

finance reform, in this session, with this Congress and this President, that it has to be a bipartisan effort.

It is my view that when Mr. DASCHLE, the minority leader, made this unanimous-consent request, that he was not seeking to make this a partisan issue. Senator DASCHLE has indicated that he believes that the so-called McCain-Feingold bill ought to be the vehicle for achieving campaign finance reform. He has indicated that he disagrees with some aspects of it. But I believe that the Senator from South Dakota is a friend to the issue of campaign finance reform.

Nonetheless, I think we will do better on the issue of campaign finance reform if it is offered on the basis of a bipartisan agreement, either by Senators working together on the bill, as Senator McCAIN and Senator WELLSTONE and I are doing, or preferably if the two leaders, the Senator from Kansas and the Senator from South Dakota, were to get together and make sure that in the very near future this body turn specifically to the issue of campaign finance reform as the order of the day. That is what all of us who cosponsor this bill prefer, although we stand ready to attach this bill as an amendment to other legislation if we are not afforded that opportunity.

So let me just reiterate, the campaign finance reform effort is the first bipartisan effort of its kind in 10 years in this body. It is a real effort. It is an effort that has enormous support, and we will not allow any partisan maneuvers on either side to prevent us from our opportunity to make this change that the American people want very, very much.

---

#### INTERNATIONAL TRADE AND BRIBERY

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, on another matter, international trade is a high priority in almost every country today. We are negotiating all sorts of agreements to bring down barriers and protect our workers and promote economic development worldwide.

One issue, Mr. President, that I have tried to identify as a barrier for competition for American businesses is the issue of bribery. American businesses live in accordance with the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act. This was a bill offered by my predecessor from Wisconsin, Senator William Proxmire. Most businesspeople praise it as a way of maintaining honesty, and thus stability, in their business relationships. But, unfortunately, other countries—and one example is Germany—actually give their businesses the opportunity to write off a bribe in a foreign country as a tax deduction at the end of the year. So it is illegal for one German to bribe another German, but if they were to offer that bribe to somebody in another country, they can use it as a tax deduction. This produces some pretty unhappy faces when American businesspeople find this out.

Some say that bribes are the cost of doing business overseas, particularly in some developing countries. I believe, however, it is a barrier to doing business in the long run, particularly overseas, since it can only retard economic growth in some of the developing countries.

As a result, Mr. President, I have introduced legislation to try to get at this problem. In the State Department authorization bill for this year, I offered an amendment requiring an interagency study on bribery and corruption and the impact it causes on American businesses. I was disappointed that the majority dropped it in conference committee, but I am pleased that the Commerce Department is going ahead and pursuing a study of its own on this study anyway. I appreciate that.

I have also raised the issue of international bribery consistently in the Senate Foreign Affairs Committee, not only as we examine how to promote U.S. products, but in my role as the ranking member of the Subcommittee on African Affairs, to try to raise the issue of bribery with the African heads of States and other officials when we have confirmation hearings for ambassadors headed to the region. I believe that the ambassadors should be intimately involved in this issue as we seek to promote American products overseas.

I also want to praise Ambassador Kantor's very direct and public efforts on this issue and to say that I think his recent efforts have been critical in making headway on a universal acceptance of the principles that underlie the American Foreign Corrupt Practices Act. I am particularly encouraged that the administration seems to want the WTO to consider sanctions against bribers when Government contracts are under consideration.

Mr. President, it is important that even though we have this tough law and our businesses have to abide by it, we are not alone in this campaign. There have been many significant accomplishments. The Organization of Economic Cooperation and Development, OECD, took a landmark step 2 years ago in recognizing that bribery is a destabilizing factor in international trade, and they recommended that the member states cooperate on revisions of their domestic laws about bribery.

