United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 105th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 144 WASHINGTON, MONDAY, FEBRUARY 2, 1998 No. 4

House of Representatives

The House was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Tuesday, February 3, 1998, at 12:30 p.m.

Senate

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 2, 1998

The Senate met at 12 noon, and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. THURMOND).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Lloyd John Ogilvie, offered the following prayer:

On this day, one hundred and sixty-six years ago, Samuel Frances Smith penned these familiar words of prayer:

Our Fathers' God, To thee,
Author of liberty,
To Thee we sing;
Long may our land be bright
With freedom's holy light;
Protect us by Thy might,
Great God, our King.

Thank You, Father, for Your faithfulness in answering this prayer as it has been sung all through the years. You have answered the prayers of Your people in times of success and need, war and peace.

Today, grant the women and men of this Senate an acute awareness that millions of American prayers for them are being answered. May they see their work this week as Your answer to the prayers of the American people. Remind them that You provide for what You guide. You will meet their needs and, through them, meet the needs of our Nation. There is no limit to what can be done when we place our lives in Your all-powerful hands. Through our Lord and Savior. Amen.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The able majority leader, Senator LOTT of Mississippi, is recognized.

Mr. LOTT. Thank you very much, Mr. President.

SCHEDULE

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, today, we will be in a period of morning business from 12 noon until 1 p.m. to accommodate a number of Senators who have requested time to speak. For this week's legislative schedule, it's my hope that the Senate will be able to complete consideration of the legislation renaming the Washington National Airport after former President Ronald Reagan. At this time, I am still hopeful that the other side of the aisle will allow the Senate to get a time agreement worked out so that we can complete that very, I think, appropriate legislation, in a reasonable time this week. Also, the Senate may consider a resolution regarding Iraq, as well as several nominations on the Executive Calendar, specifically, the nominations of Carlos Moreno and Christine Miller to Federal judicial appointments, as well as the nomination of David Satcher, to be an Assistant Secretary of HHS.

As I announced last week, no rollcall votes will occur today. However, all Members should be prepared to be present and voting throughout the remainder of the week, with the exception of Friday. We will not have recorded votes on Friday. We will not be in session on Friday because of a conflict we have with a conference that a number of Members wish to attend. The first votes will occur as early as noon on Tuesday, February 3, with respect to the two judicial nominations. We had thought those votes would occur earlier, but we will have morning business first in the morning, and then we will have the two recorded votes probably right at noon. In addition, we will be in session next Monday, February 9. At this time, it is not anticipated that any votes will occur on that Monday, February 9.

I thank all Senators for their attention. We will have, I suspect, a number of votes Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday of this week. And then we will continue to move on to legislation that we have pending, which are very important to be considered before we go out for the President's Day recess.

I yield the floor.

Mr. INHOFE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMAS). The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the hour of 12:30, I be recognized for such time as I may consume as in morning business.

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

Mr. HAGEL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska is recognized.

BURIALS AT ARLINGTON NATIONAL CEMETERY

Mr. HAGEL. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to address what I believe is a serious issue. Let me read just the opening paragraph of a story that appeared this morning in The Washington Times. The headline of the story is ''Koop given waiver for burial at Arlington; former Surgeon General helped Hillary.''

The first paragraph of the story is this:

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper containing 100% post consumer waste

President Clinton overrode Army opposition and granted a unique burial waiver at Arlington National Cemetery to C. Everett Koop at a time when First Lady Hillary Rodham Clinton had enlisted the former Surgeon General to support her national health care plan, internal documents showed yesterday.

The story goes on to talk about not just the dynamics of an implied deal, but it is far more serious than just an implied deal in my opinion, Mr. President, because what we are talking about here is giving sacred resting spots of our Nation's veterans away as deals, as rewards, as bargaining chips, as thank yous, as awards, as quid pro quos.

Mr. President, this is not only a bad precedent and very dangerous for the future of our country, but it flies in the face of the honor and the trust that America has always placed in its veterans and their service to our country. This is hallowed ground, Mr. President, this is sacred ground. Arlington National Cemetery is a national shrine. It should be a national shrine. We have very strict regulations and limitations as to who is allowed the great and distinct honor to be laid to rest at Arlington.

Mr. President, I have no quarrel with Dr. Koop. He was a very successful and important Surgeon General, a renowned doctor, and he has done many good things for his profession and our country and our Government. But someone has to talk about this because, you see, there is a connection; there is a connection between what obviously was done and what is not being done today for our active military men and women in uniform and for our retirees. I would like to read just two lines from one of Rudyard Kipling's finest poems. This poem, Mr. Kipling wrote is called ''Tommy.'' Many veterans will know this poem. Two of the last lines go like this:

For it's Tommy this an' Tommy that, an' chuck him out the brute!
But it's ''savior of 'is country'' when the guns begin to shoot.

Mr. President, this is a time when this body will debate and vote on shortly—in the next few weeks—whether we are going to ask our military, our men and women in uniform, who we call on every day to protect our liberties around the world, and we are going to commit them to more responsibility in Bosnia, NATO expansion, Iraq, maybe, yet we are now in a position to be giving away burial spots that were originally always intended for the man and the woman who put on America's military uniform and serve our country with great honor and great distinction. This is also a time, Mr. President, when veterans are having difficulty using the veterans' preference in getting jobs in the Federal Government. We are asking them constantly, especially over the last few years, as we have cut more and more of our defense budget, to do more with less. We are asking them to go on longer deployments and more deployments.

The state of our military housing is embarrassing. Yet, the President is very proud to submit a military budget that has no increases. I watched this morning the President's news conference, bragging about this small, limited little Government we have, that we have cut Government. Well, again, as I said last week, I don't know how he measures the cutting of Government, but the fact is we are going to spend $1.7 trillion on this Government this year. The Defense Department budget continually gets hammered and hammered. There has been no increase, but a 40 percent reduction in the last 10 years.

Health care. What have we done about health care for our retirees? We have done nothing. We have essentially taken away the promise that we made to these men and women in uniform, who served our country in time of war and peace, and now we are saying you need to get into the Medicare queue. I am sorry we cut back on military hospitals and on military personnel. Don't we understand that this may well inhibit readiness, retention, recruitment, and the best people for the military? Of course, it will.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's 5 minutes have expired.

Mr. HAGEL. I thank the Chair.

In closing, Mr. President, this is a bad signal and a bad symptom. I hope that the Congress of the United States addresses this issue.

Mr. BYRD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

THE INTERMODAL SURFACE TRANSPORTATION EFFICIENCY ACT

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the provisions of ISTEA, the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act, expired on September 30, 1997. The Senate took up the ISTEA reauthorization bill on October 8, 1997, but between that date and October 29, the Senate was unable to adopt even one substantive amendment due to the impasse over Senate consideration of campaign finance reform legislation. As a consequence, the six-year ISTEA Bill was taken down and returned to the calendar.

Finally, on November 10, the Senate passed a short-term extension of our existing highway and transit programs, thus delaying the completion of Senate action on our nation's surface transportation policy until the second session of the 105th Congress, the first week of which has now passed into history. Despite the stated intentions last November of the distinguished Majority Leader to take up the ISTEA reauthorization bill, S. 1173, at the beginning of this session, the bill has not been taken up, it is not before the Senate, and we are still operating on the short-term extension.

With each passing day, I am increasingly concerned that the Senate may not return to the ISTEA reauthorization bill until after action is completed on the fiscal year 1999 budget resolution, which may not occur until late spring.

I supported the enactment of the short-term extension bill back in November, but, as I said then, it was only a stopgap measure, and it provided only for one-half year of funding for our existing highway program, the highway safety programs, and the transit programs. Meanwhile, the various highway departments in the 50 states cannot establish a budget for the current fiscal year because they do not know the final level of federal resources they will receive even for this fiscal year which ends on September 30. The short-term extension bill will expire at the end of March, when the advent of spring will have made its appearance. Whether a new short-term extension of our highway programs will occur by the end of March is highly questionable. Meantime, how can the Governors and the highway departments of 50 states plan for the construction season that will soon be opening throughout the country? It is a classic case of dawdling and indecision in Washington which is throwing our states into highway planning and budget limbo!

Dante, the author of ''The Divine Comedy'', in Canto IV, described Limbo, as the ''first circle of Hell.'' This, it seems to me, is a very apt description of the situation in which the Governors and heads of highway departments throughout the states now find themselves as they attempt to budget and plan for the upcoming construction season, and their situation may very well become worse than hell as, more and more, they find themselves unable to do any long-term budgeting and planning in respect to highway construction.

They cannot develop and implement any long-term financing plan because they do not know the level of federal resources that will be available to them over the five years following the current fiscal year. This is an impossible situation for our state highway departments. Given the costs and the duration of major highway projects, and the complexities associated with short construction seasons in our cold weather states, planning and predictability are essential to the logical functioning of our Federal-Aid Highway program. That kind of rational planning is precisely what our states cannot do at this time because of the inaction of Congress regarding the highway bill. This is not how our state and local transportation agencies should have to do business. It is, nonetheless, the precise circumstance in which our transportation agencies are being placed due to the failure of Congress to enact a multiyear ISTEA reauthorization bill in a timely manner.

It is not only unreasonable, it is also very unfair, for Congress—because of inaction—to place this burden upon the Governors, the Mayors, and the highway agencies throughout the country.

Plainly speaking, Congress is shirking its responsibility!

Meantime, while Congress sits on its hands, Americans who buy gasoline are continuing to pay a 4.3 cents-per-gallon gas tax every time they drive up to the pump. That gas tax previously went to deficit reduction, but it is now being deposited in the highway trust fund, and Congress should pass legislation to authorize that it be spent on our nation's considerable highway needs. The money from these gas taxes is accumulating in the highway trust fund, but Congress has passed no legislation authorizing it to be spent for surface transportation needs. The American people have been told by the Congress that monies in the highway trust fund would be spent for highways and other surface transportation needs.

And as long as Congress fails to live up to its commitment the American people are being misled. As long as Congress fails to live up to its commitment, the American people are being duped into believing that the gas taxes in the highway trust fund will be spent on highway construction and other transportation needs, but Congress, meanwhile, dillydallies, sits on its hands, and lets these tax revenues build up in the highway trust fund. It amounts to an abuse of the trust which the American people have placed in us. Meanwhile, the potholes deepen, the asphalt chasms open wider, and danger stalks our nation's highways.

By the end of this fiscal year, more than seven billion dollars in additional new revenues will have been deposited into the highway trust fund, not one penny of which is, as of this moment, authorized to be spent on highway construction and other surface transportation needs under the committee reported ISTEA bill.

Instead, these funds will continue to sit in the highway trust fund, earning interest, and being used as an offset to the federal deficits—if, indeed, they are not siphoned off, in the meantime, and used for purposes other than highway and other surface transportation needs.

The time to act on the highway bill is now! The first week of the second session has gone with the wind. We are now into the second week. The clock is ticking and the calendar is running. The highway construction seasons will soon be upon us, and yet, as of this moment, there is no indication that Congress will return to the highway bill.

I hope that the Governors, who will soon be meeting in the Nation's Capital, will contact the leadership in both Houses and request that the highway bill be taken up immediately. I hope that the Mayors and the state highway departments will do the same. The first day of spring is only seven weeks away, and Congress must begin promptly to debate the highway bill in both houses if we are even to hope that the bill can be enacted by the time that ''the lark's on the wing'' and ''the snail's on the thorn.'' It should be done. But it can be done only if the leadership will bring up the bill. I respectfully urge the Senate leadership to do that promptly.

I thank the Chair. I yield the floor.

Mr. KYL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. KYL. Thank you, Mr. President.

MEDICARE BENEFICIARIES FREEDOM TO CONTRACT ACT

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I want to provide a brief update for my colleagues this morning on the Medicare Beneficiaries Freedom To Contract Act.

This is the bill which has 46 cosponsors in the Senate, 150-some cosponsors in the House, led by the chairman of the House Ways and Means committee, BILL ARCHER, to restore the freedom to America's senior citizens to seek the medical care they desire rather than to be dictated to by the Medicare Program to only receive that care under Medicare that they may desire.

Here is the situation as it evolved. Mr. President, up until January 1st of this year, senior citizens in this country had always had the right under Medicare to go to the doctor of their choice, and if they wanted to be treated outside of Medicare they could do that. Of course, Medicare couldn't pay the bill. But that freedom always existed. As of a couple of years ago, the administration began to threaten physicians saying that they had to submit all bills for senior citizens to Medicare. The rationale was that anybody over 65 was ''Medicare eligible'' because they were 65, and if they were ''Medicare eligible'' then a doctor had to submit the bill to Medicare. So physicians began being concerned that they couldn't treat people outside of Medicare even though that had always been the patient's right and the physician's right.

To ensure that situation wouldn't continue, I introduced an amendment last year during the negotiations—during the time we were negotiating the balanced budget amendment—and it passed here under a vote of 64 to 35 to ensure that patients had the right to ''privately contract,'' as it is called, and go to the doctor of their choice; not necessarily to go to Medicare, if they didn't want to. That amendment passed. It became part of the Medicare portion of the balanced budget amendment. But in the middle of the night some negotiators from the House and Senate caved in to the President's demands that if the Kyl amendment stayed in then the entire balanced budget amendment would be vetoed and, therefore, caved into his demands that a special limitation be placed on any physician providing this care; namely, that the physician had to get rid of all of his or her Medicare patients for a 2-year period in advance or you couldn't treat the person outside of Medicare. That is what went into effect January 1st.

This legislation that I just reported on will remove that 2-year requirement so that the patient has the freedom to go to the doctor of his or her choice. Even though you are over 65 years old, you don't have to be treated under the Medicare system if you do not want to be, and the physician has the right to take care of you without getting rid of his or her other Medicare patients.

When did this situation arise? There are a lot of different situations. Take for example the psychiatric patient who doesn't want the records in Medicare to reveal the kind of treatment that patient has been receiving. Under the current administration plan—Medicare or no care—you either do it under Medicare or you don't get the treatment. No doctor can take care of you. Our bill would say no. You can go outside of Medicare and be treated. Again, you have to pay the bill—not the taxpayer. But you can do it.

Another case: You are in a small town. There are not that many specialists. You need specialty care. You go to a doctor who says, ''I am not taking any more Medicare patients. The President and the Congress have cut our payments so much that it don't pay me anymore. In fact, I lose money on every one. I will take care of the ones that I have, but I am not going to see any more new Medicare patients.'' This enables the patient to say, ''Fine. Just bill me. I will pay you. We will save Medicare the money.'' And that will be the end of it.

Another situation: You want to go to that specialist. Maybe it is a person who is on a university faculty who is not taking Medicare patients, and you want to be treated by that person because it is the one person that can save your life or your spouse's life. You ought to have the right to do that in this country. Under the current law that wouldn't be possible.

So our legislation restores the right of senior citizens—and all the rest of us have this right—to go to the doctor of their choice, and if they want to be treated outside of the Medicare system have the right to do that. It does not enable the doctor to charge more money to Medicare. Whatever the doctor charges they have to pay outside of the Medicare Program.

So this is not going to be used very often, I suspect. But in those situations where people really want to take advantage of their freedom in contract they ought to have the right to so.

Mr. President, in conclusion, this is not something that is just of concern for America's senior citizens, because all of us should be concerned about a fundamental right being taken away from us—the right to provide the health care that we want for ourselves or our families.

As the President is talking about making Medicare available to more and more people at younger and younger ages, I would have to ask them: Is it such a good deal to buy into Medicare when the first thing that happens when you do that is you give up a basic right that you have today—that every one of

us has today—but doesn't exist for somebody who is 65 years old or older because they are Medicare eligible? It is not a good bargain.

So what I am hoping is that the Finance Committee will hold hearings later this month—those hearings have already been set, I understand, by Senator ROTH—and that there will be legislation coming to the floor, and our bill coming to the Senate floor very soon thereafter. And sometime in the early spring we can pass on to the President a bill which will restore the right of all seniors in this country to go to the doctor of their choice without being told by Medicare that they can't do that; that, in effect, it is either Medicare or no care. That is un-American. It is wrong. It denies the basic right of all Americans. And we need to ensure that we can correct that problem through the passage of the Medicare Beneficiaries Freedom Contract Act.

In closing, if any one of my colleagues who have not done so already would like to sponsor the legislation, please see me because we will be moving forward on this very quickly.

Thank you.

Mr. GRAMM addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. I might say that under the order the Senator from Oklahoma reserved time at 12:30.

Mr. GRAMM. I think I have sufficient time between now and then, Mr. President. Thank you.

ISTEA

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, Senator BYRD has already spoken about the highway bill. I want to amplify on what he has said.

When you go to the filling station and you pull up your car or truck and you take out that pump and stick it into your gasoline tank, now most filling stations don't have the little clip on the bottom. So you have to stand out there and pump it. Probably most people have done what I have done. And that is while you are standing there you read what is written on the gasoline pump. What is written on the gasoline pump is sort of bad news and good news. The bad news is that a third of the cost of a gallon of gasoline in this country on average is taxes. The good news is, as it says right on the gasoline pump, that every penny you pay in gasoline taxes is going to build roads.

The problem that Senator BYRD and I are talking about today and the problem which we are trying to fix is that the bad news is true. A third of the cost of a gallon of gasoline is taxes. But the good news—that it is spent on roads—is not true. In fact, today over 25 cents out of every dollar collected in gasoline taxes goes to general Government. It funds programs that have absolutely nothing to do with highways, transportation, or with gasoline taxes.

My colleagues will remember—perhaps some people in the country that follow the debate will remember—that last year I offered an amendment to the tax bill that took the 4.3 cents a gallon tax on gasoline that had been part of the President's 1993 tax increase, and took that money away from general revenue and put it back into the highway trust fund where it belongs.

That became the law of the land last October 1st. It went into effect. It went into the highway trust fund. Senator BYRD and I are trying to take a final step which we view as an honesty-in-Government step, and that is to require that the money that we collect in gasoline taxes be spent on roads. Those who oppose this amendment are trying to delay its consideration to get it commingled with the budget so that it simply can be portrayed as another competition for available money, and perhaps an effort to bust the budget.

I want to remind my colleagues that the amendment which Senator BYRD and I have offered specifically does not bust the spending caps. All we are doing is asking that the money that we collect in gasoline taxes be spent for the purpose that we are telling the American people that the money will be spent. That would require us over the next 5 years to reallocate 1.4 percent of nondefense discretionary spending, and by reallocating it guarantee that the money goes to the purpose that we said that the money would go when we collected it at the gasoline pump.

We have 50 cosponsors. I urge my colleagues to join us in this effort. I urge our leadership to not commingle this with the budget. We have a highway bill to write. The current highway bill will terminate on May 1. Money will not be available for construction after that time unless we act.

I think it is important that we bring the bill up and that we have an up-or-down vote on honesty in Government, and that vote is, do you believe the gasoline tax, which we tell people goes to road construction, should actually go for that purpose? I believe it should. That is why I am a cosponsor with Senator BYRD, Senator BAUCUS, Senator WARNER, and many others in this effort to basically require that gasoline taxes be spent on roads.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Oklahoma is recognized.

Mr. INHOFE. I thank the Chair.

EXECUTION OF KARLA FAYE TUCKER

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I see the Senator from Texas. I would ask him, although it would elicit probably too long a response, if he has ever done anything that is really politically stupid. And I am sure he has either knowingly or not knowingly—as I am about to do—done something that would fall into the category of political stupidity.

Tomorrow an execution is scheduled to take place at 6 p.m. in the State of Texas. The young lady's name is Karla Faye Tucker. It happens we have an individual we know in common, so I became somewhat familiar with this case, and I will just give a thumbnail sketch as to what happened.

Karla Faye Tucker, when she was a very, very small child, went into heroine at age 10. She is the daughter of a prostitute. Karla Faye went into prostitution when she was 13 years old. She never had a childhood, I guess we could say. Fourteen years ago, while living in a drug cult, an individual on a motorcycle came riding into her living room, dripping oil and breaking things and stealing things and rode out. And the next day, Karla and an accomplice broke into the apartment of the motorcycle rider, who was in bed with a girl, and murdered both of them—a brutal murder.

I do not think there is anyone in the Senate who has a stronger record and background in punishment as a deterrent to crime than I have, nor is there anyone here who has been more active in establishing stronger death penalties than I have. The Furman case took place in 1972, and that is what struck down most of the States' capital punishment laws. I was in the State Senate at that time, and for 5 consecutive years I was the author of the capital punishment bill in the State of Oklahoma. I have always felt that punishment should be severe, it should be swift, and it should be equal.

We had a person who became very famous after 15 years on death row, Roger Dale Stafford, who brutally murdered nine Oklahomans. This guy was left on death row for 15 years. No one ever questioned that he was guilty. He never had any remorse. He just sat there and got fat. He gained 100 pounds while he was in there watching color TV. I have often said the longer the length of time between the conviction, the sentence to death and the carrying out of that sentence, the less that punishment serves as a deterrent to crime. So I have always felt that punishment should be carried out immediately.

But as I watched developments unfold with Karla Faye Tucker, I came to the conclusion that I have reached in a very unusual way. It is something I never thought I would do. It occurred to me that if Carla Faye Tucker had been a man, Carl Tucker, already either he would have been executed or would have been commuted to life and we would never have even known about it. Nobody would have cared.

The controversy that has been stirring around this—which I think probably would have gotten a lot more controversial if it had not been for the sex scandal that has dominated the media in recent days—was, I think, primarily because Karla Faye Tucker is a woman. It would not have happened if Karla Faye Tucker had not been a woman. Now there is all the public and

political pressure to execute this person for this heinous crime she committed that I don't think there would be if she had not been a woman.

I took the time a few weeks ago through the Richmond Law Review to check to see how many cases have been commuted to life imprisonment from death row since the Furman case of 1972. I found that there have been 76 cases. I have not reviewed all of these cases because I have not had the time to do it, but I did look at several of them. I found that there are a lot of circumstances in the Tucker case that were similar to those which caused these other cases to be commuted, 76 of them since 1972. And I will use as an example, in the State of Georgia, William Neil Moore whose sentence was commuted to life imprisonment.

There were several reasons, but the four that kept coming up in his case were, No. 1, an exemplary prison record; No. 2, a strong feeling and expression of remorse for the crime he committed; No. 3, a religious conversion; and, No. 4, pleas from the families of the victims of the crime for clemency. I looked at Karla's case to find that all four of those are there, but it is much more so than it was in the case of William Neil Moore whose sentence was commuted to life imprisonment.

In the Tucker case, it is not just the sister of one of the victims and the brother of the other, but three of the four prosecutors who have made a plea for clemency. The homicide detective, J.C. Moser, the guy who put her away, has quite a passionate story that he tells on how he has never felt any kind of remorse for anyone he has sent up and now he is lined up with several others. Even the prison guards have actually passed a petition around asking for clemency.

I have a letter here I just received this morning from Mr. W.C. Kirkendall, who is from Seguin, Tx. I will read the first and last two sentences of this letter. This is a letter of December 9 to Governor Bush. ''I have been a prosecutor since 1984, favor the death penalty in the appropriate cases and have prosecuted many people who I believe deserved the ultimate penalty that society can inflict.''

The last paragraph says, ''In sum, there is nothing that her execution will accomplish and much that commuting her sentence to life will do to show both the efficacy and justice of the Texas death penalty system. Please spare her life.''

In this letter he goes into all kinds of detail as to how strong he feels about the death penalty and why he would be asking the Governor for an exception in this case.

Having looked at this, I think there can be a case made that if Karla Faye Tucker had been Carl Tucker, there would not have been all of the public and political pressure applied to demand the death penalty.

We went through something very similar in Oklahoma. In Oklahoma 2 years ago we had the most cruel, I guess, mass murder or terrorist act in the history of America when 168 innocent Oklahomans were murdered. And Timothy McVeigh went through the necessary trials, and they found him to be guilty, and they gave him the death sentence. And then Terry Nichols, who was an accomplice in the case, went through the trial, and they did not give him the death penalty.

I never try to second-guess what juries do. I had an experience myself back in the 1970's after the Furman case. I was in the State Senate, and I was the author of the death penalty bill, and I was called for jury duty. There I was. And it was a murder case. And so when they were trying to decide whether or not we should qualify as jurors, they asked me a series of questions. I said, ''Look, I can save you a lot of time. I am a member of the State senate. I am the author of the death penalty bill. I already know this guy is guilty. I have been reading about it, and the guy ought to fry.''

They did not disqualify me, and I ended up being the chairman of the jury that acquitted him. So a long time ago I stopped trying to second-guess the decision. Anyway, in the case of Terry Nichols, they did not do that. I wondered quite a bit since this case came up if Terry Nichols had been a female, would there have been so much pressure applied to everyone who would be listening to make sure that Terry Nichols got the death penalty because we didn't want an exception being made because Terry Nichols might have been a woman.

And so I look at what's happened. Just a few minutes ago, the Texas Pardons and Parole Board made a decision, and I think it was a decision that we all knew they would make, that they would deny any clemency to Karla Faye Tucker. In fact, a guy named Victor Rodriquez—I do not happen to know him, he is the chairman of the Texas Pardons and Parole Board—said way back on the 6th of January on the ''Rivera Live'' show that it did not make any difference what they came up with, that he was not going to be willing to offer commutation to Karla Faye Tucker. And the commutation petition was not even filed until January 22. So that decision has been already made. It was a done deal. And, of course, they came out and said she should not be granted clemency.

I do know Governor Bush. He is a very fair and very compassionate individual. I have looked at the constitution of the State of Texas. It is a little bit different. It gives a lot more power to the Pardons and Parole Board than some of the other States, but in the case of the Texas Pardons and Parole Board, after they have said they would deny clemency, article 4, section 11, of which I will read one sentence that is significant, says:

> The Governor shall have the power to grant one reprieve in any capital case for a period not to exceed 30 days.

All Governor Bush can do right now is to make that recommendation. And during that time he would be able to look at some of these cases. What I think I would do, if I were the Governor of Texas, and knowing what I know so far, is go ahead and grant that 30 days reprieve; nothing would really be lost by that, and then in the meantime during that period of time I would send for—in fact, I would be glad to send them to him—the 76 cases in America where clemency has been offered in the form of commutation of a death sentence into life imprisonment and then look at the standards to see if those standards are not at least met or exceeded by Karla Faye Tucker. I think he would be able to do that.

In the absence of that, of course, tomorrow at 6 o'clock Karla Faye Tucker will be executed. I hate to think that we would wake up on Wednesday morning and go back and start researching and find that those standards were at least met or exceeded. I guess we could call this gender backlash.

