCH xxx-xx-x-
 TIMOTHY L. BRAY xxx-xx-x-
 GARY L. BROOKS xxx-xx-x-
 STEPHEN K. CALENDINE xxx-xx-x-
 DENNIS CARRERAS xxx-xx-x-
 KENNETH A. CONNER xxx-xx-x-
 JOHN J. CONROY xxx-xx-x-
 RICKY D. COOK xxx-xx-x-
 WILLIAM E. DINSE xxx-xx-x-
 JON M. DOSSETT xxx-xx-x-
 BRYAN D. DYE xxx-xx-x-
 ROBERT C. GELLACH xxx-xx-x-
 JAMES J. GIFT xxx-xx-x-
 SCOTT L. GOLDSTEIN xxx-xx-x-
 LORA D. GRAVES xxx-xx-x-
 VANDANA GUPTA xxx-xx-x-
 MARIANNE C. HARTMAN xxx-xx-x-
 TERRANCE L. HAUCK xxx-xx-x-
 BRIAN R. HOLT xxx-xx-x-
 STEVEN T. HOWARD xxx-xx-x-
 CONSTANCE A. HUFF xxx-xx-x-
 JEFFREY P. JESSUP xxx-xx-xxxx
 RAY S. JETER xxx-xx-x-
 JEFFREY S. KLEINHAIN xxx-xx-xx
 MICHAEL J. KNOTT xxx-xx-x-
 RUSSELL M. LARSEN xxx-xx-x-
 GERALD C. LEAKE, JR. xxx-xx-x-
 JOHN M. LEIB xxx-xx-x-
 WAYNE S. H. LEONG xxx-xx-x-
 MIKE A. LUTZ xxx-xx-x-
 SCOTT A. MACKAY xxx-xx-x-
 CURTIS M. MARSH xxx-xx-x-
 JANET Y. MARTIN xxx-xx-x-
 BRENT S. McCLENNY xxx-xx-x-
 JOHN P. MCPHILLIPS xxx-xx-x-
 KARL L. MEYER xxx-xx-x-
 MARK E. MUTH xxx-xx-x-
 MICHAEL P. NAJERA xxx-xx-x-
 KYLE C. NUNLEY xxx-xx-x-
 JOHN M. NUSSTEIN xxx-xx-xxxx
 MICHAEL D. PETERSEN xxx-xx-x-
 MICHAEL H. QUINN xxx-xx-x-
 RONALD K. RISINGER xxx-xx-x-
 DOUGLAS L. RISK xxx-xx-x-
 KEVIN J. ROURN xxx-xx-x-
 KENT A. SABEY xxx-xx-x-
 JEAN M. SCHULIZ xxx-xx-x-
 MARK A. SLABBEKORN xxx-xx-x-
 JEFFREY R. SLAVKOVSKI xxx-xx-x-
 ROSALIND K. VIOHL xxx-xx-x-
 MATTHEW T. WELLES xxx-xx-x-
 DAVID L. WELLS xxx-xx-x-
 JOHN L. WHITTL xxx-xx-x-
 BRIAN D. WIGHT xxx-xx-x-

MEDICAL CORPS

To be major

JAMES G. ADAMS xxx-xx-x-
 TURGUT ALAGOZ xxx-xx-x-
 HARRY ALBERT xxx-xx-x-
 NANCY J. ALBRIGHT xxx-xx-x-
 RAYMOND B. ALLEN, JR. xxx-xx-x-
 STEVEN R. ALLEN xxx-xx-x-
 NORMA L. ALLGOOD xxx-xx-x-

ORLANDO M. ALVAREZ xxx-xx-x-
MARC O. ANDERSON xxx-xx-x-
JOHN G. ANEMA xxx-xx-x-
ALLISON A. ANGOTTI xxx-xx-x-
DAVID E. ANISMAN xxx-xx-x-
FRANK J. ARCHER xxx-xx-x-
GARY I. ARISHITA xxx-xx-x-
MARY LOUISE AUCHUS xxx-xx-x-
RICHARD J. AUCHUS xxx-xx-x-
MICHAEL B. AUSTIN xxx-xx-x-
ELEANOR E. AVERY xxx-xx-x-
JOHN MARK BAAR xxx-xx-x-
LEISA H. BAILEY xxx-xx-x-
KORNFIELD JOHN M. BALBUS xxx-xx-x-
JOHN M. BALDAUF xxx-xx-x-
CONSTANTIN A. BALOURI xxx-xx-x-
CHARLES L. BANE xxx-xx-x-
CHRISTINE BANKA xxx-xx-x-
CRAIG E. BARNES xxx-xx-x-
STEVEN L. BARNES xxx-xx-x-
THOMAS P. BARNES xxx-xx-x-
DEBBIE LYNN BATTISTINI xxx-xx-x-