Several weeks ago, OECD tried to eliminate tax writeoffs on the laws of the member States of the kind that exist in Germany. Latin America has also taken this issue on. In March of this year, the Inter-America Convention Against Corruption, known as the Caracas Convention, identifies corruption as a main obstacle to democratic development in public trust in government institutions, and it also calls and provides for the prohibition on transnational bribery.

Mr. President, perhaps some might see this document from the Inter-America Convention as a utopian document that cannot be enforced, but

what it does do is begin the process, in Latin America, as has been done in the rest of the world, to commit the parties—in theory, at least—to the notion that bribery is a destructive force in democratic development and international business.

Given the developments with the OECD, the United States and Latin America, one would have thought it was a trend for the future, but we are really making progress. Unfortunately, however, at the end of April, the seven-member Association of Southeast Asian Nations spoke out for the first time on the issue of bribery and unfortunately opposed any attempt by the United States to stamp out corruption, saying they would not talk about it in the context of the World Trade Organization.

Deputy United States Trade Representative Jeff Lang tried to raise the issue and was criticized by Malaysia and Indonesia officials for plotting against the developing nations. This reaction to the seven countries is a very counterproductive reaction. We focus on bribery to engage more in business, not to discriminate. I hope that Malaysia and Indonesia and others think of this as an area of cooperation, of mutual interest, rather than an area for polarizing, as has been done in this case.

Mr. President, to conclude, if international markets are indeed to connect nations around the globe, somehow we have to be able to conduct business in a transparent and responsible manner. Bribery has to be discouraged, not rewarded, by all governments.

I hope that the ASEAN countries will reconsider this issue and join governments from every continent in seeking to end the corruption that does exist in international markets.

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

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

---

#### WHITE HOUSE TRAVEL OFFICE LEGISLATION

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

AMENDMENT NO. 3960

Mr. FAIRCLOTH. Mr. President, I rise today in support of the teamwork for employees and management. If ever there were a law that makes no sense, it is to forbid teamwork between management and employees.

This is a bill to encourage worker-management cooperation. It is sorely needed in this country in industry today. Senator DOLE has made this part of the repeal of the gas tax and a rise in the minimum wage. The TEAM Act will permit employees in nonunion

settings, which are most of the employees in this country, to work with management to address, in a commonsense way, workplace issues that are mutual interests and will benefit the workplace scenery and the company as a whole.

Under current law, these discussions are permitted only if employees are represented by a union and the discussions go through the union bargaining representative. Nothing could be more ludicrous as a way to have cooperation than to have to channel your discussion through union representatives. It just does not make common sense, or any other kind of sense.

The current law prohibits workers and managers in nonunion settings from sitting down to cooperate on a long list of basic workplace issues—safety, quality, and productivity. By not allowing employee involvement, this antiquated law deprives 90 percent of U.S. workers in the private sector of having any voice in their workplace. They simply cannot talk to the owners and the management for whom they work, and you eliminate cooperation. The lack of employee involvement also makes the American industrial sector less competitive. Almost every U.S. industry faces strong and aggressive competition from foreign firms that are free to draw on and utilize the ideas, thoughts, and abilities of their employees. They use this to compete against American companies and American workers.

Now, American business leaders know that including employees in this decisionmaking would make them more competitive. They would have an ability to draw firsthand on the workers, what would be more efficient, more effective, and what would cut costs, which would certainly lead to increased competitiveness. The older approach of telling workers, "When you punch the time clock, leave your mind at the door," and dictating to them how to do the job without having any back-and-forth discussion with the worker as to the best way to do the job is absolutely the worst law, which should be abandoned. Employers know that the people who perform the work know better how to do it and the most efficient way to do it.

It concerns me that, under current law, employees cannot be involved in workplace decisions, unless they do it through a union steward or a union representative. Workers that are knowledgeable about how to do the work, how to do it better, should have a say in making the decisions and certainly should share their opinions about how it should be done. Employers are anxious to listen to them. They are anxious to have the input and the advice. They want it. The TEAM Act will give employees the voice in the workplace that everyone wants them to have and that they want to have.