The other day I was watching someone on TV—I cannot remember who it was right now, but they said on the 3d of February at 6 o'clock Karla Faye Tucker will be executed in Texas and O.J. Simpson will be playing golf.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

SCHEDULING THE ISTEA BILL

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I rise, with all due respect, to ask the majority leader to reconsider the schedule which he has set so that we take up the Intermodal Surface Transportation Act, otherwise known as ISTEA, right away rather than deferring it as presently seems to be the case. I say this because our States, contractors, all of our people who depend on highways, very much depend upon the Congress to reauthorize the highway bill. Unfortunately, we have yet to do that.

The current program, as we know, expired last year on September 30. However, despite the fact that the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee favorably reported a six-year reauthorization in October, neither the full Senate or the House considered it. Instead, we were forced to pass a temporary, stopgap, 6-month extension, which expires May 1.

Mr. President, if the current schedule holds, that is, if the highway bill is not brought up until after the budget resolution, there is a strong possibility that Congress may not pass a highway bill until shortly before it adjourns this year, which is in October.

That result would be totally unacceptable. It would be unacceptable to our people, to our contractors, and to our highway workers. And it would be unacceptable to me. Frankly, it would not be a responsible way to conduct our Nation's business. Senators should understand just how long it takes a

State highway commission and contractors to plan these projects. It certainly requires months and in many cases it takes years. Furthermore, State legislatures must set their budgets so they can come up with the funds to match the Federal highway funds. This takes time, especially if a legislature meets once every two years. Transportation projects are not something you just turn on and turn off like a spigot. Our current course is very disruptive.

All this is critically important because States cannot obligate funds for highways unless obligation authority is provided by law. Our current 6-month extension expires May 1. After May 1, States will be unable to enter into contracts for their highway programs. That will bring hundreds of projects to a stop, with the resulting loss of jobs.

We might ask, Why doesn't Congress pass another short-term extension? First, that is an on-again-off-again way of doing business. No business would operate like that. And government shouldn't either. We are playing with people's livelihoods if we continue this ''on-again-off-again,'' strategy by passing a series of short term extensions.

Second, there is no guarantee that Congress can easily pass another short-term extension. That's because it would probably take unanimous consent in the Senate so that we limit amendments. We know some states like the current formula and others like the new formula. As we get closer to the election, it will be increasingly difficult to get Senators to refrain from offering amendments to change the formula. I'm sure most of my colleagues can appreciate how incredibly difficult it would be to quickly pass another simple extension under those circumstances. And even if we could, it would be continuing a bad on-again-off-again policy.

We have only 49 days in session until May 1. The bill is going to take a couple or three weeks in the Senate. The House must pass its version of the bill. Then we have to go to conference. That is a lot to do in just 49 days. So it is all the more reason to start as soon as we can in the Senate.

Furthermore, we don't have a lot of business before us right now. There is nothing that is so urgent, except the highway bill. The highway bill is urgent. It is just common sense that if something is both important and urgent, we should be devoting our attention to it. Well, the ISTEA legislation is both urgent and important. We should take it up now, not later.

I know the majority leader has lots of competing considerations here. One is the budget and how to handle the expected surplus. Should we pay off the debt? Lower taxes? Increase spending for priority programs? Secure Social Security and Medicare? Invest in our transportation infrastructure? I understand the argument that some are making: Let's put the highway bill off so we do it all together, all at once. The problem with that is very simple, it means we will probably not have a highway bill until September. And in the meantime, we will be hamstrung with formula fights and other issues on short-term extensions. As I said before, we all know the closer we get to the end of this year, to elections, the more difficult it is because then the formula fights among States become more real.

I think there are ways to work this out. Basically, we have to sit down with people on both sides of the argument here and find some way to resolve this to get the highway bill up.

I also might add that this is not just a highway bill. It is a mass transit bill. For those people in our country who live in the more populated States where mass transit is more important than it is in more rural States like Montana where I come from, they must know the transit legislation is an integral part of the ISTEA bill.

Mr. President, how much time do I have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Actually, the Senator's 5 minutes have expired.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, may I have 2 more minutes?

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

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, it is highways that are being postponed; it is transit being postponed; it is all the safety programs that are in the highway bill that are being postponed; it is the intermodal connections. My friend Senator MOYNIHAN is the father of the ISTEA bill. All his good work will be on hold until we can reauthorize the program. Senator DORGAN has been very helpful in this matter, as has Senator BYRD, Senator GRAMM, Senator WARNER—many of us want the highway bill up now. Our basic point is let's just bring it up now while we have the time. Otherwise we are going to be caught in a situation where delay upon delay means the ISTEA bill is not reauthorized until September or October.

So I close by asking the majority leader to again look at the consequences of delaying the highway bill and to reconsider his decision, because this is a very, very serious matter and I hope we can find a way to avoid these kinds of disruptions. I am willing to work with the leadership, with Senators CHAFEE and WARNER, and other members to accomplish that objective. I yield the floor.

Mr. GRAMM addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I might speak for 7 minutes.

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

THE CLINTON BUDGET

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, I want to talk about the Clinton budget which was sent to Congress this morning. I want to try to outline basically what the budget does in terms of spending and taxes. I want to talk a little bit about the tobacco settlement. I want to talk about protecting Social Security. And I want to note that it is very important for people, in understanding the President's budget, to look beyond just the cover page, because the President's budget has a number of new programs that are funded by offsetting receipts and, as is usually true when a Government document is half as high as you are, there is a lot of hidden agenda, hidden spending, hidden taxes in the President's budget. My staff and I have spent yesterday evening and this morning going over the President's plan. I am not sure we have ferreted out all the new spending and all the new taxes, but we have numbers and I think they are important.

First of all, the President proposes $130 billion of new spending programs. That is a larger scale of new Government spending than has been contemplated by any budget since 1994 when the President proposed having the Government take over and run the health care system. If you exclude the health care proposal, where the President proposed that the Government on a massive scale take over and run the health care system, you have to go all the way back to at least the Carter administration to find a budget that proposes the massive increases in social programs that are contained in the Clinton budget. Interestingly enough, when you look at the Clinton budget it claims to spend $1.733 trillion, but in reality, as large as that number is and as substantial as that increase is over last year, there is at least another $42 billion that is hidden in spending that is offset by fees and by asset sales, so that in reality the budget spends $1.775 trillion, which makes it far and away the largest budget ever submitted in the history of America.

I think it is startling to note that the President's budget contains $115 billion worth of new taxes. Some of these taxes are called by different names, but they all represent taxpayers paying more in taxes, more in fees, more for the things they buy so that Government can spend more as their real purchasing power is less. There is some tax relief in the President's budget: $24 billion. But when you add it all up it is a net tax increase of a whopping $91 billion.

What I think is amazing about this tax increase, which is the largest tax increase since President Clinton proposed his tax increase in 1993, is that the tax burden on American workers is higher today than it has ever been in the history of our Republic. Not during the peak of the war effort in the Civil War, not during the peak of the war effort in World War II, did the average American citizens send 30.5 cents out of every dollar they earn to government at some level before. This year American families on average will send 30.5 cents out of every dollar they earn to government, which will spend it on

their behalf and supposedly in their interests. It is amazing to me that the President, when we are facing the highest tax burden in American history, would be talking about another $91 billion of net taxes.

Let me talk about the tobacco settlement. The President is counting on $65 billion of revenues coming from the tobacco settlement and, except for a tiny amount—$800 million which is spent on Medicare—this $65 billion goes to an array of new spending programs that have absolutely nothing to do with the tobacco settlement. I want to remind my colleagues and anyone who is interested in this issue that the whole logic of the tobacco settlement is that the tobacco companies, by selling tobacco to consumers, and through the health effects of smoking, have imposed a massive cost on the Federal taxpayer. But where has that cost occurred? It has not occurred in child care, it has not occurred in new school buildings, it has not occurred in the cost of new teachers—it has occurred in mounting costs for Medicare. Interestingly enough, while the States are big beneficiaries in their Medicaid Program from the tobacco settlement, for every $1 of cost imposed on Medicaid by people smoking in the past, there have been perhaps $6 of costs imposed on Medicare.

So I believe if we have a tobacco settlement, that money ought to be put to a noble cause and that cause is saving Medicare, not just for our parents but for our children. I don't think we ought to take money in the name of reimbursing the taxpayer for medical care costs that have been borne through Medicare and spend that money on other things. I believe, if there is a tobacco settlement, that the money ought to go to save Medicare and I intend, as chairman of the subcommittee with jurisdiction over Medicare, to fight to see that any tobacco settlement goes to Medicare, that it doesn't just become a grab bag to fund new Government programs that have nothing to do with the health effects of tobacco.

The President says that he wants to use the surplus to save Social Security. No. 1, I think the President's words ring hollow when you note that he is busting the spending caps that we agreed to last year in a bipartisan budget. I am sure some of my colleagues will remember that I thought the spending level was too high in last year's budget. In fact, last year in writing that budget we broke the spending caps of the budget that President Clinton had pushed through Congress in 1993. But now the President is already trying to break the agreement that we adopted last year, and I reject that.

Finally, I don't know how the President can claim to be saving Social Security when the Social Security system will pay in $600 billion more into the Social Security trust fund than will be spent on Social Security, and the President spends $400 billion of the $600 billion. I believe we need to set up a program to take that $600 billion and invest it in Social Security by making real investments that are owned by the individual worker so that young Americans will have some chance of getting some benefits from Social Security.

So I believe the President's budget breaks the agreement that he entered into with Congress last year. The President's budget breaks the spending caps. The President's budget proposes the largest increase in spending contemplated by Government since he proposed having the Government take over and run the health care system. The President proposes the largest tax increase, $91 billion, larger than the tax cut from last year—he proposes the largest tax increase contemplated by our Government since 1993. The President takes $400 billion that will be paid into the Social Security trust fund and spends it on general Government under this budget. I believe that should be stopped.

Finally, if we have a tobacco settlement, the money ought to go to save Medicare, it ought not to go to fund general Government.

So, I believe the President is breaking the deal that he made with Congress. I believe your word is your bond on these matters.

I am opposed to the President's budget. I think we should hold the line on spending. I think whatever surpluses we have, A, we ought not to do anything with them until we have them, and, B, when we do have them, we should use them to make real investments so that our young workers will have some benefit from Social Security, a program that they will pay into their entire working lives. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KYL). Will the Senator from Texas suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. GRAMM. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, on behalf of the leader, I ask unanimous consent that there be a period for morning business until 2 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

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

Mr. THOMAS. I would like to speak up to 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized.

ISTEA FUNDING

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, we have had this afternoon several Members rise to talk about ISTEA funding. I rise to support the things that they have said. One of the most important bills that we passed in our committee last year, and I think one of the most important elements before us now in the Senate, is the funding of the Intermodal Transportation Act.

We worked a great deal last year. I happen to be on the Committee on Environment and Public Works, and we came up with an extension of the ISTEA bill, which expired last year, by the way. Now, of course, we are operating on a temporary arrangement, which makes it very difficult for State highway departments to make the contracts that are necessary. I think it is particularly important for States like Wyoming and the northern part of the country, where you have a relatively small short contracting and construction time, that we move to pass this bill so that the States will know what money is available to them.

There should have been approval last year, other than an extension. Unfortunately, we couldn't come to an agreement with the House. Furthermore, right here in the Senate, as I recall, there were some things that were brought up that kept us from considering ISTEA. But now it is time to do that.

We also have before us a proposal to extend the authority for spending, to use more of the dollars that are collected, and I agree with that. I have not yet become a sponsor of it, but I, frankly, propose to be. We have been spending in the neighborhood of $21 billion a year on ISTEA, but Federal taxes have been raising more like $27 billion. Now, of course, as a result of last year's budget, we converted the 4.3-cent tax, having gone to the general fund, to now go to the highway fund. I support that idea. So it is time for us to do that.

I am concerned, of course, that we do it within budget guidelines. I am not interested in breaking the budget caps by simply spending. I know when you have a unified budget, if you are going to spend more money here, you have to make arrangements on the other side, too, which restricts spending. I am for that.

I think it is necessary for us to do it. I am sorry that it has been postponed. It was my understanding that it would be the first item of business to be considered or early, at least, in this session. I know there is controversy now with the budgeteers in terms of how that works, but this is an authorization, as I understand it. It is not an expenditure, of course. It authorizes what will then be put together by the budgeteers and appropriators.

Mr. President, I certainly want to endorse the notion that there is nothing more important or nothing that needs to be dealt with more currently than the idea of expanding ISTEA. I hope

that the leader and others in the leadership will give some consideration to that. I think we can move forward. I know that there is not certainty in the House as to the direction they want to take, but I believe passage of the Senate proposal and shipment of it to the House would cause that to happen. If it is difficult, it is difficult. It is no more difficult now than it will be later. To the contrary, as we get toward the end of this session, it may be even more difficult to find time.

I suggest, hope and urge that we bring it to the floor as soon as possible, and we resolve that issue so that we can move forward on this transportation question, which is probably one of the most important economic things we do in our States. These dollars go there, they are contracted, they go into business, and we provide a better transportation system.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

MCKINLEY WISE: THE SENATE'S FIRST AFRICAN AMERICAN REPORTER OF DEBATES

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, this month marks the 22nd year the United States has celebrated Black History Month. I want to take this opportunity to mark a relevant piece of Senate history. I am proud to serve with CAROL MOSELEY-BRAUN of Illinois and to have served with Edward Brooke of Massachusetts. These outstanding Senators and African Americans are well known and recognized by those who follow the Senate. But today, I also want to recognize McKinley Wise.

Twenty years ago this month, McKinley Wise was asked to work in the office of the Official Reporters of Debates and in March 1978 became the first African American to stand on the Senate floor and record the words of this body.

I was privileged to be a Member of the Senate at that time, and I know that this happened not because there was a quota to be achieved but because McKinley Wise's ability qualified him to work on the floor of the Senate.

In 1978, the Senate was beginning its debate on the Panama Canal treaties. Because this was such an important debate and all Senators were expected to participate, the Chief of the Official Reporters of Debate expected long hours and knew that they were going to need more staff. G. Russell Walker, the chief reporter at the time, set out to find qualified people to work part time and help record the Senate's debate. One of those people he recruited was McKinley Wise. Here's how Mr. Walker explained how Mr. Wise's name came to his attention:

> We had before the Senate in late January the Panama Canal Treaties, and there was a very good possibility of the Senate's having 12- and 14-hour-a-day sessions, and we needed more reporters. I went through our file and saw McKinley Wise's name. He was well qualified, had all the certificates, and seemed to have a good background. I asked for and received authority to call him, to see if he could come down and assist us. It was on Friday, February 24th, when I called him and asked him if he could come in the following Tuesday. Not many reporters could leave their businesses and come to Washington on such short notice, but Mac was there, and he did a magnificent job.

Mr. President, I remember that very well. And we did have those 12- and 14-hour and sometimes longer days. But he was there.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article from the May 1978 issue of the Circuit Reporter, the official publication of the United States Court Reporters Association, be printed in the RECORD at the end of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit No. 1.)

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I bring this to the attention of the Senate to highlight not only this moment in the Senate's history, but also to note that qualifications and hard work do count. Although no longer working for the Senate, McKinley Wise has continued to use his skills over the past 20 years and is currently working in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. We spend a lot of time in the Senate talking about opportunity and providing every American the same chance at life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. Hard work is the key to success, but people need the opportunity to perform. The Senate gave that opportunity to Mac Wise in 1978, and both are better for it.

EXHIBIT NO. 1

FORMER U.S. DISTRICT COURT REPORTER, FIRST BLACK REPORTER ON SENATE FLOOR

February 24, 1978, was the day a dream came true. McKinley (Mac) Wise, a former Official Court Reporter in the United States Court in Philadelphia, Pa., had long dreamed that some day he would have the honor and privilege of being the first black court reporter to serve on the Senate floor—but he thought it was just another of his dreams.

G. Russell Walker, Chief Reporter, Official Reporters of Debates, United States Senate, had Mac's name on his list of highly qualified reporters to call upon in an emergency. He made that call to Mac on February 24, inquiring whether Mac could report for temporary duty in connection with the expected lengthy debate on the Panama Canal Treaties.

Mac lost no time in rearranging the busy schedule of his reporting firm, McKinley Wise & Associates, Inc., of Philadelphia, and four days after the call he was on his way to achieving another ''first'' in his long career of ''firsts.''

When he arrived at the Office of the Official Reporters of Debates, Mac was cordially greeted by all of the reporters, transcribers, and staff, and before he knew what was happening, he was there—on the Senate floor—with his Stenograph machine.

A feeling of awe came over Mac when he realized that here he was at last, sitting among this august and distinguished body of United States Senators. At first, Mac had a supervisor beside him, identifying the speakers, and explaining the procedures. Mac said, ''I was able to conquer the words spoken, but when it came to putting them into the proper format, it was an art to which I had never been exposed. In the beginning I felt inept, but said to myself, 'The job must do done', and I did it.''

Everything went along smoothly until the arrival of Morning Business, which was somewhat like taking pleas before a magistrate. The proceedings go very rapidly, because it is usually routine to the lawmakers, with deviations coming later in the office where proper headlines and sub-headlines are inserted.

Mac said that the cooperation of his colleagues overwhelmed him, and that their knowledge on just about any subject was astounding. No one was ever too busy to take time to answer any question that Mac had.

Mac said, ''I think that being the first black reporter on the Senate floor, especially at a time when a debate of critical importance to the country was taking place, is something which I will never forget. It isn't often that one of your wildest dreams comes true.''

Mr. Walker, Chief Reporter of the Official Reporters of Debates, confirmed the fact that McKinley Wise was the first black or any other minority reporter to serve on the Senate floor. Walker said that, to his knowledge, no black or minority reporter has yet served on the floor of the House.

When asked how he came to call Mac Wise, Mr. Walker replied, ''We had before the Senate in late January the Panama Canal treaties, and there was a very good possibility of the Senate having 12 and 14-hour-a-day sessions, and we needed more reporters. I went through our file and saw McKinley Wise's name. He was well-certified, with all of the certificates, well-qualified, and he seemed to have a good background.

''I asked for and received authority to call him, which I did, to see if he could come down and assist us. It was a Friday when I called Mac, asking if he could come in the following Tuesday. Not many reporters could leave their business and come to Washington on short notice, but Mac was there, and he did a magnificent job.''

Mr. Walker went on to say, ''Ordinarily, when someone comes into this office as one of the Official Reporters of Debates, he or she is given great in-depth training in all of our forms, and parliamentary procedures, Senate rules, and so forth. I didn't give Mac any of that. We just wanted somebody to write, and write fast, because this is the kind of debate where there was not at that time a lot of parliamentary procedure going on; it was mostly stand-up, straight, hot and heavy debate.

''As I said before, he did a magnificent job.''

Mac was born in Jeanrette, Louisiana, but with his parents moved to Port Arthur, Texas, at a very early age. He was graduated from Lincoln High School there, after which he served in the United States Navy, where he was given a stenomask reporting in order to report courts-martial and other related proceedings. Mac found the stenomask unsatisfactory, and while in the Navy started studying stenotype at the Certified School of Stenotype in San Francisco, California, completing his course after being discharged from the Navy.

Since then Mac Wise has had a varied reporting career, involving free lance work in New York City, substituting in many of the courts in New York City; serving as an assistant in the Philadelphia County courts,

free-lancing in Philadelphia, before becoming an Official Court Reporter in the United States District Court in Philadelphia, where he served the Hon. Charles R. Weiner and the Hon. J. William Ditter, Jr., from 1967 to 1975.

Mac left his official job to return to the free lance field, and is now the owner of McKinley Wise and Associates, Inc., with a staff of seven certified reporters. Daily copy is the specialty of the firm.

During the time when Mac was reporting in the Federal courts in Philadelphia, he was a member of USCRA. He is a member of PSRA and NSRA. Mac is now serving NSRA as Chairman of the Free Lance Committee, as a member of the Advisory Committee, Professional Examination Service, the Committee on Testing, and the Ad Hoc Committee for Professional Standards.

Mac is the holder of the following certificates from NSRA, RPR, CP, CM, and in Pennsylvania holds the CSR certificate, as well as being a Qualifier in the PSRA Speed Contest at 280 wpm.

USCRA is proud of the fact that one of its former members has achieved the distinction of being the first of his race to serve on the floor of the Senate.

THE PRESIDENT'S FISCAL YEAR 1999 BUDGET PROPOSAL

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I want to commend the President of the United States on his budget submission to Congress. For the first time since 1971, a President has proposed a balanced budget. I hope and believe that this Congress will be the first in almost 30 years, since 1969, to enact a balanced budget without sacrificing our educational, environmental, health care and law enforcement priorities.

The President noted in his State of the Union speech last week, two historic pieces of legislation have reduced the deficit to the point where a balanced budget is now within our grasp: The Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993 and the Balanced Budget Act of 1997. I am proud to have voted for both of these historic laws.

When President Clinton took office, the deficit was at its highest point ever: $290 billion. But he decided to tackle the runaway deficits of previous administrations. In 1993, the Senate and House of Representatives passed President Clinton's economic plan by the slimmest of margins and without a single Republican vote.

That was a tough vote around here, but it was the right thing to do. I am proud that I voted for it. It reduced the deficit by 75 percent. Unfortunately, we were forced to make this historic deficit correction without the help of a single Republican vote in either the House or the Senate.

Last year, Democrats and Republicans together made additional deficit reduction progress by passing the bipartisan budget agreement to reach balance by 2002.

That package included net savings of more than $900 billion over the next ten years. It also secured and strengthened Medicare for our seniors and made the largest investment ever in education for our children.

Today, the deficit is at its lowest dollar figure since 1970—$5 billion—and at its lowest point as a percentage of the economy in 30 years. This past year, the Gross Domestic Product grew at its highest rate since 1988, unemployment fell to a 24-year low, and inflation dropped to levels last seen in the 1960s. Our economy is in the best shape in a generation in no small part because of these two historic deficit reduction measures.

I am most proud that the President and Congress can achieve a balanced budget this year without demeaning the fundamental charter of our democracy, the Constitution of the United States. The proposed constitutional amendment to require a so-called balanced budget did not reduce the deficit by a single dollar or move us one inch closer to achieving those goals. Rather, it was a political exercise serving only to delay and distract—a display in bumper sticker politics.

I hope the Senate will learn from this lesson and abandon such destructive efforts for illusionary quick-fixes by constitutional amendment for the rest of this session and into the future.

Instead, Congress working with the President can do the job today.

Hard choices and bipartisan cooperation are what is needed. We cannot legislate political courage and responsibility. No amendment to the Constitution can supply the people's representatives with these essential attributes.

Political courage has been an essential ingredient that has helped us achieve remarkable deficit reduction over the past six years. We have succeeded in reducing the deficit every year of the past six. We have cut the deficit by more than 98 percent in that time while pursuing sound economic and strong fiscal policies.

Now we need to stay the course and work in a bipartisan way to finally balance the budget. We should now be focusing our attention and energies on the strenuous tasks of building a working consensus on budget priorities and achieving agreement on how to balance the budget.

Within a balanced budget, we must reach consensus on strong support for education funding as one of our top priorities. As I watched my colleagues during the State of the Union address, I noticed that those with school-aged children cheered the loudest at the President's continuing commitment to keep education a national priority. A national commitment to education, however, is not just for the students and parents of today; it is for all of us.

Only a few decades ago, our students were taught that the countries blessed with the most natural resources held the keys to the highest standards of living and the most vibrant economic growth. Today, it is the countries that invest in their ''human capital'' that have the greatest success in the global economy.

I applaud the President for investing in our people by making a higher priority of education at all levels—from an expansion of Head Start, to access to affordable quality child care, to more teachers in the classroom, to literacy training, to lower fees for college students using loans.

The only way to keep our nation strong and successful in the global marketplace is through an educated workforce. To do this children must understand the basics, the three R's. We need to make sure that teachers are trained and have access to continuing training education. Only after this foundation is built will computers and other technologies in the classroom help students reach their full potential.

Technology in the classroom can be a great leveler. On the Internet students can see Michelangelo's work on ceiling of the Sistine Chapel in wonderful detail. Students in the United States can ''chat'' with students in Japan or South America or even their U.S. senator about their daily lives to better understand one another.

Another great leveler is to ensure that students of all abilities have access to quality education. To this end, I am committed to increasing federal funding for the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). More than two decades ago the federal government made a commitment to local school districts to provide assistance in this funding, and the federal government has not lived up to its end of the bargain. I am disappointed that the budget did not include an increase for this program. I am committed to working with my colleagues as we move through the budget and appropriations process to remedy this shortfall.

I also find room for improvement with the Administration's proposal for Amtrak. Last year was a critical one for our national passenger railroad. Included in the Taxpayer's Relief Act was a one-time, $2.3 billion infusion of capital, intended to modernize Amtrak and enable it to reap sufficient revenues to become self-sufficient. Congress also passed a far-reaching Amtrak Reform Bill, which will refine the way Amtrak does business for the 21st Century, while making sure that its employees are fairly treated. I am disappointed that the Administration has proposed using a portion of these capital funds, instead, for Amtrak's day-to-day operating costs. This would undermine Amtrak's modernization plan and all of the hard work we did last year on these proposals. As always, I will work with my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee to try to find ways to ensure that Amtrak receives the resources it needs.

Mr. President, on balance, the President has proposed a budget that reflects priorities that are good for the nation and that will find strong support by the American people. I am delighted that the President and Congress can achieve a balanced budget this year while serving the needs of the nation. I look forward to working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to enact the first balanced budget in a generation.

Mr. President, I see nobody else seeking recognition, so I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

WASHINGTON NATIONAL AIRPORT

Mr. ROBB. Mr. President, I rise today to note my opposition to the effort to overshadow the name of our first President, which graces the airport that serves as the gateway to the city bearing his name.

Washington National Airport is located in the Commonwealth of Virginia, the birthplace of George Washington. It lies adjacent to the city of Alexandria, the hometown of George Washington.

The people of Alexandria are proud to live in George Washington's city and have asked this Congress not to displace Washington's name on the airport.

In fact, the original airport terminal, whose facade reflects the design of Mount Vernon's portico, was preserved when the airport was recently renovated.

The people of Arlington County, the local municipality that surrounds Washington National Airport, have expressed their strong opposition as well.

The Greater Washington Board of Trade, as well as local businesses that would be harmed by this bill, oppose the legislation that has been offered.

In 1986, Mr. President, legislation was approved by the U.S. Congress transferring the operation of Washington National Airport from the Federal Government to the Metropolitan Airports Authority.

The Airports Authority is a nonfederal entity established by interstate compact between the District of Columbia and the Commonwealth of Virginia.

President Ronald Reagan, who championed State and local control, rather than Federal control, whenever and wherever it was appropriate, was the President who signed that legislation.

Former Virginia Governor Linwood Holton, a Republican and the chairman of the Airports Authority, said, ''Unilateral action by the Congress to take the drastic action of changing the name of the airport is inconsistent with both the spirit and the intent of the transfer.''

