

form of malignant tumor on the tendon, said Pryor. If it had been only a few years earlier, my son would have lost his whole leg, and a short time before that, he would have been doomed, he said.

When Hatfield called upon Bennett, the Utah Senator didn't respond. He obviously wanted to speak, but his grief was so cutting that it took a bit to pass. He directed his remarks to a young researcher who was on one of the witness panels. She had described in her testimony watching the president of Brigham Young University, Rex Lee, lose his battle with cancer. Bennett revealed that Lee was his best friend.

There was a lull in the conversation, and someone recalled the discussion earlier, when Samuelson described how her day goes. "From the moment I am awake, I wonder, 'how will my body react today?'" she said. "Initially it is always stiff and sluggish and unpredictable until it adjusts to medication. For the first hour or two, I cope with a sudden sharp tremor in one or both hands, or one leg suddenly freezing up or contorting in a way that prevents walking. Crawling around the house is sometimes the only way to keep getting ready as I wait for the drugs to begin to work."

Then Mack, with an edge to his voice, questioned aloud, "When are we going to do something about this? To provide what is needed?"

Hatfield warned that funding for biomedical research is not going to continue to increase and may not even hold stable, because in 1999, 2000 and through 2002 there isn't the money to carry out deficit reductions. "We are trying to balance the budget by taking money from only 18% of the budget," he emphasized. "And that isn't enough to do the job."

This was the last hearing that will be chaired jointly by Cohen and Hatfield. It was probably the most honest hearing on the Hill in a lot of years. Senators came face to face with why research is important. The witnesses now know these Senators as kindred souls who hurt as they do, a new reason to fight on through the pain and the grief.

Egos and arrogance left the room and honesty, caring and empathy remained. No heroes, just folks trying to figure out how to help each other.

#### DELAWARE COMPANY HONORED AS FAMILY-FRIENDLY

• Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, in this time of two worker households, working parents are increasingly faced with the difficult task of balancing work and family.

Every day in this country, families must find a way to meet the challenges that await them at home after a long day on the job. Some days it seems impossible to maintain a career while trying to figure out a way to get the shopping done, put dinner on the table and pick up the kids at soccer practice.

That is why today, Mr. President, I am proud to stand here to announce that Delaware companies are taking the lead and making it easier for working parents to balance their careers and families.

One particular company, MBNA America, which is based in Wilmington, DE, was recently honored as one of the top 10 family-friendly companies by Working Mother magazine.

This is the second straight year that MBNA has been named as one of the

top ten companies for working mothers and the fifth straight year that it has been named in the top 100.

Also, in the September 16 issue of Business Week, MBNA was named as one of the top 10 businesses in terms of their work and family strategies. This is the first time that Business Week has rated companies for their family friendly practices, and it shows that businesses are most successful if they take their work and family strategies seriously.

Speaking about MBNA, Business Week stated that "the bank won the highest grades from employees, who cited strong programs and job flexibility."

MBNA is to be commended for instituting policies and programs that are sensitive to the realities of two income families.

For example, MBNA offers three on-site day care centers that serve MBNA employees. I have had the opportunity to visit one of the two centers that are in Delaware, and I cannot stress enough what a benefit it is for workers to be able to take advantage of these day care centers. In Delaware, these centers give the parents of around 400 children the peace of mind that their child is in good hands.

Also last year, 109 men and 264 women took advantage of childbirth leave of absences that averaged 13 weeks. This is a wonderful opportunity for parents to be there for those precious first weeks of their child's life.

Another important benefit that is offered by the company is adoption assistance of up to \$5,000. This allows employees to provide a stable home and family to a child who needs that love and stability so badly. Just another way that companies can help build strong families.

Employees can take advantage of \$849,000 in company-sponsored college scholarships that allow those who wish to better themselves the opportunity to do so. After all, education is the greatest investment this country can make.

Working Mother magazine also applauded MBNA for having flexible work hours by utilizing job-sharing strategies and compressed work weeks.

And, the study showed that women account for a high percentage of executive positions at MBNA. Women make up 39 percent of vice presidents at MBNA and 16 percent of all senior executives are women.