Mr. President, I am a cosponsor of Senate bill 295. I believe this legislation is essential if we are going to im-

prove our competitive position in America as compared to other countries around the world—especially in manufacturing, where we so sorely need jobs to be created.

If we are really concerned about doing something to help the working Americans to improve their lot in life and also the competitiveness of the country as a whole, the best we think we can do is to pass the TEAM Act.

Mr. President, I thank you. I yield the floor.

Mr. PRESSLER addressed the Chair. THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota is recognized.

Mr. PRESSLER. I thank the Chair. (The remarks of Mr. PRESSLER, Mr. WARNER, and Mr. BRYAN pertaining to the introduction of S. 1735 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. HATCH addressed the Chair. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I thank you. I just have a few words to say about the state of affairs on the floor of the U.S. Senate.

I was somewhat appalled with the President's press conference, which is clearly as blatantly political a press conference as I believe has ever happened in this town, basically saying that the Republicans are tying up this legislation in the Senate today.

How could anybody make that comment when his own side refuses to grant cloture on something as simple, as fair, as decent, as worthwhile, as bipartisan as the Billy Dale bill? And they do it all under the guise that they are not getting what they want on the minimum wage, and then they vote against cloture today knowing that Senator DOLE said they can have a vote on their minimum wage. But if they want their vote on minimum wage, we are going to do something about the gas tax, and we are going to do something about the TEAM Act.

I have to say I support Senator DOLE in his effort to repeal the 4.3-cent-per-gallon tax on gasoline that President Clinton and the Democrats passed back in 1993. While some critics might try to dismiss this bill as an election year gimmick, I believe they are missing the main point. This is about far more than just the 4.3-cent gas tax.

The fact is the 1993 tax bill was the largest tax increase in history. We are now paying taxes at the highest rate in history. Yesterday was tax freedom day, signifying how long we have to work just to pay our State and local taxes, and that does not include all the costs of regulatory burdens and other things. As of yesterday, the seventh of May, it took the average American all those months, the first 4 months and 7 days, just to pay their Federal and State taxes. Think about that.

The fact is that the President has added the largest tax increase in his-

tory. We are paying at the highest tax rates in history, and we are still going into debt phenomenally because the tax increases, like the gas tax, have not gone to fill the pot holes in the roads or to help our highway system or to help States with their peculiar difficulties in highways and roads; those moneys have gone for more social spending, more social welfare spending by none other than Democrats throughout the country.

Frankly, they have used the gas tax, which is disproportionately unfair to the poor, disproportionately unfair to the West, disproportionately unfair to rural States, and plowed it all back into their core constituencies right back here, primarily in the East, or in other large major urban areas, rather than using those funds to benefit everybody through road improvements.

We are talking about \$30 billion here that we are going to repeal. Our colleagues on the other side really do not want that repeal to occur, because that means there is going to be more pressure on them because they will not be able to spend more and more buying votes out there in social spending programs, which has been the route that they have taken to power for most of the last 60 years. It is not right. It is not right. It is not fair. It is disproportionately harmful to the poor. It is disproportionately harmful to the West. It is disproportionately harmful to rural States, and it is time to be fair in this process.

Well, that is what the repeal of the gas tax will do.

I have to say that this 4.3-cent tax has caused gas prices to go up. It is not the only reason it has caused it to go up, but it is one of the pivotal reasons. Gas taxes would not be as high as they are had it not been for that 4.3 cents added on in 1993.

We were told time after time by President Clinton in 1993 that the tax bill would affect only the very wealthiest in our society. Yet, that bill contained at least nine separate new tax hikes on families who are not wealthy—at least nine.

The gas tax increase of 4.3 cents per gallon was one of the worst of those. I wish we could repeal all the 1993 tax bill, because it has caused damaged to our economy.