BRANTLY W. BAYNES xxx-xx-x-
ANDREW J. BEHNKE xxx-xx-x-
PAUL S. BEIGHLEY xxx-xx-x-
GEORGE A. BELECANGHI xxx-xx-x-
WILLIAM B. BELL xxx-xx-x-
WILLIAM BENINA xxx-xx-x-
ERIC H. BENINK xxx-xx-x-
STEPHEN J. BERGES xxx-xx-x-
SVEN T. BERG xxx-xx-x-
GUY R. BIBEAL xxx-xx-x-
DAVID K. BILLMAN xxx-xx-x-
ROBERT W. BJORKAER xxx-xx-x-
ROBERT V. BLAKEBURN xxx-xx-x-
MICHAEL L. BLEDSOE xxx-xx-x-
HOWARD P. BLOUNT xxx-xx-x-
LUIS A. BOLANOS xxx-xx-x-
KEITH J. BOLYARD xxx-xx-x-
MARTIN D. BOMALASKI xxx-xx-x-
EUGENE V. BONVENTRE xxx-xx-x-
PAUL E. BOOR xxx-xx-x-
TOMASZ W. BOROWIECKI xxx-xx-x-
EDGAR M. BOYD JR. xxx-xx-x-
BRIAN R. BRADSHAW xxx-xx-x-
WAYNE A. BREARLEY xxx-xx-x-
DANIEL S. BREM xxx-xx-x-
ROBERT W. BRENNER xxx-xx-x-
SIDNEY B. BREVARIA xxx-xx-x-
DEAN A. BRICKER xxx-xx-x-
JACK L. BRIDGES xxx-xx-x-
IRVIN P. BROCK III xxx-xx-x-
DOUGLAS R. BROWN xxx-xx-x-
JAMES P. BROWN xxx-xx-x-
LAURENCE B. BROWN xxx-xx-x-
STEVEN R. BROWN xxx-xx-x-
SUSAN A. BROWN xxx-xx-x-
TIMOTHY R. BROWN xxx-xx-x-
JOEL E. BRUCH xxx-xx-x-
LESLIE R. BRYAN xxx-xx-x-
BARBARA R. BUCKHAM xxx-xx-x-
CHRISTOPHER BUDNY xxx-xx-x-
RITA A. BURR xxx-xx-x-
MARTIN G. BUTLER xxx-xx-x-
GERALD T. BYERS xxx-xx-x-
ROBIN W. CALDWELL xxx-xx-x-
ROBERT A. CAMBRIDGE xxx-xx-x-
MARK S. CAMPBELL xxx-xx-x-
SCOTT A. CARLSON xxx-xx-x-
MATTHEW T. CARPENTER xxx-xx-x-
TIMOTHY J. CARR xxx-xx-x-
ANTHONY T. CARTER xxx-xx-x-
TIMOTHY D. CASSIDY xxx-xx-x-
ANN C. CHILDRESS xxx-xx-x-
JOHN R. CHU xxx-xx-x-
DAVID A. CIAROLLA xxx-xx-x-
MICHAEL S. CITAN xxx-xx-x-
CAROLYN CLARK-TILLEY xxx-xx-x-
MICHAEL J. CLAY xxx-xx-x-
DAVID A. COGGINS xxx-xx-x-
ADAM J. COHEN xxx-xx-x-
DAVID B. COHEN xxx-xx-x-
HARRY C. COLE III xxx-xx-x-
JACK E. COLKER xxx-xx-x-
JOHN T. COLUMBUS xxx-xx-x-
JAMES E. CONLEY xxx-xx-x-
DAVID A. COOK xxx-xx-x-
DON C. COONCE xxx-xx-x-
JANE E. CORNETT xxx-xx-x-
PAULA A. CORRIGAN xxx-xx-x-
STANLEY L. CRAWFORD JR. xxx-xx-x-
MANUEL O. CRESPO xxx-xx-x-
ROBERT J. CROWTHER xxx-xx-x-
KEVIN CULBERT xxx-xx-x-
MOIRA CUNLEY xxx-xx-x-
STEVEN A. CURRIE xxx-xx-x-
RICHARD T. DAHLEN xxx-xx-x-
CLIVE G. DANIELS xxx-xx-x-
DAVID G. DAVENPORT xxx-xx-x-
JAMES A. DAY xxx-xx-x-
BART J. DEBRUOK xxx-xx-x-
MICHAEL J. DECKER xxx-xx-x-
DANIEL J. DECOOK xxx-xx-x-
STEVEN C. DECOUL xxx-xx-x-
PATRICIA A. DEGRUIT xxx-xx-x-
MARC M. DEHART xxx-xx-x-
