

5. The National Right to Life Committee has both a 5601(c)(3) and (c)(4). Its get out the vote information drive will be paid for by its 501(c)(4). Contributions will not be reportable, but are not tax deductible.

6. The City of San Diego has a city account that accepts contributions to help support a variety of civic activities, including the convention host committee in raising their shortfall. Contributions to the city account may or may not be reported but are tax deductible.

**American Defense Institute**  
1055 North Fairfax Street— \$700,000  
Suite 200, Alexandria, VA (501c3)  
22314, 703/519-700, 703/519- (tax-deduct-  
8627 (fax), Contact: Red ible)  
McDaniel.

**United Seniors Association**  
12500 Fair Lakes Circle— \$2.4 mil.  
Suite 125, Fairfax, VA 22033, (501c4)  
703/803-6747, 703/803-6853 (not deduct-  
(fax), Contact: Sandra ible)  
(Sandy) Butler, President  
(Anita Benjamin, her office manager).

**National Right to Life Committee**  
419—7th Street, N.W.—Suite \$2 mil  
500, Washington, D.C. 20004, (501c4)  
202/626-8820, 202/737-9189 (not deduct-  
(fax), Contact: Dr. David ible)  
O'Steen, Exec. Dir. (Direct line: 626-8814 or 626-8826).

**Americans for Tax Reform**  
1320—18th Street—Suite 200, \$6 mil  
Washington, DC 20036, 202/ (501c4)  
785-0266, Contact: Grover (not deduct-  
Norquist, President. ible)

**City of San Diego** ..... \$4 mil  
(501c3)  
(tax-deduct- ible)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Senator JOHNSON is recognized under a previous order.

#### CHILD CARE

Mr. JOHNSON. I was extremely pleased that recently President Clinton and Mrs. Clinton hosted a White House Conference on Child Care. The conference was not only informative, but also very effective, I believe, in drawing nationwide attention to the widespread difficulties that most parents have in finding child care that is both affordable and of high quality.

It is estimated that each and every day 3 million children under the age of 6 will spend time being cared for by someone other than their parents, including one-half of all babies younger than 12 months of age. We all know that these early years are critical years for child development and that we need to be concerned about the quality of care that these children are receiving. Unfortunately, for too many children, the quality is simply not high enough.

One national study, which was published in 1994, rated the majority of child care centers as mediocre or poor.

One out of eight child care centers were found to actually jeopardize children's safety and development. Not surprisingly, Mr. President, children in substandard care have delayed language and reading skills, they are more

aggressive than other children their age, and we should, therefore, recognize that raising the quality of care has long-term benefits not only for these kids but for our society as a whole. Clearly, strong families and strong parenting comes first, but we need to complement that with a greater emphasis on quality, affordable child care.

We understand and we recognize that child care can be extremely expensive, costing thousands of dollars per year for each child, and over \$8,000 a year in some parts of our country. Many parents struggle with paying these bills, which are frequently larger than their rent, mortgage, or car payment. In the case of middle- and lower-income families—especially single-parent families—child care costs can easily consume more than one-quarter of a family's annual income.

I have been holding a series of meetings with child care providers in my State of South Dakota. We face some special challenges in our State. Among these challenges is the fact that we have the highest percentage of working mothers in America. For more than 70 percent of the children in South Dakota, both parents work; or in the case of a single-parent family, the sole parent works.

Another item discussed at these meetings was the negative impact of cuts in the child and adult care food program that were part of the Welfare Reform Act of 1996. Many child care providers have relied on this assistance to provide affordable care, and many families now face increasing costs and reduced access to child care. One of the consequences of the change in the nutrition program was to actually create a disincentive for child care providers to remain licensed and certified.

Mr. President, I believe that the evidence is abundantly clear that we need to do more to provide more affordable and higher quality child care. This can be accomplished, I believe, without the creation of some new bureaucracy. Instead, working in partnership with the States, local governments, and nonprofit organizations, the Federal Government, working in Federal-State-local and a public-private partnership can achieve a great deal.

In an effort to seek constructive solutions, I have recently cosponsored two bills, the CIDCARE Act and the Early Childhood Development Act. These bills would work together in a complementary fashion.

I would like to congratulate Senators JEFFORDS and DODD for their efforts in authoring the CIDCARE Act, S. 1037. I am pleased to join them as a cosponsor. The bill contains several provisions that would be a very positive step forward for all forms of child care.

First, the bill would refocus the existing child and dependent care tax credit by making it refundable for low-income families and by increasing the credit for families with incomes under \$55,000. These steps will provide much-

needed assistance to families with the costs of whichever kind of quality care they choose.