It is highly ironic that this Congress is attempting to impose its Federal will on local governments, a State/local airports authority, and the local business community, in the name of Ronald Reagan, whose career and legacy centers on his deep commitment to limiting the reach of the Federal Government.

Mr. President, creating a controversy that is contrary to his legacy does not honor Ronald Reagan.

Like the vast majority of Americans, I have long admired President Reagan's personal courage, his strong convictions, his infectious spirit, and his leadership of our Nation and the international community.

There are many appropriate ways to honor the name and the legacy of this great American.

On May 5, we will dedicate the Ronald Reagan Building and International Trade Center in downtown Washington. It is the largest Federal building ever built in Washington, DC. Among all Federal buildings throughout the entire Nation, only the Pentagon is larger.

In addition, Congress has appropriately named the next aircraft carrier after President Reagan in a resolution I heartily supported and was pleased to cosponsor.

The U.S.S. *Ronald Reagan* will be a magnificent and, indeed, a fitting tribute to a Commander in Chief who stood for U.S. military strength throughout our world.

There will undoubtedly be many more opportunities to honor Ronald Reagan and his legacy—and, indeed, jurisdictions where it might be particularly appropriate, such as California or Illinois, might choose to put his name on an airport.

But overshadowing the name of our first President, ignoring the expressed views of local governments and their people, as well as the local business community, interfering in operations of an airport, that because of a bill signed by Ronald Reagan is no longer truly Federal, is not the way to do it.

Mr. President, in summary, there are many appropriate ways to honor the name and the legacy of Ronald Reagan. Renaming Washington National Airport is not one of them.

So I ask my colleagues to oppose this legislation, not out of disrespect for the man, but as a symbol of respect for the principles for which he has lived. It may be that after appropriate consultation with the local jurisdictions directly involved, and indeed with the President and particularly Mrs. Reagan, whose views on this particular matter have not been publicly ascertained, that some action regarding Washington National Airport would be in order. But to move forward without that consideration would detract from the honor intended, as well as the very appropriate and fitting ceremonies planned for May 5.

TIME TO TACKLE UNFAIR TAXES

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, there are a lot of things wrong with our nation's Tax Code, but two things in the code that have always struck me as particularly egregious are the steep taxes imposed on people when they get married and when they die. While it will probably take some time to build the kind of public consensus that will be necessary to overhaul the Tax Code in its entirety, there is broad public support for us to do something in the short term about these taxes—the notorious marriage penalty and the death tax—and in the process take two meaningful steps closer to a tax system that is simpler and more fair.

Mr. President, what rationale can there possibly be for imposing a marriage penalty? All of us say we are concerned that families do not have enough to make ends meet—that they do not have enough to pay for child care, college, or to buy their own homes. Yet we tolerate a system that overtaxes families. According to Tax Foundation estimates, the average American family pays almost 40 percent of its income in taxes to federal, state, and local governments. To put it another way, in families where both parents work, one of the parents is nearly working full time just to pay the family's tax bill. It is no wonder, then, that parents do not have enough to make ends meet when government is taking that much. It is just not right.

The marriage penalty alone is estimated to cost the average couple an extra $1,400 a year. About 21 million American couples are affected, and the cost is particularly high for the working poor. Two-earner families making less than $20,000 often must devote a full eight percent of their income to pay the marriage penalty. The highest percentage of couples hit by the marriage penalty earns between $20,000 and $30,000 per year.

Think what these families could do with an extra $1,400 in their pockets. They could pay for three to four months of day care if they choose to send a child outside the home—or make it easier for one parent to stay at home to take care of the children, if that is what they decide is best for them. They could make four to five payments on their car or minivan. They could pay their utility bill for nine months.

A constituent of mine from Tucson, Arizona put it this way: ''We need your help as young married middle class Americans to plan our family's future. We need help to plan our retirement, our children's education, our dignity. Please help get rid of the marriage tax.''

Mr. President, this constituent is simply asking that a young family be able to keep more of what it earns. Taxing marriage is wrong. It is bad social policy and bad economic policy. We ought to do away with it this year. And with that in mind, I have joined Senators FAIRCLOTH and HUTCHISON and 35 of our colleagues who have cosponsored S. 1285, the Marriage Tax Elimination Act. A similar bill on the House side, H.R. 2456, has 233 cosponsors. Given the broad support the initiative enjoys in both chambers—and around the country—I think we stand a good chance of getting this done this year. We should.

The death tax is just as wrong, and we ought to do something about it, too. It is wrong to make grieving families face the funeral director and the tax collector in the same week. And it is wrong to break up family-owned businesses just to extract an additional tax from someone one last time before he or she is laid to rest.

The death tax imposes a heavy toll on families, as well as the communities in which they live. Maybe that is why 15 states have repealed their state death taxes since 1980.

Mr. President, in its January 12 edition, the Wall Street Journal carried a story about the impending sale of America's largest African-American newspaper chain, Sengstacke Enterprises, Inc. The chain's pioneering leader, James Sengstacke, passed away last May, and the chain is now faced with the daunting task of raising enough cash to pay the estate tax—something that is more commonly known as the death tax.

I do not know the Sengstacke family, but their story is compelling, and I hope our colleagues will listen closely as I read a few lines from the Journal's report. The article begins by noting that the newspaper chain is comprised of the daily Chicago Defender and three weeklies—the New Pittsburgh Courier, the Tri-State Defender, and the Michigan Chronicle. And then it goes on with the extraordinary story of the family business:

> Founded by Robert Sengstacke Abbott in 1905, the Chicago Defender helped ignite the Great Migration—the move of tens of thousands of Southern black sharecroppers northward to Chicago and other cities. When Mr. Abbott's nephew, John Sengstacke, took over in 1940, the Defender grew from a weekly to a daily, printing stories that challenged discrimination on nearly every front, from the U.S. Army to the baseball field.
>
> Mr. Sengstacke was instrumental in persuading Brooklyn Dodgers owner Branch Rickey to hire baseball's first black player, Jackie Robinson. For several decades, the Defender was viewed as the most important training ground for aspiring black journalists.

Mr. President, the tragedy is that the death tax may force the Sengstacke family to part with this treasured piece of their heritage—a family-owned company that has, among other things, worked hard to try to stamp out the scourge of discrimination around the country. Contemplating the thought of the chain being taken over by outsiders, the founder's grandniece, Myiti Sengstacke, said, ''No one—black or white—is going to understand and cherish the vision my uncle had for starting the company other than someone in his family.''

Other families around the country have similar stories to tell. Here is what a good friend and constituent of mine wrote in a letter to me last year:

> Since my father died, our lives have been a nightmare of lawyers and trust companies with the common theme, ''you have to protect the family business.'' It was hard enough trying to recuperate after my father's long illness, and then adjusting to the reality he was gone.

This family in Arizona built up a printing business from just one employee 39 years ago to over 200 employees today. The founder—the family patriarch—was one of the most generous people I have ever met. He gave to just about every charitable cause in our community, and he made our community a much better place in the process.

Mr. President, hard work and thrift, creating jobs, and contributing to the community are among the last things we ought to penalize. And so I sponsored the Family Heritage Preservation Act, S. 75, to repeal the cruel death tax. Twenty-nine of our colleagues have joined me as cosponsors of that measure, and the companion House bill, which was introduced by Congressman CHRIS COX, has 166 cosponsors. A recent poll commissioned by the seniors group, 60 Plus, found that fully 77 percent of Americans are supportive of death-tax repeal.

We took some important steps in the direction of death-tax relief last year when we approved a phased increase in the unified credit and new protections for a limited number of family-owned businesses. Unfortunately, the ''family-business carve-out'' made what is arguably the most complex portion of the Tax Code even more complicated. Here is what representatives of small businesses told the House Ways and Means Committee on January 28.

The National Federation of Independent Business told the committee that even though the 1997 Taxpayer Relief Act gave small-business owners some relief from the unfair death tax, small-business owners should not be paying this tax at all. Jack Faris, the President of NFIB, said that the organization continues to fight for complete elimination of this onerous tax.

The Small Business Council of America described last year's changes this way. ''The new Qualified Family-Owned Business Interest Exclusion is now the most complex provision in the Tax Code. At best, it will help less than five percent of family businesses facing sale or liquidation from the death tax.''

These sentiments are consistent with the message we heard from delegates to the 1995 White House Conference on Small Business, who placed death-tax repeal fourth among their 60 recommendations to Congress and the President. And with good reason. The death tax is gradually destroying family enterprise, first by slowing business growth, then by forcing companies to restructure through mergers or sales.

According to the Heritage Foundation, repeal of the death tax would free capital resources for more productive investment, leading to an average of $11 billion per year in extra output, an average of 145,000 additional jobs created, and personal income rising an average of $8 billion per year above current projections. So not only would death-tax repeal be good for families, it would help the economy as well.

Mr. President, repealing the marriage penalty and the death tax should be among our top priorities this year. Together, these two steps will get us closer to the kind of Tax Code we all say we want—one that is fairer, flatter, and simpler. Let us do this for America's families.

THE VERY BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, at the close of business Friday, January 30, 1998, the Federal debt stood at $5,490,064,235,079.64 (Five trillion, four hundred ninety billion, sixty-four million, two hundred thirty-five thousand, seventy-nine dollars and sixty-four cents).

One year ago, January 30, 1997, the Federal debt stood at $5,315,796,000,000 (Five trillion, three hundred fifteen billion, seven hundred ninety-six million).

Twenty-five years ago, January 30, 1973, the Federal debt stood at $450,068,000,000 (Four hundred fifty billion, sixty-eight million) which reflects a debt increase of over $5 trillion—$5,039,996,235,079.64 (Five trillion, thirty-nine billion, nine hundred ninety-six million, two hundred thirty-five thousand, seventy-nine dollars and sixty-four cents) during the past 25 years.

SECRETARY JAMES R. SCHLESINGER'S STATEMENT BEFORE THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES ON THE REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE NATIONAL DEFENSE PANEL

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I would like to take a few moments to address the comments made by James R. Schlesinger, the former Secretary of Defense, Secretary of Energy, and Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, in his appearance last week before the Committee on Armed Services. The purpose of the hearing was to review the Quadrennial Defense Review of the Department of Defense, and the report of the National Defense Panel, in order to determine what measures are necessary to ensure our national security establishment is able to meet the threats of today and tomorrow.

The testimony provided by Secretary Schlesinger was very sobering in that he provided the Committee with a clear picture of the crisis we are facing due to the imbalance between our foreign policy commitments and the diminished capabilities of our Armed Forces. In his own words, ''By early in the next century, at the latest, we shall be obligated to spend far greater sums on procurement. Alternatively, we can watch the force structure itself age and erode—until it will no longer be capable of sustaining the ambitious foreign policy that we have embraced.''

Mr. President, it is unfortunate that the entire Senate was not able to attend last week's hearing and discuss the problems outlined by Secretary Schlesinger. I believe it is important, especially at a time when the U.S. military may once again be called upon

to protect our interests in the Persian Gulf, for all of the members to fully understand the extent to which our military capability has diminished in recent years, and the impact this will have upon our ability to pursue an aggressive foreign policy.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statement provided by Secretary Schlesinger to the Committee on Armed Services be printed in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT OF JAMES SCHLESINGER BEFORE THE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE, UNITED STATES SENATE, ON THE REPORT OF THE NATIONAL DEFENSE PANEL JANUARY 29, 1998

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee: You have requested that I comment on the Report of the National Defense Panel and, in particular, to develop further the discussion of alternative strategies and alternative force structures. At the outset, let me say that the Panel has done a commendable job. Overall, its diagnosis of the emerging international scene is excellent, its stress on the need for the transformation of defense is correct. Many of its specific recommendations are admirable. While I shall later comment to some extent on alternative strategies, at the moment I simply wish to state that the reticence of the Panel in the area of alternative strategies and force structures is understandable.

For reasons I shall spell out, I sympathize with the Panel on this point, for it was facing a formidable task. Quite simply you can't get there, that desired point in the 21st Century, from here—given the apparent fiscal limits. The United States has a very ambitious foreign policy. It has accepted the role of the world's principal stabilizing power, the one universal power. Yet, there is no way that it can sustain over time the force structure that the QDR calls for—on three percent of the gross Domestic Product. That is not a matter of analysis; that is simple arithmetic. To fulfill our present commitments and to modernize the QDR force for the more challenging years of the next century would require four percent-plus of the GDP. That does not appear a surprising sum for a nation that aspires to be the sole universal power. Our present level of expenditure, relative to GDP, is less than it was before Pearl Harbor.

In this decade, we have been cushioned by allowing the principal equipments, inherited from the Cold War years, to age. Obviously such action is tolerable only in the short run. We now spend some forty billion dollars a year on procurement. Yet, the depreciation on our equipment—at replacement costs—runs over a hundred billion dollars per year. In brief, we have been enjoying an extended Procurement Holiday. By early in the next century, at the latest, we shall be obliged to spend far greater sums on procurement. Alternatively, we can watch the force structure itself age and erode—until it will no longer be capable of sustaining the ambitious foreign policy that we have embraced.

In the period around 2010, the Department of Defense believes that a new peer-competitor of the United States might emerge. It would be a time, according to present assertions, that we now intend to expand NATO to include portions of the former Soviet Union. It would be a time that expenditures on entitlements programs would be escalating as the baby-boom generation retires, and the budget is projected to go into deficit. Yet, at that very time the effects of the aging of major items of equipment and the erosion of our military capabilities would become clear. Unless we alter our present course, under those circumstances we would have no prudent choice but to retrench on our foreign policy objectives and commitments.

Can we not shrink the present force structure—and thereby provide more funds for modernization? In principal, we should be able to do so, but in practice we would encounter vast difficulties. The operations tempo of the Armed Forces is at this time at an all time peak in peacetime. Force deployments in the post-Cold War years have been far more frequent, of substantially larger size, and of longer duration than in the 1980's. To be sure, the optempo of the Services could be trimmed. We should certainly review the training regime of the Services, which has not changed since the end of the Cold War. With Goldwater-Nichols, the regional CINC's have piled on additional requirements. We do need an overall review to see whether so high an optempo is desirable. But, we should recognize, given our present foreign policy commitments, we can only trim rather than substantially reduce the optempo. So long as that is the case, any hankering substantially to reduce the force structure remains unachievable.

Quite rightly, the National Defense Panel points to the growing strategic uncertainties of the early part of the 21st Century, the possible emergence of a peer-competitor, the serious arrears in funding the re-equipping of the forces, the emerging (re-emerging) issue of homeland defense, the need for space control, the need to incorporate the benefits of the revolution in military affairs, in short, the need to transform defense. It questions whether the two major-regional-conflicts measuring rod is realistic—or is just ''a means of justifying current forces.'' It points to the generally low-risk international environment of today. Quite rightly, the Panel states that the ''priority must go to the future.'' It argues that the pursuit of the two MRC strategy consumes resources that could reduce the risk to our long-term security. given the budgetary limits, the Panel suggests that we surrender the two-MRC standard. There are risks and certain strategic questions that arise following such a path. Yet, given the constraints, it is a plausible suggestion. Nonetheless, at this time, the optempo of the Armed Forces precludes a reduction of the force structure sufficiently large to generate the funds for re-capitalizing the forces.

The Panel recommends other means of generating funds within the present budget. It correctly urges a further attack on our excessive infrastructure—and urges the outsourcing of some 600,000 positions in the DOD, including the civilianizing of certain active military positions. I applaud the further closing of bases and I am receptive to pushing outsourcing as far as feasible. I note, however, that there are still some 20 major domestic bases to be closed still left from the BRAC of 1993. I note that most of the reductions in civilian personnel under the quadrennial review is based upon a base-closing exercise which the Congress has already rejected. I note that base closings to this point have generated less than $6 Billion in savings. Thus, admirable as a further assault on our infrastructure may be, it will not generate substantial additional savings to recapitalize the Forces.

Yet, the suggestion that we move more vigorously to outsourcing is certainly correct. In the view of the doubts and resistance that inevitably will occur, it will be many years before the resources become available. Given the legal, administrative, and political constraints, less is likely to be obtained by these measures in the necessary time-frame than both the Panel and I would wish.

All in all, the transformation of defense is a meritorious, if not an essential, objective. Yet, it is a far more difficult task, given the resources available, than we are ready to acknowledge. We are not dealing with a system at rest, a garrison military like the pre-World War II German *Wehrmacht*. The U.S. military now is always on the go, moving around the world and conducting operations in dozens of countries. To transform a force so active is a far more arduous task. While we should embrace the objective, we should also recognize the difficulties that stand in our path.

Mr. Chairman, let me now turn away from household tasks to an examination of what the Panel describes as the ''cusp of a military revolution.'' The opportunity for such a revolution has been created by the immense technical advances in computers, microelectronics, telecommunications, sensors, and precision guided munitions. These new military technologies were first unveiled in the Gulf War. Admittedly, the conditions were ideal for exploitation of these new technologies. It permitted our senior officers to have dominant battlefield awareness, while Iraq's unfortunate generals had limited ability to communicate and were largely unaware of what was transpiring on the battlefield. However, one element must be kept in mind: our showcasing of these military technologies means that we will never again have the element of surprise, nor will we again be able so easily to exploit the advantages that these technologies offer. We shall have to labor hard, as others acquire these technologies, both to stay ahead and to exploit fully the opportunities offered by them. When I say that we must work hard, I mean that we must not be lulled into complacency by such phrases as ''full spectrum dominance.'' There is no guarantee of permanent American military dominance. Others will be learning the capabilities of information warfare and weapons of mass destruction. Thus ''eternal vigilance'' remains essential.

That leads me—all too briefly—into alternative strategies and alternative force structures. You will understand, of course, Mr. Chairman that I can only throw out a few brief observations. A complete review would require far more time. But it is essential that, as conditions change we continue to seek alternative means to achieve military or national goals—and to choose those means that achieve our goals most effectively. I have dwelt upon the Gulf War as a watershed event. The military establishments of many nations are busily seeking to discern the lessons of the Gulf War.

In this light I find it curious that the United States, which developed, exploited, and revealed these new military technologies in the Gulf War, has failed fully to grasp at least one of the principal lessons from that war. The lesson I refer to, that has not been fully absorbed, is the immense success of the air offensive prior to and during the hundred hour ground war. The six weeks of coordinated air attacks prior to the launching of the counter offensive on the ground significantly crippled the combat power of the Iraq forces—and continued to do that during the four days of the ground war. Nonetheless, to date the U.S. military establishment has failed to absorb the lessons of the immense success of the air war into either doctrine or war plans. In touching on so many issues, the Panel failed to note the centrality of this issue of strategy. And the Air Force itself has been remiss. For so many years it treated ''strategic'' and ''nuclear'' as synonymous that it failed to analyze and articulate the strategic role that Tac Air can play.

Despite all our talk of jointness, the Services still have yet to formulate a sufficiently shared vision of our military future. Air

power is not just an ancillary to the ground counteroffensive. If we have air superiority, it too can attrit enemy ground forces. And it can do so at a far lower cost in American blood. All this potentially has major implications for budgets and force structure. It is ironical that those who comment upon—and sometimes complain—that sixty percent of the procurement budget goes to Tac Air, have not fully grasped the potential advantages that that confers. It raises a question, for instance, whether the allocation between platforms and munitions is the right one. Given the military significance of precision-guided munitions, one wonders whether it is wise to allow our inventories to be as low as they are. (The Committee may wish to check what kind of a dent the air war against the Bosnian Serbs in 1995 or (what may be) the forthcoming military operations against Iraq put into our inventory of precision guided weapons.) It is a regrettable fact that, if inventories are constrained and are expected to be limited, that in itself may alter military plans—in a way that makes them less effective. The size of inventories is also a choice.

An issue of at least equal importance that we have not yet thought through is what dependence on these newly-available military technologies may do to our vulnerability. Not only is the United States more dependent upon these technologies than any other nation, its extraordinary military leverage now comes from these technologies. That makes us more vulnerable to all of those stratagems that fall under the rubric of information warfare.

That underscores at least two things. First, it is essential for the United States to continue to forge ahead of other nations, not only in the exploitation of information warfare, but in defensive measures. Other nations are now industriously studying how to exploit information warfare. The secret is now out.

Second, we must continuously examine whether or not we are becoming *overly dependent* on these new technologies in a way that might create a critical vulnerability. If these technologies are essential as force multipliers, neutralization by others of our exploitation of these technologies would place us at an immediate disadvantage. We must, therefore, examine to what extent we should hedge against such a vulnerability. Such hedging could be costly. To hedge against the neutralization of force multipliers, one can maintain larger forces. But if one were totally to hedge, one would forfeit the cost benefits (though not the benefits in effectiveness) embodied in the revolution in military affairs.

I close by reminding the Members of the Committee of the longer-term problems of sustaining our military advantages and thereby sustaining our ambitious foreign policy. The Department of State has recently stated (in response to Russian complaints about our indifference to their sphere of influence in the ''Near Abroad'') that the Department of State states that the United States does not acknowledge the legitimacy of spheres of influence. That presumably applies only to *other* countries, since the United States, as the single universal power, regards all the outside world as its sphere of influence. Yet, if we are unable to sustain our military forces and sustain our military advantages into the 21st Century, despite the ambitions of our foreign policy, we would be obliged to retreat.

Mr. Chairman, I thank you and the Members of the Committee for your attention. I would be pleased to answer any questions that you may have.

MEMORIAL FOR ISRAELI PRIME MINISTER YITZHAK RABIN

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, two years ago last November, Israel lost its beloved Prime Minister, Yitzhak Rabin, and the world lost a great peacemaker. My son Patrick and I had the sad honor of traveling to Israel for the funeral. Like millions of people around the world, we admired his leadership and the power of his vision of reconciliation between Israel and the Arab world.

On November 13, friends and admirers of Prime Minister Rabin gathered in Boston for a memorial service to commemorate his life and pay tribute to his leadership in putting Israel on the path to peace. His Eminence Bernard Cardinal Law, Israel's renowned poet Yehuda Amichai, and Israel's Consul General Itzhak Levanon gave voice to the grief of the world. As we work to carry on the work of peace in the Middle East, the guiding presence of Prime Minister Rabin is deeply missed.

I believe my colleagues will be interested in the eloquent reflections of the speakers at the service on Prime Minister Rabin's life and death, and especially on his extraordinary commitment to peace in the Middle East. I ask unanimous consent that the remarks at the memorial service in Boston be printed in the RECORD.

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

INVOCATION BY HIS EMINENCE BERNARD CARDINAL LAW

To remember is at the heart of Jewish (and Christian) faith. To recall God's covenant, His fidelity and His promises, is a solemn duty which each son and daughter of Abraham is asked to fulfill. Only by thinking back on what God has accomplished yesterday, will we have sufficient courage for today and tomorrow.

In light of this profound religious conviction, we are here to remember a life, prematurely snatched from us by the bullet of an assassin—Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin.

Because his death had so many tragic implications, our mood may be dark and despairing as the one described in the Book of Wisdom: ''. . . they seemed to be dead; their departure was reckoned as defeat, and their going from us a disaster.''

Wisdom confronts and challenges this earthly despair with the emphatic reminder that, ''The souls of the just are in the hands of God . . . they are at peace, for though in the sight of men they may be punished, they have a sure hope of immortality; and after a little chastisement they will receive great blessings, because God has tested them and found them worthy to be His.'' (Wis: 3; 1–6).

We shall also never forget—but remember with undiminished hope—Yitzhak Rabin's dream of peace between Israel and the Palestinian people. The steps toward this peace which he took with such great courage cannot be reversed, for both people have gone too far along the path toward that day when the pslamist's prayer will be answered.

Let the psalmist's words be ours this evening:

Pray for the peace of Jerusalem: ''May they prosper who love you.
Peace be within your walls, and security within your towers.''
For the sake of my relatives and friends I will say, ''Peace be within you.''

Amen.

REMARKS OF YEHUDA AMICHAI

I would like to strike a rather personal note. There were a lot of traumatic events for us, one event which has a lot of trauma in it. Trauma number one is that it is the death of our generation, the generation of people who grew up towards 1948 and we were in the Palmach, the commando unit of the Haganah, and later the Israeli army. Yitzhak was already a big commander there, I was a very small commander, and he was actually the last of the Palmachniks to fall, many years after the end of the war, and there had been about two thousand out of six thousand that had fallen in the war, so he was the last of us. And the second trauma is the trauma of Jewish history, of ''milhemet achim'', of Jews killing each other, and it brings up the whole traumatic event of the destruction of the second temple, and we were hoping that it would never be again.

When Yitzhak Rabin received his peace award in Oslo, he invited me and my wife to join him there, and he read this poem which I am going to read, in his acceptance speech in Oslo of the peace award.

G-d has pity on kindergarten children.
He has less pity of schoolchildren
And on grownups he has no pity at all
He leaves them alone
And sometimes, they must crawl on all fours in the burning sand to reach the first aid station, covered with blood.

But perhaps he will watch over true lovers
And have mercy on them and shelter them
Like a tree over the old man sleeping on a public bench.
Perhaps we too will give them the last rare coins of compassion that mother handed down to us so that their happiness will protect us now, and in other days.

And Yitzhak Rabin added to this poem his own words, and he said ''Let's hope that now'' after the peace agreement ''there will be pity for all of us.''

He was already, I must say, he was already in his fighting days as a commander of the Har-El brigade, he had already the clear eyes of vision towards peace. While he was deeply involved in winning that war against this vast Arab majority, in his eyes there was something of a vision, very harsh and hard vision of peace. While all of us were still involved in war he was a very down to earth like our prophets. He never was enthuasiastic or showed enthusiasm about peace, he was always very inverted, and very much introverted, but he was down to earth like our prophets. Perhaps the most famous prophecy of peace in the bible is about the lamb and the wolf shall lie alongside each other and not disturb each other. They never, the prophets were down to earth, they knew that love and peace may be far away, but at least you start by two enemies lying alongside each other without disturbing each another. And Yitzhak Rabin was one of those, that is why his vision was so wonderful because it was down to earth. I would like, I think that in a way, with Yitzhak Rabin, it is perhaps the greatest trauma for all of us. It was as if, in your American terms, Kennedy and Lincoln were murdered with him again, because he engulfed everything—the beginning of the state, and the middle of the state, the war and the peace, our our national anthem is called Hatikvah, The Hope. And I hope that we will still have, and his spirit will not let our hope die.

And I would like to finish with a poem that I read at his first ''shloshim,'' first memorial in Jerusalem. And it is about a friend of both of ours who was in the Palmach and who fell back in 1948, and I wrote this poem and I think it fits Yitzhak too.

And you, who remember only a face,
Do not forget the outstretched hands, and the legs that run so easily in the earth.
Remember that even the road to terrible battles always passes by gardens and windows, and children playing, and the barking dog
Remember the fruit that fell and reminded of its leaves and the branch
Remind the hard ones that they were soft and green in springtime
And do not forget that the first too was once the palm of an open hand and fingers.