CHRISTOPHER A. DEMAIORIBUS xxx-xx-x-
ROBERT C. DESKO xxx-xx-x-
DAVID E. DEVOID xxx-xx-x-
JAMES B. DICKEY xxx-xx-x-
LORRAINE A. DICKEY xxx-xx-x-
MARCEL V. DIONNE xxx-xx-x-

SUDHAKAR DIXIT xxx-xx-x-
STEPHEN DOLAN xxx-xx-x-
MARY P. DOUGARIAN xxx-xx-x-
GAIL J. DUDLEY xxx-xx-x-
RUSSELL D. DUMIRE xxx-xx-x-
PATRICIA J. DURY xxx-xx-x-
JOHN P. DZIK xxx-xx-x-
DAVID A. EARL xxx-xx-x-
JAMES D. EASON xxx-xx-x-
MICHAEL C. EDWARDS xxx-xx-x-
LAURIE P. ELWELL xxx-xx-x-
JOHN M. ERBICELLA xxx-xx-x-
THOMAS A. ERCHINGER xxx-xx-x-
JAMES M. ERTEL xxx-xx-x-
JAMES E. EVERSOLE xxx-xx-x-
SANDRA KAY FALKENHAIM xxx-xx-x-
ROBERT G. FANTE xxx-xx-x-
DAVID R. FARRIS xxx-xx-x-
DAVID L. FAY xxx-xx-x-
JOHN F. FELLER xxx-xx-x-
CARMEN A. FERNANDEZ xxx-xx-x-
JEANNE M. FERRANTE xxx-xx-x-
KELSON M. FIGARO xxx-xx-x-
JAMES A. FIKS xxx-xx-x-
PETER T. FILIPON xxx-xx-x-
JOHN R. FISCHER xxx-xx-x-
CHARLES R. FISHER III xxx-xx-x-
MARCUS S. FISHER xxx-xx-x-
LES R. FOLIO xxx-xx-x-
LADONNA D. FORD xxx-xx-x-
CHARLES D. FOWLER JR. xxx-xx-x-
PETER E. FRASCO xxx-xx-x-
CLIFFORD B. FREILING xxx-xx-x-
PAMELA M. FRIEL xxx-xx-x-
SPENCER J. FRINK xxx-xx-x-
ANN S. FULCHER xxx-xx-x-
MITCHELL A. GARDNER xxx-xx-x-
BARRY L. GARDNER xxx-xx-x-
DAVID GARRETT JR. xxx-xx-x-
LARRY DON GEE xxx-xx-x-
DIANE C. GEORGE xxx-xx-x-
ELENA M. GEOVANES xxx-xx-x-
GORDON M. GERSON JR. xxx-xx-x-
HOWARD E. GILL II xxx-xx-x-
ARLA A. GILLILAND xxx-xx-x-
ROBERT T. GILSON xxx-xx-x-
DANIEL C. GINSBERG xxx-xx-x-
GUY G. GLATZ xxx-xx-x-
LEIGHANNE GLAZENER xxx-xx-x-
CARL D. GLIDDEN xxx-xx-x-
ROSE L. GLYNN xxx-xx-x-
JOHN S. GOLDEN xxx-xx-x-
MICHAEL S. GOLDSTOFF xxx-xx-x-
GEOFFREY H. GOLEMBIEWSKI xxx-xx-x-
GUILLERMO GONZALES xxx-xx-x-
HUBERT L. GOOCH JR. xxx-xx-x-
AUDREY L. GRAHAM xxx-xx-x-
MARK A. GRAHAM xxx-xx-x-
KENDALL E. GRAYSON xxx-xx-x-
KEVIN R. GREEN xxx-xx-x-
DAVID N. GREENBERG xxx-xx-x-
NED J. GROSS xxx-xx-x-
JOHN C. GUEVARRA xxx-xx-x-
MAUREEN M. HACKBARTH xxx-xx-x-
DANIEL L. HAFNER xxx-xx-x-
ANTHONY S. HAGADON-THIRATHY xxx-xx-x-
SCOTT A. HAGEN xxx-xx-x-
EUGENIE T. HAIGHT xxx-xx-x-
KEVIN A. HALL xxx-xx-x-
LEATON H. HALL xxx-xx-x-
ROBERT B. HALL xxx-xx-x-
JACQUELYN HALL-DAVIS xxx-xx-x-
GLENN D. HAMILTON xxx-xx-x-
GEORGE ROBERT HANSEN xxx-xx-x-
PAUL A. HANSLIK xxx-xx-x-
VAUGHN W. HANSON xxx-xx-x-
STUART A. HARLIN xxx-xx-x-
JEFFERSON H. HARMAN JR. xxx-xx-x-