Second, the bill contains a number of provisions to encourage child care providers to offer higher quality care by boosting training levels. Child care providers would be eligible for more generous tax deductions for education and training that helps them receive professional credentials. Additionally, States would receive grant funding to operate training programs and to offer scholarships to providers who receive training.

One aspect of the child care quality problem is the extremely high turnover among child care workers, which is not surprising when one realizes that most child care center workers make barely more than the minimum wage. The CIDCARE Act approaches this problem in creative ways.

First, the bill would create a problem for student loan forgiveness of child care workers who earn degrees in early childhood education, or who receive professional care credentials. Additionally, grant money would be made available to the States under this bill, which could be used for programs to provide salary increases for providers, who receive professional credentials.

We should do all we can to encourage more private sector businesses to offer child care benefits. The CIDCARE Act would provide tax credits to employers to reduce the costs of starting up a child care center, for the professional development expenses of child care staff, and for cost also related to getting a child care facility accredited.

All in all, the CIDCARE Act contains a number of innovative nonbureaucratic provisions, and I believe it would be a great step forward in increasing child care quality and in making it more affordable.

The second piece of legislation that I have cosponsored is the Early Childhood Development Act, S. 1309. I became an original cosponsor of this legislation when it was introduced just 2 weeks ago. I congratulate Senator JOHN KERRY and Senator BOND for their work on this bill.

One of the more critical needs in my State of South Dakota is for after-school programs. More than half the school-age children in my State have no parent at home in the hours after school lets out. From nationwide statistics, we know that juvenile crime is at its highest between the hours of 3 p.m. and 6 p.m., the hours between when kids get out of school and before parents, all too often, get home from work.

The Early Childhood Development Act contains provisions to expand Federal financial assistance to innovative programs that target at-risk children by providing constructive activities and care after school lets out. The bill does not create some new Federal bureaucracy. Instead, it offers grant money to States who will, in turn,

make grants to local after-school programs that are typically run by non-profit organizations, such as the Boys and Girls Clubs. We need more of these after-school programs, and we need more resources to expand the number of children that these programs can reach.

The Early Childhood Development Act would also strengthen programs that offer care to our youngest kids, aged 0 to 6. The more we learn about early childhood development, the more we realize how critically important it is that these children receive quality care. This bill would supplement the Federal child care and development block grant for at-risk infants, toddlers, and preschoolers.

Along the same lines, the bill would increase funding for the new Early Head Start Program, which provides comprehensive child development and family support services to infants and toddlers. This program not only offers a high-quality educational component for young children, but also parent education, parent-child activities, and health services.

Mr. President, I believe that these two important bills—the CIDCARE Act and the Early Childhood Development Act—will go a long, long way toward addressing the critical child care needs that we have throughout America today. I look forward to working on them in a bipartisan fashion during this next session of the 105th Congress. I yield the floor.

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

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

## ANNIVERSARY OF THE U.S. MARINE CORPS

### THE AIR FORCE MEMORIAL

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, the U.S. Marine Corps will be marking another one of its historic birthdays, No. 222. I have been privileged to have worn the Marine green, together with my distinguished colleague here, Senator CHAFEE. We both served in the Korean war.

The point of my remarks, Mr. President, is that we have a most unfortunate and, indeed, I think, unforeseen dispute between the U.S. Marine Corps and the Air Force over the location of the memorial which, in every respect, the Air Force deserves and has earned through the sacrifices of its men throughout its history. I remember very distinctly in World War II, it was referred to as the Army Air Corps. And then when the Department of Defense reorganized, they created, quite properly, in recognition of the enormous sacrifices of the members of the Air

Corps in World War II, which suffered, then, the highest per capita casualties of any of the combat units. Mr. President, cooler heads have to be brought to bear on this dispute. I am hopeful that can be done.

The purpose for my seeking recognition today was to recognize the Marine Corps birthday. But into this dispute has come a very solid, fair-minded, and I must say objective person, a former Secretary of the Navy, James Webb.

I ask unanimous consent that his statement, which appeared recently in public, be printed in the RECORD in its entirety.

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

### WRONG PLACE FOR THE AIR FORCE MEMORIAL (By James H. Webb Jr.)

Earlier this year I had the sad honor of burying my father, Col. James H. Webb, Sr., U.S. Air Force (retired). His grave sits on a gentle hill in Section 51 of the Arlington National Cemetery, just next to the small park on which stands the nation's most famous military landmark, the Marine Corps War Memorial.

