

(d) COORDINATION WITH SECTION 135.—Subsection (d) of section 135 is amended by redesignating paragraphs (2) and (3) as paragraphs (3) and (4), respectively, and by inserting after paragraph (1) the following new paragraph:

“(2) COORDINATION WITH HIGHER EDUCATION CREDIT.—The amount of the qualified higher education expenses otherwise taken into account under subsection (a) with respect to the education of an individual shall be reduced (before the application of subsection (b)) by the amount of such expenses which are taken into account in determining the credit allowable to the taxpayer or any other person under section 35 with respect to such expenses.

(e) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for subpart C of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 35 the following new items:

“Sec. 35. Higher education tuition and related expenses.

“Sec. 36. Overpayments of tax.”

(f) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to expenses paid after December 31, 1997 (in taxable years ending after such date), for education furnished in academic periods beginning after such date.

On page 13, beginning with line 21, strike all through page 14, line 4, and insert:

“(B) THRESHOLD AMOUNT.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), the term ‘threshold amount’ means—

- “(i) \$90,000 in the case of a joint return,
- “(ii) \$70,000 in the case of an individual who is not married, and
- “(iii) \$45,000 in the case of a married individual filing a separate return.

#### ENZI AMENDMENT NO. 591

Mr. ROTH (for Mr. ENZI) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 949, supra; as follows:

On page 190, line 1, strike “(III)” and insert “(IV)” and insert a new subparagraph (A)(i)(III)—

“(VI) the upgrading and maintenance of intercity primary and rural air service facilities, and the purchase of intercity air service between primary and rural airports and regional hubs; and”.

#### WELLSTONE (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 592

Mr. WELLSTONE (for himself, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. REID, and Mr. CONRAD) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 949, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert:

#### “SEC. 2107A. MENTAL HEALTH PARITY.

“(a) PROHIBITION.—In the case of a health plan that enrolls children through the use of assistance provided under a grant program conducted under this title, such plan, if the plan provides both medical and surgical benefits and mental health benefits, shall not impose treatment limitations or financial requirements on the coverage of mental health benefits if similar limitations or requirements are not imposed on medical and surgical benefits.

“(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed—

“(1) as prohibiting a health plan from requiring preadmission screening prior to the authorization of services covered under the plan or from applying other limitations that restrict coverage for mental health services to those services that are medically necessary; and

“(2) as requiring a health plan to provide any mental health benefits.

“(c) SEPARATE APPLICATION TO EACH OPTION OFFERED.—In the case of a health plan that offers a child described in subsection (a) 2 or more benefit package options under the plan, the requirements of this section shall be applied separately with respect to each such option.

“(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) MEDICAL OR SURGICAL BENEFITS.—The term ‘medical or surgical benefits’ means benefits with respect to medical or surgical services, as defined under the terms of the plan, but does not include mental health benefits.

“(2) MENTAL HEALTH BENEFITS.—The term ‘mental health benefits’ means benefits with respect to mental health services, as defined under the terms of the plan, but does not include benefits with respect to the treatment of substance abuse and chemical dependency.

#### NOTICE OF HEARING

##### COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate and the public that a hearing has been scheduled before the full Committee on Energy and Natural Resources to consider the nomination of Patrick A. Shea to be Director of the Bureau of Land Management.

The hearing will take place Thursday, July 17, 1997, at 9:30 a.m. in room SD-366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building in Washington, DC.

For further information, please call Camille Heninger Flint at (202) 224-5070.

#### AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

##### COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent on behalf of the Governmental Affairs Committee to meet on Friday, June 27, after last vote, for a business meeting on issues relating to the matter of issuing subpoenas for the special investigation hearings.

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

#### ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

##### COMMEMORATING THE LIFE OF JACQUES-YVES COUSTEAU

• Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, in every area of human endeavor, major advances often seem to depend on a single individual whose unique vision and dedication to pursuing that vision break through existing barriers to understanding. On Tuesday, the world lost one of those individuals, a pioneer in the area of oceanography and marine conservation. I am speaking, of course, of Jacques-Yves Cousteau.