SEAN P. HARNEY xxx-xx-x-
PAUL A. HEMMER xxx-xx-x-
BARRY A. HENCH xxx-xx-x-
DANIEL R. HENLEY xxx-xx-x-
LINWOOD J. HENRY xxx-xx-x-
WAYNE R. C. HENTSCHEL xxx-xx-x-
NEIL E. HERENDEEN xxx-xx-x-
SANDRA J. HERRINGTON xxx-xx-x-
DARRELL E. HESTER xxx-xx-x-
STEVEN M. HETRICK xxx-xx-x-
JOHN E. HEUSNER xxx-xx-x-
ROBERT W. HICKEY xxx-xx-x-
GREGORY A. HILL xxx-xx-x-
JAMES B. HOER xxx-xx-x-
MICHAEL D. HOFFSTEIN xxx-xx-x-
LEWIS A. HOFMANN xxx-xx-x-
DAVID E. HOLCK xxx-xx-x-
JAMES S. HOLLAND xxx-xx-x-
DAG HOLMSEN xxx-xx-x-
TERRY M. HOMMEL xxx-xx-x-
PATRICK A. HONAKER xxx-xx-x-
DANIEL C. HOOD xxx-xx-x-
CRAIG HORNBERGER xxx-xx-x-
LAURA A. HOTCHKISS xxx-xx-x-
LESTER A. HUFF xxx-xx-x-
JON W. HUGHES xxx-xx-x-
STEVEN W. HUMBURG xxx-xx-x-
DARRYL C. HUNTER xxx-xx-x-
ROBERT M. HUNTER xxx-xx-x-
BART O. IDDIS xxx-xx-x-
JANE Y. IKEDA xxx-xx-x-
VINCENT L. IMBERIAN xxx-xx-x-
FREDERICK S. ISAAK xxx-xx-x-
JACQUELYN I. ISLANI xxx-xx-x-

VENKATARAO IYYALASOMAYAZULA xxx-xx-x-
PHILLIP F. JACKSON xxx-xx-x-
ARTHUR M. JAMES xxx-xx-x-
LILLIAN S. JARDINE xxx-xx-x-
ANTHONY J. JASLOWSKI xxx-xx-x-
DAVID M. JENKINS xxx-xx-x-
DONALD H. JENKINS xxx-xx-x-
STEVEN P. JENSEN xxx-xx-x-
TIMOTHY T. JEX xxx-xx-x-
DONNA A. JOHNSON xxx-xx-x-
KEVIN R. JOHNSON xxx-xx-x-
THOMAS R. JOHNSON xxx-xx-x-
MICHAEL J. JOHNSTON xxx-xx-x-
MICHAEL L. JONES xxx-xx-x-
NEIL L. JORGENSEN xxx-xx-x-
KAREN E. JOYCE xxx-xx-x-
JEFFREY J. JUCHAU xxx-xx-x-
EUGENE S. JUSTUS xxx-xx-x-
TERESA KANDAH xxx-xx-x-
JERROLD J. KARTAGAN xxx-xx-x-
ELIZABETH M. KEENE xxx-xx-x-
JUDITH E. KERPELMAN xxx-xx-x-
KEITH A. KERR xxx-xx-x-
MANSUR A. KHAN xxx-xx-x-
PHILIP G. KIELY III xxx-xx-x-
SIK K. KIM xxx-xx-x-
AZIZ A. KLAYON xxx-xx-x-
MARK R. KLINKER xxx-xx-x-
CAROL J. KOEBLE xxx-xx-x-
SHARI L. KOGAN xxx-xx-x-
EDWARD W. KOLAR III xxx-xx-x-
CHRISTOPHER KONTOGIANIS xxx-xx-x-
ELIZABETH P. KORNEGAY xxx-xx-x-
SUSAN L. KORT xxx-xx-x-
SALLY A. KRONER xxx-xx-x-
DEBORAH A. KULLER III xxx-xx-x-
ROSEANNE C. LABARR xxx-xx-x-
MOLLY F. LAIRD xxx-xx-x-
CHAD C. LAMB xxx-xx-x-
JOSEPH R. LAMB xxx-xx-x-
JOHN E. LANCASTER JR. xxx-xx-x-
LAURIE B. LANDEEN xxx-xx-x-
ROBERT L. LANDGRAF xxx-xx-x-
BRIAN W. LANE xxx-xx-x-
KEVIN A. LANG xxx-xx-x-
ANTHONY J. LANGENFELD JR. xxx-xx-x-
MARIO A. LANZA xxx-xx-x-
MARY R. LANZA xxx-xx-x-
MARK R. LAROSE xxx-xx-x-
JAMES C. LARRISON JR. xxx-xx-x-
