

in battle, for every victim of terror, knew that when an opportunity for peace presented itself, he must seize it. A pragmatic conclusion to be sure, but also a morally-centered one.

I was privileged to attend Yitzhak Rabin's funeral last week in Jerusalem, the city of his birth. He is buried among Israel's fallen heroes on Mount Herzl, and there could be no more appropriate place. He was a patriot and hero for Israel as a soldier and a leader, in wars of survival and in the struggle for peace.

The funeral was a powerful testimony to his achievements. Yitzhak Rabin, the military hero, was saluted by weeping soldiers, and buried with full military honors. Yitzhak Rabin, the peacemaker, was honored by the entire world. Dozens of heads of state and foreign dignitaries, from every corner of the globe, came to pay their respects. There could be no greater evidence of the incredible progress made by Yitzhak Rabin toward peace and ending Israel's isolation.

Most inspiring of all was the presence of leaders from seven Arab countries—Jordan, Egypt, Morocco, Tunisia, Qatar, Oman, and Mauritania—and the Palestinian Authority. Such a thing could not have happened even 3 years ago. The peace that Yitzhak Rabin was striving to build was brought to life by the presence of President Mubarak of Egypt, on his first visit to Israel, and by Jordan's King Hussein, who called Rabin "my brother."

It now falls to Shimon Peres, Israel's acting Prime Minister, to continue the work of his partner, Yitzhak Rabin. Israel is fortunate to have such a wise and capable leader ready to step in to the void created by this tragedy. Shimon Peres has served Israel with distinction over many years as Prime Minister, Foreign Minister, Defense Minister, and many other posts.

Shimon Peres is in many ways the architect of the Israeli-Palestinian agreements, and his commitment to achieving a comprehensive peace that protects Israel's security is unquestioned. If there is any consolation in this time of grief, it is that Yitzhak Rabin's partner, Shimon Peres, who shared Rabin's vision, will be able to carry that vision forward.

As the tributes to Yitzhak Rabin continue to flow forth from around the world, we must rededicate ourselves to supporting Israel in its pursuit of peace. It is a sad irony that at the moment of Yitzhak Rabin's death, Congress had allowed the Middle East Peace Facilitation Act—which Rabin considered essential to the success of his peace policies—to lapse.

While this problem was rectified following the funeral, we know that Congress will have many future opportunities to express support for the peace process. When we fail to do so, we undermine Israel's peace efforts and dishonor Yitzhak Rabin's legacy.

Let us commit to one another and to the memory of Yitzhak Rabin, that we

will place support for Israel's peace efforts above partisan or political disputes. Bringing peace to Israel and the Middle East—which was Rabin's life's work—deserves to be such a priority. If we fail to do this, all our words and tributes in praise of Yitzhak Rabin will ring hollow.

Let us also commit ourselves to condemning violence and the incendiary rhetoric of extremists, wherever we find it. The painful lesson of Rabin's death is that violent words can indeed have violent consequences. Tragically, "Death to Rabin" was not just a slogan. It is up to all of us to isolate those who use such words.

Israel and the world have lived 10 days without Yitzhak Rabin, and we are far poorer for his loss. While the pain does not fade easily, his memory can be a source of comfort. This past Sunday night, at the conclusion of the 7-day mourning period, tens of thousands of Israelis returned to the site of his assassination—renamed Yitzhak Rabin Square—and sang songs of peace in his honor.

For Israel, for the Jewish people, and for all who loved and respected Yitzhak Rabin, may his memory be a blessing. In death as in life, may he give hope and strength to his people.●

#### RECOGNITION OF MINNESOTA TEACHER OF THE YEAR

● Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, I would like to take this opportunity to recognize an outstanding Minnesotan who has been chosen as Minnesota's "Teacher of the Year."

A resident of Owatonna, MN, Donald Johnson has been teaching for more than 27 years. This year he was selected as teacher of the year for his significant contributions to education.

Described by his principal at Owatonna Senior High School as a teacher who "lights up the classroom," Mr. Johnson specializes in history with a focus on American, European, art, and religious history.

Known for his quick wit and sense of humor, Mr. Johnson never shrinks from a challenge and never settles for the old way of teaching. He is always looking for new and innovative curriculum to challenge himself and bring out the best in his students.

Teachers like Donald Johnson represent the key to America's future. As our children face the challenges of the 21st century, it is dedicated educators like Mr. Johnson who accept the challenge of turning the young people of today into the leaders of tomorrow.