Besides MBNA, two other Delaware companies were honored recently as family friendly companies. DuPont and DuPont-Merck Pharmaceutical were named as two of the top one hundred companies by Working Mother magazine for their leadership in creating job strategies that are sensitive toward families. DuPont was also named in Business Week's top10n list, and other companies with facilities in Delaware, such as Hewlett-Packard and Nations Bank, have been praised for their family oriented policies.

Mr. President, these work strategies that take into account everyday family life do not just benefit the employees, but also the employer. There is little doubt that recruitment, retention, morale, and therefore productivity all increase when companies implement family-friendly policies.

I am proud that MBNA and other Delaware companies have emerged as leaders in creating family work strategies, and I hope that this trend continues throughout Delaware and throughout the country. •

#### INTERNET CENSORSHIP AND CHINA

• Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, almost 1 year to the day after the Senate approved the Communications Decency Act [CDA], the Federal District Court in Philadelphia concluded that congressional approval of the CDA was "unquestionably a decision that placed the CDA in serious conflict with our most cherished protection—the right to choose the material to which we would have access."

Mr. President, this fall the Supreme Court will consider an appeal of that Federal District Court decision, issued in June 1996, which found the CDA to be unconstitutionally vague and a violation of free speech. The action by the Supreme Court will, without doubt, be one which determines whether the Congress will continue to encroach upon one of our most fundamental rights.

The Communications Decency Act was badly flawed in a number of ways—and I have spoken of those flaws often and in great detail on the floor of this Senate—but its most serious flaw was that it criminalized speech transmitted via the Internet which the Supreme Court has ruled is protected by the first amendment—so-called indecent speech. While its proponents claimed to be most concerned about sexually explicit and obscene materials on the Net—the transmission of which is already a violation of criminal law—the CDA swept more broadly, effectively prohibiting speech which is perfectly legal if it appears in a newspaper, magazine, or book.

Mr. President, when I and other Senators pointed out the great danger of the act's overly broad prohibitions of on-line speech, we were told that we were overreacting. We were told that this minor erosion on speech rights will not lead to greater restrictions on the rights of Americans.

But, Mr. President, what danger could be greater than a Congress willing to subjugate speech rights to the political needs of the day? While indecency may have been the target of Congressional disapproval in 1995, when the Communications Decency Act was first considered, the target of our current political climate appeared to be violence in media. The Senate Commerce Committee has considered and reported legislation that puts the Federal Government in the business of determining

what violent television programming is acceptable and what is not. In the name of protecting children, this Congress has edged closer and closer to Federal content regulation of speech in mass media. It is an unfortunate but true fact, that the propensity is high for Congress to jeopardize speech rights for the sake of political expediency.

That the United States Congress has taken the same path of countries which do not hold free speech as one of their most cherished rights—such as China and Singapore—should be of great concern to the American people.

For example, earlier this year, China passed a law allowing use of the Internet, but prohibited so-called harmful information on the Internet. According to media reports, as of September 10, Chinese officials had blocked access of China's 120,000 Internet users to more than 100 different sites on the World Wide Web. China considers "harmful information" to include sexual material, political material, and other types of news information that might somehow be harmful to China's people. China has blocked access to Web sites operated by Amnesty International and Human Rights Watch as well as to foreign media sites such as the Washington Post, Cable News Network, and the Wall Street Journal.

China also requires Internet providers to use government phone lines which allow information to be routed to government choke points where access can be blocked. And Internet users are required to register with the government. Media reports indicate, however, that the censors are already missing some sites such as the Swedish-Tibet Network and that many computer users have found ways to circumvent the ban.

Why are China's actions so significant? The Chinese Government has shown us three things. First, they have shown how fear of a new form of electronic communications leads to excessive regulation and censorship. While censorship is acceptable in China, it is repugnant and unacceptable to most citizens of the United States.

Second, they have shown us that once certain types of speech are prohibited by a government, the ban must be enforced. The regulations imposed by China to enforce their ban—the required use of government phone lines and the registration of users with the Government—has led to even greater erosion of civil liberties of the Chinese people. And third, they have shown us that speech and access prohibitions are ineffective when broadly applied to this new form of electronic communication. China's ban on certain types of speech is being circumvented. Their misguided efforts to protect the public from foreign sources of information and other sites are not likely to be effective.