Let me get into the 1993 tax increases on the nonrich:

No. 1, increase in individual marginal tax rates. That affects the nonrich in the cases of estates and trusts, small businesses, S corporations, and so forth. No question, there has been an increase in marginal tax rates, which always hurts the middle class.

No. 2, increase in the percentage of Social Security benefits that are taxable. This happened because of President Clinton. That is not just on the 2 percent rich, it is on many many senior citizens.

No. 3, the 4.3-cent-a-gallon tax on gasoline.

No. 4, the reduction in the compensation limit for qualified retirement plans. This is important.

No. 5, reduction in the meals and entertainment expense deduction that has cost an awful lot of damage in the restaurant industry and other industries as well, which used to be stronger because they had that deduction.

No. 6, the increase in the withholding rate on supplemental compensation.

No. 7, the increase in the recovery period for depreciation of nonresidential real property.

No. 8, limitations in moving expense deductions that have cost the middle class.

No. 9, increased marriage penalties that have always been very, very unfair.

I have to say, the Heritage Foundation, one of our better think tanks here in Washington, although conservative in nature, recently released a study that shows that President Clinton's 1993 tax and budget plan cost the economy \$208 billion in lost output from 1993 to 1996. In 1995 alone, our gross domestic product would have grown by \$66 billion more than it actually did if these taxes had not been raised. Moreover, there would have been 1.2 million more private-sector jobs created absent the 1993 bill, and those jobs would have meant more revenue to the Treasury, not less.

The thing that is mind-boggling is what President Clinton said. Why would he say this during his campaign, and then immediately revoke it by the tax increase? He said: "I oppose Federal excise gas tax increases."

Now, why would the President say that if he did not mean it? No sooner does he get elected than he does the exact opposite. That is what Bill Clinton said when he ran for President in 1992: "I oppose Federal excise gas tax increases."

But what he did once he was elected was push through the Democrat-controlled Congress a permanent 4.3-cent-per-gallon gas tax hike as part of his overall \$268 billion tax increase in 1993, the largest tax increase in history.

Not a single Republican in the House or the Senate voted for that tax increase. Just think about it. His gas tax increase affects all Americans, not just the rich. In fact, President Clinton's gas tax hike hits hardest those families least able to afford it.

Now, as Senator DOLE said today, drivers across America are paying for the President's mistake. President Clinton raised the gas tax hoping to generate \$25 billion. That is what the administration represented before the Senate Finance Committee, upon which I sit. But they thought it would generate \$25 billion to help fund the President's liberal agenda and social welfare programs, not to fund highway and transportation maintenance, as was historically done with general excise taxes.

The President originally wanted to raise the gas taxes even more, propos-

ing a sweeping \$73 billion Btu energy tax increase in 1993 that would have raised the price of gas by 7.5 cents per gallon. Senate Republicans, under the leadership of Senator DOLE, killed that. I was one of those who worked hard to kill that. We killed Clinton's Btu tax. It should have been killed. It was not fair. It was not fair to the average person, was not fair to society as a whole and, frankly, was not fair in light of the excessive taxes that we are paying today.

I might say, voters should not be surprised by the President's gas tax increases. As Governor of Arkansas, President Clinton raised the State gas tax by a total of 10 cents per gallon from 1979 to 1991. He loves to raise taxes. They do it under the guise that they are reducing the deficit, when in fact these taxes have gone for social spending programs. There is no question about it.

Let me just say this. The Heritage study also shows that income tax rate increases in the 1993 tax bill delivered only 49 percent of the revenues that the President promised we would have or that were estimated by the Congressional Budget Office to be received by the Treasury. When compared with the jobs that were never created because of this bill, this means we sacrificed 17,600 jobs for every \$1 billion in deficit reduction. This is a very high price to pay for deficit reduction that can be achieved in a better way.

My Democratic colleagues and the President are quick to defend the 1993 tax bill by pointing out the progress that has been made in the deficit over the last few years. Let me be clear about this. Balancing the budget should not provide the rationale for raising taxes. It is merely an excuse for those who want to continue the tired, old liberal policies of taxing and spending.