Mr. President, I hope that you and the rest of our Senate colleagues will join me in congratulating one of America's outstanding educators.●

#### TRIBUTE TO LT. GEN. WILLIAM M. KEYS

● Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I rise to pay tribute to a great American, Lt. Gen. William M. Keys, who recently re-

tired from the U.S. Marine Corps. General Keys was awarded the Distinguished Service Medal in recognition of his exceptional service during the last few years of his long career. From the jungles of Vietnam to the sands of Kuwait, General Keys answered the call to duty, and today, on behalf of all Senators, I pause to thank him.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of his award citation be printed in the RECORD.

The text of the citation follows:

CITATION TO ACCOMPANY THE AWARD OF THE  
DEFENSE DISTINGUISHED SERVICE MEDAL TO  
WILLIAM M. KEYS

Lieutenant General William M. Keys, United States Marine Corps, distinguished himself by exceptionally distinguished service as Commander, United States Marine Forces, Atlantic, from June 1991 to July 1994. General Keys displayed dynamic leadership, doctrinal and operational boldness, and dogged determination in aggressively pursuing initiatives that enhanced the Force's ability to successfully prevail on the joint battlefield. He significantly improved the Commanders-in-Chief's ability to best utilize the operational capabilities of all the forces available. With the establishment of the United States Atlantic Command (USACOM) as the joint force integrator for CONUS-based forces, General Keys' leadership was crucial in shaping and defining many joint warfare concepts, including the standardized development of the Joint Air Force Component Commander (JFACC) concept within USACOM and United States Pacific Command. As Joint Task Force Commander for Ocean Venture 92, he built upon improved communications capabilities and better joint tactics, techniques, and procedures within the JFACC/JTCB. He also played a key role in the development of joint training concepts and exercise schedules currently emerging from USACOM. The distinctive accomplishments of General Keys culminate a distinguished career in the service of his country and reflect great credit upon himself, the United States Marine Corps, and the Department of Defense.●

#### LIECHTENSTEIN-BASED LOTTERY ROLLS OUT ON INTERNET

● Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I ask that the following article be printed in the RECORD.

The article follows:

[From Reuters News Service, Oct. 3, 1995]

#### LIECHTENSTEIN-BASED LOTTERY ROLLS OUT ON INTERNET

LONDON.—A new international lottery, licensed by the government of the tiny European principality of Liechtenstein, was launched via the Internet Tuesday.

InterLotto will give the world's 50 million Internet users the opportunity every week to win a jackpot of at least \$1 million by dialing up a new World Wide Web page on the Internet computer network.

"It is the first government-licensed lottery on the Internet," David Vanrenen, chairman of the International Lottery in Liechtenstein Foundation, told a news conference.

The launch in London, headquarters of the computer services firm Micro Media Services Ltd, which provides the hardware and technology for InterLotto, came on the heels of controversy over Britain's National Lottery.

The opposition Labor Party Monday criticized the National Lottery for making profits and there have been jibes that the lottery funds elitist causes.

Interlotto officials said players could nominate charities to receive awards. At least five percent of InterLotto revenues will go to charity initially with 65 percent going in prize money and the rest going toward paying costs.

"Every time you book a ticket, you enter a nomination for a charity," Vanrenen said. The foundation, authorized and controlled by the Liechtenstein government, is operating InterLotto.

Liechtenstein, a tax-free country of 30,000 residents wedged between Switzerland and Austria, will not receive any money from the lottery which is non-profit-making.

The government will select charities to receive donations. Ticket purchasers will then vote to decide which of the selected groups receive funds. Organizers hope to sell one million tickets a week by the end of the year.

The British National Lottery donates 28 percent of its revenues to good causes and charities. Like most other government-run lotteries in Europe, the British lottery pays out 50 percent of revenues in prize money. •

#### BUDGET RECONCILIATION VOTES

• Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, during consideration of the Budget Reconciliation Act of 1995, the Senate conducted a remarkable number of rollcall votes, including a record 39 votes on Friday, October 27. I want to take some time now to discuss several of the more critical votes about which I was unable to comment at the time.

First of all, Mr. President, I generally voted against motions to waive the Budget Act for amendments that resulted in higher deficits and amendments to strike budget savings in the bill because they would have moved us away from the goal of balancing the budget by the year 2002. These amendments included the Jeffords amendment on two-part dairy, the Specter amendment to strike all of the savings derived from the Medicare disproportionate share payments, and the Moy-nihan amendment to strike the indirect medical payments provisions. Aside from the respective merits of each amendment, their adoption would have resulted in a deficit in the year 2002, taking the reconciliation package out of balance and causing us to miss our primary goal in this budget process—enactment of a balanced budget.

