

health and safety of professional boxers. We work hard to protect our amateur boxers and take great pride in their accomplishments in the Olympics. Yet, when these and other young men step into the professional ranks, we deny them even the most basic health and safety protections such as minimum uniform national standards. Professional boxers are faced with a patchwork system of health and safety regulations that vary State by State, both by rule and enforcement.

Along with my colleague, Senator DORGAN, I have worked to ensure that the legislation we have adopted does include minimum uniform national health and safety standards. This will ensure that every professional boxing match in the United States is conducted under these standards. Every professional boxer will know that a physician must be at ringside; that an ambulance must be available; and that promoters must provide medical insurance. I commend Senator MCCAIN and Senator BRYAN, the sponsors of S. 187, for including these health and safety protections in this legislation.

Despite numerous lucrative offers, Dave Tiberi has never fought again. Instead, he has dedicated his efforts to reforming boxing and working with young people in Delaware. I believe that, in large part, without Dave Tiberi's work, we would not have passed this boxing reform legislation.

Professional boxing is important not only to its millions of fans, but also because the sport creates opportunities for many young men who have few opportunities. We owe these young men a system outside the ring that works as hard to protect them as they do inside the ring. That is why I have worked to reform professional boxing and I commend my colleagues for adopting this important legislation.●

#### THE PROFESSIONAL BOXING SAFETY ACT

● Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I am very pleased the Senate passed S. 187, the Professional Boxing Safety Act, last night. This bill will make professional boxing a safer and better sport, and serve to protect the athletes who sustain this industry with their skill, dedication, and courage.

This legislation is the product of over 2 years of consultation with dozens of State boxing officials, professional boxers, and concerned industry members. S. 187 is an effective and practical measure that will strengthen and expand the health and safety precautions to protect the welfare of professional boxers. It will also go a long way toward enhancing the integrity of the sport.

I am deeply grateful for the strong support that Senator RICHARD BRYAN of Nevada has lent to this effort. As prime cosponsor of S. 187 and as a Senator representing America's premier boxing State, Senator BRYAN's assistance on this issue has been vital to its progress.

I would also like to thank Senators PRESSLER and Senator ROTH for cosponsoring this bill. Chairman PRESSLER helped move S. 187 through the Commerce Committee, and Senator ROTH has been a leader in bringing the issue of boxing reform before the Senate. Senator ROTH and Senator DORGAN helped strengthen the bill with additional health and safety provisions, as well.

I would like to speak for a moment on why the passage of boxing legislation is an important and necessary step for the Senate to take. Aptly described as "the Red Light District of Sports" some 70 years ago, professional boxing has continued to be an industry rife with controversy and scandal.

I have been an avid fan of boxing since I was a teenager, and I look back fondly on my days of painful mediocrity as a boxer at the U.S. Naval Academy. I idolized Sugar Ray Robinson, and have closely followed the many great champions and challengers who have followed in his wake. At its best, professional boxing can be a riveting and honorable contest between athletes.

Unfortunately, this standard of honorable competition is often ignored with respect to boxing in America today. Boxing continues to be corrupted by woefully inadequate safety precautions, fraudulent mismatches, and unethical business practices. The boxing industry has been justifiably tarnished in the public's eye due to individuals whose profit motives consistently outweigh their conscience.

Instead of the health and welfare of each boxer being paramount, many professional boxers are treated as sacrificial workhorses whose long-term interests do not count. This is especially true for the unknown club fighters who are the backbone of the sport. They live far out of the glare of the media spotlight, and box because it is the only way they know to make a living. A majority of professional boxers never make more than a few hundred dollars per bout during their entire careers.

Many boxers are routinely subjected to excessive punishment and injury in poorly supervised events. These bootleg shows feature dangerous mismatches and few if any health or safety precautions. Instead of being allowed to heal during a mandatory recuperation period, injured boxers are often lured to another State to avoid the suspension. Finally, when they are too old or debilitated to even attempt to compete, journeymen boxers are quickly dismissed from the sport.

There is no pension or medical assistance awaiting most boxers once they hang up their gloves. Indeed, their retirement often consists of nothing more than a steady and irreversible decline of their body and mind. This sad fate has faced literally thousands of boxers in America, and my overriding objective in introducing S. 187 is to prevent it from happening to future generations of boxers.