For almost half of the last century, the Federal Government has spent \$1.59 in expenditures for every \$1 received through taxes or every new \$1 in taxes. Government is not taxing the American people to eliminate the deficit; it is taxing the people in order to continue spending. I do not think anybody really doubts that on either side of the floor.

We Republicans have demonstrated that we can balance the budget without increasing taxes. In fact, we balanced the budget while cutting taxes on the American family by providing incentives for new economic growth.

Mr. FORD. Would the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HATCH. If I could finish.

Mr. FORD. I want to ask about Social Security.

Mr. HATCH. I will be happy to yield if the Senator wants me to.

President Clinton chose to veto the Balanced Budget Act of 1995, just as in 1993 he turned his back on the American family and vetoed the bill that would have gone a long way toward reversing the tax increases he pushed

through in 1993. President Clinton's veto of the Balanced Budget Act cost a family of four a minimum of \$1,217 a year. A minimum. For many families, it will cost a lot more than that. That is the average family of four. This figure does not even begin to take into account possible tax savings from capital gains tax rate reductions, the adoption credit, the enhanced IRA provisions or deductions for student loan interest.

Can you imagine what it really cost the American family? The least it costs them is \$1,217 a year. Also, that does not take into account the substantial savings that would accrue to American families on mortgage interest, auto loans, student loans, other private borrowing, that a balanced Federal budget would mean by lowering interest rates by an estimated 2 percent. Those are economic realities.

I am the first to agree this 4.3-cent-per-gallon tax repeal would not solve all of our problems. I agree with that. But it is an important start in reversing the trend toward taxing Americans to death. Frankly, that is what we have seen from this administration in the 4 years that it has been in existence.

I said yesterday was tax freedom day. This is the day that the nonpartisan Tax Foundation says that average American workers stop working for the Government and start earning money that they can spend on their families. That was yesterday. You have the first 5 months of this year. Never has tax freedom day occurred so late in the history of this country as it has in 1996. Look at the calendar. And 1996 is more than a third over.

Americans work one-third of the entire year just to support the Federal, State and local governments. Just think about it. A family of four in my home State of Utah, with an estimated median income of about \$45,000, paid \$8,800 in direct and indirect Federal taxes. On top of this outrageous amount, they must also pay over \$5,700 in State and local taxes, bringing the total family tax burden to \$14,500. This is an effective tax rate for the average family of four of over 32 percent. Think about it.

But if we add to this the cost of Federal and State regulations and their effect on the prices of goods and services—and, of course, we have had filibusters against trying to change the regulatory system so we can get some reason into it, so people can live within the system, so we can still regulate in a reasonable and decent way, so we do not have the overbalances that we have today—even so, if you add the cost of Federal and State regulations and the effect they have on the prices of goods and services, along with the added interest, the cost the families must pay because of our failure to balance the Federal budget, the true family tax burden is even much higher than that \$14,500, or 32 percent. In fact, these costs are estimated—just these costs alone, these overregulatory costs—at

about \$8,600 for a family of four in Utah. Thus, the estimated total cost of government to a family of four earning \$45,000 a year is over \$23,000, better than half of what that family has coming in.

This is over half of the typical Utah family's income. So when you talk about repealing the gas tax, I say, let us do it. But I call on the President to go beyond this repeal and let us pass more of the significant tax relief provisions that were included in last year's Balanced Budget Act.

Having said that about the gas tax, let me just say a few words about the TEAM bill. Having been in labor, one of the few who really came through the trade union movement, I was a card-carrying union member as a wood, wire, and metal latherer. I worked in building construction trade unions for 10 years. As one who would fight for the right to collective bargain and who has fought for free trade unionists all over the world, I have to say that to allow what Senator DOLE has offered to our colleagues on the other side to be stopped—some on the other side do not want to allow employees, workers, if you will, to meet with management, in the best safety interests of the workers and of the companies—is just plain unbelievable.