PHILLIP L. LATHAM xxx-xx-x-
SAMUEL S. LAU xxx-xx-x-
PHILIP J. LAVALLEE xxx-xx-x-
MAUREEN P. LAVIN xxx-xx-x-
LINDA L. LAWRENCE xxx-xx-x-
THEODORE S. LAWSON xxx-xx-x-
MYUNG MOO LEE xxx-xx-x-
KENNETH S. LEFFLER xxx-xx-x-
DOUGLAS S. LEHREH xxx-xx-x-
DOUG R. LEIGH xxx-xx-x-
PETER E. LETHBRIDGE xxx-xx-x-
LORI A. LEVI xxx-xx-x-
LOREN L. LEWIS xxx-xx-x-
STACY K. LEWIS xxx-xx-x-
JOHN R. LEYENDECKER xxx-xx-x-
JOHN E. LINDNER xxx-xx-x-
CHRISTOPHER J. LISANI xxx-xx-x-
KIM E. LOPEZ xxx-xx-x-
KARL F. LOVE xxx-xx-x-
MICHAEL J. LOVELY xxx-xx-x-
DAVID A. LOWRY xxx-xx-x-
WILLIAM L. LUBKE xxx-xx-x-
PHILLIP D. LUEBBE xxx-xx-x-
WILLIAM E. LYLES xxx-xx-x-
THOMAS E. LYNN xxx-xx-x-
WILLIAM D. MACDONALD xxx-xx-x-
KATHLEEN C. MADDEN xxx-xx-x-
THOMAS J. MAGNER xxx-xx-x-
ROBERT J. MAHA JR. xxx-xx-x-
ROBERT M. MAKEEVER xxx-xx-x-
IVAN A. MALAVE xxx-xx-x-
HARRY D. MALCOLM xxx-xx-x-
CARLOS E. MALDONADO JR. xxx-xx-x-
SUZANNE M. MALIS xxx-xx-x-
ROBERT E. MANAKER xxx-xx-x-
CURTIS A. MANNING xxx-xx-x-
MICHAEL J. MARCHESSAULT xxx-xx-x-
JACOB C. MARSHALL JR. xxx-xx-x-
GEORGE A. MARTIN xxx-xx-x-
THOMAS V. MARTIN xxx-xx-x-
DAVID G. MARTINEZ xxx-xx-x-
MERIA G. MARTIROSIAN xxx-xx-x-
MARSHA MASSELINK xxx-xx-x-
BRIAN J. MASTERSON xxx-xx-x-
JOHN H. MATSUURA xxx-xx-x-
FRANK R. MATTIA xxx-xx-x-
MARK E. MAVITY xxx-xx-x-
KIMBERLY P. MAY xxx-xx-x-
NATALIE S. MAYER xxx-xx-x-
WILLIAM D. MAYER xxx-xx-x-
DAVID M. MCAFEE xxx-xx-x-
KURT D. MCCARTNEY xxx-xx-x-
RANDY A. MCCOOL xxx-xx-x-
LYNN S. MCCURDY xxx-xx-x-
BRUCE E. MCGHEE xxx-xx-x-
SUZANNE E. MCGLOTH xxx-xx-x-
MICHAEL A. MCGRIFF xxx-xx-x-
MICHAEL P. MCGUNIGAL xxx-xx-x-
KENNETH M. MCINTYRE xxx-xx-x-
DANIEL P. MCKELLAR xxx-xx-x-
JANET I. MCMAHON xxx-xx-x-
SUSAN E. MCMAHON xxx-xx-x-

ALAN G. MCNABB xxx-xx-x.
MICHAEL G. MCNAMARA xxx-xx-x.
MICHAEL P. MCNAMARA xxx-xx-x.
SUSAN E. MCNEIL xxx-xx-x.
PAUL D. MCWHIRTER xxx-xx-x.
THOMAS D. MEACHAM xxx-xx-x.
PATRICIA A. MEIER xxx-xx-x.
SCOTT W. MELANSON xxx-xx-x.
DALE A. MENARD, JR. xxx-xx-x.
MICHAEL MERCANDETTH xxx-xx-x.
GWENDOLYN MORE MERCER xxx-xx-x.
JOHN T. MEREDITH xxx-xx-x.
RAPPORT BARBARA J. MESSINGER xxx-xx-x.
ANTHONY G. MICCIO xxx-xx-x.
MICHAEL G. MILLER xxx-xx-x.
NORMAN MINDREBO xxx-xx-x.
JOHN MIRABELLO xxx-xx-x.
NANCY A. MIRANDA xxx-xx-x.
JOSEPH P. MIRANTE xxx-xx-x.
KENNETH J. MISHAK xxx-xx-x.
JONAS O. MOEN xxx-xx-x.