There are two major reasons these abuses have not been curbed. The first is the absence of a private governing body in the industry to mandate proper safety regulations and ethical guidelines. Second, the State-by-State nature of boxing regulation in America allows promoters to hold unsafe boxing shows in States with weak or nonexistent boxing regulations.

The Professional Boxing Safety Act will end this disturbing situation in an efficient and nonobtrusive manner. S. 187 will achieve the single most important step to make boxing safer: requiring State boxing officials to responsibly evaluate and supervise every professional boxing event held in the United States. Public oversight by State officials is absolutely essential to protect the health and safety of boxers.

We simply cannot allow the business interests which dominate the boxing industry to sanction and supervise events which they themselves organize and promote. The final authority for the content and conduct of each boxing event must rest with State athletic officials—not promoters or sanctioning bodies. State boxing officials are responsible for protecting both the welfare of the boxers and serving the public's interest, and S. 187 will greatly assist them in this important work.

Let me briefly describe the major provisions of this bill. First, all boxing events must be reviewed and officially approved by State boxing commissioners. If a State does not have a boxing commission—and currently six States in the United States do not—commissioners from a neighboring State must be brought in to supervise the event at the expense of the promoter.

Second, each boxer competing in the United States will receive an identification card which will be tied into the private boxing registries which serve the industry. This will assist State commissioners in evaluating the career record and medical condition of each boxer coming to their State to compete.

Furthermore, S. 187 requires all commissioners and promoters to honor the medical suspensions of boxers that have been ordered by other State commissions. This means no boxer can compete while suspended due to a recent knockout, injury, or need for a medical procedure. Commissioners will also be required to promptly share the results of the boxing shows they supervise with commissioners from other States.

Several additional health and safety provisions were added to S. 187 before it was passed by the full Senate. Licensed physicians must be continuously present at ringside for all boxing events, and an ambulance service must either be present at the site or have been notified of the event. Promoters are required to provide medical insurance for each boxer, as well. The

amount required will be left up to the discretion of each State.

These reasonable measures are already required by most State commissions, but establishing them as national standards will protect those boxers competing in less carefully regulated jurisdictions.

The U.S. attorneys in each State will enforce S. 187. The bill will empower U.S. attorneys to seek a temporary or permanent injunction against individuals violating this act. This will bolster State commissioners to resist the intimidation that results in dangerous and fraudulent professional boxing events.

Let me clearly emphasize what this legislation does not do. Unlike other boxing reform proposals that have been introduced in the Congress over the last decade, S. 187 requires no new Federal or State tax dollars; establishes no Federal boxing bureaucracy; and imposes no burdensome regulations upon State officials.

I am very pleased that S. 187 has received virtually unanimous support from every sector of the boxing industry. It has been enthusiastically endorsed by the Association of Boxing Commissions [ABC], which represents 35 State boxing commissions across the United States. Over 20 chief State boxing officers have written to me in support of this bill, ranging from prominent boxing States such as Nevada, Florida, and New Jersey, to smaller commissions such as Kentucky, Ohio, and my home State of Arizona.

Most important to me, however, is the enthusiastic support I have received from professional boxers themselves. They bear all the risk of this violent profession, and they are the people I want to protect with this legislation. Legendary champions Muhammad Ali, George Foreman, and Sugar Ray Leonard each wrote to me in support of S. 187, and I am deeply grateful to them.

I also want to note the special participation of two extremely impressive boxing industry professionals in this effort. Mr. Eddie Futch, perhaps the greatest trainer of this era, and accomplished junior featherweight Jerome Coffee both took the time to testify on boxing safety before the Commerce Committee. They graced the committee with their experienced views, and I again extend my sincere gratitude to the both of them for their contributions.●

#### SNOWBASIN LAND EXCHANGE ACT

● Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, yesterday Senators HATCH, BENNETT, CRAIG, and I introduced S. 1371, the Snowbasin Land Exchange Act. This bill would facilitate a land transfer in Utah.

The consolidation of ownership of lands in the West has been a goal of many Members of the Senate, including me. I have supported many land exchanges for Montana, and I am pleased to be a cosponsor of S. 1371. This bill

deals with lands in Utah and would allow the Snowbasin ski area, which will be one of the sites for ski events of the 2002 Winter Olympic Games. The bill would transfer about 1,320 acres from the Forest Service to the ski area and Forest Service would receive lands of equal value which they desire.