I have had the pleasure and honor of knowing Jacques Cousteau as a friend and colleague for more than three decades. Our relationship was based on a common passion for exploring and pro-

tecting the oceans. We also shared a lifelong interest in ocean and coastal management and in sustainable development and use of marine resources. One of the most valuable perks of membership in the U.S. Senate is the opportunity it affords us to meet gifted leaders from every walk of life. Few of those leaders have made a greater or more lasting contribution than Jacques-Yves Cousteau.

Jacques' first adventure underwater was in Vermont at age 10. For the next 75 years, he continued his adventures, and he brought the rest of us with him. He was a pioneer in undersea exploration, and I can testify firsthand that diving with him was an unforgettable experience. He developed the first scuba gear, took the first underwater color pictures, and started the first undersea colony.

Probably as important as his scientific and technical achievements, Jacques brought the oceans to life for millions of Americans through breathtaking books, films, and his documentary television series, “The Undersea World of Jacques Cousteau.” His film “The Silent World” brought viewers aboard his ship, the *Calypso*, for the first time and won an Oscar for best documentary. He went on to win 2 more Oscars, 10 Emmys, and numerous other awards by astonishing viewers with the life under the waters all over the world from the Red Sea to Antarctica and from the Caribbean to the Indian Ocean.

As Jacques continued to explore the ocean, he became deeply committed to protecting it against pollution and other manmade hazards. In 1971, he accepted the Senate Commerce Committee's invitation to testify and spoke to us about the International Conference on Ocean Pollution. He later testified before the committee on other ocean issues. His testimony and other activities were key to public realization that the oceans are not a vast and unlimited resource, that human activities do indeed have profound impacts on the oceans, and consequently, that we have a duty to protect the marine environment.

A number of years later, I was privileged to present Jacques with the 1983 Neptune Award of the American Oceanic Organization. The award recognized his extraordinary contribution to promoting the use, understanding, and protection of the oceans. At the award ceremony, Jacques showed his new film on his trip up the Amazon River. None of those present will forget his evocative description of the pink dolphins and flooded forests of the Amazon. Jacques had a rare gift for allowing people to see the wonderful diversity of life beneath the water's surface.

Jacques-Yves Cousteau taught the world how to appreciate, understand, explore, use, and preserve the oceans which cover 71 percent of the Earth's surface. We will greatly miss his wit, wisdom, and zest for life.●

## MISS KANSAS

• Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I rise to congratulate Ms. Lesley Moss of Hoxie, KS, who has been crowned Miss Kansas. Lesley began competing in the Miss Kansas pageant at the age of 17—the youngest allowable age for a Miss Kansas participant—and was a top 10 finalist.

Last year Lesley won first runner-up in the Miss Kansas pageant. When the 1996 Miss Kansas, Tara Holland, relinquished her crown after winning the title of Miss America, Moss passed up the chance to take Holland's place, because she wanted to compete for the title again.

Growing up on a farm 3 miles north of Hoxie, Lesley realized that there is a special sense of community throughout rural Kansas.

Lesley developed an original program called Project L.E.A.D. (Learning what leadership is, Exercising personal leadership skills, Acting in collaboration with others, Devoting time and energy into community service) which encourages leadership through volunteerism within schools and communities of all sizes. As Miss Kansas, Lesley will promote leadership to thousands of students at over 200 schools this year. Project L.E.A.D. will also be her platform when she represents Kansas at the Miss America pageant in September.

Mr. President, I am proud of Lesley's commitment to improve the lives of Kansans and commend her for the perseverance and dedication it took to win the title of Miss Kansas. I wish her the best as she travels our great State promoting community leadership in the 21st century. •

## WHAT IS RIGHT FOR MEDICARE

• Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, earlier this week, the Senate voted on a reconciliation bill that will make some of the most significant changes in the 30-year history of the Medicare Program, and I want to explain to my colleagues and constituents why I opposed the Senate's bill.

I opposed the bill with some regret, because, for the most part, it reflects the bipartisan budget agreement, which I have supported. For example, I voted for the bipartisan budget resolution earlier this month. That plan requires the Congress to pass legislation to cut the deficit by just over \$200 billion over the next 5 years, with about \$115 billion of that deficit reduction to come from slowing down the rate of growth of Medicare. So I am not unwilling to vote for restraining Medicare spending in order to reduce the deficit.