MELISSA M. MOLEN xxx-xx-x.
JOY D. MOLEN xxx-xx-x.
JEFFREY S. MOORE xxx-xx-x.
WILLIAM A. MOORE xxx-xx-x.
PETER C. MORAN xxx-xx-x.
STEPHAN G. MORAN xxx-xx-x.
PETER J. MORELLI xxx-xx-x.
CHRISTOPHER W. MORRIS xxx-xx-x.
RICHARD D. MORGAN xxx-xx-x.
KENNETH A. MORHAIN xxx-xx-x.
RICHARD P. MORSE xxx-xx-x.
STEVEN W. MORTENSON xxx-xx-x.
ROBERT W. NAEF, III xxx-xx-x.
DIANE C. NAPOLI xxx-xx-x.
PATRIC Y. NASSAU xxx-xx-x.
GREGORY S. NEAL xxx-xx-x.
JOSEPH A. NEWELL xxx-xx-x.
JENNIFER L. NEY xxx-xx-x.
MARGARET K. NICHOLS xxx-xx-x.
STEPHEN J. NILES xxx-xx-x.
JOHN C. NOTARO xxx-xx-x.
DAIN NOVAK xxx-xx-x.
RUTH U. OAKS xxx-xx-x.
DAVID M. OBRIEN xxx-xx-x.
LORETTA M. OBRIEN xxx-xx-x.
DANIEL M. OCKNER xxx-xx-x.
AMY ELIZABETH OKSA xxx-xx-x.
WILLIAM J. OLIGMUELLER xxx-xx-x.
KENNETH N. OLIVIER xxx-xx-x.
MELANIE D. OLSON xxx-xx-x.
MARGARETTA A. OREILLY xxx-xx-x.
CARL L. OVERMILLER xxx-xx-x.
GREGORY R. OWENS xxx-xx-x.
JOSEPH V. PACE xxx-xx-x.
KAREN L. PADDUCK xxx-xx-x.
TAMMY E. PANNELL xxx-xx-x.
LARRY W. PARSONS xxx-xx-x.
AUGUST C. PASQUALE, III xxx-xx-x.
CRAIG P. PATTERSON xxx-xx-x.
ALBERT W. PEARSON, III xxx-xx-x.
JOHN R. PEARSON, III xxx-xx-x.
TIMOTHY LEE PENDLETON xxx-xx-x.
KATHERINE A. PETERS xxx-xx-x.
DAVID W. PETERSON xxx-xx-x.
KRISTIN K. PETERSON xxx-xx-x.
BRIAN D. PEYTON xxx-xx-x.
ROGER N. C. PHAM xxx-xx-x.
CHRISTOPHER J. PHILLIPS xxx-xx-x.
ANDRE F. PICHON xxx-xx-x.
EDWIG K. PLOTNICK xxx-xx-x.
LEONARD A. PLUNK xxx-xx-x.
JON E. POPOVICH xxx-xx-x.
KIM A. PORTERFIELD xxx-xx-x.
ELISHA T. POWELL, IV xxx-xx-x.
JOSEPH L. PRATT xxx-xx-x.
JAMES R. PRINCE xxx-xx-x.
JOSE M. PUJOL xxx-xx-x.
JURIS PURINS xxx-xx-x.
JEFFREY P. QUAM xxx-xx-x.
DAYLE QUIGLEY-MALCOLM xxx-xx-x.
JAMES M. QUINN xxx-xx-x.
ARNALDO R. QUINONES xxx-xx-x.
WILLIAM S. RAMBO xxx-xx-x.
PETER A. RAMIREZ xxx-xx-x.
LINDA E. RANGE xxx-xx-x.
THOMAS W. RATLIFF xxx-xx-x.
BRIAN V. REAMY xxx-xx-x.
LAWRENCE RECCOPPA xxx-xx-x.
CHRISTIANNE M. RECKLEY xxx-xx-x.
SCOTT A. RESWEBER xxx-xx-x.

AUDRY G. RHODES xxx-xx-x.
RANDALL E. RHODES xxx-xx-x.
MARK W. RICHARDSON xxx-xx-x.
WILLIAM R. RICHARDSON xxx-xx-x.
JESSICA B. RICHMOND xxx-xx-x.
MATTHEW R. RICKS xxx-xx-x.
ROBERT C. RIGBY xxx-xx-x.
STEPHEN C. RIGGS xxx-xx-x.
DIANE C. RITTER xxx-xx-x.
GERANT RIVERA xxx-xx-x.
EDGARDO J. RIVERA-RIVERA xxx-xx-x.
BARBARA LYNN ROACH xxx-xx-x.
JOSEPH F. ROBERTS xxx-xx-x.