About 10 years ago, discussions began between the owners of this land and the Forest Service. Since 1985, there have been studies, hearings, and assessments on the exchange. These include an environmental impact statement, environmental assessment, cultural and historical assessment, fish and wildlife studies, soil and water reviews, and geological studies. Despite a decision made by the Forest Service to exchange 700 acres of land at Snowbasin in 1990, the exchange remains uncompleted today.

Congress needs to act quickly on S. 1371 so the exchange can be completed in the near future. For the 2002 Olympic Games, planning has already begun. This exchange is important so the work at Snowbasin can be completed for Olympic ski events scheduled there.

The 2002 Olympic Games are important to the people of Montana for many reasons. For one, the Olympics will draw people to the Inter-Mountain West, including Montana. This means more travel and tourism dollars to Montana and greater exposure of the attributes Montana possesses.

Mr. President, the Public Lands Subcommittee will hold a hearing on S. 1371 next week, and I look forward to this bill moving forward quickly.●

#### ENERGY AND WATER APPROPRIATIONS ACT

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, yesterday evening, the Senate passed the conference report on H.R. 1905, the Fiscal Year 1996 Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act. I would like to comment on one aspect of this bill that has tremendous meaning to people in my State of Washington.

During the debate, the senior Senator from Washington made a statement regarding a recent agreement between the various Members of the Senate from the Pacific Northwest and the Clinton administration regarding the recovery of salmon runs in the Columbia and Snake Rivers. He correctly pointed out the two things it represents: First, an acknowledgment by the administration of the need to stabilize recovery costs; and, second, an interim solution that provides some breathing space for the region to develop ideas for longer-term solutions.

My colleague also went the extra step of pointing out all the problems with the status quo, problems on which there is almost no disagreement. He spoke of the escalating costs of recovery measures. He spoke of the increasing financial pressures on Bonneville Power Administration. He spoke of conflicting Federal laws. He spoke of the inability of the Federal Govern-

ment to develop solutions that work for a very unique region of the country. These are things on which we can both agree. These are problems on which I want to work with him to solve.

He also spoke of his goals in this debate. And again, his goals are substantially similar to mine. He spoke of the need to rebuild the once vibrant salmon runs which so much define the people of the Northwest and their culture. He wants to accomplish that soon, and so do I. He wants the Pacific Northwest—and the United States—to continue to benefit from the magnificent Federal Columbia River Power System, and I think he's right on target.

During his remarks, however, he drew an interesting parallel between this issue and the spotted owl controversy that has vexed our region for so many years. He said, in effect, that while owls are important, they should not be more important than people. I do not think any right-thinking person ever argued that owls should be more important than people; I know I have not. But most people know the real issue has been the gradual degradation of the public forests for which the owl became a symbol. The public has soundly rejected overcutting and overexploitation of the national forests, in favor of ecosystem management approach currently embodied by the Northwest forest plans.

The senior Senator suggests that—like his approach to the spotted owl—we should restore fish, but not at the expense of anyone else. I think that he fundamentally misjudges the differences between the salmon issue and the spotted owl issue. This is not as simple as jobs versus owls. Unlike the owl, salmon are firmly identified with people. They are part of people's basic vision of the Northwest, and they are part of the economic foundation on which our great State has been built. Salmon mean jobs. They put a roof over the heads of fishers and their families. They are at the spiritual center of native American cultures. They are at the core of many family relationships; how many parents have taken their child out for his or her very first fishing trip?

And the decline of salmon has sent a horrendous ripple effect through our economy, through our State, our politics, and even our international relations. The decline of salmon has driven fishers from Washington and Oregon up to Alaska. It has driven parents out of homes. It has created tension between politicians from neighboring States. Lawsuits have been filed. Indian peoples have threatened to enforce their treaty rights. Canada has taken a punitive line against our fishing boats, and our treaty with them has fallen into serious dispute. Why? Because the Federal Government has not taken care of our salmon runs. It is as simple as that, and it's a problem we can fix.

My colleague from Washington correctly points out that the administrative agreement reached last week to