We must put this country on track toward a balanced budget while ensuring the health and stability of the Medicare Program. Doing so requires that we limit the rate of growth of the Medicare Program. The Medicare Program has been growing at a rate of about 10 percent a year, a rate of growth that the country cannot sustain, especially once the baby boomer

generation begins retiring and putting additional financial stress on the program.

I had hoped to support the Senate's bill. In fact, the bill includes many items I have supported for a long time, including expanding Medicare's coverage for preventive benefits, expanding the health plan options available to seniors in North Dakota and across the country, and other changes to improve access to health care in rural areas and strengthen our ability to fight fraud and abuse in the program. I voted for a substitute Medicare package offered by Senator REED that included these provisions but did not include the more controversial provisions found in the Senate bill. Most notably, the Reed substitute, like the Senate bill, would have extended the life of the Medicare trust fund for 10 more years, but would have done so without asking Medicare beneficiaries to pay significantly more for their health care and without knocking a number of seniors out of the Medicare Program.

Unfortunately, in several extremely important areas, this bill did not abide by the bipartisan budget agreement achieved during months of negotiations this spring. The Senate bill abandoned this approach by including several provisions that will result in significantly higher out-of-pocket health care expenses for our Nation's older Americans.

The Senate bill included two significant structural changes—an increase in the Medicare eligibility age from 65 to 67 and a means test for the Medicare part B premium paid by upper income older Americans. I voted to strike these provisions from the Senate bill because I think it is inappropriate to make these kinds of central changes to the Medicare Program on the spending side of the budget ledger in order to make room for larger tax cuts on the tax side of the ledger. It is my view that changes made to Medicare should be made for the purpose of strengthening the program—not to provide room for tax cuts, the bulk of which will go to upper income earners in this country. Let's keep Medicare healthy and our older Americans healthy as well.

Why in this bill was it proposed that we ask seniors who make more than \$50,000 to pay higher prices for their Medicare policies so that investors who make \$500,000 or more could be given tax cuts? There is no denying a direct connection when the Medicare changes were proposed in the context of reconciliation legislation that includes tax cuts. In this reconciliation process, the act of achieving Medicare savings was intertwined with the desire for tax cuts on the revenue side.

There are some signs of reasonableness in this bill. For example, I support this bill's creation of a national, bipartisan commission charged with making recommendations to Congress on the long-term changes necessary to ensuring the extended solvency of the Medicare program. On the advice of this Commission we should confront the de-

mographic changes facing our country over the next 30 to 40 years as the baby boomers retire and our Nation grays. The commission will have one year to study and report its recommendations to Congress. Let's hope that this process will ultimately result in a solid package of changes that the Congress will act on quickly.

With this package of recommendations on long-term solvency I am willing to consider basic structural changes to the program, including means testing and/or increasing the eligibility age if the following conditions are met.

First, if we consider increasing the eligibility age, we must be able to respond to the needs of the retirees between the ages of 65 and 67 who will still need affordable insurance coverage. The Senate bill does not consider this issue. It simply proposes to leave these folks uninsured. Already, the number of retirees with employer-provided health insurance has dropped 14 percent in the six years between 1988 to 1994, and every indication is that this trend would be exacerbated by raising the Medicare eligibility age. Most low- or even middle-income seniors in their mid-sixties will never be able to afford the premiums that will be assessed by the health insurance industry to cover people of that age.

Now, I voted in support of increasing the Social Security retirement age in 1983, as part of a plan to extend the solvency of the Social Security program well into the next century. But I do not agree with those who compare the increase in the eligibility age for Medicare to increasing the Social Security retirement age to 67. Under Social Security, seniors who need or choose to retire before age 67 will still have the option to do so, at a reduced benefit level. The ramifications are very different for increasing the Medicare eligibility age. Under the Senate bill, these seniors will not have an option for getting Medicare benefits before they turn 67 and many of them will become uninsured.

If we raise the Medicare eligibility age from 65 to 67, we must provide some means to guarantee the availability of affordable insurance coverage for the citizens in that age group. One of the issues the Medicare commission created by this bill is charged with studying is whether it is feasible to allow retirees who have not yet reached the eligibility age for Medicare to buy into the program. This idea deserves consideration before we act to increase the eligibility age.

With respect to means testing or income relating, as it is called in the Senate bill, I am willing to support means testing for Medicare, but again, only after careful consideration of the ramifications for the entire Medicare program and for the purpose of extending the solvency of Medicare, not as