There is only one reason why the folks on this other side take this position. Their biggest single funder of Democratic Party politics in this country happens to be the trade union movement. The trade union movement brings in about \$6 billion a year. It is well known in this town that 70 to 80 percent of every dollar in dues that comes in goes to paid political operatives who do nothing but push the liberal agenda in this country.

Even something as simple and as reasonable and as decent as allowing workers to meet with their owners and their managers, in the best interests of safety on the job, is being fought against by these folks over here for no other reason than big labor does not want that TEAM Act.

Now, why do they not want that TEAM Act? I cannot see one good reason why, except you have to think like they do. They know that the more the employees and the employers get together in meetings and discuss things, the more they find common ground, the better the employees understand the management concerns, and the better the management people understand the employees' concerns, the better they work together. Because of that, the union movement believes they will find there is no need for a union because management will treat the employees fairly, and the employees will treat management fairly. Why pay union dues? That is pretty shortsighted.

There are good reasons to have unions. Frankly, unions should not be afraid to compete in a reasonable situation. If they have good programs and they have good policies and they have

good approaches, the employees will join them. If they do not, then they are not going to join. That is why the movement dropped from 33 percent of the work force down to 13 percent of the work force today. It is because of being afraid of even allowing employees and employers to get together. Why are they not allowed to get together under current law? You would think reasonable, educated, civilized countries would allow employees and employers to get together and talk about safety and the best interests of both sides. You would think that would be just a given.

The reason it is not a given, Mr. President, is because the National Labor Relations Board has been taken over by Clinton appointees who do whatever organized labor within the beltway wants them to do, regardless of whether it is in the best interests of the worker. A few years back, the National Labor Relations Board threw out the right to have teamwork together between management and labor, causing a divide and divisiveness that should not exist, for no other reason than because their largest supporters, the union leaders in Washington, did not like it and were afraid they might lose union members because of a reasonable relationship with management.

That is ridiculous. It is not right. It is not fair. That is what the National Labor Relations Board ruled. Now we are stuck with it unless we pass a statute that allows these two interested parties, who ought to be getting along together, who ought to look for common ground, who ought to work together in the best interests of safety, unless we allow them to get together. That is all this is. It is such a simple, small thing, you would think nobody who looks at it objectively and reasonably could disagree.

Then we have the President at a press conference indicating we are slowing things down. Gracious, what will he not say if he can say something like that? Is there no argument that he will not make no matter how unjustified it might be? We have had almost 70 filibusters in a little over a year since the Republicans have taken over. I cannot remember ever having anything like that for Republicans when we were in the minority.

Now, I will say this: Senator MITCHELL had this common habit of coming out here and filing a bill and then filing cloture and accusing us of filibuster when nobody on our side intended to filibuster anyway. In almost every case where there was a reasonable bill, the bill passed or at least was debated.

Here we have had a slowdown on almost everything, and for the last number of days because the other side wanted the minimum wage. Senator DOLE walks out here and reasonably says, "We will give it to you and let you have a vote up or down on your bill, on your minimum wage, but we want these two other things that are

reasonable—repeal the tax gas in the best interests of our citizens, and we certainly, certainly, want to allow employees to meet with their management leaders in order to work on the workplace concerns of businesses all over America. Employees have every right to talk to their employers and express their concerns. I think these are reasonable requests, and I think the majority leader is being very reasonable.

Frankly, I do not understand why we have to continue to put up with the stonewalling that we have on the other side. Now, I cannot remember referring to stonewalling in several years, and I have not seen the word "stonewalling" used by the media during the last 2 years, hardly at all. I do not recall a time. I am sure there have to be a few times, but I do not recall. It was a daily drumbeat when the Democrats were in control and the Republicans were fighting for principles they believed in.