Second, I voted against amendments to roll back the \$245 billion in tax relief for middle-class families and small businesses. As I have noted previously, as a consequence of the \$900 billion in savings generated from our budget over 7 years, the Congressional Budget Office estimates that an economic dividend will accrue to the Federal Government. In my mind, this tiny surplus belongs to the taxpayers who make all the other Government programs possible, and for that reason, I opposed all amendments to reduce the size of the tax cut. These amendments included the Rockefeller motion to reduce the savings from Medicare to \$89 billion and to offset this reduction by reducing the tax cuts by a like amount; the Bumpers amendment to delay the tax cut for 7 years; the Dorgan-Harkin-

Kennedy amendment to limit the capital gains tax reduction; the Lautenberg amendment to prohibit high-income people from benefiting from the lower taxes; the Baucus amendment to strip out the tax cuts in order to avoid any reductions in spending that might impact rural America; the Simon-Conrad substitute amendment to strike the tax cuts and entitlement reforms; and the Byrd amendment to strike the tax cuts altogether.

As I have said previously, I fully support providing American families and businesses with this modest tax cut. The Republican budget projects that the Federal Government will spend about \$12 trillion over the next 7 years. The tax cut included in this bill would return to the taxpayers just a fraction of that amount. This is certainly reasonable, especially considering the primary beneficiaries of these tax cuts are low- and middle-income families—families that have seen their Federal tax burden rise dramatically over the past 40 years.

Mr. President, let me comment on the Rockefeller motion in particular. The effort to tie the tax cuts included in the budget reconciliation bill with the necessary reforms made to Medicare is disingenuous. With or without tax cuts, the Medicare trustees have stated in no uncertain terms that the Medicare trust fund will go insolvent in 2002. The Senate reconciliation bill makes the fundamental reforms necessary to keep Medicare solvent and it lays the foundation for long-term reform of the Medicare system. These reforms have nothing to do with any tax cuts included in the bill and everything to do with preserving Medicare for future generations.

Mr. President, there were a few amendments offered that pertained to the treatment of low-income families. I opposed Senator BRADLEY'S motion to increase spending for the earned income tax credit by raising unspecified taxes. While the basic premise and goals of the earned income tax credit are sound, it is apparent that the program is in need of reform. As was stated clearly during the debate, the EITC has suffered in recent years from fraud and abuse. According to the Governmental Accounting Office, the EITC has an error and fraud rate of between 30 and 40 percent. Aside from cheating the taxpayers, this problem is also cheating deserving families from receiving payments for which they are eligible.

Under this budget, spending on the ETIC Program will continue to increase, from \$19.8 billion this year to \$22.8 billion in 2002. As a result, the maximum credit available to low-income families with two children will increase from \$3,110 this year to \$3,888 in the year 2002. Contrary to what was argued during debate, EITC payments don't go down under this legislation, they go up.

Another amendment worth commenting upon was the Breaux amendment to

make the \$500 per child family tax credit refundable against employee-paid payroll taxes by limiting the tax credit to children under 16 years of age and phasing it out to families with incomes between \$60,000 and \$75,000. As I noted at the time, I support making the \$500 family tax credit refundable against employee-paid payroll taxes. Nevertheless, I opposed this amendment because it would unfairly exclude many middle-class families who also need this relief. In my State of Michigan, there are many families where both the husband and the wife work. It's not hard to imagine a family where the husband is an auto worker, the wife is a teacher, and their combined incomes are well above the arbitrary cut-off established by the Breaux amendment. Furthermore, there are many families with children aged 16 or 17 who will also lose out under the Breaux amendment. I should point out that teenagers are just as expensive as younger children—if not more; I don't need to remind anyone just how much college costs these days, or car insurance for that matter. Parents of children aged 16 and 17 are struggling to make ends meet too, and they need the tax relief the Breaux amendment would take from them. It is my hope that FICA refundability will be raised during conference and that a solution will be adopted to provide tax relief to as many American families as possible.

Another group of amendments related to Medicare, Medicaid, and other health related matters. Senator GRAHAM of Florida offered a motion to recommit the reconciliation bill to the Finance Committee in an effort to reinstate the Federal entitlement and reduce the level of savings from the Medicaid program proposed in the Republican bill. This was, in essence, a killer amendment. As with the Rockefeller Medicare motion to recommit, the Graham amendment struck at the core of our efforts to balance the Federal budget by the year 2002.

Republicans believe it is time to end the Washington knows best mentality that dominates our budget policies and programs. Under our budget, we want to give the States more control over the Medicaid Program in exchange for an overall reduction in the growth rate of the program. The States have proven that they can deliver government services more efficiently and at less cost if they are given the freedom to do so. The Republican bill does that by placing fewer strings on the funds it provides to the States while focusing its resources on those workers on the frontlines—providing direct assistance to the needy.

There were separate amendments offered by Senators CHAFEE and DODD related to Medicaid eligibility issues. I voted to maintain the Medicaid eligibility criteria already included in the reconciliation bill by the Finance Committee. The Chafee and Dodd amendments would have mandated to the