May Yitzhak be forever.

REMARKS OF ISRAELI COUNSEL GENERAL ITZHAK LEVANON

A master in the skies, the Albatross was soaring high in the air. Remaining airborne on motionless wings, and gliding abreast the strongest winds with little effort. He was watched from the land, flying majestically towards new horizons. The sky was clear and the winds favorable. The Albatross showed self-confidence, determined to reach new heights, disregarding the dangers. None would dare to defy him on his royal journey.

Suddenly three gun shots fatally hit the Albatross. He swung in the air, refusing to bend and hit the ground. He looked toward the sky, which he has just conquered a few moments before and whispered: why?

Rabin was like this. He flew high in the sky, defied strong winds, knew which direction to head and covered long distances in a short time. He too asked himself, lying on the ground, why? Why should a leader who dedicated his entire life to the welfare of his own people, die like the Albatross died? This question is still on the lips of every Israeli, two years after his assassination, and will remain so for years to come.

Rabin's fatalism reminds me of another leader in the Middle East—Anwar Sadat. He too disregarded the warnings. He too believed that he was doing only what was right for his people and therefore, there was no cause for one of them to harm him. But both were so trusting, and both paid the price.

I remember his face, full of happiness and satisfaction that evening in Montreal, after a poignant speech at the General Assembly where he spoke in all frankness about his fears and his hope for the peace process. When we arrived in this room he laid his eyes on his wife Lea, and, with a typical Israeli expression said to her ''Nu?'' You could see the joy in his face and how, with his timid smile, he wanted to say 'I am happy that they hear my words,' and how he felt that he was not alone in his struggle. Indeed, battalions were behind him.

Senator Edward Kennedy recently wrote to me about Rabin, and the absence created by his death, describing him in the following words: ''The cause of peace lost one of its greatest champions of our time, perhaps of all time, and I continue to miss his leadership.''

After Rabin's death, many poems were written. I have chosen one of them, which in my judgment reflects the feelings of most Israelis, The Tears, by Smadar Shir:

There are left wing people and there are right wing
There are religious and there are secular
There are Sephardi and there are Ashkenazi
There are Israelis and there are Arabs
There are clever people and there are dumb
But for all of them there is the same tear and the tears are still warm, aching and painful
These tears are for a great man, who fell down while trying to reach peace between all these people.

Many disagreed with Rabin's ideas. Others criticized him, but none can argue the fact that for most Israelis he was like a godfather, the one who took care of everything. He was the mind which thought, the authority which made decisions, the man who endorsed responsibility and the leader who did not worry about damaging his standing if it benefited his people. Rabin was a leader, but he was also the commander, the diplomat, the politician, and most of all, the father.

May the soul of this great man be blessed forever.

Thank you.

HONORING STEVEN CHOTIN

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, today I honor Mr. Steven Chotin, one of Colorado's leading citizens, for his many contributions and outstanding dedication to our great state.

On the heels of his 50th birthday, I would like to take this opportunity to formally recognize my friend, a longtime motorcycling partner, for his philanthropic and civic activities of the past few decades. Steven has been a legend in a variety of charitable causes in Colorado, giving of his time and energy generously, as well as financially, to The Denver Center for the Performing Arts, The Colorado Symphony, The Allied Jewish Federation of Denver, National Jewish Hospital, Shalom Park and many other worthy endeavors.

Mr. Chotin has served on the boards of numerous community and charitable organizations, including Fresh Start, a program committed to paving a way out for Denver's inner-city youth. Equally renowned are Steven's activities in civic and business affairs. As head of The Chotin Group Corporation, National Mortgage Corporation and Merchants Mortgage Corporation, he has succeeded in providing gainful employment to a significant number of Denver area residents.

I am sure I speak for all Coloradans in extending Steven my congratulations and appreciation for leaving such an indelible mark on our state by the young age of 50. I wish him many more years of happiness and fruition as a Colorado resident.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROBERTS). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. COLLINS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent I may speak as in morning business for 20 minutes.

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

Mr. HOLLINGS. I thank the distinguished Chair.

THE BUDGET

Mr. HOLLINGS. Madam President, last week in remarks on the floor I referred to the Congressional Budget Office's report, ''Economic and Budget Outlook for the Fiscal Years 1999 to 2008.'' And at that particular time, Madam President, I pointed out that even the Congressional Budget Office had projected deficits not only of $188 billion for the present year and $170 billion for 1998, but of $200 billion for 1999, the year in which everyone in this town has been screaming we will reap a budgetary surplus.

Now we have the President's budget. Madam President, this morning we not only received that budget, we saw in this country's newspapers of record such headlines as ''On Budget Eve, Congress Feels Surplus Fever.'' This particular article reports that the distinguished Speaker of the House, Newt Gingrich, stated, ''We are on the edge, if we will have discipline, of a generation of surpluses.''

So we have the President talking about balanced budgets as far as the eye can see in his State of the Union Message. And we now have the distinguished Speaker talking about surpluses as far as the eye can see for the next generation.

Would that it were so. Would that we did not have any increase in the national debt. Would that we had no increase in the deficit. Would that we had no increase in the interest costs of the carrying charges on our national debt, which are now projected, Madam President, to be $1 billion a day, or $365 billion a year. That is one thing that everyone can agree on: that the interest on the federal debt is going up, up, and away.

Let me emphasize the matter of the debt before I home in on the matter of Social Security and the spending of surpluses. In 1981, we had a national debt of $995.5 billion. We had not reached a trillion-dollar debt.

For the first 200 years of our history, including the costs of all the wars our nation fought during that time—the Revolutionary War, the War of 1812, the Mexican-American War, the Civil War, the Spanish-American War, World War I, World War II, Korea, and Vietnam—we did not reach a trillion-dollar debt. But in the last 16 years, we have reached now a $5.5 trillion debt, with interest costs of a billion dollars a day. Interest on the debt used to stand at a mere $95 billion; it now stands at $365 billion. So we are spending $270 billion more on interest alone than when we supposedly were going to balance the budget back in 1981.

I remember when our distinguished President Ronald Reagan ran on balancing the budget and was elected in 1980. He came into office in 1981 and said, ''Whoops. This is way worse than I ever expected. Instead of balancing the budget in a year, it's going to take me 3 years.''

Even after passage of the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings Bill, we ran into the highest deficits we ever had heard of. The deficits and debt went up, up, and away under Reaganomics. Of course,

the whole idea of Reaganomics, which George Bush called voodoo economics, was that cutting tax revenues some 25 percent would spur people to spend more, thus leading to increased government revenues from sales taxes and income taxes. This in turn, proponents of so-called Reaganomics said, would enable us to grow out of the federal deficit and national debt. In contrast, of course, we have grown into them.

As a result, we now spend a billion dollars a day on interest to service the federal debt. The first thing at 8 o'clock every morning that the Government does is go down to the bank and borrow a billion dollars—every Sunday morning, Christmas morning, every holiday, every day in the year. It borrows and spends this billion dollars to pay the carrying charges on the debt. This money doesn't go for anything constructive: no highways, no foreign aid, no defense money. It's just waste added to the debt.

This is the dilemma we find ourselves in. This is really the bottom line. But it has never been emphasized in this body. And momentarily, seeing that I had an opportunity to emphasize this on the floor of the Senate, I said to myself: ''Now's my chance to sober everyone up, because we are spending more and getting less.'' And everybody wonders why they are not getting adequate Government services. The reason we are not is because we are spending $270 billion more on interest than we were spending in 1981. We are spending more for absolutely nothing—a total of $365 billion for nothing.

And now we have the President's budget. And as is the usual custom, the Administration says one thing and does another. I will never forget Attorney General John Mitchell's admonition, ''Watch what we do, not what we say.'' That could be the mantra of Congress and the White House today: ''Watch what we do, not what we say.''

Of course, if you look in the very first part of the President's budget, you can see projected on page 10 of the budget for next year, 1999, a $9.5 billion surplus. Isn't that grand? Isn't that wonderful? There it is: a $9.5 billion surplus on page 10.

But, Madam President, let us, if you please, go all the way back to page 367 of the President's budget. You have to go search through the whole budget. I don't know that anybody has done this, but I have learned how to search out the truth in these budgets. On page 367 you will find a chart similar to the one by the CBO titled ''Projections of the Federal Debt by Fiscal Year.'' You will find the Federal Government's financing and debt. And when you look in the very, very small print, you will see it under the title ''Total Gross Federal Debt.''

Of course, they have highlighted other elements of the budget, such as ''Debt Outstanding End of the Year.'' They have highlighted in bold, black letters the ''Debt Subject to Statutory Limitations End of the Year.'' But it is in very small letters that they provide the ''Total Gross Federal Debt.'' But if you squint your eyes, you can see that the debt goes from $5,543.6 billion in 1998 to $5,738.1 billion in 1999.

So the President, in his own budget—although you have to be a detective to find this—projects a deficit that, if adopted, ipso facto will be $194.5 billion.

This is the situation that confronts us. But today one has to read in all the papers and magazines about this ''surplus fever and tax cuts''; and you have to listen to the debate on the floor. ''No, I think we ought to spend more for this program or that program. No, I think we ought to have tax cuts. That's what we ought to do with the surplus.''

Madam President, the only way that anyone can possibly project any kind of balanced budget or surplus for next year of $9.5 billion is to use the trust funds—not just those of Social Security, because there is another $113 billion of Social Security being used—but the $90 billion in other trust funds.

The easiest way to figure whether or not you have a deficit is to see whether or not you make more money than you spend each year. This works for families; it works for everyone. We must look at whether the Federal Government receives more money than it spends. Of course, if it spends more than it receives, it has a deficit. And that is why you must look at the bottom line of the national debt, where you will see that we actually spend $194.5 billion more than we take in.

But the greatest gimmick and the actual fraud, Madam President, is the so-called unified budget. Supporters of this sham argue that President Lyndon Johnson and the Congress balanced the budget this way in 1968–1969. This is absolutely false; absolutely false. President Lyndon Baines Johnson did not use any surpluses in order to balance the budget.

Madam President, I have a chart that shows the state of the national debt under President Johnson. In fact, it provides the debt under all the Presidents, beginning with President Truman in 1945 and continuing to February, 1998. I have here the United States' total budget. I have the borrowed trust funds. This is in the chart and I ask unanimous consent that this be printed in the RECORD.

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

HOLLINGS' BUDGET REALITIES

[In billions of dollars]

President and year	U.S. budget (outlays)	Borrowed trust funds	Unified deficit with trust funds	Actual deficit with without trust funds	National debt	Annual increases in spending for interest
Truman.						
1945	92.7	5.4	−47.6	--	260.1	
1946	55.2	−5.0	−15.9	−10.9	271.0	
1947	34.5	−9.9	4.0	+13.9	257.1	
1948	29.8	6.7	11.8	+5.1	252.0	
1949	38.8	1.2	0.6	−0.6	252.6	
1950	42.6	1.2	−3.1	−4.3	256.9	
1951	45.5	4.5	6.1	+1.6	255.3	
1952	67.7	2.3	−1.5	−3.8	259.1	
1953	76.1	0.4	−6.5	−6.9	266.0	
Eisenhower.						
1954	70.9	3.6	−1.2	−4.8	270.8	
1955	68.4	0.6	−3.0	−3.6	274.4	
1956	70.6	2.2	3.9	+1.7	272.7	
1957	76.6	3.0	3.4	+0.4	272.3	
1958	82.4	4.6	−2.8	−7.4	279.7	
1959	92.1	−5.0	−12.8	−7.8	287.5	
1960	92.2	3.3	0.3	−3.0	290.5	
1961	97.7	−1.2	−3.3	−2.1	292.6	
Kennedy.						
1962	106.8	3.2	−7.1	−10.3	302.9	9.1
1963	111.3	2.6	−4.8	−7.4	310.3	9.9
Johnson.						
1964	118.5	−0.1	−5.9	−5.8	316.1	10.7
1965	118.2	4.8	−1.4	−6.2	322.3	11.3
1966	134.5	2.5	−3.7	−6.2	328.5	12.0
1967	157.5	3.3	−8.6	−11.9	340.4	13.4
1968	178.1	3.1	−25.2	−28.3	368.7	14.6
1969	183.6	0.3	3.2	+2.9	365.8	16.6
Nixon.						
1970	195.6	12.3	−2.8	−15.1	380.9	19.3
1971	210.2	4.3	−23.0	−27.3	408.2	21.0
1972	230.7	4.3	−23.4	−27.7	435.9	21.8
1973	245.7	15.5	−14.9	−30.4	466.3	24.2
1974	269.4	11.5	−6.1	−17.6	483.9	29.3

HOLLINGS' BUDGET REALITIES—Continued

[In billions of dollars]

President and year	U.S. budget (outlays)	Borrowed trust funds	Unified deficit with trust funds	Actual deficit with without trust funds	National debt	Annual increases in spending for interest
Ford.						
1975	332.3	4.8	−53.2	−58.0	541.9	32.7
1976	371.8	13.4	−73.7	−87.1	629.0	37.1
Carter.						
1977	409.2	23.7	−53.7	−77.4	706.4	41.9
1978	458.7	11.0	−59.2	−70.2	776.6	48.7
1979	503.5	12.2	−40.7	−52.9	829.5	59.9
1980	590.9	5.8	−73.8	−79.6	909.1	74.8
Reagan.						
1981	678.2	6.7	−79.0	−85.7	994.8	95.5
1982	745.8	14.5	−128.0	−142.5	1,137.3	117.2
1983	808.4	26.6	−207.8	−234.4	1,371.7	128.7
1984	851.8	7.6	−185.4	−193.0	1,564.7	153.9
1985	946.4	40.5	−212.3	−252.8	1,817.5	178.9
1986	990.3	81.9	−221.2	−303.1	2,120.6	190.3
1987	1,003.9	75.7	−149.8	−225.5	2,346.1	195.3
1988	1,064.1	100.0	−155.2	−255.2	2,601.3	214.1
Bush.						
1989	1,143.2	114.2	−152.5	−266.7	2,868.3	240.9
1990	1,252.7	117.4	−221.2	−338.6	3,206.6	264.7
1991	1,323.8	122.5	−269.4	−391.9	3,598.5	285.5
1992	1,380.9	113.2	−290.4	−403.6	4,002.1	292.3
Clinton.						
1993	1,408.2	94.3	−255.0	−349.3	4,351.4	292.5
1994	1,460.6	89.2	−203.1	−292.3	4,643.7	296.3
1995	1,514.6	113.4	−163.9	−277.3	4,921.0	332.4
1996	1,560.3	153.6	−107.3	−260.9	5,181.9	344.0
1997	1,601.3	165.5	−22.3	−187.8	5,369.7	355.8
1998	1,670.3	164.8	−5.5	−170.3	5,540.0	365.1

Historical Tables, Budget of the US Government FY 1998; Beginning in 1962 CBO's 1998 Economic and Budget Outlook.

TRUST FUNDS LOOTED TO BALANCE BUDGET

[By fiscal year, in billions of dollars]

	1997	1998	2002
Social Security	631	732	1,236
Medicare			
HI	117	113	109
SMI	34	34	51
Military Retirement	126	133	163
Civilian Retirement	431	460	584
Unemployment	62	72	98
Highway	22	23	56
Airport	7	10	30
Railroad Retirement	19	20	23
Other	53	55	68
Total	1,502	1,652	2,418

Mr. HOLLINGS. With this chart, we can see the borrowed trust funds and the unified deficit including the trust funds. But then we see the actual deficit without the trust funds, the real deficit, with a column for each President: Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, Johnson, Nixon, Ford, Carter, Reagan, Bush and Clinton. This table shows the national debt under each President, as well as the annual increases in spending on interest costs on that debt.

If we look at 1968–1969, we find that listed actual trust funds totalled $300 million. Since the unified deficit with trust funds was $3.2 billion, the actual deficit without Social Security trust funds was $2.9 billion. So trust funds were not used to balance the budget. This is a fallacious argument.

In fact, let me clear that up. In those days the distinguished Chairman of the Ways and Means Committee was Congressman Wilbur Mills of Arkansas. He was the authority on the federal budget and our nation's fiscal state. If you ever wanted to find out about a tax or revenue, if you ever wanted to talk about fiscal policy or otherwise, you went to see Wilbur. He was a brilliant individual. In 1972, he entered the Presidential race. Of course, before he got into that Presidential race—I cannot remember the exact year he announced—he came out and said we had so much money in Social Security that we should give recipients a cost-of-living-increase of 10 percent. And President Nixon said, ''Well, if Wilbur Mills will give you 10 percent, I will give you 15 percent,'' and we started spending away the Social Security moneys. We never did have a difficulty with Social Security until those shenanigans commenced.

By 1980, we determined that Social Security would be running into the red and we created the Greenspan Commission, under the distinguished head of the Federal Reserve, Alan Greenspan. The Greenspan Commission came out with a report adopted in 1983, which said that not only are we going to balance Social Security's budget, we are going to have an inordinately high tax, a graduated tax, to make sure that we build up a surplus to take care of the baby boomers. That was the intent of building up the surplus. They knew they were going to have extra money. It wasn't a mystery because it was an inordinately high tax. They built up this surplus intentionally. And Section 21 of the Greenspan Commission report states that in order to maintain the surplus for the baby boomers through the year 2056, we must take Social Security out of the unified budget.

Now, that is what Greenspan recommended. And this Senator worked as a member of the Budget Committee to get that done. Finally, in 1990, we reported it out from the Budget Committee by a vote of 20–1 that we do just that, take Social Security off budget. And 98 Senators voted for that on the floor of the Senate. And President George Bush, on November 5, 1990, signed section 13–301 into the law. Section 13–301 of the budget law says that the Congress and the President you shall not submit a budget using Social Security trust funds.

Of course, that was violated and it is being violated now in this particular budget. Right here, it is violated. There is no question it is being violated because that is what all the newspapers are reporting on—they are talking about page 10, not page 367.

Here is what has been occurring. Let's go right to Social Security. Last year we owed the trust funds $631 billion; by the end of September 1998, the Congressional Budget Office estimates we will owe $732 billion; and under the President's budget plan, by the year 2002 we will owe $1.236 trillion. Everybody is saying, wait a minute, we have to do something because in 10 years Social Security is going to be broke. Come on, it is broke now. If we look to the end of this year, we will owe Social Security $732 billion. Now, who in the year 2002 is going to recommend a tax increase of $1.236 trillion to redeem the Social Security IOUs? He will not be able to stand on the floor and get one vote. They will run him out. That will not happen.

That is why this particular Senator has been insistent from the very beginning that we look at all the trust funds and the condition of the Government—Medicare, military retirement, civilian retirement, unemployment, highway, airports—to evaluate the federal deficit and debt.

For example, at the end of this fiscal year we will owe highway trust funds $23 billion. Now, why are the highways crumbling and the bridges falling? Because the vehicle-automobile, gasoline taxes are not being used on the roads and the bridges. They are being used for food stamps, for foreign aid, or for any and every other purpose except for highways. Why don't we have updated radar at all the major airports in the U.S. for passengers' safety? After all, who pays airline tax? But the airline tax is not going to the airports. It is going for any and every other purpose but the airports. We owe them $10 billion. And I don't want to get the military retirees or the Civil Service retirees upset, but as of the end of September we will owe $133 billion to make payments to them. We will owe $460

billion, almost half a trillion dollars, to civilian retirees.

This charade, this fraud, has got to stop. It is outrageous that the President comes to the American people and says in one breath, ''Tonight I propose that we reserve 100 percent of the surplus—that is every penny of any surplus—until we have taken all the measures necessary to strengthen the Social Security system for the 21st century.'' And then, after giving that message last week, today he comes and loots the Social Security trust fund to the tune of $113 billion in order to report a $9.5 billion surplus. Of course, all the editorial writers and news columnists are writing that we will enjoy balanced budgets as far as the eye can see. We will have surpluses as far as the eye can see, they say, when the actual deficit under the President's budget is $194.5 billion. Look on page 367 of his report and you will see nothing but deficits for as far as the eye can see—namely, the debt increasing; namely, a billion dollars a day being paid now with the lowest of interest rates that we have had in our history. That amount is going to soar when interest rates rise because spending for interest goes up, up and away under the President's budget proposal. We really are in a downward spiral of financial responsibility here in the National Government.

Now, I delight in the President's budget with respect to child care. I delight in the provisions in there for 100,000 more Border Patrol agents; 100,000 more cops; higher pay for teachers; and smaller classroom size. But we are going to have to pass a tobacco tax settlement or some other measure to get extra moneys for these particular programs. This Senator is willing to vote to pay for those programs. I am trying to put Government on a pay-as-you-go basis.

I know about fiscal responsibility. I achieved the first AAA credit rating for the State of South Carolina, the first Southern State to receive this bond rating. In 1959 I worked like the dickens to get it done. I voted for that federal balanced budget in 1968–69. The entire budget, with the costs of the war in Vietnam and the Great Society, was only $178 billion. Today, we suffer from a $1.7 trillion budget. But we balanced it then.

I was a cosponsor of Gramm–Rudman-Hollings in order to try to cut the deficits, but of course the quickest way to anonymity in public office is to cosponsor a bill with Senator GRAMM or Senator Rudman. I never heard since from it but that is how it works around here. But we did get the majority of Democratic votes, 14 votes up and down against the opposition of the majority leader, the chairman of the Budget Committee and the Democratic whip. They all opposed Gramm–Rudman-Hollings, but we had a majority of Democrats on this side of the aisle vote for Gramm–Rudman-Hollings. I even suggested at one time a value-added tax to get on top of this sea of red ink, allocated to the deficit and the debt so we wouldn't get into this waste of $1 billion a day.

I am still working now, not just on the amount of the deficit and debt but for the principle of truth, truth in budgeting. How do you get the national media, the national press, who are co-conspirators in this charade, to report the truth. They are talking about conspiracy around this town with regard to special prosecutors, when in reality the conspiracy is right here, in the so-called unified budget. The budget the White House submitted today results without question in a $194.5 billion deficit if adopted as it is now submitted. It is time everyone realize this. It is time we practice truth in governing and reporting.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. DORGAN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 10 minutes in morning business.

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

THE BUDGET FOR 1999

Mr. DORGAN. Madam President, I wanted to make a couple of comments following those of the Senator from South Carolina, Senator HOLLINGS. He knows that I certainly agree with him on the issue of the Social Security trust funds and the unified budget. There are some definitional issues about the budget.

I was at the White House this morning, at the invitation of President Clinton, when he made a presentation on the budget that he released today. Frankly, the budget contains a lot of good news. The Senator from South Carolina is correct about the unified budget. But it is also correct to say that this President, beginning in 1993, said that we are going to change courses here and we are going to set this country on a different direction. Between then and now, we have wrestled the Federal budget deficit to the ground.

Is our job over? No. There is more to be done because of the Social Security trust funds and some other issues. But this President deserves substantial credit for deciding that we are going to change courses, change directions, and wrestle this budget deficit to the ground. I must say that, in 1993, when he proposed to do that, it was very controversial because, up until then, we had seen budget after budget with deficits that continued to increase, year after year. It was 535 bad habits around here, wanting to give tax cuts and spending increases. And the deficit continued to grow, and the Federal debt continued to escalate.

In 1993, when President Clinton said let's change direction here, he proposed a couple of things that were very controversial. He said, let's really cut some Federal spending, let's really increase some taxes on a selected basis. And it became very controversial because all those folks who had stood up and talked the loudest about controlling the Federal deficit, when it came time to take the vote, where were they? They weren't here. We didn't get one vote from the other side of the aisle—even by accident. We won by one vote in the U.S. Senate and one vote in the U.S. House, and that set this country on a different course.

Five years later, we now see daylight with the Federal deficits, and the deficits in future years are well under control. In fact, in the long-term, even with Social Security funds out of the calculation, we will reach a balanced budget.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Will the Senator yield briefly?

Mr. DORGAN. I yield to my friend.

Mr. HOLLINGS. The Senator is right on target with respect to giving the President credit. There is no question, we increased taxes, cut spending, and cut the number of Federal employees. And in increasing the taxes, I will never forget the colleague from Texas, when he stated on the floor—regarding increasing taxes on Social Security—that they were going to be hunting us Democrats down in the streets and shooting us like dogs. I will never forget that. They not only projected a recession and a depression, but that Social Security tax increase, which I don't see anybody putting into a bill or talking about today—but at that particular time, taking on that hard choice, as they talked about, without a single Republican vote, was very, very difficult. But we faced the fire, and to President Clinton's credit, now we have the economy headed in the right direction. My comments on the unified budget and deficit is to make sure we don't go in the other direction.

Mr. DORGAN. The Senator is certainly correct. The last thing we want to do is step back into the hole we were in before. Just the hint of a budget surplus in the future has persuaded a legion of people here to talk about new tax breaks on the one hand or new spending on the other hand. We ought rather to decide to have discipline. Let's accept the good news that we have wrestled the Federal budget deficit to the ground. Let's work to keep it there, instead of getting right back into the same fiscal mess we were in before.

I know some will dispute my recitation of the facts. But there is no dispute that, in 1993, we had a huge vote in the Senate. And we passed that deficit reduction bill by one vote, which sent this country on a different course. That vote indicated that we cared

about bringing down Federal budget deficits. We knew they hurt this country and we did something about it.

Everybody else wants to talk about it and shout about it and chant about it. But when it comes time to vote, the question is, who is going to stand up and, on behalf of the country's future, say, count me in, I want to cast a vote that is tough; I am willing to cast a vote that is hard, politically. In fact, some colleagues who voted the same way I did are not here in the Senate anymore because they cast that vote.

I just think it is important for all of us to understand that this President and enough Members of Congress, in the Senate and the House, 5 years ago, said that we are going to change direction and put this country on a course of fiscal policy that will wrestle the Federal budget deficit to the ground, and we have done that.

Now, the fact is, there are some people around here who handle good news like a chronic toothache. You could not get them to smile for any reason. But things are better. The budget is better, the economy is up, unemployment is down, inflation is down, the deficit is down, crime is down, welfare is down. Does that cause a smile? No. It is as if they are in a dental chair getting a root canal. They have to be crabby about something. I just saw a press conference by colleagues who are continuing to be crabby about what is going on in this country.

The fact is, this country is on a better course, moving in a better direction, and the news is better. Most of the American people understand that.

The President's budget, incidentally, is not perfect. I have some disagreement with portions of it. But, on the whole, I think it is an awfully good blueprint for this country. The President proposes some things that I think make a lot of sense.

The President proposes that we increase some spending in certain areas, and he pays for it with cuts in other areas. Let me describe one area where he proposes an increase in spending.

President Clinton proposes a 50 percent increase in funding over the next 5 years for the National Institutes of Health. There is not a family in this Chamber, or listening to these proceedings, that hasn't been touched by heart disease, stroke, cancer, AIDS, those scourges that kill Americans and ruin families.