Here is Senator DOLE willing to give the other side an opportunity on the principles that they want to fight for, give them a chance to vote up or down, and all he asks is we have a chance to vote up or down on some of the principles we want to fight for and let the chips fall where they may. That is the right way to do it in this particular case. It may be the right way to do it in many cases.

Mr. President, it bothers me that underlying this whole thing, knowing that Senator DOLE, our majority leader, is making an effort to try to bring people together, to try to get the matters moving ahead, to do things that give both sides shots at their particular bills, that underlying this whole thing is a deliberate attempt to try to deny Billy Dale and his colleagues, former White House staff, who were just plain treated miserably, unfortunately, dishonestly, by people who got their marching orders from, according to those who testified, the highest levels of the White House, from getting just compensation for the attorney's fees they were unduly charged because of the mistreatment that they suffered at the hands of the White House.

It is a bill that I think would pass the U.S. Senate 100-0. It is being held up for no good reason at all. Now, the ostensible reason was that the Democrats did not have a chance to get a vote on the minimum wage they wanted to amend to the bill. Now Senator DOLE has provided them with that opportunity. Why do they not seize that and let Billy Dale get compensated?

Mrs. BOXER. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. Sure.

Mrs. BOXER. I wanted to know the Senator's feeling on this. Is it the Senator's view that the taxpayers ought to pick up the bills of any individual who is indicted by a grand jury, Federal grand jury, and then after indicted, is proved innocent, is not proven guilty, does he think it would be appropriate for the taxpayer to do what he wants to

do in this particular case for all of those who were indicted by a Federal grand jury?

Mr. HATCH. Of course not. The fact of the matter is this is a case that everybody agrees is an egregious example of excessive use of power, and greedy power at that, of the White House, and this is a case where the President himself said we should reimburse them with legal fees.

Mrs. BOXER. The reason I ask the question, I want to make the point that when we set precedence around here—

Mr. HATCH. I ask, Who has the floor? Let me say to my distinguished friend and colleague, let me finish making my explanation, and then I will be glad to yield for another question.

The fact of the matter is we have an injustice here, a gross injustice, which the Democrats and the Republicans admit is a gross injustice, caused by White House personnel and outside people who were greedy. The President wants this to be done and says he will sign the bill. It is not comparable to everybody who is indicted.

Second, I said yesterday that if people are indicted who are unjustly treated like this because of the same circumstances, I would be the first to come to the floor and try to help them. But not everyone who is indicted fits that category. In fact, very few do. I do not know of many White Houses that have shabbily treated former White House staff like this one has.

Now, when we find something similar to that, I am happy to fight for it, regardless of their politics or regardless of who they are, regardless of whether I like them or do not. I am willing to go beyond that. I would like to right all injustices and wrongs, but the mere fact that somebody is indicted does not say we should spend taxpayer dollars to help them. We have to look at them as individual cases. As chairman of the Judiciary Committee, I can say that this is what we have done in the past, what we will do in the future. As I view my job as chairman, it is to right wrongs and to solve injustices.

Now, we have the distinguished Senator from Arkansas here yesterday saying we should reimburse all of the people who have appeared before the Whitewater committee. Well, we are not giving Billy Dale reimbursement for attorney's fees in appearing before Congress. Frankly, I do not think you do that until you find out what is the end result of Whitewater, and then maybe we can look at it and see if there are some injustices. I think you will be hard pressed to say there is some injustice that comes even close to what has happened to Billy Dale and his companions. And if we put it to a test and have a vote on it, I think you would find that 100 percent of the people here will vote for it. I think that will be the test.

Mrs. BOXER. If the Senator will yield for a final question and observa-

tion, the reason I raise the question is, I think it is important when we do take action around here, that we let the taxpayers know what they are paying for. Actually, when this first came up, I say to my friend, it did not come into my mind until it was raised by another Senator, who said that there are many people who are indicted by a Federal grand jury and then the guilt is not proven.