Between his grave and the sculpture of the Marines raising the flag at Mount Suribachi on Iwo Jima, the Air Force Memorial Foundation proposes to build a large and intrusive memorial of its own. It is deeply unfortunate that the location of this proposed memorial promises nothing but unending controversy. And I have no compunction in saying that the foundation's methods in lobbying for this site would have puzzled and offended my Air Force father, just as it does both of his Marine Corps-veteran sons.

Until late this summer, few among the general public even knew that this site, which is within 500 feet of the Iwo Jima statue, had been approved by the National Capital Planning Commission (NCP). The Air Force's first choice had been a place near the Air and Space Museum, a logical spot that would provide the same dignity, synergy and visitor population that benefit the Navy Memorial's downtown Washington location. Later, deciding on Arlington Ridge, the Air Force during hearings erroneously maintained that the Marine Corps posed no objection to the erection of a memorial so near to its own. The Marine Corps had yet to take an official position, and no Marine Corps witnesses were called to discuss the potential impact.

Once the NCP decision became publicly known, it was met with a wide array of protest, including that of citizens groups and a formal objection from the Marine Corps. Despite a lawsuit and several bills having been introduced in Congress to protect the site, the Air Force is persisting.

This is not simply a Marine Corps issue or a mere interservice argument. Nor is it a question of whether the Air Force should have a memorial. Rather, it is a matter of the proper use of public land, just as important to our heritage as are environmental concerns. We have witnessed an explosion of monuments and memorials in our nation's capital over the past two decades. New additions should receive careful scrutiny. Their placement, propriety and artistic impact concern all Americans, particularly those who care about public art, through which continuing generations will gain an understanding of the nation's journey.

The mood around the heavily visited "Iwo" is by design contemplative, deliberately serene. The site was selected personally just after World War II by Marine Commandant

Gen. Lemuel C. Shepherd Jr., who was concerned that the statue required "a large open area around it for proper display." Dozens of full-dress official ceremonies take place each year at the base of the hallowed sculpture. Even casual ballplaying is forbidden on the parkland near it. It is, for many Americans, truly sacred ground.

To put it simply, the proposed Air Force memorial would pollute Arlington Ridge, forever changing its context.

The main argument in favor of this location—that it is within a mile of Fort Myer, where the first-ever military flight occurred in 1908—is weak, as all the services have extensive aviation capabilities that might be traced to that flight. The Air Force also argues that since the "above-ground" aspect of its memorial would be 28 feet lower than the top of the flagpole on the Iwo Jima statue, it will not interfere with the grandeur of the Marine Corps memorial. What Air Force officials take pains to avoid discussing is that if one discounts the flagpole, their memorial would actually be higher, wider and far deeper. Some 20,000 square feet of below-the-ground museums and interactive displays are planned, enough floor space for 10 average-sized homes.

The Air Force plan for an extensive three-story museum and virtual-reality complex at its proposed memorial is a clear departure in context from this quiet place. During the period leading up to America's bicentennial commemoration, the Marine Corps itself considered constructing a visitor center and museum on the land adjacent to the Iwo Jima memorial. It abandoned this plan because such facilities would be inconsistent with the purpose and the impact of the monument itself. It is not without irony that the land the Marine Corps deliberately left open is now being pursued by the Air Force for the very purpose that was earlier rejected.

Existing federal law precludes this sort of intrusion. Title 40 of the U.S. Code states in section 1907 that "a commemorative work shall be so located as to prevent interference with or encroachment upon any existing commemorative work and to protect, to the maximum extent possible, open space and existing public use." There can be no clearer example of the intention of such law than the case of the Marine Corps War Memorial.

The puzzling question is why the Air Force leadership argues so vociferously that its memorial will not negatively affect the Iwo Jima memorial.

I grew up in the presence of some of the finest leaders our Air Force has ever produced, leaders who would never have considered dissembling before a political body about whether the Marine Corps concurred in a proposal that might diminish the impact of its most cherished memorial—leaders who in this situation would have shown the public, and particularly the Marine Corps, great deference, knowing that its open support was vital. Indeed, leaders who remembered that the very mission in the battle of Iwo Jima, carried out at a cost of 1,000 dead Marines for every square mile of territory taken, was to eliminate enemy fighter attacks on Air Force bombers passing overhead and to provide emergency runways for Air Force pilots who had flown in harm's way.

It is now up to Congress to enforce the law and assist the Air Force in finding a memorial site that will honor its own without taking away from the dignity of others.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I have known Jim Webb for many years. When I was Secretary of the Navy, he was a young officer on my staff, having served with great distinction, for which this Nation awarded him the highest in