Guess what is happening down at the National Institutes of Health? I have been down there. I have gone through the Lung and Blood Institute and National Cancer Institute. It is remarkable what is going on. It is breathtaking. If you take a look at the money we are investing in research on heart disease, the money that we are investing in research on cancer, to find a cure for AIDS, arthritis, diabetes, and so many other things, it is breathtaking.

One of the wonderful things I saw at the National Institutes of Health—without digressing too far—when I went into the building was, they had something called a ''healing garden,'' a little healing garden. They described the plants and vegetation they have collected from all over the world—50,000 to 60,000 plants and shrubs they have collected. They described the research they are doing to find the healing properties of plants.

Two thousand years ago, in China, if somebody got a headache, like some of my colleagues have about the fiscal policy of this country, what did they do? They would chew on a little willow bark. We do the same thing today, except we get the willow bark in pill form and call it ''aspirin.''

The most exciting thing is not the combination of chemicals and compounds, but the research on the healing properties of shrubs and bushes and plants. It is remarkable. It is wonderful what is going on.

The fact is, when we invest a dollar, a million dollars, or a billion dollars in health research, we provide enormous hope for the people of this country that we can begin to cure cancer. And we have done that with respect to some forms of cancer. We provide enormous hope to people around the country that we can deal with heart disease and stroke, the biggest killers in this country, in a much different way.

So in those areas of the budget—for example, the increase in direct investment in the National Institutes of Health—does that funding make sense? I think it does. Would people come here and say that the investment in medical research is worthless?

What about the woman that stood up at a town meeting and said, ''I had new knees put in and a new hip and cataract surgery, and I feel like a million dollars.'' Where did all that come from?

Fifty years ago, she would have been in a wheelchair, unable to walk or see. Now when someone's heart muscle plugs up and they have the breathtaking surgery that opens it up, they feel, when they are recovered, stronger than ever and they can go on for the next 10, 20 years and extend their lives.

The point is this: There are certain things we do that make a lot of sense. This President says, let's continue the investment in the National Institutes of Health and increase that investment and save lives in this country through the breakthroughs that will come from research and medicine. That makes a lot of sense to me.

The President says, among other things, let us save Social Security first, a point just discussed by my colleague from South Carolina. I know there are some people who never liked Social Security, and have never thought it was a good program.

They have a right to feel that way. But that is not the way the American people feel.

About 60 some years ago, we created a Social Security program, and I must say that the mathematics of it were quite interesting. Life expectancy, then, was 63 years of age. Social Security was created with a retirement of 65 years of age. That all works out pretty well. If you are expected to live until 63 and get retirement at 65, that system is pretty well financed. Now the life expectancy is not 63; it has gone to 77 or 78. So things have changed.

There are future challenges to the Social Security system because of that. We have to make some changes to put it on a sound basis for the long term. But what the President has said makes a lot of sense as a matter of priority. He has an answer to those who would rush off to provide tax breaks because they are popular, or who want to take the best 10 programs and add funding to them. The President has said that we should, as a priority in fiscal policy, save Social Security first.

That makes a lot of sense. We are going to have a debate on that in the Congress. Is that the priority? Or will we hear something different, as we have heard today, from those naysayers on fiscal policy, those who would be unhappy no matter what is happening? Will we hear that no, that is not a priority, saving Social Security is not a first priority, not even second or not even tenth priority? Will we hear people say that their priority is to give more tax breaks to their friends?

Let us decide that the responsible thing for the future of this country would be to embrace the principle the President has put forward. Let us save Social Security first.

The President talked in his budget message today about the priority for education. He is absolutely correct about that priority as well. He has talked about decreasing class size, and hiring 100,000 more teachers. He has talked about creating tax credits to help modernize crumbling schools. All of those things make sense to me.

President Clinton has paid for these proposals by cutting other funding and rearranging priorities. Instead of in the aggregate saying we are going to add substantial funding, he has done it within the confines of what we can and should spend relative to the budget agreement, the bipartisan agreement of last year.

The budget is not perfect. There are things in it that I don't like and there are some things not in it that should have been in it.

But this President has submitted a budget plan that is a responsible set of priorities for this country's future. This President should get some credit. And those in this Congress who have supported deficit reduction, both the 1993 bill and the bipartisan agreement last year, deserve some credit too for a budget outlook that is much, much different now than anyone would have expected 2 or 3 years ago.

THE HIGHWAY BILL

Madam President, let me make one further point about the priorities for the Congress this year.

We must bring to the floor of this Senate, sooner rather than later, the

highway funding bill. I know there has been a lot of juggling back and forth about whose fault it is that we haven't considered this bill sooner. But the fact is, the highway bill was supposed to have been done last year by the Senate, and it ought to be done now.

We were told it was going to be one of the first items of business. Now we are told by the budgeteers that it must wait to follow the budget. To me, that approach is a big mistake. Let me tell you why.

If we delay the highway bill until after we have finished the budget this year, we will have delayed the highway bill, which we should have passed last year, until well after the middle of this year.

States like mine, North Dakota, in the Northern region of this country, will be terribly disadvantaged once again if we do not pass this bill soon. Northern states have a short construction season. They need to commit most of their money in the spring in order for necessary work to get done before winter sets in again. The plans for highway building and bridge building, in my state and many other states, are on hold because this Congress has yet to pass this bill. That is why the Congress must act quickly in this matter.

This is a jobs issue. It is an issue about investment in our infrastructure. Highways and bridges are vitally important to economic development in every state. The longer the highway plans are on hold, the longer people have to wait to make their investment decisions.

So I say to the majority leader and others, when the leaders of the Senate are planning what the Senate should do tomorrow, the next day, or the next week, I hope they will decide to bring the highway bill to the Senate floor.

This country needs a highway bill. We have it in our grasp to bring a highway bill to the floor and to debate it and pass it.

Someone said, ''Well, gee, there are 100 or 200 amendments to the highway bill.'' So that means it should have been brought up yesterday or the day before, and maybe we would have gotten rid of 20 of those amendments.

Let us, day by day, make progress on the highway bill so the American people know that this Congress views transportation investment as a high priority.

Madam President, I yield the floor. I make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUESTS—S. 1575

Mr. COVERDELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 301, S. 1575, the Ronald Reagan airport legislation.

I further ask unanimous consent that there be one amendment in order to be offered by myself, Senator COVERDELL, relative to a modification of the original bill.

I ask unanimous consent that the total time for debate be limited to 2 hours equally divided between Senator MCCAIN and HOLLINGS, or their designees, and following the debate the Senate proceed to vote on or in relation to the amendment to be followed by third reading and a vote on passage of S. 1575.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DASCHLE. Madam President, reserving the right to object, this is very similar of course to the offer made last week.

I guess I will just ask: What is wrong with regular order? What is wrong with bringing a bill to the Senate floor, having a good debate, allowing the opportunity to offer amendments, and proceed under the rules of the Senate? Why do we need this gag rule with regard to this piece of legislation? Many of us are confused about that. And, unfortunately, many of the objections raised are being, in my view, misinterpreted by some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. All we want is an opportunity to offer amendments and to have a good debate.

Some have suggested that this opposition is cynical. I don't know that the opposition expressed in the last several days by local officials including the mayor of Alexandria, Kerry Donley, by the Chairman of the Metropolitan Washington Airport Authority, Chris Zimmerman, by the former Governor of Virginia, Linwood Holton, are cynical in their opposition to this piece of legislation. We are simply raising concerns about whether or not this is the right thing to do.

But that again argues, it seems to me, that we need the opportunity to have a good debate. This should not be done in 2 hours and with just one amendment. I give the distinguished Senator credit for his persistence and his determination to see this legislation through—but as I understand it, the one amendment to be offered by our Republican colleague is the one that literally takes the name ''Washington'' out of the title and instead puts in the name ''Reagan.'' We ought to have a discussion about that.

I suggest that perhaps there are other airports that should be considered to be renamed rather than Washington National Airport. For instance, it seems to me that Dulles International Airport might be a better candidate. We could have two airports named after two Presidents in the Washington area, ''Washington'' and ''Reagan,'' without affecting the first President of the United States. But we ought to have an opportunity to debate it. We ought to have an opportunity to discuss it and consider other amendments.

We have suggested as well that nothing would honor this former Ronald Reagan more than the opportunity to directly address a concern that he raised while he was President: the need to reform the IRS. Legislation to do just that passed 426 to 4 in the House of Representatives last year. We ought to pass it unanimously here in the Senate before more and more Americans are adversely affected by actions taken by IRS. Since we failed to act last November, one and a half million Americans have been adversely affected by actions taken by the IRS.

So let's deal with that legislation. Let's offer that as an amendment in tribute. We could even refer to it as the ''Ronald Reagan IRS reform amendment.''

I would just hope that we don't proceed as the first order of business imposing a gag rule on the Senate not allowing the opportunity for regular order, not having an opportunity to debate, to listen and respond to local officials.

How ironic that in the name of Ronald Reagan we carelessly demonstrate a lack of sensitivity to the local officials that Ronald Reagan said ought to be paramount in governmental decisionmaking. Unfortunately, we are attempting to override the objections that local decisionmakers have about what name should be placed at Washington National Airport. Do we really want to do that? Again, how ironic it would be if we did.

So, Madam President, for all those reasons I would simply ask unanimous consent that the Senator's request be modified to provide for three first-degree amendments to be in order per side during the consideration of that bill.

Mr. COVERDELL. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator agree to modifying his request?

Mr. COVERDELL. No. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. DASCHLE. Madam President, regrettably, under those circumstances I would have to object to the distinguished Senator's request as well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. COVERDELL. Madam President, first let me say this to my good friend, my distinguished colleague, the minority leader. It is incorrect to suggest that we are not talking about debate. We want to move to the bill and debate its merits, both for or against it. It is true that perhaps I, more than any other, am objecting to the concept of taking a memorial statement to a former President and turning it into a free-for-all about IRS or other issues. I just do not think that is appropriate. I can understand. And if we have a local official, a former Governor, who is opposed to it, then during the course of

the debate that can be heard and people can make their judgments about whether that is correct or wrong. But I can't accept the idea of taking something in the face of the family and finding ourselves in who knows what.

With regard to the propounding of but one amendment—and that being mine, although I know the minority leader and the majority leader have not had a chance to talk about this—but from my point of view that amendment does not need to be offered. It was an administrative attempt to be in concurrence with the House which removed it and made it Ronald Reagan National Airport. My original legislation is Ronald Reagan Washington National Airport just like it is Washington Dulles Airport. I know this is not the moment to resolve that. But the minority leader is here, and I am here, and I am passing that along.

With regard to the minority leader's suggestion as to other amendments, of course I would not know what those are. And I hope that during the course of the afternoon or tomorrow that the minority leader and the majority leader will have a chance to come to terms on it. But I do say in the strongest way that, while we can debate whether we should or shouldn't, I do not think it is appropriate. I think it would be unseemly to the family and everybody associated to open this up where we are debating other issues—no one wants to modify IRS more than I. But I wouldn't do it on this bill. And that is just a point of disagreement between us.

I agree with the Senator that it is unfortunate. I do think it is—I am the one that used the word ''cynical''—I do think it is reflective of the city, that we find ourselves dealing with this effort in this way, approaching a filibuster again. I think that it speaks for what it is.

We can debate it and vote for it or against it depending on whatever the individual Senator's desire would be, no matter their side of the aisle. I did think that the arguments—and the minority leader wasn't the source of all of those arguments—but they were, I thought, derived in an attempt to suggest a debate when in fact it was an attempt to stall or delay the legislation.

I say to the minority leader, I am going to go on and talk a bit about this, and I do not want him to feel impounded by that in that I basically responded to his comments.

Madam President, let me first say this legislation is awfully simple. It doesn't require some of the work such as an overhaul of the IRS or redesignation of Medicare. This is an attempt, a very appropriate attempt, to honor one of the great Presidents of our time.

This past Friday I referred to the process as being cynical. It reminds me of just how many changes have occurred in this Capital City of ours. At first it was suggested last week that to name it Ronald Reagan National Airport was removing the name of a former President, but everybody knows that the use of the word ''Washington'' with regard to Washington National is referring to location, although I certainly, as I told the minority leader, have no problem leaving it the Ronald Reagan Washington National Airport. But I am doing that because I am still certifying where the airport is. It is in Washington, DC.

It was suggested to me a little bit earlier that the Baltimore-Washington International Airport is not named after Lord Baltimore—it is named after a city called Baltimore that is named after Lord Baltimore—any more than the designation ''Washington'' in Baltimore-Washington International Airport refers to our first President. It refers to the two geographic locations in a very wise marketing attempt on the part of Baltimore to be an auxiliary airport to Washington National, or to the city airport here in Washington. I just do not feel that is a real nor meritorious problem in dealing with this legislation.

Probably the most offensive of the arguments that were offered this past Friday was the argument that the Reagan family is not here asking for this to be done. What an unseemly thing to be saying, ''Well, if we are going to honor former President Reagan you all have to come here, kind of crawl through the door and ask us to do this.'' They will never do that. They will never do that. What are they supposed to do, launch a lobbying effort or buy some public relations firm to come up here and plead with the U.S. Senate that this would be an appropriate gesture?

Madam President, I have already taken issue with the idea that you take a memorial, a memorial to a great American leader, and you use it as a vehicle to handle all the other processes that go on in the Capital City, whether it's IRS or Medicare or some other issue. We all know better than that. Protocol and etiquette simply dismisses that as being inappropriate, related to a memorial designation. As I said last week, this ought to stand or fall on its own merits. You either support the idea of honoring President Reagan in this way or you don't. But the idea of trying to cripple it through a series of amendments is demeaning and inappropriate.

I frankly think this filibuster is inappropriate. It seems to become more and more of the process the other side is using. But if you had to find one area where it just was inappropriate, it would be using it in the context of a memorial statement to a former President. And I want to repeat, we are dealing with a gentleman who was a great American President, who was wounded in the twilight of his years, made one of the most magnanimous statements to his countrymen, one of the finest demonstrations of courage and bravery and ongoing public responsibility, whose birthday is this week. This town is not honoring itself in this debate—both in the context of the way this is being handled and now we find ourselves in the midst of yet another, in my judgment demeaning characteristic, and that is a filibuster.

In an era where America yearned for a leader, Ronald Reagan answered the call. It is easy to forget that leadership is not doing what is popular based on a poll, it is doing what is right. Time and time again, President Reagan made his decisions on the strength of his convictions, regardless of current polls or popular opinion. How quickly we forget how he was mocked, chided, ridiculed when he called the Soviet Union an evil empire, but history has borne him out.

I remember very vividly the mocking of President Reagan when he characterized the Soviet Union as an evil empire, and I remember wondering in my mind, and aloud, why in the world would anybody mock somebody for describing the Soviet Union in such a way? This was an avowed adversary that had enslaved millions of people in a dictatorship. But he was mocked when he referred to the Soviet Union as an evil empire.

Did it deter him? Was he shaken by this? Did he call another press conference to try to explain what he meant? No. He said it was an evil empire and an avowed adversary and we ought to understand it in that way. As I said, people scoffed at his naivete when he demanded that Mikhail Gorbachev tear down the Berlin Wall. I can still see him standing there: ''Tear down this wall.'' Freedom won. The Berlin wall fell and the world is a completely different place because of the convictions—not only of him. He'd be the first, if he were here, to say, ''I didn't do this alone.'' But he was a giant in the effort.

I remember several years ago, before his illness, he was in Atlanta, GA. It was a Republican Party event that he had agreed to attend. At the end of the meeting, in a very inspiring way, very emotional, the chairman of the dinner walked over and gave him, encased, a piece of the Berlin wall, and said, ''I hope you will let this rest on your desk to remind you of the achievement your strength of convictions meant to our country and to the world.''

Now that the wall was down—and instead of this forceful edifice of oppression that looked down on people, that enslaved people, that threatened people—it had come to the point that it was but a mere souvenir to be sitting on desks or in libraries around the world.

Originally, the Congress that I am unfortunately dealing with here today balked at the idea that families, not Government, should decide how to spend tax dollars. Under Ronald Reagan, the families won one of the largest single tax cuts in American history. And we certainly have seen the benefit of it—millions of new jobs. The decade of the 1980s was one of unbridled optimism. As we lowered the pressure on our families, left more of the income they produced in their checking

accounts, we saw an unprecedented turnaround from stagflation, from unbelievable interest rates, from high taxes; and you saw the American people come forward with almost boundless optimism.

For some of the people in this city, they called that a decade of greed. I call it a decade of growth and strength and authority for the United States—not only in the context that we were able to stand up and force the Soviet Union to tear the wall down, but that our everyday families from Iowa to Georgia, were better off, and they were optimistic, and they regained—you know—it's ''morning in America,'' as he would say. And it showed. We were a smiling Nation again.

Throughout his Presidency, Ronald Reagan stood on principle, and history has, again, borne him out. In 1981, the office he inherited and the country he was to govern was in grave crisis, both at home and abroad. We forget, inflation was double digits.

What is that versus today? Several times what it is today. Interest rates were over 20 percent. It means if you wanted to buy a house, if you wanted to buy a car, you were going to pay 20 cents on the dollar just to use the money. All of you have seen the ads for automobiles today. Some are as low as 6 percent. So it was dragging our economy down.

Ronald Reagan's most critical opponents would acknowledge that President Reagan's policies reversed our course, bringing prosperity to home and allowing us to stand tall once again abroad.

President Reagan taught us that leadership, as I said, is more than polls and focus groups. Leadership is not doing what is popular and then trying to make it right. It is doing what is right and then making it popular. As Eric Sevareid said of Harry Truman in David McCullough's book ''Truman,'' ''Remembering him reminds people of what a man in that office ought to be like. It's character, just character, and he stands like a rock in memory now.''

Madam President, Ronald Reagan is a rock of our time, and history is going to demonstrate that again and again.

The Wall Street Journal of Monday, January 5, 1998, talks about Ronald Reagan. ''Reagan National Airport'' is the headline. I am going to share it with the Senate:

The Republican Governors Association has unanimously endorsed renaming Washington's chief transportation gateway the ''Ronald Reagan Washington National Airport.''

I might add, that includes the current Governor of Virginia, not a former Governor, the current Governor.

The move gives impetus to a plan by Congressional leaders to pass legislation honoring the former President in time for his 87th birthday on February 6.

This week, which is what is so frustrating about this filibuster. We are running on a short fuse here, Madam President.

A big booster of the idea is Governor George Allen of Virginia, where National Airport is located.

Of course, he is now retired from that governorship.

He notes that many airports are named after famous people, from San Diego's Lindbergh to New York's LaGuardia, Chicago's O'Hare, Washington's Dulles Airport and Orange County's John Wayne Airport. A serious effort is under way to rename Los Angeles' airport after actor and World War II aviator Jimmy Stewart. The late President John F. Kennedy was honored by having the nation's largest international airport named after him in 1964.

Friends of Mr. Reagan say National Airport is a more appropriate memorial than the new $818 million government office building in Washington that is also named after him.

I know this to be the case. Washington National is a symbol. It is something that millions of passengers see every year, both domestic and foreign. Those of us who share my view think that is the appropriate memorial to designate Ronald Reagan Airport.

To have him identified with [this building]—

And I am going to modify this language, I don't want to read it exactly—''represents everything he was opposed to, is the ultimate irony.''

That is the big building.

''He wanted to pare back government,'' says former Senator Paul Laxalt. In contrast, renaming National Airport would cost almost nothing.

Now we know it costs nothing because we have had letters from people willing to pay for any changes, citizens who are willing to step forward.

''You're talking about a few signs and a logo,'' says David Ralston, chairman of the airport's authority. Grover Norquist, who came up with the idea as head of the Ronald Reagan Legacy Project, says he will be happy to raise money to pay for any extra costs if Democrats find that a reason to object.

We have already put that to bed. We have another citizen who already stepped forward who said he would see to any financial costs associated with renaming the airport.

A few already are grouching privately. While President Clinton has declined to say if he would sign the name change into law, some Democrats in Congress mutter that Mr. Reagan is an inappropriate choice. Washington, D.C.'s Mayor Marion Barry says ''a host of other people'' should be considered.

As I have said, if they believe that this memorial is inappropriate, they should speak to it and vote against it. But using specious arguments to somehow cloud the effort I do not think is appropriate.

But the first frontal assault on the idea came from Mary McGrory, the Washington Post's venerable liberal columnist. She says the idea ''should be nipped in the bud.''

She must have some influence here.

Mr. Reagan ''didn't only rail against Washington, he genuinely despised it. . .''

I have to say that is just such an inappropriate characterization of our former President. He didn't like a lot of the ideas. He didn't like the idea that this town thought it ran America, but he did love America, and he was a believer in its optimism and its glory and understood that this was the capital of the free world for which he gave so much of his life to protect.

She says:

He took no part in its revels or its problems. He was in no way attached to it.

I think most Americans would find not being attached to the Capital City an attribute. If I have one criticism of the city in the brief time I have been here, it is that too many people succumb to this city and the idea that it dominates the Nation.

She concludes by saying ''we do not know what Ronald Reagan feels about all this. He is not himself.''

That is accurate. He has fallen ill, as we all know.

That may be true, but Nancy Reagan and Mr. Reagan's son Michael are on record as supporting the idea. Governor Allen says a Reagan Airport would gladden the hearts of millions of Americans who don't view Washington as an imperial city.

It is true that President Reagan did not view this as an imperial city.

He says generations of future lawmakers would do well to remember Mr. Reagan as they fly in to pass laws. ''Every time they come here, they'll be reminded they're here to serve the people, even though they're far from home,'' Governor Allen says.

Nothing can restore Ronald Reagan to the inspirational vitality that so inspired Americans during the 1980s, qualities that are vividly recalled in the superb PBS biography of Mr. Reagan that will air nationally on February 23 and 24. Still, we can't help but think the country would benefit from having such a visible national symbol honoring him.

Great last line:

Name this one for the Gipper.

Madam President, I have alluded several times here this afternoon to the fact that our former President has been afflicted with a crippling illness. President Reagan faced personal adversity many times during his Presidency. Being cut down by an assassin's bullet would have been enough to knock the wind out of almost anybody, but not President Reagan. I remember this incident so vividly. I think most Americans would.

I happened to be in London that afternoon. Nancy and I were having dinner. It is very interesting. The waiter came over, and he leaned over, and he said, ''Pardon me. Are you Americans?''

I guess we must have looked a little different to him or maybe it was the southern accent. I am not sure. But he said, ''Are you Americans?'' And I said, ''Yes, we are. Thank you.'' And in the most somber way, he leaned over and he said that he was so sorry to advise me that, ''Your President has been shot.'' He was just stunned. And he said, ''We would like to help you, so we have arranged for a television in our living quarters upstairs, if you might like to understand what has happened.'' We immediately dashed upstairs.

We shared the shock of everyone in the world wondering at that moment,

had we lost this great President. And where was the Vice President? And what was actually happening? But even in that moment you could sense the world's admiration, even in this waiter, even in this community, this restaurant, their admiration for President Reagan, and trying to help the only Americans that were right there in front of them to see them through this situation.

Or do you remember when he was diagnosed with cancer? He bounced back again. Couldn't take the Gipper down.

But now he faces his greatest battle—Alzheimer's disease. And he has not shrunk from the challenge. Ronald Reagan chose to use his personal suffering to bring public focus on the devastation caused by this disease, and in so doing once again took the cards he was given and turned them to another public use.

Last Thursday, Madam President, I shared the unbelievable letter that President Reagan wrote to his fellow countrymen and to the world, for that matter. I am going to share that again this afternoon because it is not long. And I think it speaks to the nature of the individual we are trying to honor on his 87th birthday.

He said, on November 5, 1994—not that long ago:

My fellow Americans, I have recently been told that I am one of the millions of Americans who will be afflicted with Alzheimer's disease.

Upon learning this news, Nancy and I had to decide whether as private citizens we would keep this a private matter or whether we would make this news known in a public way. In the past, Nancy suffered from breast cancer and I had my cancer surgeries. We found through our open disclosures we were able to raise public awareness. We were happy that as a result, many more people underwent testing. They were treated in early stages and able to return to normal, healthy lives.

So now we feel it is important to share it with you. In opening our hearts, we hope this might promote greater awareness of this condition. Perhaps it will encourage a clearer understanding of the individuals and families who are affected by it.

At the moment I feel just fine. I intend to live the remainder of the years God gives me on this Earth doing the things I have always done. I will continue to share life's journey with my beloved Nancy and my family. I plan to enjoy the great outdoors and stay in touch with my friends and supporters.

Unfortunately, as Alzheimer's disease progresses, the family often bears a heavy burden. I only wish there was some way I could spare Nancy from this painful experience. When the time comes, I am confident that with your help she will face it with faith and courage.

In closing, let me thank you, the American people, for giving me the great honor of allowing me to serve as your President. When the Lord calls me home, whenever that day may be, I will leave with the greatest love for this country of ours and eternal optimism for its future.

I now begin the journey that will lead me into the sunset of my life. I know that for America there will always be a bright dawn ahead.

Thank you, my friends. May God always bless you.

Sincerely, Ronald Reagan.

Every time I read this I am just struck, as I was with the assassination attempt, with the bout with cancer. I remember when he was first running for President—he had been an actor—and there was no way he possessed the qualifications to be President. And then, of course, he was too old. I think this President defied about everything they could put in front of him. And he turned out to be one of the truly great American Presidents of this century and for all time.

I know that if we are able to accomplish this, and can do so by his birthday this week, we will have made but a small gesture to acknowledge our gratitude for an enormous career and an America for which all time—all time—will be changed, for which millions of people are now free that were not, for thousands upon thousands of men and women in our military and others who did not have to lift up their arms to accomplish the transformation in Europe.

Many of those people probably do not realize how much they are indebted to this great President. Wouldn't it be nice to remind them, and wouldn't it be nice for them to understand, through this gesture, what a great leader can mean to the Nation, our country and our future?

Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. COVERDELL. Madam President, one of President Reagan's most ardent supporters, if not the most ardent, oddly enough, is not an American citizen. A moment ago I was talking about an individual—I wish I kept this person's name—that was a British citizen. Oddly enough, it was this individual's Prime Minister who is probably President Reagan's most ardent supporter, Margaret Thatcher, Prime Minister of Britain, 1979 to 1990.

Recently, a book has been published of vignettes and remembrances of Ronald Reagan. There is a short one from Margaret Thatcher that I will share with the Senate.

I . . . met Governor Reagan shortly after my becoming conservative leader in 1975. Even before then I knew about Governor Reagan because Denis [her husband] had returned home one evening in the late 1960s full of praise for a remarkable speech Ronald Reagan had just delivered to the Institute of Directors.. I read the text myself and quickly saw what Denis meant. When we met in person [she is talking about meeting Governor Reagan] . . . I was immediately won over by his charm, sense of humor, and directness.