LYNETTE C. ROBERTS xxx-xx-x.
MARC S. ROBINS xxx-xx-x.
PAULA R. ROBINSON xxx-xx-x.
JEFFREY L. ROCHEN xxx-xx-x.
REBECCA D. RODIE xxx-xx-x.
GLISETTE RODRIGUEZ xxx-xx-x.
HILTON J. RODRIGUEZ xxx-xx-x.
JAMES K. RONE xxx-xx-x.
BRET A. ROSANI xxx-xx-x.
VALERIE H. ROSS xxx-xx-x.
JOSEPH L. RUEBEN xxx-xx-x.
BRIAN W. RUSS xxx-xx-x.
GARY D. RUSSELL xxx-xx-x.
SCOTT A. RUSSI xxx-xx-x.
MARC S. RUSSO xxx-xx-x.
ANDREW H. RUZICK xxx-xx-x.
CHRISTOPHER W. RYAN xxx-xx-x.
MICHAEL S. SAENGER xxx-xx-x.
LINDA M. SAKAI xxx-xx-x.
JOSEPH S. SAVAGE xxx-xx-x.
PATRICIA H. SAWYER xxx-xx-x.
BRIAN P. SCHAFER xxx-xx-x.
CHRISTINE MICHELLE SCHAPIER xxx-xx-x.
JONATHAN C. SCHNITKER xxx-xx-x.
CATHY J. SCHOORENS xxx-xx-x.
HEATHER M. SCHULTE xxx-xx-x.
JOHN G. SCHULTE xxx-xx-x.
GLENN J. SCHULTZ xxx-xx-x.
DON A. SCHULTZ xxx-xx-x.
SCOTT H. SCHULTZ xxx-xx-x.
STEPHEN M. SCHUTZ xxx-xx-x.
MICHAEL R. SCHWARTZ xxx-xx-x.
STEPHEN L. SCHWARTZ xxx-xx-x.
STEPHEN D. SCOTT xxx-xx-x.
GREGORY S. SEAL xxx-xx-x.
THOMAS M. SEAY xxx-xx-x.
CURTIS M. SEITZ xxx-xx-x.
JEFFREY M. SEITZ xxx-xx-x.
GUSTAVO SERRANO xxx-xx-x.
CHARLES A. SHAPIRO xxx-xx-x.
MICHAEL L. SHAPIRO xxx-xx-x.
RICHARD K. SHARP xxx-xx-x.
KEVIN P. SHEAHAN xxx-xx-x.
HEATHER ANN SHELTON xxx-xx-x.
PAUL E. SHINGLEDECKER xxx-xx-x.
ROBERT D. SHUTT xxx-xx-x.
PATRICIA A. SILVIA xxx-xx-x.
BARBARA T. SITTON xxx-xx-x.
MARK E. SLAVEN xxx-xx-x.
NADIA C. SLYSH xxx-xx-x.
DAVID L. SMITH xxx-xx-x.
MICHAEL A. SMITH xxx-xx-x.
MICHAEL A. SMITH xxx-xx-x.
STANLEY G. SMITH xxx-xx-x.
TED R. SMITH xxx-xx-x.
MICHAEL R. SNIDER xxx-xx-x.
LISA R. SNOW xxx-xx-x.
JAMIE L. SNYDER xxx-xx-x.
ALBERT L. SOLOMITO xxx-xx-x.
LISA D. SOMERSON xxx-xx-x.
DAVID G. SORGE xxx-xx-x.
ALAN J. SORKEY xxx-xx-x.
THERESA B. SPARKMAN xxx-xx-x.
GREGORY A. SPENCER xxx-xx-x.
NEIL O. SPENCER xxx-xx-x.
BRUCE D. SPINZIG xxx-xx-x.
MARISS L. SRADERS xxx-xx-x.
CRAIG H. STAGG xxx-xx-x.
KENNETH E. STAGUS xxx-xx-x.
MICHAEL D. STAMATAKOS xxx-xx-x.
NICHOLAS W. STANEK xxx-xx-x.
RICHARD A. STANGLER xxx-xx-x.
JOHN L. STANLEY xxx-xx-x.
RUSSELL B. STAPLETON, III xxx-xx-x.
TIMOTHY R. STAPLETON xxx-xx-x.
PHILIP J. STARCESKI xxx-xx-x.
ANDREW J. STASKO xxx-xx-x.
RAYMOND M. STEFKO xxx-xx-x.

STEVEN R. STEINHUBL xxx-xx-x.
JAMES A. STEVENS, JR. xxx-xx-x.
MATTHEW B. STEVENS xxx-xx-x.
TIMOTHY P. STEVENS xxx-xx-x.
KEVIN A. STIERER xxx-xx-x.