We have to be careful what we are doing here. I think the fact that my friend responded in the way he did, that he is open to looking at this in a larger context, is important because I think whatever we do here will have ramifications. That was the purpose of my question, and I thank my friend for answering.

Mr. HATCH. I thank my colleague. She makes the very good point that we should not just be an open pocket for people who get indicted.

In this particular case, I think almost everybody admits we have to right this wrong. It is the appropriate thing to do. There may be others that we will have to treat similarly. I will be at the forefront in trying to do so.

With that, I yield the floor.

Mr. MURKOWSKI addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska [Mr. MURKOWSKI] is recognized.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, let me recognize and thank my friend, Senator HARKIN, who was kind enough to allow me to proceed out of order to accommodate my schedule. I ask unanimous consent that he may be recognized next.

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

#### NUCLEAR WASTE STORAGE

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, very soon, we must make an important decision which will lead us to a safer future for all Americans. Mr. President, today we have highly radioactive nuclear waste and used nuclear fuel that is accumulating at over 80 sites in 41 States, including waste stored at DOE weapon facilities.

Here is a chart showing the locations of used nuclear fuel and radioactive waste destined for geologic disposal. Each Member can see where used nuclear fuel is stored in his or her own State. Out at Pearl Harbor, we have naval reactor fuel. In Illinois and New Jersey, for example, we have commercial reactors. In many States, particularly on the east and west coasts, we have shut down reactors with spent fuel on site. We have non-Department of Energy research reactors, as indicated by the green, in various States. We have DOE-owned spent fuel and high-level radioactive waste scattered in across the country.

The purpose of this chart is to show each Member that used fuel is stored in populated areas. It is near neighborhoods, it is near schools, it is on the

shores of our lakes and rivers, and in the backyards of our constituents young and old all across our land.

Now, as you can see, this nuclear fuel is being stored in highly populated areas, near where most Americans live. It may be in your town, your neighborhood, my neighborhood. Unfortunately, used fuel is being stored in pools that were not designed for long-term storage. Mr. President, some of this fuel is already over 30 years old. With each year that goes by, our ability to continue storage of this used fuel at each of these sites in a safe and responsible way diminishes.

It is irresponsible to let this situation continue. It is unsafe to let this dangerous radioactive material continue to accumulate at more than 80 sites all across America. It is unwise to block the safe storage of this used fuel in a remote area, away from high populations. This is a national problem that requires a coordinated national solution.

Senate bill 1271 solves this problem by safely moving this used fuel away from these areas to a safe, monitored facility in the remote Nevada desert. This is a facility designed to safely store the fuel. It is the very best that nuclear experts can build—certified safe by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Senate bill 1271 will end the practice of storing used fuel on a long-term basis in pools such as Illinois, Ohio, Minnesota, California, New York, New Jersey, and 35 other States across the country. And Senate bill 1271, Mr. President—make no mistake about it—will solve an environmental problem. That is why I was so dismayed to receive the statement of administration policy, dated April 23, 1996, which threatened to veto Senate bill 1271 "because it designates an interim storage facility at a specific site."

Mr. President, although the statement claims, "The administration is committed to resolving the complex and important issue of nuclear waste storage in a timely and sensible manner," such words ring hollow in the context of a threat to veto any legislation that does anything but perpetuate the status quo. That is just what a veto of Senate bill 1271 would do.

I hope that it is not true, but I have to ask if the President is playing politics with this issue. If so, it's a political calculation that I do not understand. Perhaps the President is simply getting poor advice.

Are President Clinton and Vice President GORE really telling the voters in Illinois, New Jersey, and all of the other States on this map, that nuclear waste is better stored in their States than out there in the Nevada desert? I challenge Vice President GORE, who feels strongly about the environment—much to his credit—to go to the State of Minnesota, to go to New Jersey, to go to Wisconsin, and tell those voters that they must continue to store nuclear waste in their State.