These are all very important characteristics of President Reagan. Charm. The other side all referred to him as Teflon. Sense of humor. It was absolutely captivating to be in his presence because he could so effectively use humor to calm things down, to take the sting out of a confrontation, to move people back to the table. He was the best at using his sense of humor. And then the directness. Directness.

Years ago when he was first running for President, in 1976, I was summoned to a meeting at Atlanta International Airport which is named for Hartsfield, one of our distinguished former mayors. The Governor was going to visit with us. He was reaching out and trying to meet Republicans everywhere. We didn't have many in Georgia at that time, but a few of us gathered together, and he came in the room. I tended to support our sitting President, President Gerald Ford. I thought it made sense the party should stick with the incumbent President. The Governor was making a case for himself.

I asked the very last question. I asked the Governor, ''Now, look, if we are going to be in such a tough election, why does it make sense to replace a sitting incumbent with all the assets that that person can bring to the contest?'' And that threw Governor Reagan a bit, threw him off. So then the person stood up and said, ''Well, that concludes our meeting,'' and without a heartbeat, Governor Reagan said, ''We are not ending this meeting on that question,'' and he took another question that was on a more optimistic note and completely turned the meeting around. His directness and his ability to take charge in any setting was remarkable.

In the succeeding years I read his speeches, advocating tax cuts as the root to wealth creation and stronger defenses as an alternative to detente. I also read many of his radio broadcasts which his press secretary sent over regularly for me. I agreed with them all. In November 1978 we met again in my room in the House of Commons.

In the early years Ronald Reagan had been dismissed by much of the American political elite though not by the American electorate. . . [they considered him] a right-wing maverick who could not be taken seriously. Now he was seen by many thoughtful Republicans as their best ticket back to the White House. Whatever Ronald Reagan had gained in experience, he had not done so at the expense of his beliefs. I found him stronger than ever. When he left my study, I reflected on how different things might look if such a man were President of the United States. But, in November 1978, such a prospect seemed a long way off.

The so-called Reagan Doctrine, which Ronald Reagan developed in his speech to both Houses of Parliament in 1982, demonstrated just how potent a weapon in international politics human rights can be. His view was that we should fight the battle of ideas for freedom against communism through the world, and refuse to accept the permanent exclusion of the captive nations from the benefits of freedom.

This unashamedly philosophical approach and the armed strength supporting it transformed the political world. President Reagan undermined the Soviet Union at home by giving hope to its citizens, directly assisted rebellions against illegitimate Communist

regimes in Afghanistan and Nicaragua [in our own hemisphere] and facilitated the peaceful transition to democracy in Latin American countries and the Philippines. Of course, previous American governments had extolled human rights, and President Carter had even declared that they were the ''soul'' of U.S. foreign policy. Where President Reagan went beyond these, however, was in making the Soviets the principal targets of his human rights campaign, and moving from rhetorical to material support for anti-Communist guerrillas in countries where Communist regimes had not securely established themselves. The result was a decisive advance for freedom in the world . . . In this instance, human rights and wider American purposes were in complete harmony.

Madam President, I will read a letter to the Senate.

JANUARY 2, 1998.

GENTLEMEN: I endorse and support H.R. 2625 and S. 1297. Both would redesignate Washington National Airport as ''Ronald Reagan Washington National Airport.''

Sincerely,

GERALD R. FORD.

Madam President, this next Friday, February 6, as President Reagan likes to put it, will be the 48th anniversary of his 39th birthday.

We have been blessed to have had such a great leader, dedicated to principle. Ronald Reagan distinguished himself in several careers in his lifetime. He was a radio sportscaster, announcing Cubs games for WHO in Des Moines, IA; an actor in films, such as ''Knute Rockne, All-American;'' a union leader—head of the Screen Actors Guild; a two-term Governor of California; and a twice-elected President of the United States.

So today, Madam President, I say to my colleagues, let's pass this one for the Gipper.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

Mr. FORD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky is recognized.

Mr. FORD. Madam President, we are developing a position here that I don't particularly like, as it relates to naming an airport after one of our great Presidents. One of the things that concerns me most is what Ronald Reagan did as President. When he wrote his federalist papers, the Executive Order, I believe, 12612, it related to States rights and local authority.

I want to explain my views on this legislation to rename the Washington National Airport. This airport has been named the Washington National Airport since 1941. Franklin Roosevelt laid the cornerstone for the airport. The airport is on property that once belonged to the family of Martha Washington and the stepson of George Washington. What we are about to do is not an appropriate way to honor, in my opinion, one of our Presidents. In fact, in a sense, it dishonors our first President.

Ronald Reagan will have his place in history, having served two terms as President. His name is already etched on the second-largest Government building in this community. And in April, his lovely wife Nancy will be here to celebrate and dedicate the opening of that building. President Reagan clearly believed that State and local governments should be given the power to act, wherever possible, rather than the Federal Government. In fact, he issued an Executive order so that all Federal agencies made sure that local decisions were respected.

Each of our major airports named after a President was accomplished because of local decisions. In Houston, George Bush's name was added to the name of the airport because of a decision by the mayor and the city council. In New York, the mayor, city council, and port authority honored John F. Kennedy. Here, we have objections, not support, from local communities. We may all agree that it should be renamed, but should we run roughshod over the views of the local citizenry? That would be contrary to President Reagan's papers, the Executive Order 12612.

One year prior to signing the executive order on federalism, Congress enacted legislation, championed by President Reagan's Secretary of Transportation, that created a multi-State airport authority to run and operate the two Washington-area airports. We turned over the keys to the Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority, which we refer to as MWAA. On March 1, 1987, Secretary of Transportation Elizabeth Dole signed a 50-year lease with MWAA. Lock, stock and barrel, subject to certain limitations, we gave them the keys to the Washington National Airport.

Section after section of the 1986 act recognizes the independence of MWAA from the Federal Government for the purposes of running the airport. The lease also has similar language.

It is not clear to me that we can clearly usurp the local airport authority's power and merely rename the airport. Yet, this bill does just that. In 1990—just think back a few short years ago—Senator Dole appropriately introduced a resolution to rename the Dulles Airport after former President Eisenhower. Now, Eisenhower was a very good President. He was a very good military leader; World War II was won by his genius. The Dole bill, however, recognized the local operating authority, and rather than usurping that authority, it urged the airport authority to make the name change. That was done appropriately and by the law and by President Reagan's federalist papers, where he said local authority should be the uppermost.

If we had worked this issue properly, Madam President, I suspect we would have come to a similar conclusion and found a way to recognize our former President. Instead, we will rename the airport by fiat and let the lawyers have their day in court. The legality may be challenged and, in my view, the lawyers may have an excellent chance of winning. We are running over local authority with this piece of legislation. They say that closer to the runway are those who are associated with this area, and those who operate the airport would prefer that the 56-year-old airport stay Washington National. And joining officials from Alexandria, who are opposed, and Arlington, who have previously said they oppose the change, the Greater Washington Board of Trade weighed in against this change last week. ''With all due respect to President Reagan, we believe that renaming the airport would be very confusing to air travelers, visitors, and local residents alike,'' the chairman of the Board's Transportation and Environment Committee said.

Let me quote the first Republican Governor of Virginia this century—and I served with him—A. Linwood Holton, Jr.:

I also urge Congress not to impose the change on the Metropolitan Washington Airport Authority, which oversees National and Dulles International Airport under this 50-year lease from the Federal Government.

Linwood Holton says:

I hate to see even something as politically popular as this begin to chip away at the independence of local authority.

It's not easy to stand up here and be opposed to having the name of a famous and well-liked President on an airport. But someone, somehow has to understand that we are usurping local authority and the local people do not want it, and we would be giving them something they don't want, and that is typically Federal Government.

My colleague from Georgia, Mr. COVERDELL, read a letter from the former President announcing his problems with having Alzheimer's and his wife having a problem as it relates to breast cancer. And if the Gipper could tell us today what he would rather have, I believe he would rather have something named on behalf of his wife as it relates to the fight against breast cancer in this country today. That would be meaningful. That would be helpful. And it would be something that I think you would find 100-percent support for.

So, Madam President, I regret that I must oppose this piece of legislation. You can go across the country. I named Houston for President George Bush, New York for President Kennedy, Denver—they decided to name the airport after a former mayor. And Las Vegas named it after a former Senator.

So it is on and on, and all of the decisions were made by the people of those communities. President Reagan would not want us to violate his principles in the process of naming something in his honor.

Let's think about that just a minute. President Reagan would not want us to violate his principles in the process of naming something in his honor.

The law states that the airport assumes all rights and obligations as an airport. And it should be treated like all other airports. Can we mandate a renaming of any other airport? I don't think so.

So, Madam President, I hope that something can be worked out rather than having the resolution amended to add other names; the resolution be amended to take care of the IRS, the resolution be amended to do a lot of other things.

So let's look at the ownership of this property for a moment, if we may.

Originally it was owned by the Alexandria family, for which the city of Alexandria is named. That is who owned this property.

The property was later owned by the Custis family. John Parke Custis acquired the land from the Alexandria family. John Parke Custis was the son of Martha Washington, and the stepson of George Washington.

George Washington was close to John Custis, and following John's death adopted his two children. The children then lived at Mount Vernon. And the airport was designed after Mount Vernon.

The Abington Plantation was returned later to the Alexandria family.

In the 1920's, the land was owned by Lewis Smoot, and later sold to the Richmond, Fredricksburg, and Potomac Railroad.

Two airports were located near the Virginia side of the 14th Street Bridge; one the Hoover Field. That was after a President, which opened in 1926, and Washington Airport opened in 1927. The airports merged because of the Depression.

The decision to build Washington National Airport did not occur until 1938 when Franklin Delano Roosevelt effectively bypassed this body and began construction.

Following a series of disputes over who actually owned the land, the District of Columbia and Virginia claimed title. The Federal Government asserted jurisdiction in 1946.

So not only has the George Washington family—the first—of these United States been involved in this property in this area for the lifetime of this country but I think that leaving the name as it is, or changing the name to whatever should be, as President Reagan insisted that we do back in the 1986 when he wrote his Federal Executive order, I think it would be much better to honor his wife since his name is already etched in the second-largest building in this area, second only to the Pentagon. I hope that a way can be found rather than to make it look partisan, and some will take my position because they think it is right. Others will take an opposite view because of the political arena. Some will take the same view I have because of politics. I have taken the view because of what President Reagan said in his papers, Executive Order 16612, that said that communities and the States and in their judgment should be respected. And I think we ought to do what the former President asked us to do.

I see no one wanting the floor. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Thomas, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

REPORT OF THE BUDGET OF THE U.S. GOVERNMENT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1999—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—PM 88

The Presiding Officer laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; referred jointly, pursuant to the order of January 30, 1975, to the Committee on Appropriations, and to the Committee on the Budget.

To the Congress of the United States:

The 1999 Budget, which I am submitting to you with this message, is a balanced Federal budget, marking the first such budget in 30 years and bringing an era of exploding deficits to an end.

By reaching balance, my budget represents a remarkable turnaround in our fiscal policy over the last five years. It brings to an end three decades of fiscal chaos, a period in which Americans had lost confidence in their Government and the ability of their leaders to do the people's business.

This budget is not just balanced, it is balanced the right way. It not only ends the deficit, it reflects the values that Americans hold dear—the values of opportunity, responsibility, and community. The budget reflects my commitment to continue helping working families with their basic needs—to raise their children, send them to college, and pay for health care.

The budget invests in education and training and in research to raise the standard of living for average Americans. It invests in the environment and in law enforcement to raise the quality of life across our Nation. It invests in our communities at home while providing the resources to maintain a strong defense and conduct the international relations that have become so important to our future.

In the public and private sectors, prospects for a budget surplus are spurring a wide array of ideas about how to spend it. At this point, the Government has not yet reached the surplus milestone, and I continue to believe strongly that we should not spend a surplus that we don't yet have.

More specifically, I believe that the Administration and Congress should not spend a budget surplus for any reason until we have a solution to the long-term financing challenge facing Social Security. With that in mind, my budget proposes a reserve for the projected surpluses for 1999 and beyond.

PREPARING THE NATION FOR A NEW AMERICAN CENTURY

Five years ago, my Administration took office determined to restore the American Dream for every American. We were determined to turn the economy around, to rein in a budget that was out of control, and to create a Government that once again would focus on its customers, the American people.

Five years later, we have made enormous progress. Our economy is strong, our budget is headed toward balance, and our Government is making noticeable progress in providing better service to Americans.

We are beginning to bring Americans together again, to repair the social fabric that has frayed so badly in recent decades. All across America, crime is down, poverty is down, and welfare is down. Incomes are rising at all levels, and a new spirit of optimism is sweeping through many of our urban and rural communities that are rebounding from decades of lost jobs and lost hope.

Now that we have turned the economy around, our task is to spread the benefits of our economic well-being to more Americans, to ensure that every American has the chance to live out his or her dreams. As we move confidently ahead as a Nation, we want to ensure that nobody is left behind.

A century ago, the economy shifted from agriculture to manufacturing, changing the way that Americans lived, the way they worked, the way they related to one another. Today, the economy is shifting once more, this time from manufacturing to services, information, technology, and global commerce.

We can ensure that every American fully enjoys the benefits of this exciting new age, but only if we continue to give people the tools they need and create the conditions in which they can prosper. That is what my budget is designed to do.

CREATING A BRIGHT ECONOMIC FUTURE

When my Administration took office, the Nation was mired in economic problems. The economy had barely grown over four years, creating few jobs. Interest rates were high. Incomes remained stagnant for all but the most well-off. The budget deficit, which had exploded in size in the early 1980s, had reached a record $290 billion and was headed higher. Clearly, the Nation needed a new course.

We launched an economic policy with three central features that had never before been tried together: We set out to reduce the deficit, invest in the American people, and open up markets abroad. Only by pursuing all three elements could we restore the economy and build for the future.

My 1993 budget plan, the centerpiece of our economic strategy, was a balanced plan that cut hundreds of billions of dollars of Federal spending while raising income taxes only on the top 1.2 percent of Americans. By cutting unnecessary and lower-priority spending, we found the resources to cut taxes for 15 million working families while investing in education and training, the environment, and other priorities.

Five years later, we have cut the deficit dramatically, and this budget will finish the job by reaching balance and keeping the budget in balance for the foreseeable future. We have invested in the education and skills of our people, giving them the tools they need to raise their children and get good jobs in an increasingly competitive economy. We have expanded trade through global as well as bilateral agreements, generating record exports that create high-wage jobs for millions of Americans.

The economy responded almost immediately to our policies. When I announced my 1993 budget plan, interest rates fell, and they fell even more as I worked successfully with Congress to put the plan into law. These lower interest rates helped to spur the steady economic growth and strong business investment that we have enjoyed for the last five years. Our policies have helped create over 14 million jobs, while interest rates have remained low and inflation has stayed under control.

As we move ahead, I am determined to ensure that we stick with the policies that are working. We must maintain our fiscal discipline so that we not only reach balance, but also keep the budget in balance.

IMPROVING PERFORMANCE THROUGH BETTER MANAGEMENT

We are balancing the budget the right way, by reducing the size and scope of our Government.

We have done more than just eliminate hundreds of Federal programs and projects. We have cut the civilian Federal work force by over 316,000 employees, giving us the smallest work force in 35 years. In fact, as a share of our total civilian employment, we have the smallest work force since 1931.

But we set out to do more than just cut Government. Under the leadership of the Vice President's National Performance Review, we set out to make Government work, to create a Government that is more efficient and effective, to create a Government focused on its customers, the American people.

We have made real progress, but we still have much work to do. We have reinvented parts of departments and agencies, but now we are determined to turn our agencies around from top to bottom. For 1999, the Vice President will lead an effort to improve the performance of agencies that interact most with the American people. We want to enable Americans not only to quickly enjoy better service from our Government, but to regain confidence in Government as well.

At the same time, I am determined that we will solve the very real management challenges before us. A good example is the challenge of ensuring that our computer systems can accurately process the year 2000 date change. I have directed my Administration to take the necessary steps to meet the problem head-on.

PREPARING FOR THE 21ST CENTURY

Nothing is more important to our future than education. It has become the dividing line between those who are moving ahead and those who are lagging behind. That is why I have devoted so much effort to ensure that we have a world-class system of education and training in place for Americans of all ages. Over the last five years, we have worked hard to ensure that every boy and girl is prepared to learn, that our schools focus on high standards and achievement, that anyone who wants to go to college can get the financial help to attend, and that those who need a second chance at education and training or a chance to improve or learn new skills can do so. My budget significantly increases funds to help children, especially in the poorest communities, reach challenging academic standards and makes further progress in implementing voluntary national tests. It proposes to build more classrooms and pay for 100,000 more teachers so that we can reduce class sizes. For higher education and training, my budget increases Pell Grants and other college scholarships from the record levels that we have already achieved; expands College Work-Study to a record one million students; streamlines student loan programs and cuts student fees; and expands access to job placement services, training, and related services for dislocated workers and others. Now that anyone who wants to attend college can find the means through Hope scholarships, Pell Grants, and other assistance that we worked so hard to enact, I want to provide the same universal opportunity for job training and re-training to those who need it.

Over the last five years, we have worked hard to help working families. We cut taxes for 15 million working families, provided a tax credit to help families raise their children, ensured that 25 million Americans a year can change jobs without losing their health insurance, made it easier for the self-employed and those with pre-existing conditions to get health insurance, provided health care coverage for up to five million uninsured children, raised the minimum wage, and provided guaranteed time off for workers who need to care for a newborn or address the health needs of a family member. Now, with my new Child Care Initiative, I am determined to provide the help that families need when it comes to finding safe, high-quality, affordable child care. Parents should know that, when they go to work, their children are in safe, healthy environments. I also propose to address the problems faced by a particular group of working families—legal immigrants. In signing the 1996 welfare reform law, I said that I would try to restore the cuts in benefits for legal immigrants that were not only harsh and unnecessary but that had nothing to do with the fundamental goal of welfare reform—to move people from welfare to work while protecting children. My budget restores Food Stamps to 730,000 legal immigrants and lets States provide health insurance to the children of legal immigrants.

This past year, we continued to improve health care for millions of Americans. We strengthened Medicare by extending the life of the trust fund until at least 2010, while we also invested in preventive benefits, introduced more choice of health plans, and strengthened our expending array of activities to combat fraud and abuse. We extended health care coverage to up to five million uninsured children. We created the Advisory Commission on Consumer Protection and Quality in the Health Care Industry and we later endorsed its Health Care Consumer Bill of Rights. With this budget, I propose that we build on our achievements on a host of important fronts. I want to work with Congress to enact national bipartisan tobacco legislation; nothing is more potentially important to the health of our people, particularly children. My budget also proposes to expand health care coverage for some of the most vulnerable Americans aged 55 to 65, to enroll more eligible children in Medicaid, to provide for unprecedented levels of investment in health research, to expand access to powerful AIDS therapies, to expand access to cancer clinical trials, to increase funds for substance abuse treatment and prevention, and to help reduce health-related disparities across racial and ethnic groups.

Last year was a remarkable one for the environment, and I am determined to build on our progress. Led by the Vice President, the Administration reached a historic international agreement in Kyoto that calls for cuts in greenhouse gas emissions. We also issued new, more protective air quality standards to better safeguard public health, and we strengthened our citizens' right to know about toxic chemical releases. We continued to protect our natural treasures, such as Yellowstone National Park and Florida's Everglades, and to make further progress toward my goal of cleaning up 900 hazardous waste sites under the Superfund by the end of the year 2001. With this budget, I am proposing an Environmental Resources Fund for America that will support increases for many of

our key environmental programs. It provides for more construction, maintenance, and land acquisition for national parks, forests, refuges, and other public lands; for a new effort to improve the quality of our water; for improvements to community drinking water and wastewater facilities; and for continuing our efforts to clean up abandoned hazardous waste sites. My budget also includes a new, five-year, $6 billion program to prevent global warming, and more resources to protect endangered species, control pollution, and preserve the global environment.

I am proposing a Transportation Fund for America, reflecting my commitment to provide the resources to ensure that our transportation infrastructure remains safe, integrated, and efficient enough to serve our growing needs. Investment in infrastructure is good for America because it helps grow the economy, improve safety and public health, strengthen our competitiveness abroad, support our national security, and increase the mobility, access, and choice for Americans who need to travel. We must build upon our vast network of roads, highways, and bridges to meet the demands of the next century for a system that links our various modes of travel, that is cleaner and safer, and that helps bring together and support our urban and rural communities. My budget maintains the Administration's record support for transportation, and the Fund includes all of the Transportation Department's highway, highway safety, transit, and air transportation programs.

Scientific and technological advances have created a world vastly different from the one our grandparents knew. They have helped generate huge leaps in the speed and economy of transportation, enormous increases in farm productivity, lightning-fast flows of information and services across national borders, and advances in treating and preventing diseases and protecting the environment. Because I am committed to America's continued leadership in science and technology, I am proposing a Research Fund for America, from which many of our important investments will flow. It includes record increases for the National Institutes of Health, higher funding for the National Science Foundation, new resources to address global climate change, and a wide variety of investments in basic and applied research. These investments are vital; they help to create new knowledge, train more workers, spur new jobs and industries, address our health care challenges, strengthen our understanding of environmental problems, better educate our children, and maintain a strong national defense.

Our anti-crime strategy is working. Serious crime is down five years in a row and, in 1996, we witnessed the largest drop in violent crime in 35 years. But, because crime remains unacceptably high, we must go further. My budget expands our community policing (COPS) program, which is already putting 83,000 more police on the streets toward my goal of 100,000 by the year 2000. The budget also proposes a new Community Prosecutors Initiative to help prosecutors prevent crimes from occurring, rather than simply prosecuting criminals after the fact. And it provides the necessary funds to prevent violence against women, to help States and Indian Tribes build prisons, and to address the growing law enforcement crisis on Indian lands. To boost our efforts to control illegal immigration, the budget provides the resources to strengthen border enforcement in the South and West, to remove illegal aliens, and to expand our efforts to verify whether newly hired non-citizens are eligible for jobs. To combat drug use, particularly among young people, my budget expands programs that stress treatment and prevention, law enforcement, international assistance, and interdiction. It continues to build on our innovative Drug Courts initiative, proposes School Drug Prevention Coordinators for our schools, supports local efforts that target drug-using offenders, expands drug testing, and strengthens our efforts to make our ports and borders more secure from drugs while disrupting drug trafficking organizations overseas.

Most Americans are enjoying the fruits of our strong economy. But while many urban and rural areas are doing better, too many others have grown disconnected from our values of opportunity, responsibility, and community. Working with State and local governments and with the private sector, I am determined to help bring our distressed areas back to life, to replace despair with hope. My budget expands my national service program, giving more Americans the chance to serve their country and help solve problems at the local level while earning money for college. I am proposing to create more Empowerment Zones and Enterprise Communities that offer tax incentives and direct spending to encourage the kind of private investment that creates jobs, and to provide more capital for lending through my Community Development Financial Institutions program. My budget also expands opportunities for homeownership, provides more funds to enforce the Nation's civil rights laws, maintains our Government-to-Government commitment to Native Americans, and strengthens the partnership we have begun with the District of Columbia.

Because America continues to have a tremendous stake in world affairs, my budget proposes the necessary funds to maintain national security, to conduct our diplomacy, to promote democracy and free markets abroad, and to increase exports. Last year, my Administration worked with Congress to increase international affairs spending. But, Congress faces an unfinished agenda to provide financial support for, and fulfill America's obligations to, a number of international organizations that benefit our economy and serve other objectives, including the International Monetary Fund (IMF), the United Nations system, and the multilateral development banks. Congress should continue to support the decisive action of the IMF as well as our leadership in that institution by providing the supplementary contingent IMF funding that the Administration has sought and replenishing the IMF's basic financial resources. Congress also should give the President traditional trade negotiating authority to help fuel our surging exports into the next century. To enhance national security, my budget maintains large-scale funding to support the Middle East peace process, continues assistance to Bosnia to carry out the Dayton Accords, supports NATO expansion, and increases aid to the New Independent States of the former Soviet Union to support the development of democracy and free markets. I am also proposing a major initiative to provide critical, targeted assistance to African countries that are undertaking difficult economic reforms, and my budget increases counter-narcotics aid to Latin American countries and supports the Summit of the Americas.

Our military serves as the backbone of our national security strategy, and I am committed to maintain a strong and capable military that protects our freedoms and our global leadership role as we approach the 21st Century. The budget continues the Administration's plan to complete the careful resizing of our military forces, to fully support military readiness, to strengthen quality of life programs for our armed forces, and to provide increased funding to modernize our forces as new technologies become available after the turn of the century. My budget reflects the recommendations of the Quadrennial Defense Review and of the Defense Department's recent Defense Reform Initiative to achieve a leaner, more efficient, and more cost-effective organization by improving management and business practices. To implement these improvements, the Defense Department will send legislation to Congress in conjunction with this budget, including a request for two more rounds of base closures and realignments.

INVESTING IN THE COMMON GOOD

Our commitment to balance the budget, and to keep it in balance, will mean that the Administration and Congress must use taxpayer dollars as wisely as possible. If we are to continue funding Federal programs, they will have to show that they are reaching the goals set for them. That is, they will have to show that they are well-run and that they can produce results.

In 1993, I actively supported, and was eager to sign, the Government Performance and Results Act. With this budget, I am delighted to send Congress what the law envisioned—the

first comprehensive, Government-wide Performance Plan.

In developing this budget, the Administration for the first time could rely on performance measures and annual performance goals that are now included in agency Annual Performance Plans. We have made a good start on the process that the Administration and Congress outlined in enacting the 1993 law.

As we continue to implement this law, my Administration will focus more and more attention on how programs work, whether they are meeting their goals, and what we should do to make them better. We look forward to working with Congress on our shared goal of improving Government performance.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 2, 1998.*

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second time by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. ALLARD (for himself and Mr. BREAUX):

S. 1593. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act and the Controlled Substances Import and Export Act with respect to penalties for powder cocaine and crack cocaine offenses; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNETT:

S. 1594. A bill to amend the Bank Protection Act of 1968 for purposes of facilitating the use of electronic authentication techniques by financial institutions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. FRIST (for himself, Mr. BOND, Mr. GREGG, Mr. LOTT, Mrs. HUTCHISON, and Mr. LUGAR):

S. 1595. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Commission to Promote a National Dialogue on Bioethics.

By Mr. COVERDELL:

S. 1596. A bill to provide for reading excellence; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. SPECTER:

S. Res. 171. A resolution designating March 25, 1998, as ''Greek Independence Day: A National Day of Celebration of Greek and American Democracy''; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. BENNETT:

S. 1594. A bill to amend the Bank Protection Act of 1968 for purposes of facilitating the use of electronic authentication techniques by financial institutions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

THE DIGITAL SIGNATURE AND ELECTRONIC AUTHENTICATION LAW OF 1998

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Digital Signature and Electronic Authentication Law (SEAL) of 1998.