TROY F. STOREY xxx-xx-x.
ROBERT C. STREETER xxx-xx-x.
JOHNNIE W. STRICKLAND, JR. xxx-xx-x.
ROBINSON H. STUBLEY, III xxx-xx-x.
DAVID E. SULLIVAN xxx-xx-x.
WAYNE K. SUMPTER xxx-xx-x.
JOHN A. SUNDELL xxx-xx-x.
JEFFREY J. SUTTON xxx-xx-x.
DOUGLAS J. SWANK xxx-xx-x.
JOHN C. TABB xxx-xx-x.
COLLEEN C. TAILLEN xxx-xx-x.
WILLIAM S. TANKERSLEY xxx-xx-x.
MAUREEN C. TERRAZANO xxx-xx-x.
GREGORY J. THESING xxx-xx-x.
DAN E. THOMAS xxx-xx-x.
ROBERT A. THOMAS xxx-xx-x.
ROBERT S. THOMPSON xxx-xx-x.
KAREN S. THROWER xxx-xx-x.
PHILIP T. THWING xxx-xx-x.
PAUL W. TOWNER xxx-xx-x.
PATRICK W. TOWNSEND xxx-xx-x.
JAMES W. TRAUTH xxx-xx-x.
PHILIP TRIFFLETT xxx-xx-x.
ROBERT T. TROIANI, JR. xxx-xx-x.
WILLIAM BRADLEY TROUTMAN xxx-xx-x.
ERIC C. TROYER xxx-xx-x.
JAMES E. TUREK xxx-xx-x.
MICHAEL JOHN UHRIG xxx-xx-x.
HOEK TODD LEE VANDEN xxx-xx-x.
ELIZABETH A. VANDERBURGH xxx-xx-x.
MARK P. VANDERBURGH xxx-xx-x.
LORI L. VANHORN xxx-xx-x.
RICHARD D. VATT xxx-xx-x.
WALTER D. VAZQUEZ xxx-xx-x.
JAY L. VIERNES xxx-xx-x.
STEPHEN M. VOLTAREL xxx-xx-x.
MARY J. WAGNER xxx-xx-x.
JOHN A. WAITES xxx-xx-x.
LANE L. WALL xxx-xx-x.
GEORGE S. WALMSLEY xxx-xx-x.
JOHN F. WALSH xxx-xx-x.
LAURENCE E. WALSH xxx-xx-x.
DIANE E. WALTER xxx-xx-x.
JAMES W. WALTER xxx-xx-x.
LINDA M. WANG xxx-xx-x.
KATHRYN C. WAREHALL xxx-xx-x.
BRYAN D. WARNER xxx-xx-x.
DENNA E. WASHINGTON xxx-xx-x.
DENNIS D. WEAVER xxx-xx-x.
PAMELA S. WEBBER xxx-xx-x.
BEVERLY F. WEDDA xxx-xx-x.
SCOTT A. WEGNER xxx-xx-x.
ERIC S. WEINSTEIN xxx-xx-x.
JAMES H. WELCH xxx-xx-x.
MATTHEW P. WICKLUND xxx-xx-x.
LORI ANN R. WILCOX xxx-xx-x.
GUSTAV C. WILDE xxx-xx-x.
SUSAN S. WILDER xxx-xx-x.
SHARI D. WILLIAMS xxx-xx-x.
TRACY G. WILLIAMS xxx-xx-x.
KRISTINE M. WILLS xxx-xx-x.
DOUGLAS R. WILSON xxx-xx-x.
JURGEN G. WINKLER xxx-xx-x.
BRIAN E. WINN xxx-xx-x.
JOE B. WISEMAN xxx-xx-x.
RICKY D. WOLFE xxx-xx-x.
EDWARD A. WOLFF, III xxx-xx-x.
WILLIAM A. WOMACK xxx-xx-x.
ALLEN WONG, xxx-xx-x.
ANDREW KI WONG xxx-xx-x.
KEVAN L. WONG xxx-xx-x.
KONDI WONG, xxx-xx-x.
MICHAEL T. WONG xxx-xx-x.
JOHN B. WOOD, III xxx-xx-x.
WILLIAM A. WRAY xxx-xx-x.
GARY D. WRIGHT xxx-xx-x.
ROBERT E. WRIGHT xxx-xx-x.
SUSAN K. WYNNE xxx-xx-x.
WAY YIN, xxx-xx-x.
GAVIN S. YOUNG xxx-xx-x.
PAUL A. YOUNG xxx-xx-x.
DANIEL J. YOUSIF xxx-xx-x.
VINCENT CHAIWAN YU, III xxx-xx-x.
RICHARD D. ZENIN xxx-xx-x.
MARY L. ZOZULIN xxx-xx-x.