Surely, the actions of the 104th Congress in approving the CDA are substantially different from the Chinese

Government's actions. Nevertheless, Mr. President, there are some striking similarities.

China reacted to the freedom of the Internet by applying the same type of controls they have used for centuries to control information—a ban on speech and prohibition on access. Similarly, Congress reacted to the presence of objectionable and offensive materials on the Internet by imposing the same types of speech restrictions that have been used in broadcasting. Both governments reacted in fear to a new and poorly understood technology by imposing overly restrictive controls that do not take into account the unique nature of the Internet. The difference is that China has a centuries-old tradition of restricting speech while Americans hold their first amendment rights among their most cherished freedoms. Governments with such vastly different values should not be following the same path on speech restrictions.

Senator LEAHY and I urged this body to take the time to study how we might more effectively protect children on the Internet without jeopardizing free speech rights. There are less restrictive and more effective means of protecting children on the Internet than the unconstitutional Communications Decency Act. Instead, like China, congressional fear of the unknown led this body down the perilous path of censorship.

Some in this body might find China's methods of enforcing the ban completely inapplicable to the Communications Decency Act. Surely, the United States would never require adults to register to use the Internet. However, the Department of Justice hasn't yet determined quite how the CDA would be effectively enforced. They have suggested credit card verification, which may not yet be viable. They have also suggested adult identification cards and tagging systems. Some involved in the debate of the CDA last year suggested that users be required to get an information superhighway drivers' license. That sounds remarkably like the registration requirements employed by the Chinese.

Mr. President, the fact is that the only way to effectively enforce the CDA is to dramatically restrict the constitutional rights of adult Americans. And that is simply unacceptable.

Congressional passage of the Communications Decency Act was a misguided attempt to reach an honorable goal—protecting children from those who seek to harm them on the Internet. While we should continue our efforts to protect children, we must seek more effective and constitutional means to achieve that goal.

The 104th Congress failed to honor its obligation to uphold the Constitution when it passed the Communications Decency Act. After the Federal District Court ruling, the Congress should have repealed the CDA—a law we knew to be unconstitutional.

I hope that the 105th Congress will repeal this unconstitutional statute soon after it convenes next year. Maybe then we can get down to the business of protecting children.●

#### MONTGOMERY COLLEGE 50TH ANNIVERSARY

● Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I rise today to acknowledge the many accomplishments of an exceptional institution of higher education in my own State of Maryland.

This year Montgomery College celebrates its 50th anniversary of providing quality higher and continuing education to the men and women of Montgomery County and the entire State of Maryland.

Since it began educating the men and women of Maryland 50 years ago, Montgomery College has experienced remarkable growth. From its modest beginnings with 186 students in borrowed classrooms at a local high school, Montgomery College's enrollment has increased to over 22,000 students who study at three campuses across the county in Germantown, Rockville, and Takoma Park. Over the years, half a million students have benefited from a Montgomery College education, preparing themselves for enrollment in a 4 year college and for direct entry into an increasingly high-technology workplace.

The rapid pace of technological development and the increasing complexity of our economy has created a new set of challenges for our Nation's institutions of higher education. Montgomery College has proven to be a national leader in responding to these challenges, developing a new state-of-the-art high technology and science center to be dedicated on October 10, 1996. This innovative project—a joint effort of State and local government—encompasses advanced technologies to further the educational opportunities for Maryland students and improve the economic competitiveness of our State.

Mr. President, it is my view that offering students the opportunity for a true education and helping them to develop their potential for success in our sophisticated and complex society are among the most important challenges facing our Nation. Montgomery College has risen to meet these challenges and is to be commended for its ambitious views of the future as well as its open-door admission policy, which makes that future accessible to all the citizens of Montgomery County and of Maryland.

Fifty years ago, Montgomery College was viewed as a "great experiment in higher education." It is clear from the accomplishments of the past half century that this experiment has been eminently successful in providing lifelong learning and enhanced opportunities for thousands of Marylanders.●