We Americans place such trust in the act of signing a document that we traditionally have referred to the written signature as a ''John Hancock'' after one of the first signers of the Declaration of Independence and one of our country's founding fathers. As the country moves into the 21st century and into the digital age, it is necessary for the government to validate the use of equally trustworthy forms of authentication for electronic transactions. In doing this, our country will secure its position as a leader in the international digital economy.

Electronic authentication, broadly defined, is any technology which provides a way for the recipient of a message to verify the identity of the sender, make sure the message was not altered in transit, and confirm that the message was the one the sender intended to transmit. Parties to electronic transactions must have access to this authentication process in order to feel secure in conducting business over open networks.

While this concept is fairly simple, the legislative process has proven quite complex. Many states have enacted legislation on electronic authentication, but the state laws are vastly different. Because electronic transactions do not respect state or national boundaries, there are no clear rules to govern this activity. This lack of direction has limited the use of electronic authentication. The process is further complicated by the number of competing technologies available to provide authentication as well as the fact that businesses from all different sectors of the economy seek to use and offer authentication services.

As Chairman of the Banking Committee's Subcommittee on Financial Services and Technology, I have examined this issue and have determined that the appropriate first step toward addressing it is to introduce a firmly grounded, free-market bill that addresses the concerns of financial institutions. In introducing this bill, I do not want to suggest that this authority should belong exclusively to that group. I have stated repeatedly my belief that all entities, banks and nonbanks alike, should be authorized to use electronic authentication for their own transactions and offer the service to third parties. In attempting to fashion a bill that would appropriately address the needs and concerns of all interested groups, however, I have reached an impasse. My attempts to reach out and engage those representing nonbank interests in serious discussions have failed. I have determined, therefore, that it is appropriate for me to take a first step and introduce this bill to address the needs of financial institutions.

While I do not intend to create a monopoly for banks, and indeed hope that this legislation can be amended to include other entities, I do recognize that there are valid reasons why we may choose to address the concerns of financial institutions separately.

Financial institutions are accustomed to assuming ''trusted third party'' roles, including serving as trustee and offering notary and signature guarantee services. Offering electronic authentication services is the functional equivalent of those traditional bank activities.

Financial institutions are highly regulated entities, and the financial institution regulators have experience in supervising these ''trusted third party'' activities.

Many of the transactions which individuals and businesses will seek to authenticate are likely to be financial transactions.

In Europe and other countries around the world, electronic authentication activities are conducted almost exclusively by financial institutions. By taking a first step and authorizing our financial institutions to use electronic authentication, we will strengthen our position in establishing the conditions for international transactions.

The Digital SEAL Bill is, as I have described it, a minimalist, free-market bill. It provides quite simply that a financial institution may use electronic authentication in the conduct of its business and that the use of such electronic authentication shall be valid. A financial institution's use of electronic authentication shall be governed by the rules of the system or agreement under which it operates and shall be regulated by the appropriate financial institution regulator. The bill defines electronic authentication broadly in an effort to be as technologically neutral as possible.

Of equal importance is what this bill does not do. It does not create a new regulatory bureaucracy to supervise this activity. It does not impair consumers' rights under the Truth in Lending Act, the Electronic Fund Transfer Act, or any state law of similar purpose. Finally, it does not limit, in any way, the ability of any other entity to use or offer electronic authentication in the course of its business.

The time has come for Congress to begin a serious discussion of the impact of technology on commercial transactions and consider how age-old concepts, like the importance of a signature, will fit into an increasingly electronic world. Electronic authentication is a good starting point for this discussion, and passage of this bill will advance the development of electronic banking and commerce.

I look forward to working with my colleagues to enact this legislation to give financial institutions, and appropriate other entities, the authority to use electronic authentication.

By Mr. FRIST (for himself, Mr. BOND, Mr. GREGG, Mr. LOTT, Mrs. HUTCHISON, and Mr. LUGAR):

S. 1595. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Commission to Promote a National Dialogue on Bioethics.

THE COMMISSION TO PROMOTE A NATIONAL DIALOGUE ON BIOETHICS ESTABLISHMENT ACT OF 1998

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, In recent years, I have often voiced concern that medical technology is moving at an unprecedented pace, leaving the rest of society ill-prepared to cope with the increasingly complex moral and ethical dilemmas that follow in the wake of new inventions. We must never attempt to divorce scientific progress from ethical considerations. We must instead fashion timely answers to the timeless question ''Is there a line that should not be crossed even for scientific or other gain, and if so, where is it?'' (Washington Post editorial, Oct. 2, 1994)

The recent furor over Dolly the cloned sheep, and Dr. Seed's subsequent announcement that he intended to clone a human being through the same technique, has highlighted the necessity of an independent, balanced forum to address the ethical implications of new technological capabilities. Two temptations threaten both science and ethics in the current milieu. There is pressure on legislators (often unfamiliar with scientific issues) to rush to draft laws that could hamper important research efforts. There is a parallel tendency on the part of academic scientists to resist any input from law or ethics into their research. Thus, science and ethics are lost in the political morass, while the public often remains uninvolved and frightened. The example of the cloning debate provides ample evidence of this tendency.

There are no fewer than six legislative proposals to address cloning on the horizon, ranging from sweeping prohibitions to largely symbolic bans. The National Bioethics Advisory Commission (a commission appointed entirely by President Clinton) did a good job of trying to assimilate the information on cloning under their ninety day deadline last year, but they were unable to substantively address the ethical issues surrounding human cloning. The Commission cited inadequate time to tackle difficult ethical issues in the context of our pluralistic society, and primarily focused on scientific concerns as well as the less abstract issue of safety. They then appealed to each American citizen to step to the plate and exercise moral leadership in forming a national policy on human cloning.

In an effort to follow up on the Commission's recommendations, the Senate labor Committee's Subcommittee on Public Health and Safety, which I chair, held a hearing June 17, 1997, entitled ''Ethics and Theology: A Continuation of the National Discussion on Human Cloning.'' We heard testimony on all sides of the issue, from the Christian, Islamic, and Jewish traditions, and from philosophers well-schooled in biomedical ethics. We launched a broader public debate with questions about the nature of human individuality, family, and social structure.

However, time has shown that both a Presidential Commission, and the United States Congress are inadequate and inappropriate forums for bioethical issues of intricacy and importance. I am therefore proposing to establish a new independent National Bioethics Commission, representative of the public at large, with combined participation of experts in law, science, theology, medicine, social science, and philosophy/ethics with interested members of the public.

It is my hope that this Commission will forge a new path for our country in the field of bioethics. That they will enable us to have an informed, thoughtful, scientific debate in the public square without fear or politics driving our decisions. The Majority and Minority Leaders of Congress would appoint members of the panel, but no current Member of Congress or Administration political appointee would be allowed to participate during their term of office. We simply must depoliticize these discussions while simultaneously broadening input from the general public. Each and every citizen should have the opportunity to contribute to these great debates.

I anticipate that some may question the role of theology in a public policy debate. Certainly the President's advisory commission found that their considerations were incomplete without examining the religious mores of our culture. Our founding fathers also recognized that public policy could not be formulated in a theological vacuum. While they forbade the establishment of a state religion, they simultaneously affirmed the rights of God-fearing people to make their voices heard in the public arena. Today, and throughout history, religion has been a primary source of the beliefs governing these decisions for men and women of all races and creeds.

So it is vital that our public debate and reflection on scientific developments keep pace, and even anticipate and prepare for new scientific knowledge. The moral and ethical dilemmas inherent in the cloning of human beings may well be our greatest test to date. We do not simply seek knowledge, but the wisdom to apply that knowledge. As with each of the mind boggling scientific advances of the last century, we know that there is the potential for both good and evil in this technology. Our task as legislators is to define the role of the federal government in harnessing this technology for good. Our task as citizens is to exercise responsible stewardship of the precious gift of life. May this Commission enable us to fulfill our trust.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 10

At the request of Mr. BURNS, his name was withdrawn as a cosponsor of S. 10, a bill to reduce violent juvenile crime, promote accountability by juvenile criminals, punish and deter violent gang crime, and for other purposes.

S. 260

At the request of Mr. ABRAHAM, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 260, A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act with respect to penalties for crimes involving cocaine, and for other purposes.

S. 261

At the request of Mr. DOMENICI, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. JEFFORDS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 261, a bill to provide for a biennial budget process and a biennial appropriations process and to enhance oversight and the performance of the Federal Government.

S. 348

At the request of Mr. MCCONNELL, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 348, a bill to amend title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to encourage States to enact a Law Enforcement Officers' Bill of Rights, to provide standards and protection for the conduct of internal police investigations, and for other purposes.

S. 412

At the request of Mr. LAUTENBERG, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 412, A bill to provide for a national standard to prohibit the operation of motor vehicles by intoxicated individuals.

S. 497

At the request of Mr. COVERDELL, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 497, a bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act and the Railway Labor Act to repeal the provisions of the Acts that require employees to pay union dues or fees as a condition of employment.

S. 836

At the request of Mr. ABRAHAM, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. DEWINE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 836, a bill to offer small businesses certain protections from litigation excesses.

S. 837

At the request of Mr. CAMPBELL, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 837, a bill to exempt qualified current and former law enforcement officers from State laws prohibiting the carrying of concealed firearms and to allow States to enter into compacts to recognize other States' concealed weapons permits.

S. 887

At the request of Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN, the names of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. FORD) and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. FAIRCLOTH) were added as cosponsors of S. 887, a bill to establish in the National Service the National Underground Railroad Network to Freedom program, and for other purposes.

S. 1069

At the request of Mr. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from Delaware

(Mr. ROTH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1069, a bill entitled the ''National Discovery Trails Act of 1997.''

S. 1096

At the request of Mr. KERREY, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1096, a bill to restructure the Internal Revenue Service, and for other purposes.

S. 1119

At the request of Mr. ABRAHAM, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. COVERDELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1119, a bill to amend the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act, 1930 to increase the penalty under certain circumstances for commission merchants, dealers, or brokers who misrepresent the country of origin or other characteristics of perishable agricultural commodities.

S. 1215

At the request of Mr. ASHCROFT, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1215, a bill to prohibit spending Federal education funds on national testing.

S. 1251

At the request of Mr. BREAUX, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. WELLSTONE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1251, A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the amount of private activity bonds which may be issued in each State, and to index such amount for inflation.

S. 1255

At the request of Mr. COATS, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. ABRAHAM), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. DEWINE), and the Senator from Indiana (Mr. LUGAR) were added as cosponsors of S. 1255, a bill to provide for the establishment of demonstration projects designed to determine the social, civic, psychological, and economic effects of providing to individuals and families with limited means an opportunity to accumulate assets, and to determine the extent to which an asset-based policy may be used to enable individuals and families with limited means to achieve economic self-sufficiency.

S. 1297

At the request of Mr. COVERDELL, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1297, a bill to redesignate Washington National Airport as ''Ronald Reagan Washington National Airport.''

S. 1308

At the request of Mr. BREAUX, the names of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. NICKLES) and the Senator from Nevada (Mr. BRYAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1308, A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure taxpayer confidence in the fairness and independence of the taxpayer problem resolution process by providing a more independently operated Office of the Taxpayer Advocate, and for other purposes.

S. 1334

At the request of Mr. BOND, the names of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. FORD), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. MURKOWSKI), and the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) were added as cosponsors of S. 1334, A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to establish a demonstration project to evaluate the feasibility of using the Federal Employees Health Benefits program to ensure the availablity of adequate health care for Medicare-eligible beneficiaries under the military health care system.

S. 1360

At the request of Mr. ABRAHAM, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. DEWINE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1360, A bill to amend the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 to clarify and improve the requirements for the development of an automated entry-exit control system, to enhance land border control and enforcement, and for other purposes.

S. 1413

At the request of Mr. LUGAR, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1413, A bill to provide a framework for consideration by the legislative and executive branches of unilateral economic sanctions.

S. 1461

At the request of Mr. LAUTENBERG, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. BREAUX) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1461, A bill to establish a youth mentoring program.

S. 1573

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) and the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1573, A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to increase the Federal minimum wage.

S. 1577

At the request of Mr. CHAFEE, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1577, A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide additional tax relief to families to increase the affordability of child care, and for other purposes.

S. 1589

At the request of Mr. HUTCHINSON, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. GRAMS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1589, A bill to provide dollars to the classroom.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 30

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the names of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. JEFFORDS), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. HOLLINGS), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. KEMPTHORNE), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. FORD), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. DORGAN), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. DEWINE), the Senator from Maine (Ms. SNOWE), the Senator from Illinois (Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON), and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. MURKOWSKI) were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 30, A joint resolution designating March 1, 1998 as ''United States Navy Asiatic Fleet Memorial Day'', and for other purposes.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 55

At the request of Mr. GREGG, the names of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. FRIST), the Senator from New York (Mr. MOYNIHAN), and the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) were added as cosponsors of Senate Concurrent Resolution 55, A concurrent resolution declaring the annual memorial service sponsored by the National Emergency Medical Services Memorial Service Board of Directors to honor emergency medical services personnel to be the ''National Emergency Medical Services Memorial Service.''

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 71

At the request of Mr. LOTT, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. BURNS) was added as a cosponsor of Senate Concurrent Resolution 71, A concurrent resolution condemning Iraq's threat to international peace and security.

SENATE RESOLUTION 155

At the request of Mr. LOTT, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. ABRAHAM), the Senator from Illinois (Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN), and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CLELAND) were added as cosponsors of Senate Resolution 155, A resolution designating April 6 of each year as ''National Tartan Day'' to recognize the outstanding achievements and contributions made by Scottish Americans to the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 168

At the request of Mr. HUTCHINSON, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. GRAMS) was added as a cosponsor of Senate Resolution 168, A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the Department of Education, States, and local educational agencies should spend a greater percentage of Federal education tax dollars in our children's classrooms.

SENATE RESOLUTION 171—DESIGNATING ''GREEK INDEPENDENCE DAY: A NATIONAL DAY OF CELEBRATION OF GREEK AND AMERICAN DEMOCRACY''

Mr. SPECTER submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 171

Whereas the ancient Greeks developed the concept of democracy, in which the supreme power to govern was invested in the people;

Whereas the Founding Fathers of the United States of America drew heavily upon the political experience and philosophy of ancient Greece in forming our representative democracy;

Whereas the founders of the modern Greek state modeled their government after that of the United States in an effort to best imitate their ancient democracy;

Whereas Greece is one of the only 3 nations in the world, beyond the former British Empire, that has been allied with the United States in every major international conflict this century;

Whereas the heroism displayed in the historic World War II Battle of Crete epitomized Greece's sacrifice for freedom and democracy as it presented the Axis land war with its first major setback and set off a chain of events which significantly affected the outcome of World War II;

Whereas these and other ideals have forged a close bond between our 2 nations and their peoples;

Whereas March 25, 1998, marks the 177th anniversary of the beginning of the revolution which freed the Greek people from the Ottoman Empire; and

Whereas it is proper and desirable to celebrate with the Greek people and to reaffirm the democratic principles from which our 2 great nations were born: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates March 25, 1998, as ''Greek Independence Day: A National Day of Celebration of Greek and American Democracy''; and

(2) requests the President to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe the day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

NOTICES OF HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I would like to announce for information of the Senate and the public that an Executive Session of the Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources will be held on Wednesday, February 4, 1998, 9:30 a.m., in SD–430 of the Senate Dirksen Building. The Committee will consider S. 1579, Rehabilitation Act amendments.

For further information, please call the committee, 202/224–5375.

NOTICE OF ADDITION TO HEARING AGENDA

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 the nomination of Margaret H. Greene to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the United States Enrichment Corporation will be considered at the hearing scheduled for Wednesday, February 4, 1998 at 9:30 a.m. in Room SD–366 of the Dirksen Senate Office building in Washington, D.C.

For further information, please call Allyson Kennett at (202) 224–5070.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

THE CRISIS IN CHIAPAS

• Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, every day we read about bone-chilling atrocities around the world, in Algeria, Colombia, Sri Lanka, and even in Mexico.

I have always felt relations between the United States and our southern neighbor left a lot to be desired. On the one hand it is a relationship fraught with tensions fueled by illegal immigration, racism, drug trafficking, and a long history of misunderstanding. Yet on the other hand it is a relationship based on friendship and respect, and of many shared interests.

A traveler to Mexico is immediately struck by the great disparity in the standards of living between our two countries. Millions of Mexico's people, especially members of indigenous groups, live in poverty. If they are lucky they own a piece of land, but rarely enough to support their families. They work from sunrise to nightfall bent over a hoe in the fields, or at some other backbreaking job. They sleep in a house built of scraps of wood and tin with a dirt floor, wash in a polluted stream, live in fear of the police, and do their best to care for half a dozen poorly clothed, hungry children who have little hope of anything better.

But there is another Mexico. It is one of modern factories, busy cities, a government that is evolving from one-party rule to democracy, and an economy that has been largely state controlled becoming increasingly market-based. It is managed by well-educated professionals who grapple daily with seemingly intractable problems.

Mexico is, above all, a land of contrasts, and the United States has an enormous stake in Mexico's development. Our economies are increasingly interdependent. Some of our most pressing problems are also Mexico's. No fence, no matter how impenetrable, along our border, will solve those problems, whether they are drugs, other types of crime, infectious diseases, polluted air and water. If we are to combat these threats successfully, we have to work together.

It is for that reason, Mr. President, that the recent violence in Mexico—in the states of Chiapas, Guerrero and Oaxaca—should be of such concern to both our countries. Last July I spoke on this floor about the situation in Chiapas, and warned that unless the Mexican Government dealt effectively with the causes of the conflict there, renewed violence was likely. My warning, like similar warnings by many others, was ignored. Today I rise to speak again about Chiapas, and the tragic events there shortly before Christmas. But I want to emphasize that Chiapas is representative of a much larger problem in Mexico—as in so many other parts of the world—which can most succinctly be attributed to the widening disparity between the haves and have-nots.

The brief but dramatic Zapatista uprising in 1994 was the result of centuries of discrimination and mistreatment of indigenous people in Chiapas, a situation largely unknown outside Mexico's borders. That violent outburst shook the nation, and led to talks between the Zapatistas and Mexican authorities which sought to address the underlying causes of the unrest. Those negotiations resulted in the San Andres Accords, but the Mexican Government walked away from that agreement apparently concluding that it was too favorable to the Zapatistas. Whatever hope there was that those negotiations would lead to profound changes in Chiapas had been virtually extinguished by the end of last year. The Mexican Government's attention was focused elsewhere, mostly on the national elections which to its credit were the most free and fair in Mexico's history.

Meanwhile, Chiapas has remained in an undeclared state of war between the Zapatistas and their sympathizers, and anti-Zapatista paramilitary groups who have been encouraged and supported by local and state authorities. Tens of thousands of Mexican soldiers have also been sent to Chiapas, where they have contributed to the tensions and they have apparently stood by as local officials have armed the paramilitary groups. Caught in the middle are the people of Chiapas.

Three days before Christmas, Chiapas again exploded in violence. In the village of Acteal, 45 unarmed Indian men, women and children were slaughtered in cold blood by paramilitary forces reportedly with the support of government authorities. Two weeks later, Mexican police fired on a crowd in the town of Ocosingo that was protesting the December 22nd massacre, killing a woman and wounding her 3 year-old daughter and a 17 year-old boy.

Mr. President, who but the most hate-filled people would carry out such a barbaric deed? The fact that government officials are reputed to have had a role in the slaughter is particularly outrageous. But it should not surprise anyone who knows the history and has followed events in Chiapas. In fact, in the months leading up to the Acteal massacre human rights groups issued report after report describing acts of provocation and violence by paramilitary groups and Mexican soldiers. Members of Congress sent letters of concern to President Zedillo. Yet these reports and letters did not even receive a response. Chiapas was a powder-keg waiting to explode even before the Zapatistas first emerged on the scene in support of indigenous concerns about discrimination, land rights and the lack of social services. What happened in Acteal is only the latest example, albeit a particularly atrocious one, of the kind of brutality that is a fact of daily life for many indigenous people in Chiapas.

Since then, the Mexican Government has taken several encouraging steps. A federal investigation is ongoing. At least 40 persons suspected of committing the murders have been arrested. State and local officials who allegedly instigated the attack, and who later tried to cover it up, have been arrested or removed from office. The Minister of the Interior has been replaced. The Government of the State of Chiapas freed several hundred prisoners, in an attempt to restart the peace talks. These are important steps. Had the government taken the advice of so

many people years ago and treated this situation with the sensitivity and urgency it deserved, this entire debacle might have been avoided and many people might be alive today.

The situation in Chiapas remains tense. While the recent violence seems to be primarily a result of local and state officials taking the law into their own hands and unpardonable passivity on the part of federal authorities, I also continue to receive reports of provocative acts by Mexican soldiers. It is a situation the United States cannot ignore, both because Mexico's political and economic stability are of great importance to us, and because we have trained and supplied Mexico's security forces for many years. That training and equipment has been provided exclusively to combat the drug trade, but has it always been used for that purpose? Or have US-trained police or soldiers, armed with US-made weapons, also been involved in counter-insurgency operations? Were any of the weapons used by the assailants in Acteal and Ocosingo obtained from the United States—either through the anti-drug assistance program or through commercial sales licensed by the US Government?

These are not accusations, they are only questions. But they need answers. So far, I am not aware of any evidence that US equipment was used in the Acteal or Ocosingo killings. I hope there is none. It would be totally contrary to the understandings between the Congress and the administration, and between the United States Government and Mexican Government, if our assistance were misused in this way.

Two years ago I wrote an amendment, which was enacted into law and re-enacted last year, which has become known as the Leahy Human Rights Law. It is quite simple. It says that if the Secretary of State has ''credible evidence'' that a unit of a security force of a foreign country has committed gross violations of human rights, then we cannot provide assistance to that unit unless the foreign government is taking ''effective measures'' to bring the responsible individuals to justice.

Accordingly, I have posed my questions in a letter to our Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, Jeffrey Davidow, who I respect and who may become our next Ambassador to Mexico. I have, in that letter, also asked for additional information, such as what assistance we have provided to Mexico's security forces, and which units of those security forces have received our assistance. I have urged the administration to carefully review the evidence to determine if the recent events in Acteal and Ocosingo would trigger the Leahy Law cut-off of assistance.

I would also urge the administration to examine whether any US weapons, helicopters or other military aircraft which were licensed for sale to Mexico have been used by paramilitary or government security forces in counter-insurgency operations in Chiapas. I further urge the administration not to grant any license applications of this kind until we have a full accounting of these recent incidents.

Mr. President, Chiapas is not unique. There are countless examples around the world of indigenous groups that are suffering from government neglect and violence. It should also be emphasized that the crisis in Chiapas is a Mexican problem that only the Mexican people can solve. But as their northern neighbor with a long history that links us culturally, politically, and economically as well as geographically, we have, as I have said, many shared interests. And one of those interests is to ensure that human rights are not violated and that the United States is not implicated in those violations.

President Zedillo has said the investigation of the violence in Chiapas will be carried through to its conclusion. I hope that includes not simply the Acteal and Ocosingo killings, but the activities of paramilitary groups throughout the region. The government also needs to address the plight of the thousands of indigenous people in Chiapas who have fled their homes to escape the paramilitary groups and are living in makeshift camps. They are suffering from acute shortages of drinking water, food and shelter. It is a miserable situation and the sooner they can safely return to their homes the better.

President Zedillo has also said that he wants to resume negotiations with the Zapatistas. I know this has the support of the US Government. What is lacking, I am afraid, is a clearly defined strategy, or road map, for resolving this conflict. Unless both sides have confidence that such a strategy can lead to an acceptable resolution, it will be only a matter of time before another violent outburst, and more needless deaths.●

DOLLARS TO THE CLASSROOM ACT

● Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I am pleased to join with my good friend from Arkansas, Senator TIM HUTCHINSON, in introducing the ''Dollars to the Classroom Act''. This is a critically important piece of education legislation, of which I am honored to be an original cosponsor.

The ''Dollars to the Classroom Act'' will send funds supporting roughly thirty one K–12 education programs in a block grant to states, with the requirement that 95 percent of these funds go to local schools. This is a very simple concept. We should demand that 95 percent of the Federal money we spend on elementary and secondary education must be spent in the classrooms of our local schools. That's it.

Let me be clear about one thing. This legislation does not reduce the funding for the schools. Rather, it makes sure that the tax monies our citizens give for education actually makes it to the classroom.

Mr. President, I served as a public school teacher. My wife served as a public school teacher. And let me say this, there is nothing more special, than the moment when a young student and a teacher connect in the classroom. Unfortunately, there exists a complex, confusing, paperwork driven federal system that too often hinders rather than helps the students. Mr. President, this bill provides the badly needed resources to not only enhance these magic moments between students and teachers but it also guarantees that every single student and every single teacher will have the resources needed to make this all possible.

Mr. President, this is how the bill works. Instead of sending the education dollars through the usual bureaucratic gauntlet—paying the bureaucrats at the Department of Education and the state education establishments—individual tax dollars would go directly to the states in a block grant administered by the Governor. Local school districts, parents, teachers, and local school officials could then use those funds for education priorities they think are most important. Mr. President, this will allow parents and local education officials to decide how to spend these dollars. They would decide their schools' priorities and, most importantly, how best to allocate these funds.

There is another important reason for this legislation. Federal education programs and their grant processes have become so burdensome many local schools are not even applying for funds. Often our local schools and school officials are forced to spend a significant amount of their Federal education tax dollars just to apply for these funds.

Let me give you an example. The Mobile County Public Schools system, my home county in Alabama, which contains 65,443 students in grades K–12 was forced, on two different occasions, to hire grant writers at $50,000 a year just to help the school system apply for these federal grants. These grant writers were in addition to the many administrators, principals and teachers who are forced to dedicate their valuable time to filling out the paperwork associated with applying for these grants instead of educating the students of Mobile County.

And there are countless other examples. The state of Ohio calculated in 1990 that over 50 percent of its paperwork burden was related to federal education programs, even though only 5 percent of its education revenues came from federal sources.

A recent audit of the New York City public schools found that only 43% of their local education budget reaches the classrooms.

A 1996 Heritage Foundation study of federal spending on elementary and secondary education found that only 85

cents of every education tax dollar sent to Washington, was returned to local school districts—that's school districts not local classrooms.

According to the U.S. Department of Education, of the more than $15 billion allocated to its elementary and secondary education programs in 1996, over $3 billion went for purposes—like administrative overhead—rather than the real needs of local school districts.

The Superintendent of the Mobile County Public School system, Mr. Paul Sousa, supports this legislation for one simple reason: this legislation dedicates valuable dollars to the classrooms and eliminates the bureaucracy that has placed a stranglehold on his principals, his teachers, and his students. And I would say to all my colleagues, the ''Dollars to the Classroom Act'' will help to eliminate these scenarios and require that 95% of all Federal education dollars be spent in the classroom.

Mr. President, I would like to end my comments by sharing with you a quote from President Clinton, concerning this very issue. On March 27, 1996, in a speech to the National Governors' Association, the President stated: ''We cannot ask the American people to spend more on education until we do a better job with the money we've got now.'' Mr. President, I fully agree. We can not continue to spend billions of dollars on federal education programs that don't even reach our students. We must demand accountability for the federal dollars we spend on education. We need to know where our education dollars are going and how much actually gets to the individual classrooms in Alabama and across this country.

The ''Dollars to the Classroom Act'' will provide the hardworking parents and students of this country the resources and the accountability they deserve.●

A NEW INITIATIVE AGAINST ELEPHANTIASIS

● Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, in the global battle against infectious diseases, inaccessibility to safe and effective drugs remains a major obstacle for developing countries. The lack of the public health infrastructure to respond effectively to infectious diseases contributes to widespread and needless suffering. Even where that infrastructure exists, many of the world's poor cannot afford the price of drugs.

But many disfiguring and debilitating diseases can be prevented at minimal cost—in some cases with just one pill, once a year, for as little as a few cents per dose. Last May, the Foreign Operations Subcommittee heard testimony about the need for pharmaceutical companies and governments to work together to combat infectious diseases around the world. Dr. Gordon Douglas, the President of Merck Vaccines, described the company's success with the donation of its drug, Mectizan, in fighting river blindness. Since 1987, Merck has treated 18 million people, spending $70 million on the program in 1996 alone. While the global elimination of river blindness is not expected until at least 2007, Merck has made an invaluable contribution toward this goal.

Last November, Congress provided an additional $50 million to strengthen global surveillance and control the spread of infectious diseases. On December 16, 1997, amid alarming reports about the Hong Kong flu, the U.S. Agency for International Development gathered public health experts from around the world to set priorities and develop a U.S. strategy to support the global campaign against infectious diseases. And then on January 26, 1998, Smithkline Beecham, one of the world's largest pharmaceutical companies, announced that it was taking on elephantiasis, one of the world's most disabling and disfiguring tropical diseases which afflicts some 120 million people, and endangers as many as one billion people. Smithkline Beecham has generously agreed to provide for free an anti-parasitic drug called Albendazole to combat this scourge. The company estimates that it will spend some $500 million over the next two decades working with the World Health Organization to tackle elephantiasis in parts of Africa, Asia, the Pacific Islands, and Central and South America. Over time, the effort could even lead to the eventual elimination of this horrible disease. In addition to protecting against elephantiasis, it is predicted that the yearly distribution of Albendazole will improve the health of millions of children who suffer from chronic intestinal parasites.

Mr. President, Merck and Smithkline deserve our praise and gratitude. This kind of cooperative initiative between governments and private industry is a model for how we can combat infectious diseases in the years ahead, and in doing so make life better for millions and millions of people.●

RICHARD HIROMICHI KOSAKI

● Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, on December 30, 1997, Hawaii's senior journalist, A. A. Bud Smyser of the Honolulu Star Bulletin, featured in his biweekly column, ''Hawaii's World,'' the contributions of a dear friend and classmate, Richard Hiromichi Kosaki. Dr. Kosaki recently retired as the President of Hawaii Tokai International College, phasing out a distinguished educational career that has spanned over 47 years. However, I am certain that the Richard Kosaki I know will consider this to be just an end of another chapter of his life. I am certain he is now looking forward to his next chapter, equally challenging, and equally glorious.

I ask that the text of the column be printed in the RECORD.

The column follows:

HAWAII'S WORLD

(By A.A. Smyser)

Richard H. Kosaki is retiring as president of Hawaii Tokai International College, returning to an adivisory role, and phasing out a distinguished educational career that has spanned 47 years.

We talked about it at a Kaimana Hotel lunch table where we could see down the curve of Waikiki Beach to all the giant hotels now clustered on the water and along Kalakaua Avenue.

It was symbolically appropriate. Kosaki was born near the beach, grew up there, swam and fished there and watched its tremendous changes over his 73 years. Only the Moana and Halekulani hotels were there when he was born. The Royal Hawaiian didn't open until 1927. All the high rises rose since statehood in 1959.

Kosaki, for his part, has been a big mover for educational change in Hawaii. He is the architect of the University of Hawaii's community college system that now embraces well over half of all UH enrollment. He was with the UH faculty group that generated the concept of the East-West Center.

After he retired as chancellor at UH-Manoa he carried his belief in Hawaii as an international education center to helping Japan's enormous Tokai University Educational System establish an outpost here in a superbly built high rise at 2241 Kapiolani Blvd.

In his beginning years as an educator, he taught political science, worked with the Legislative Reference Bureau, and helped educate many students who went on to be leaders in government. He even helped to wise up newspaper writers like me.

We talked about two things: international education in Hawaii, and other educational changes to expect in the years ahead.

The Tokai University Pacific Center here, the umbrella under which the college exists, is not the gangbuster success early visualized. It still needs heavy subsidy from Japan. International students have never filled all of its 200 dorm spaces but they have totaled over 100, and international visitors have filled a lot of the rest.

While most of the international enrollment is from Japan, annual outstanding student award winners have come also from Taiwan, Cambodia, Vietnam and Brazil. The only U.S. winner came from Molokai.

Courses deal mostly with English and an introduction to America. They provide a ''friendly gateway'' to America for international students planning study elsewhere. Besides its help to these full-year students the center offers short-term introductions to Hawaii and Hawaiians to students regularly enrolled on Tokai's numerous Japanese campuses.

And what about education generally?

More use of Internet and TV for off-campus education.

Less emphasis on classroom lectures, though they won't disappear.

More lifelong learning. UH community college students illustrate the trend with an average age over 30.

More interaction between education and active life experiences.

He has a favorite maxim: ''Tell me and I forget. Teach me and I remember. Involve me and I learn.'' He succeeded under the old system of listening to lecturers, memorizing and feeding things back in exams. But he thinks involvement is better and should be lifelong.

Real education starts at conception, he says. Early life experiences are the most formative. Kindergarten teachers thus are more important in shaping a life than graduate school professors. The latter are much better paid but the balance is worth re-examining.●

TRIBUTE TO HERSCHEL CREASMAN

● Mr. CLELAND. Mr President, I rise today to honor Herschel Creasman, who after more than four decades of dedicated service to spreading the gospel to various organizations and in performing community services retired on Sunday, January 18, 1998. He is an outstanding example to his family and friends, and has been an asset to the many communities that he has touched over the years including Coral Springs, Florida, where he currently resides; Athens, Tennessee where he was born; and numerous others across the South and abroad.

Herschel chose to follow in his father's footsteps by becoming a minister. He first graduated from Carson Newman College and then went on to the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, which marked the onset of more than 45 years of faithful leadership in Texas, Oklahoma, Georgia, Florida and even five years in Brazil. Herschel has preached in more than 20 countries and has served as an instructor at the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary in Louisville, Kentucky. He fostered an environment within his churches that welcomed many new faces, from differing religions and communities, who come to hear his wonderfully inspiring sermons.

Many would think that with this busy schedule and his devotion to his wife Joanne, their two daughters and one son, and four grandchildren, Herschel would not have time for much more, but this is definitely not the case with this extraordinary individual. Over the years he has received several honorary doctorates, including a Doctorate of Theology and Doctorate of Philosophy from the Great Commission Seminary in Kentucky and a Doctorate of Divinity from Freedom Seminary in Jacksonville, Florida. He has also represented his community by serving on the Ethics Board and Community Relations Committee for the Coral Springs Medical Center and on the District Review Board for the North Broward Hospital District.

As many people who know him well are aware, he is an avid golfer, and as he enters this next stage in his life, I wish him the best of luck on the greens, which I'm sure he'll finally have the time to truly enjoy and perhaps master!

Mr. President, I would like to honor and commend Herschel Creasman for his outstanding and innumerable contributions over the years to the many communities and churches that he has dedicated his life to inspiring and improving, and ask my colleagues to join me in saluting and congratulating Herschel Creasman on his retirement.●

PHOEBE PUTNEY MEMORIAL HOSPITAL RECEIVES NATIONAL AWARD FOR COMMUNITY HEALTH

● Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I would like to commend Phoebe Putney Memorial Hospital in Albany, Ga., for being named one of five national 1998 American Hospital Association (AHA) NOVA Award winners. The award recognizes innovative AHA member hospitals for their outstanding progress toward restructuring the health care system with a focus on community health.

Phoebe Putney, the largest hospital in southwest Georgia, is being honored for its Network of Trust program for pregnant and parenting teens. The program was established in 1994 through a community collaborative, in partnership with Phoebe and the school system, to address the teen pregnancy problem in Albany/Dougherty County. The goals of the program are to (1) promote healthy mothers and babies; (2) decrease child neglect and teen drug abuse; (3) increase self-esteem and; (4) prevent school dropouts.

In 1994, the rate of birth to teens in the U.S. was 59 per 1,000; the rate in Georgia was 72 per 1,000; and in Albany/Dougherty County, the rate was 91 per 1,000. More than 400 babies were born to teenagers at Phoebe in 1994, with 18 percent of those babies requiring treatment in the high risk nursery and 25 percent of the mothers delivering for the second or third time.

Network of Trust is based on the concept of teens as peer counselors. The program is implemented in the school system in three phases. Phase I involves early identification to offer prenatal care and education on-site at the school. This is designed to reduce school dropout rates, build self esteem, promote parenting skills, reduce fears related to childbirth and teach anger management.

Phase II targets teen mothers after delivery to discourage repeat pregnancies. Mothers are encouraged to maintain competitive grades and are provided training to alleviate parental frustrations that often lead to child abuse. Phase II teen mothers also act as mentors to Phase I pregnant teens.

Phase III offers a summer internship at Phoebe Putney Memorial for selected Phase II participants to enhance self-esteem and decision-making skills. Interns are matched with hospital staff mentors and the participants are encouraged to pursue future education, with an educational stipend given to each teen that successfully completes Phase III.

Network of Trust also includes a component for teen fathers with weekly classes taught by instructors with special training and school counselors. Students utilize infant simulator dolls that are computerized to record the type of treatment they receive from their ''parents.''

The program's immense success can be measured in many ways. Participation has increased steadily each year, with 38 students participating in the 1994–95 school year, 241 in the 1995–96 school year, and approximately 273 students in the 1996–97 school year.

The program has also greatly reduced the number of repeat pregnancies. In 1994, 22 percent of births to teens in the U.S. were repeat pregnancies. Of the 38 participants in the Network of Trust in 1994, there were only two repeat pregnancies, or 5 percent. In 1995–96, only 3 percent of participants had repeat pregnancies. And in 1996–97, there were only 1.5 percent repeat pregnancies.

The high school dropout rate decreased significantly. In 1994, the dropout rate for Dougherty County was 45 percent. In 1995–96, only 8 percent of the participants dropped out of school and, in 1996–97, just 1.4 percent.

Also, for the first time in the 90s, the number of low birth weight babies born in Dougherty County dropped. The economic impact of the students who graduated from high school produces an additional $830,000 in anticipated income for those students as workers.

Phoebe will receive the AHA NOVA Award on Monday, Feb. 2, in Washington as part of the AHA's Annual Membership Meeting. I respectively ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Phoebe Putney Memorial Hospital on this important achievement in improving Georgia's community health.●

TRIBUTE TO MORT SILBERMAN

● Mr. CLELAND. Mr. President, I rise today to honor a very, dear friend of mine, Mort Silberman. He has recently been elected into the National Academies of Practitioners as a Distinguished Practitioner for his contributions to the cattle industry and laboratory animal medicine. It is one of the greatest professional honors, and I am delighted that he was awarded in such a way.

Mort's achievements are endless. In the academic field, Mort currently serves as an adjunct professor at several universities including the University of Georgia and Auburn University. He is the assistant director and the university veterinarian of the Robert W. Woodfuff Health Sciences Center at Emory University. He is also consulting veterinarian at the New York Zoological Park, and the White Oak Plantation in Yulee, Florida.

For over 20 years, Mort has hosted a variety of seminars, lectures and workshops. He is the author of numerous published medical writings. In addition, he has been directly involved with the design and construction of many animal facilities in Georgia and elsewhere in the country—from the animal facilities of the Atlanta Humane Society to the clinical space and animal holding areas at Georgia's Stone Mountain Park.

Mort Silberman is not only a leader in the veterinary field, but also an active community member and dedicated husband and father. Mr. President, I ask that you and all of my colleagues join in paying tribute to my dear friend. Mort Solberman, for his recent honor.●

CONTRIBUTIONS OF JAPANESE AMERICAN BASEBALL PLAYERS

• Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I rise to pay tribute to a group of Americans that contributed greatly to the game of baseball. Although not widely known in this country, the Japanese American community has contributed a significant chapter to the history of baseball as it has to many other important aspects of American society.

Beginning at the turn of the 20th century, Issei, or first generation Japanese Americans, developed a love for baseball that led to the creation of an extensive network of Japanese American leagues throughout the United States. Japanese American baseball leagues began to appear in towns and cities throughout Hawaii and the western continental United States. The popularity of baseball spread to the point where there was a team in nearly every Japanese American farming community.

By the 1920's, more than 100 teams had been formed consisting primarily of talented Nisei, or second generation Japanese Americans. Because of the discrimination and forced segregation of the time, the Nisei teams, like the teams in the Negro Leagues and in the All-American Girls Professional Baseball Leagues, played mostly against each other. However, they also successfully compete against high school, college, and semi-professional teams from white America, teams from the Negro Leagues, and even against baseball legends such as Babe Ruth, Lou Gehrig, Ted Williams, Jackie Robinson, and Joe DiMaggio.

In 1937, all-star teams consisting of Nisei players from California traveled to Japan, Korea, and Manchuria as ambassadors of goodwill. The Nisei teams competed throughout Asia where they impressed audiences with their talented play, sportsmanship, and aggressive style of fast-paced American baseball. However, the outbreak of World War II abruptly ended their overseas campaign as ambassadors of American goodwill. In the following months, many of these players and their families, because of their race, became the object of suspicion and mistrust in their own country.

The serene life of farming and playing baseball ended abruptly with the announcement of Executive Order 9066. More than 120,000 Japanese Americans were relocated to remote internment camps across the United States. In an effort to preserve a sense of community and improve the living conditions of the interment camps, Japanese Americans set about recreating many of the social networks and clubs that were an integral part of their lives prior to their internment. For many of the younger Japanese Americans this meant banding together and forming baseball leagues that played several seasons behind barbed-wire fences.

For Japanese Americans interned during World War II, playing, watching and supporting baseball was an important reprieve from the harsh nature of camp life. Popular Japanese American baseball players, such as Kenichi Zenimura, made it a mission to bring baseball to the internment camps. He and the Japanese American community worked tirelessly to build makeshift baseball stadiums where, for several hours each week, Japanese American communities could forget their worries and enjoy their worries and enjoy their favorite American pastime. For the many Japanese Americans who participated in the baseball leagues and the thousands who watched and supported the teams, the baseball leagues helped to rebuild a sense of civic pride and dignity which had greatly suffered as a result of their forced internment.

In the post-war years, Japanese American baseball players took up their former role as ambassadors of goodwill and began traveling across the Pacific to play exhibiting games in Japan. In addition, prominent Japanese American baseball players, like Tsuneo ''Cappy'' Harada, contributed to the explosion of baseball's popularity in Japan by bringing famous Americans such as Lefty O'Doul and Joe DiMaggio to Japan for exhibitions and public appearances. These efforts by Harada and other greatly contributed to the internationalization of baseball as a professional sport and the popularity of baseball in Japan. The current practice of playing exhibition games in both American and Japan was started by Japanese American baseball players and provides opportunities for both American and Japanese players to compete in each other's countries. In recent years, American Cecil Fielder played for the Hanshin Tigers in Japan's Central League, while Japanese players, like Hideo Nomo, have competed for American teams. In addition, American and Japanese All-Star teams regularly compete in Japan.

In spite of this rich tradition and history, the popularity of the Nisei Baseball Leagues gradually waned as discrimination and segregation faded in American society. By the 1970's the leagues had almost completely disappeared. However, the important contributions of Japanese American baseball players had, in recent years, been rediscovered for the benefit of all Americans. Historical exhibits, like ''Diamonds in the Rough: Japanese Americans in Baseball,'' which have traveled to many sites throughout the United States, have brought to the public's attention the important role Japanese Americans played in baseball's history. In addition, many younger Japanese Americans, have begun to participate in the historic Japanese American baseball leagues again.

It is a great privilege to bring to the attention of the Congress and the American people the important contributions of the Japanese American baseball players. From their early days playing in segregated Japanese American leagues to their more recent role as promoters of baseball around the world, they have consistently demonstrated an incredible ability to overcome adversity and make the most of opportunities in even the most difficult of circumstances. In light of their many accomplishments, I am honored to commemorate the Japanese American baseball players today.•

VIOLENCE IN ALGERIA

• Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, few weeks pass when there is not a report of an appalling atrocity in Algeria. The testimony of eyewitnesses echo the same refrain—a tale of slaughter, decapitation, mutilation, burning, and shooting of innocent men, women, and children. Thousands of civilians have fled their homes as the violence has escalated, but the protection and safety they seek is difficult, if not impossible to find.

The reaction of the international community has not been one of outrage and alarm, but a quiet, almost uneasy expression of concern. It is almost as though the reports are too grisly, too horrific to even broach—as though by addressing the subject and opening it up to scrutiny, one will somehow be tainted by the extreme levels of violence and degradation. However, the subject must be addressed and a credible investigation must be carried out.

Time and again around the world, we have seen the needless suffering that occurs when governments and the world community as a whole are too slow to shoulder their mantle of moral responsibility. The crisis in Algeria presents another opportunity to change this pattern and set a new standard for the next century.

Mr. President, on January 26, 1998, fifteen Members of Congress, Democrats and Republicans, Senators and Representatives, sent a letter to Secretary of State Madeleine Albright on the tragic situation in Algeria. I ask that the text of the letter be printed in the RECORD.

The letter follows:

WASHINGTON, DC,
January 26, 1998.

Hon. MADELEINE ALBRIGHT,
Secretary of State, Department of State, Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SECRETARY: We are writing to express our alarm concerning the recent massacres in Algeria, which have brought the toll of those killed in the five-year civil war to an estimated 80,000 persons, mostly civilians. The Algerian Government has consistently failed to adequately investigate the atrocities and bring those responsible to justice. The administration's call for an international inquiry is an appropriate and necessary first step in responding to this crisis.

Since the civil war erupted in 1992, extremist opposition groups have increased their attacks on innocent people. The tactics of these groups rank among the most inhumane seen anywhere. While their conduct should be strongly condemned, there are persistent reports that Algerian security forces have failed to stop or prevent the massacres or to arrest those involved. Eyewitnesses to the violence report that terrorist groups have operated in collusion with, and under the

protection of, units or factions of the army, police, and state-armed militias. According to human rights monitors, no one has been arrested by Algerian authorities in connection with a series of bloody attacks that occurred in August and September leaving hundreds of civilians dead. Algerian authorities have made no effort to explain why army and police garrisons located nearby failed to intervene. Since then, the frequency and brutality of the attacks have only increased—over 1,000 Algerian civilians have reportedly been killed in the last month alone.

Little progress was made during a January 20, 1998 diplomatic mission led by British Minister of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs, Mr. Derek Fatchett. Algerian President Liamine Zeroual has reportedly denounced international expressions of concern about possible official complicity in the killings. In addition, the ability of human rights organizations and the media to look into allegations of abuses has been increasingly limited by the Algerian Government and details about armed attacks are often censored.

We believe it is essential that the administration take an active and visible role in ensuring that an international investigation occurs in an expedient and effective manner with the necessary political and logistical support. We urge the administration to sponsor a resolution calling for such an inquiry to ascertain the facts and make recommendations at the March 1998 meeting of the U.N. Human Rights Commission in Geneva. We further urge that the administration send a clear message of support for this initiative in public as well as in diplomatic contacts with Algeria and other governments.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Patrick Leahy, Senator; Sam Brownback, Senator; Paul D. Wellstone, Senator; Nancy Pelosi, Representative; Robert Torricelli, Senator; Edward Kennedy, Senator; Frank R. Lautenberg, Senator; Tom Lantos, Representative; Chris Smith, Representative; Robert Wexler, Representative; James M. Jeffords, Senator, Dianne Feinstein, Senator; Dick Durbin, Senator; Russell Feingold, Senator; Tom Harkin, Senator.●

TRIBUTE TO CLAYTON MOORE

● Mr. CLELAND. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to one of my favorite heroes, Clayton Moore, better known to most as the Long Ranger. Clayton Moore, the world's most popular masked man, has inspired and entertained millions of Americans during the span of his career.

Before assuming the role of the Lone Ranger, Clayton began his performing career as a trapeze artist. Unsatisfied with this career choice he moved to Los Angeles to fulfill his dream of becoming a cowboy actor. This year marks the 65th anniversary of the first time the Lone Ranger rode into our homes over our airwaves. ''The Lone Ranger'' was created for radio in 1933, and in 1949 Clayton was chosen to be the first Lone Ranger for the new television series which began airing that year. He continued to be the man behind the mask through 1952 and then again in 1954, until the series ended in 1957. Over the years, Clayton has appeared in over 45 films and 10 major serials. He also starred in two feature films, ''The Lone Ranger'' and ''The Lone Ranger and the Lost City of Gold,'' and is the author of ''I Was That Masked Man,'' his autobiography which was published in 1996.

The 169 television episodes showed faithful fans that characters and plots in the world of the Lone Ranger were simple—good guys vs. bad guys. We all eagerly watched as the exclaimed the four simple words of ''Hi Yo Silver, Away,'' and role off into the sunset with Tonto, his faithful Indian companion. In every thought, word and deed, the Lone Ranger provided a practical guide to living in a difficult and challenging world. He embodied a code that has served as a standard of moral development—combining honesty, fairness, caring, respect, loyalty, tolerance, duty, and moral courage.

Born on September 14, 1914, in Chicago, IL, Clayton has lived a fine and exciting life, filled with adventure, glamour, danger and hard work. He was an athlete, a trapeze artist with the Flying Behrs Trapeze Act at the 1934 Chicago Worlds Fair, a model while living in Chicago and New York, and a soldier in the Air Force during World War II.

In whatever venture he has pursued, Clayton has served as a wonderful and positive example to us all. He has entertained us throughout his acting career, has exemplified courage and patriotism as he fought for this Nation during World War II, and has been a wonderful husband to his wife, Clarita, and father to his daughter, Dawn. It is with great admiration and respect that I congratulate and applaud this fellow veteran, Clayton Moore, on an outstanding career and prosperous life. I thank Clayton for teaching us that the good guys do win.●

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 1575

Mr. COVERDELL. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of calendar No. 301, S. 1575, the Ronald Reagan Airport legislation.

Mr. FORD. On behalf of several Senators on my side, I must object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

Mr. FORD. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call.

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

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

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, we have decided not to proceed with the cloture motion on the motion to proceed to the bill in anticipation of the two leaders meeting in the morning to discusses its disposition. From our point, hopefully, given the timeframe of the 87th birthday, there will be some attempt to resolve this tomorrow.

ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 3, 1998

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today it stand in adjournment until 9:30 a.m. on Tuesday, February 3rd; that immediately following the prayer the routine requests through the morning hour be granted, and the Senate then proceed to 2 hours of morning business not to extend beyond the hour of 11:30 a.m. with Senators permitted to speak for up to 5 minutes each with the following exceptions: Senator DORGAN, or his designee, to control the first hour, and Senator COVERDELL, or his designee, to control the second hour.

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

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, as in executive session I ask unanimous consent that at 11:30 a.m. on Tuesday, February 3rd, the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations on the Executive Calendar: No. 487, Carlos Moreno, and No. 489, Christine Miller. I further ask unanimous consent that there be 30 minutes for debate equally divided between the chairman and the ranking member of the committee. I ask unanimous consent that following the debate the Senate proceed to an immediate vote on the confirmation of Calendar No. 487 to be followed by a vote on the confirmation of Calendar No. 489. I finally ask unanimous consent that following those votes the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action, and the Senate then return to legislative session.

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

PROGRAM

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, at 11:30 a.m. under previous consent the Senate will proceed to executive session for 30 minutes to consider two judicial nominations, those being Carlos Moreno to be a district judge, and Christine Miller to be a judge at the United States Court of Federal Claims.

Two back-to-back votes will occur on the confirmation of the two judges at approximately 12 noon on Tuesday, February 3rd. Therefore, the first votes tomorrow will occur at 12 noon.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess immediately following those two votes until 2:15 on Tuesday in order for the weekly party conferences to meet.

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

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, all Senators can now expect two consecutive rollcall votes beginning at approximately noon on Tuesday.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. FORD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

RENAMING WASHINGTON NATIONAL AIRPORT THE ''RONALD REAGAN WASHINGTON NATIONAL AIRPORT''

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I understand the statement of my colleague from Georgia as it relates to the pending legislation regarding the renaming of Washington National Airport. I expect our two leaders then to discuss that in the morning and, I suspect, as it would be in the case of the Senator from Georgia, that it would be after the policy committee meetings tomorrow and our discussions there before any final resolution from either side could be made.

So under those circumstances, we will have the votes at noon tomorrow, and the recess until 2:15. At about that time we will kind of know where we are going.

I thank the Chair, and yield the floor.

Mr. COVERDELL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. COVERDELL. I thank the Senator from Kentucky and concur with his remarks.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I now ask that the Senate stand in adjournment under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 5:54 p.m., adjourned until Tuesday, February 3, 1998 at 9:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 2, 1998:

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

GUS A. OWEN, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE SURFACE TRANSPORTATION BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 31, 2002. (REAPPOINTMENT)

FOREIGN SERVICE

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED CAREER MEMBERS OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE FOR PROMOTION IN THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE TO THE CLASSES INDICATED:

CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR:

DOLORES F. HARROD, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED CAREER MEMBERS OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE FOR PROMOTION INTO THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, AS INDICATED:

CAREER MEMBERS OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, CLASS OF COUNSELOR:

RICHARD LENAHAN, OF OREGON
ERIC K. SLETTEN, OF TEXAS
STEPHAN WASYLKO, OF NEW YORK

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE FOR PROMOTION IN THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE TO THE CLASS INDICATED:

CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR:

LYLE J. SEBRANEK, OF VIRGINIA